



1
2
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
5 July 25, 2019
6

7 **PRESENT:** Chair Dustin Phillips, Vice-Chair Tamara Oborn, Commissioners Lisa Coombs,
8 Peter Steele, Bobbie Jo Blake, Jeffrey Butler, Tim Clyde, and Todd Fugal (Alternate)
9

10 **STAFF:** Rylee Hall, City Planner; Shaun Hilton, Staff Engineer; Kara Kresser; Planning Tech
11

12 Chair Phillips opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
13

14 **Commission Business:**
15

16 1. **Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Steele led the Pledge of Allegiance.
17

18 2. **Opening Remarks:** Vice-Chair Oborn gave the opening remarks.
19

20 3. **Agenda Approval:**
21

- 22 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved to APPROVE the agenda as part of
23 public record, as written. Commissioner Blake seconded the motion. The
24 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
25

26 4. **Staff Reports:**
27

- 28 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved to APPROVE the staff reports as part of
29 the public record. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners
30 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
31

32 5. **Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members:** Commissioner
33 Fugal declared a conflict with Item 1.
34

1 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Deny Farnworth to Amend the Vicinity Plan**
2 **for Future Local Roads Near 200 South, and Future 825 East, Near Property Located at**
3 **Approximately 950 East 200 South in the R-1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. SCRATCH**
4 **GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD**
5

6 *NOTE: Commissioner Fugal recused himself from the discussion.*
7

8 Rylee Hall, City Planner presented the staff report regarding a vicinity plan amendment at the
9 property listed above. She presented the current vicinity plan that was adopted in 2014, and the
10 proposed vicinity plan. The goal of a vicinity plan was to provide long-range planning for local
11 neighborhood streets in undeveloped areas of Pleasant Grove. For the proposed amendment, the
12 affected properties were zoned R-1-10 and R-1-9. The applicant was requesting the amendment
13 to the vicinity plan to facilitate the development of a subdivision plat. The existing vicinity plan
14 showed an interconnected road with two access points connecting 200 South to 100 South.
15

16 The proposed amendment would eliminate these access points in exchange for a single east-west
17 connection ending in a cul-de-sac. This would provide the applicant with the greatest number of
18 lots. In the Pleasant Grove City Code, the maximum length of a block is 1,300 feet. The proposed
19 vicinity plan includes a length of 1,900 feet. Generally, this would not be approved without
20 another north-south connection. The Planning Commission's role in the request was to consider
21 the relationship to existing and future roadways and developments to ensure that new
22 developments can be adequately serviced, and then make a recommendation to the City Council.
23 Staff recommended denial of the proposed vicinity plan.
24

25 Commissioner Phillips asked about the reasoning behind the regulation for 1,300-foot blocks.
26 Staff Engineer, Shaun Hilton was not sure of the exact science behind the regulation.
27

28 The applicant, Deny Farnworth, stated that they have been working on the application since
29 November. In November, they tried to work with the current vicinity plan, but it was not feasible
30 due to engineering constraints regarding the elevation change. He worked with the DRC and with
31 City Engineering and Public Works and had spent thousands of dollars coming up with different
32 plans. He was aware that the neighbors do not want the road to go through because they would
33 see a lot of high school traffic on that road. There was also an existing ditch, piping, and the grade
34 of property to consider. He noted that there was no easement for the ditch and piping, which is
35 why it was not showing up on the map.
36

37 Commissioner Clyde asked Mr. Farnworth if he had considered flipping the cul-de-sac to access
38 100 South instead of 200 South. Mr. Farnworth stated that he had considered it but it worked
39 better for the neighboring property owner this way.
40

1 Project Engineer, Mark Greenwood explained that the grade of the property is 10% in the location
2 where the road is located on the current vicinity plan. He also described issues with the ditch and
3 the piping.

4
5 Commissioner Coombs asked if it was possible for the applicant to conform to the existing vicinity
6 plan. Mr. Greenwood stated that they could not. Using the map, he identified the area that was
7 not suited for a roadway.

8
9 Engineer Hilton stated that the north-south connection on the existing vicinity plan is not feasible,
10 but a north-south connection is possible further to the west. They also had to consider that the
11 length of the block exceeds City standards. The proposed cul-de-sac could be a thru-street, which
12 would cause the applicant to lose one lot.

