



1
2
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
5 December 16, 2021

6
7 **PRESENT:** Chair Bobbi Jo Blake, Commissioners Jeffrey Butler, Peter Steele, Lisa Coombs,
8 Todd Fugal, Tim Clyde, Dustin Phillips, Jim Martineau.

9
10 **STAFF:** Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Kirsten Argall, Planning Tech;
11 Aaron Wilson, City Engineer; Kara Kresser, Planning Assistant

12
13 **EXCUSED:** Lindsey Hargett

14
15 Chair Bobbi Jo Blake called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

16
17 **Commission Business:**

18
19 **1. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Todd Fugal led the Pledge
20 of Allegiance. Commissioner Tim Clyde offered the opening remarks.

21
22 **2. Agenda Approval.**

23
24 Chair Blake announced several changes to the agenda. Item 5, (Public Hearing: Rezone – Located
25 at approximately 202 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Sam White's Lane Neighborhood) was
26 continued indefinitely. Item 7, (Public Hearing: Vicinity Plan Amendment – located at
27 Approximately 1130 West State Road. Mud Hole Neighborhood) was canceled. Item 8 (Public
28 Hearing: Rezone – Located at Approximately Garden Drive and 600 West. Mud Hole
29 Neighborhood) and Item 9 (Public Hearing: Text Amendment – Section 10-11D-16E: Multiple-
30 Family Residential Development Requirements) were both continued to the next Planning
31 Commission meeting to be held on December 21, 2021.

- 32
33 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Dustin Phillips moved to APPROVE the agenda as
34 modified by Chair Blake. Commissioner Lisa Coombs seconded the motion. The
35 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
36

1 **3. Staff Reports:**

- 2
- 3 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports.
4 Commissioner Jeffrey Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners
5 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
6

7 **4. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.**

8

9 There were no declarations or abstentions.
10

11 **ITEM 1 - Public Hearing: Vicinity Plan Amendment – Located at Approximately 1034 East**
12 **300 South.**
13 **(Scratch Grave Neighborhood)**

14 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Jackson Jones to Amend the Vicinity Plan for Future
15 Local Roads Near 300 South and Future 1100 East, Near Property located at approximately 1034
16 East 300 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) and RAO (Residential Agricultural
17 Overlay) Zone.
18

19 **ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at Approximately 1034**
20 **East 300 South.**
21 **(Scratch Grave Neighborhood)**

22 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Jackson Jones for a Six-Lot Preliminary Subdivision
23 Plat, called Loader Estates Plat 'B' on Property located at approximately 1034 East 300 South in
24 the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) and RAO (Residential Agricultural Overlay) Zone.
25

26 The above two items were heard together but voted on separately.
27

28 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, prior to any presentation expressed his
29 appreciation to Rylee Hall, City Planner, who has been with the City for three years and is moving
30 out of the State. She will be missed. Chair Blake also thanked Ms. Hall for her service. Director
31 Cardenas also expressed his appreciation to the Planning Commission for its work on behalf of
32 Pleasant Grove.
33

34 In relation to the first two Items presented, Director Cardenas indicated that the applicant is seeking
35 a Vicinity Plan amendment and approval of a new subdivision plat called Loader Estates Plat 'B'.
36 Currently, all the proposed lots are part of an existing plat, Loader Estates Plat 'A', but on approval
37 and recordation of the proposed plat, Loader Estates Plat 'A' will be vacated, and the entire
38 property encompassed by the existing plat will become Loader Estate Plat 'B'. The land currently
39 is vacant and composed of one lot and a large parcel.
40

41 Showing an image of the Property Zoning Map, the location of the subject property was identified
42 as approximately 1100 East and 300 South. It will be developed into a subdivision containing six

1 different residential lots. The property is zoned R1-9 (Single Family Residential) and RAO
2 (Residential Agricultural Overlay). Director Cardenas identified the various uses of the
3 neighboring land. Referencing an aerial map of the area, he stated that 1100 East will be dedicated
4 as a public road and continued through to 300 South. All of the lots meet the minimum requirement
5 zone R1-9 with the exception of Lot 2, which is a flag lot, and does not meet frontage requirements.
6