13
14 Mr. Farnworth described his discussions with other property owners in the area and how he had
15 considered their future developments.

16
17 The Planning Commission discussed other options for connectivity and Mr. Farnworth described
18 some of the other plans he had come up with.

19
20 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

21
22 Planner Hall read a letter staff had received from a resident. The resident expressed their support
23 for the proposed vicinity plan amendment.

24
25 Harry Payne gave his address as 835 East 100 South and stated that any development that occurs
26 on the subject property will impact his home because they are on the corner. He supported the
27 new vicinity plan because it will help spread traffic out. Currently, teenagers park up and down
28 the street during school hours, disregarding the No Parking signs. He noted that the parking
29 restrictions are not being enforced by the police.

30
31 Joann Munk was present representing her parents, Victor and Laurie Hammond, as they were
32 unable to attend. They own property at 950 East 140 South in Pleasant Grove, although they
33 currently reside at Ashford Assisted Living in Springville. Mrs. Monk explained that her mother
34 inherited the property from her parents and over the years had purchased other properties
35 contiguous to theirs. Mr. and Mrs. Hammond were concerned that their property would be greatly
36 impacted by the intended development. She read a letter written by Mr. Hammond to the Planning
37 Commission. He was opposed to any plan that included a road on the northern border of their
38 property.

39
40 Barbara Payne, who resides at 835 East 100 South, stated that if the roadway comes though, it will
41 run right up to their home. She was worried about teenage drivers causing damage to their property

1 and the property of the neighbors. She commented that the proposed vicinity plan amendment is
2 probably the best.

3
4 Carol Harmer gave her address as 755 East 100 South and indicated that she was a long-time
5 resident of Pleasant Grove and once served on the City Council. She requested that the road not
6 be required to go through. She understood the City's position on having connectivity, but in this
7 case, she did not support it.

8
9 Vice-Chair Oborn stated that the proposed vicinity plan amendment shows 100 South going
10 through, while the existing vicinity plan does not. The applicant presented the Planning
11 Commission with a copy of the first vicinity plan amendment he created, which he felt best suits
12 the neighborhood and the City. He clarified that some of the neighbors expressed support for this
13 vicinity plan. Commissioner Coombs commented that there would be the same concerns with
14 connectivity with this plan. She reminded the Commission and the residents that they could
15 discuss this alternate plan tonight but action can only be taken on the plan that was noticed on the
16 agenda.

17
18 Jay Harmer gave his address as 755 East 100 South and was in favor of keeping 100 South from
19 becoming a thru street.

20
21 Harry Payne clarified that he supported the plan proposed on the agenda.

22
23 Dale Munk supported the alternative vicinity plan that was not noticed. He did not support 100
24 South going through.

25
26 Bob Oscarson, was present on behalf of Margaret Thorne, who is in favor of the cul-de-sac
27 proposal. He was not certain of her position on 100 South. Mr. Oscarson also lives in the area
28 and briefly described his concerns about traffic.

29
30 There were no further public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing and invited the
31 Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or that he would entertain a
32 motion if no further discussion is necessary.

33
34 Vice-Chair Oborn stated that the proposed vicinity plan is outside of the City's standard for
35 maximum block length. The role of the Planning Commission is to make sure that the proposal
36 follows the Code.

37
38 Commissioner Steele commented that the Planning Commission would be making a
39 recommendation to the City Council on this matter. The existing Code does not provide for any
40 exceptions to the 1,300-foot rule.

Commissioner Coombs assumed that the City Council would still prefer to have connectivity between 200 South and 100 South. If the Planning Commission makes a recommendation of denial, it is possible that the City Council could override that recommendation and approve the request.

MOTION: Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council DENY the request of Deny Farnworth for a vicinity plan amendment for property located at approximately 950 East 200 South in the R-1-10 and R-1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zones, based on the following findings:

1. The proposed vicinity plan would include a block length over 1,300 feet.
2. The Planning Commission recommends that the Council consider requiring a north-south connection between 800 East and 850 East, and a provision for a pedestrian access along the alignment of 100 South connecting to Andersen Park and 950 East. [TF1]

Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioner unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

NOTE: Prior to the vote on Item 1, Commissioner Blake was excused from the remainder of the meeting. Commissioner Fugal and Commissioner Clyde would both be voting members for the following item.