7 Director Cardenas displayed an Existing Vicinity Plan and identified the cul-de-sacs to the north
8 and south and stated that the cul-de-sac portion of the design is to be changed. Specifically, instead
9 of providing a cul-de-sac (which is a City road), the Applicant wishes to create a flag lot concept
10 to access proposed Lot 2 only. This change means that Lot 2 would have stem access that is
11 considered private property without City services. City requirements for flag lots were found to
12 be met by the proposed plan. Staff determined that two flag lots are appropriate in the proposed
13 plat, as City Code states the use of flag lots is intended to be restricted to the interior or narrow,
14 deep parcels not otherwise accessible using residential street standards. Staff did not believe such
15 a change would pose any foreseeable negative impact to the neighboring lots or the community as
16 a whole.
17

18 Using the Preliminary Plat, Loader Estates Plat 'B' drawing, Director Cardenas reported that
19 Lots 1 and 4 will have frontage on 300 South and Lots 3, 5, and 6 will have frontage on 1100 East.
20 Lot 2 was shown to have its own stem for access. The notes did show a problem with the setbacks
21 for the Lot 4 building envelope. A recent change in the Code changed the required 25 feet of
22 setback along the roadway to 10 feet. This change would greatly benefit the applicant as the
23 building envelope would be larger.
24

25 Commissioner Steele indicated on the Existing Plans that note number 3 requires a full
26 Geotechnical Report prior to further subdividing the parcel. He asked if that report had been
27 received. City Engineer, Aaron Wilson responded that the review of paperwork submitted by the
28 applicant had not been completed by engineering, however, they felt there was enough information
29 to be comfortable with the project. He also had spoken with Public Works Director, Marty
30 Beaumont about the comment. Initially, the discussion was about the owner wanting to build his
31 own home on the parcel. The requirement was meant to apply if the owner wished to subdivide
32 the property.
33

34 Chair Blake wanted to know what was west of the stem. Director Cardenas stated that there is
35 another residential property. Chair Blake asked if there was any impact to that property. Engineer
36 Wilson stated that this issue has been extensively evaluated. The existing home lot will be able to
37 develop and split the land and would have direct access to 100 South, making it a no-impact
38 situation. Chair Blake asked if that landowner could potentially use the stem. Engineer Wilson
39 did not know the zoning requirements and if they could split the lot to take advantage of that
40 option.
41

42 It was noted that the applicant was not present.

1
2 Chair Blake opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the
3 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or
4 she would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.
5

6 There was a general discussion among the Commissioners regarding the use of stem roads and the
7 impact of setbacks on the properties. Chair Blake asked if they needed to add anything to the
8 conditions regarding setbacks, as amended, or include reference to the technical reports. Director
9 Cardenas responded that the change in setbacks impacted Lot 4.
10

11 **ITEM 1 - Public Hearing: Vicinity Plan Amendment – Located at Approximately 1034 East**
12 **300 South.**
13 **(Scratch Grave Neighborhood)**

14 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Jackson Jones to Amend the Vicinity Plan for Future
15 Local Roads Near 300 South and Future 1100 East, near Property located at approximately 1034
16 East 300 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) and RAO (Residential Agricultural
17 Overlay) Zone.
18

19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission recommend APPROVAL
20 of the request of Jackson Jones for a Vicinity Plan Amendment for property located at
21 approximately 1034 East 300 South and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff
22 report, and as modified by the condition below:
23

- 24 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
25

26 Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The
27 motion carried.
28

29 **ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at Approximately 1034**
30 **East 300 South.**
31 **(Scratch Grave Neighborhood)**

32 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Jackson Jones for a Six-Lot Preliminary Subdivision
33 Plat, called Loader Estates Plat 'B' on Property located at approximately 1034 East 300 South in
34 the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) and RAO (Residential Agricultural Overlay) Zone.
35

36 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive
37 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Jackson Jones for a subdivision plat called
38 Loader Estates Plat 'B,' on property located at approximately 1034 East 300 South in the R1-9
39 (Single Family Residential) and RAO (Residential Agricultural Overlay) Zone; and adopting the
40 exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:
41

- 42 1. The building envelope for Lot 4 will be corrected prior to recordation.

2. Geotechnical information will be provided to the Engineering Department to their satisfaction.

3. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department Requirements are met.

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

ITEM 3 - Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at Approximately 1095 West Grove Parkway.

(Sam White's Lane Neighborhood)

Public Hearing to Consider the Request of St. John Properties for a One-Parcel Preliminary Commercial Subdivision Plat, called Valley Grove Business Park Plat 'N' on Property located at approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway in The Grove Zone – Interchange Subdistrict.

ITEM 4 - Public Hearing: Site Plan – Located at Approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway.
(Sam White's Lane Neighborhood)

Public Hearing to Consider the Request of St. John Properties for a Site Plan for a Single-Story, Multi-Tenant Retail Building with a Drive-Thru on Property located at approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway in The Grove Zone – Interchange Subdistrict.

The above two items were heard together but voted on separately.

Director Cardenas provided aerial and zoning maps to show the location of the proposed commercial subdivision plat, called Valley Grove Business Park Plat 'N'. He explained that the Interchange Subdistrict has a special requirement that one-half of the uses be self-tax generating uses. The proposed project is being developed by the same applicant who has developed the surrounding land. Referencing the plat currently on the property (Valley Grove Business Park Plat 'A'), he identified Lots 2 through 5. He then indicated that Lots 2 and 3 of the existing plat will be combined to create a single lot to be called Lot 2A. This lot (which is also identified as Lot 4) will be used for a commercial building called Retail A. Director Cardenas indicated that the parking, roads, landscaping, and open space requirements have been met. He also referenced the landscaping, building renderings, and elevations and stated that the zoning requires heavy use of glass and different architectural features to separate out the building and decrease the appearance of massive structures. He noted the presence of similar buildings on the south side of North County Boulevard.

Chair Blake inquired about parking requirements. Director Cardenas stated that the project is one of the last ones reviewed by the City Planner and it appeared that parking was adequate. He did not have the exact number but stated that it was covered in the staff report. He stated that usually the first thing a City Planner checks is parking and open space requirements.

1
2 Chair Blake thought there was a note that the Applicant needed to be responsible for the
3 landscaping on 2000 West and asked what that entailed. City Engineer Wilson indicated that the
4 landscape along 2000 West and North County Boulevard is to be included in the work done. There
5 is a comment about the applicant being responsible for landscaping the area along 2000 West,
6 which is to remain using native plants. City Engineer indicated that the comment was a reference
7 to a particular sidewalk area. There was general discussion regarding landscaping and design in
8 the area taking into consideration the commercial uses of the property.
9

10 It was noted that the applicant was not present.
11

12 Chair Blake opened the public hearing. There was a question raised that was inaudible. Various
13 landmarks on the photograph were identified for clarification. There were no further public
14 comments. The Chair closed the public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the
15 discussion regarding this item or she would entertain a motion if no further discussion was
16 necessary.
17

18 Commissioner Coombs asked about the need for a pedestrian pathway to the public right-of-way.
19 There was general discussion about landscaping related to the land dedicated to The Utah
20 Department of Transportation ("UDOT") and the need for a connection to the sidewalk. Engineer
21 Wilson indicated that the UDOT property is finalizing the design, which is expected to be put out
22 for bid. He stated that there is a point where the developer will need to finish the landscaping.
23 This issue has been dealt with by St. John Properties before on the opposite side of Pleasant Grove
24 Boulevard and will be a part of the Standard Comments pertaining to the development. Chair
25 Blake asked about the stem extension to the west. Commissioner Butler stated that it is an existing
26 road with landscaping. There is a three-story building there and the developer owns the road.
27

28 **ITEM 3 - Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at Approximately 1095**
29 **West Grove Parkway.**

30 **(Sam White's Lane Neighborhood)**

31 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of St. John Properties for a One-Parcel Preliminary
32 Commercial Subdivision Plat, called Valley Grove Business Park Plat 'N' on Property located at
33 approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway in The Grove Zone – Interchange Subdistrict.
34

35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved the Planning Commission forward a recommendation
36 of APPROVAL for the request of St. John Properties for a preliminary subdivision plat called
37 Valley Grove Business Park Plat 'N,' on property located at approximately 1905 West Grove
38 parkway in the Interchange Subdistrict of The Grove Zone, and adopting the exhibits, conditions,
39 and findings of the staff report, as modified by the conditions below:
40

- 41 1. Pedestrian pathways will be provided from public rights of way to building
42 entrances and from furthest parking areas to building entrances.

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

Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**ITEM 4 - Public Hearing: Site Plan – Located at Approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway.
(Sam White's Lane Neighborhood)**

Public Hearing to Consider the Request of St. John Properties for a Site Plan for a Single-Story, Multi-Tenant-Retail Building with a Drive-Thru on Property located at approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway in The Grove Zone – Interchange Subdistrict.