ITEM 2 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Clare Moon to Amend City Code Section 10-14-24-1-C3: The Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Conditional Uses, by Changing the Conditions and Requirements for the Establishment of Use #6399: Reception Centers, within The Grove Zone and limited to the Commercial Sales Subdistrict. SAM WHITE'S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD *Continued from the July 11, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.

Planner Hall gave a brief overview of the request to change the conditional use requirement for Reception Centers in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. The discussion at the last meeting focused on pairing the reception center use to another allowed use that generates sales tax. Staff felt it was important for the reception center use to remain subsidiary to another use and conditional. The applicant proposed the removal of two of the conditions outlined in the Code for the reception center use, but the Planning Commission discussed other options. The item was continued so that the City Attorney could review and recommend language that would adequately tie the reception center use to a sales tax generating use. Planner Hall stated that Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas passed the request onto the City Attorney. However, Planner Hall was provided no feedback from either party prior to the meeting.

The applicant, Clare Moon, stated that it was her understanding that the continuance was requested because the Commission wanted further clarification on the definition of "subsidiary". She

1 thought that their concern pertained more to Condition B. She respectfully requested that the
2 Commission take action tonight rather than continue it again.

3
4 Commissioner Coombs stated that the Legal Department would still have to approve any language
5 proposed by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Steele added that they could include a
6 condition of approval based on the City Attorney approving the language, which would allow the
7 item to go to the City Council rather than coming back to the Planning Commission. Staff
8 confirmed that this was a viable option for the Commission tonight.

9
10 Commissioner Butler reported that he believes services for a reception or event are not currently
11 taxable, however, if the applicant intends to serve drinks there that could be purchased, that would
12 be taxable. Ms. Moon agreed that that is the case unless drinks are included in the rental price.

13
14 Commissioner Clyde stated that the issue pertains more to zoning.

15
16 Commissioner Butler commented that one of the purposes of the Commercial Sales Subdistrict is
17 to create developments that “contribute to the creation of a unique, signature image or the City that
18 encourages pedestrian activity, social interaction, and a quality shopping experience”. He believed
19 that a reception center fits into this description. He did not see a need to require a certain
20 percentage of sales tax uses.

21
22 Commissioner Steele reminded the Commission that this amendment will affect more than just the
23 applicant’s property and they need to consider the entire zone. The Commission discussed the
24 likelihood of other large reception centers being constructed in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict.
25 Commissioner Clyde commented that the concerns about development in the zone are different
26 now than they were four years ago.

27
28 Commissioner Butler asked Ms. Moon about the traffic of the existing food truck courts in
29 Holladay and South Jordan. She stated that both food truck courts have been very successful. The
30 Holladay location is very walkable and saw a lot of foot traffic. She commented that the food
31 truck court would be her main intent for the property. The event space would be secondary.

32
33 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed
34 the public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item
35 or that he would entertain a motion if no further discussion is necessary

36
37 There was brief discussion regarding the motion and Commissioner Fugal proposed that they
38 eliminate all of the existing conditions and create one new condition that would require the
39 reception center use be secondary to another sales tax generating use.

40
41 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City
42 Council APPROVE the request of Clare Moon for the proposed amendments to City Code Section

1 10-14-24-1C3: The Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Conditional Uses; and adopting the
2 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions
3 below:
4

5 1. In Use #6399, Subparagraphs A, B, and C be eliminated and replaced with a new
6 subparagraph stating: "shall only be subordinate in the same lot or parcel to a permitted or
7 conditional use that generates sales tax".
8

9 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met; and,
10

11 3. The proposed amendment language is subject to a legal review and approval from the City
12 Attorney.
13

14 Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The
15 motion carried.
16

17 **ITEM 3 – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the July 11, 2019 Planning Commission**
18 **Meeting.**
19

20 Commissioner Fugal briefly described the redline change he made to the minutes.
21

22 **MOTION:** Vice-Chair Oborn moved to APPROVE the minutes from the July 11, 2019 Planning
23 Commission meeting, as amended by Commissioner Fugal. Commissioner Steele seconded the
24 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
25

26 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m. Commissioner
27 Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion
28 carried.
29

30
31 
32 _____
33 Planning Commission Chair

34 
35 _____
36 Kara Kresser, Planning Tech

37 8/8/2019
38 Date Approved