MOTION: Commissioner Coombs moved the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of St. John Properties for the proposed site plan on property located at approximately 1905 West Grove Parkway in the Interchange Subdistrict of The Grove Zone and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:

1. All final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**ITEM 6 - Public Hearing: Rezone – Located at Approximately 749 West Sam White Lane.
(Sam White's Lane Neighborhood)**

Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Galloway and Company, Inc. to Apply the M-D (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone to approximately 7.8 Acres on Property Currently Zoned BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park) Zone, located at approximately 749 West Sam White Lane.

Director Cardenas presented the staff report and stated that the request involves the rezoning of two parcels from the current Business and Manufacturing Park ("BMP") Zone to Manufacturing Distribution ("M-D") Zone. He noted that the area on the map in green is the BMP zone. The subject property is near the Close to My Heart and the doTERRA Operations buildings and is located at 749 West Sam White Lane (or 700 South). The two parcels are on either side of 800 West, which is a public road with both having frontage on West Sam White Lane. Both parcels are considered corner lots. Parcel #468900001 consists of 5.81 acres. Parcel #1404000088 is 1.99 acres in size.

The applicant submitted two site plans, which were under review by staff. During the review, it was determined, according to staff's interpretation of the Code, that the proposed setbacks for the property regarding the front yard do not meet the requirements of the BMP zone. The applicant was given the option to either seek relief by way of a hearing on the Code interpretation by the

1 Pleasant Grove Hearing Officer or see a rezone. The applicant decided to apply for a rezone for
2 both parcels to accommodate the proposed site plan.

3
4 Director Cardenas reported that when the requirements for the BMP zone were originally written,
5 the intent was to create a business park environment with buffer zones between manufacturing
6 zones. In Pleasant Grove, manufacturing zones, unlike other areas, usually are along the freeways.
7 Here, the zones are inside the City. Originally setbacks were in the 40 to 50-foot range regardless
8 of the height of the building. Landscaping requirements were also very specific and detailed.
9 Approximately five years ago, the rules for the BMP zone were made less restrictive. Setbacks
10 were reduced to 25 feet for building up to 20 feet tall. For buildings taller, one foot of setback was
11 added for each foot of elevation. The M-D Zone required a 25-foot setback for buildings up to 55
12 feet in elevation. In addition, the BMP zone does not allow for the manufacturing of raw materials.
13 Rather, light manufacturing, flex space, and office space are allowed. The M-D zone allows the
14 manufacturing of raw materials, such as asphalt plants and transfer stations.

15
16 Director Cardenas shared a visual representation of the General Plan Designation and identified
17 businesses in the area that have the feeling of a business park. The General Plan extends that area
18 to Spectrum Academy and the corner of the subject property. He noted that the applicant has
19 submitted documents that show the architecture and type of materials to be used. The proposed
20 building is like the other buildings in the area. The larger parcel is already mostly surrounded by
21 the M-D Zone, which requires zero setbacks in areas other than the front setback. There are,
22 however, architectural and landscape requirements. There is also a residential zone across the
23 street from the subject property.

24
25 Commissioner Butler noted that the BMP zone goes to the doTERRA Operations building, and if
26 looking at the frontage across the street near to the "Close to My Heart" building, how was
27 doTERRA Operations building not subject to the restrictions of that zone. It was pointed out that
28 the doTERRA Operations building was in the Mixed-Use Zone, and not the BMP zone. Further,
29 Director Cardenas said this area had an overlay, similarly applied by the Planning Commission to
30 a portion of land by the freeway, which allowed for light manufacturing in the Grove Zone.

31
32 Chair Blake asked if the property south of the subject parcel had been developed. Director
33 Cardenas indicated that it was developed into flex space consisting of warehouse, light
34 manufacturing, office, and storage uses. Chair Blake noted that the area had not been rezoned.
35 Director Cardenas did not recall the status of the setbacks east of the Close to My Heart building.

36
37 The applicant, Brad Mylar, was present along with Boyd Preece from Galloway and Company,
38 Inc. Mr. Mylar stated that if they could have the zoning changed the building would be the same
39 as the one identified on the map in terms of height and setbacks. The building would be used for
40 flex space. He then identified the Wildcat Business Park, which is an eight-acre project. At the
41 time it was built, the zone was BMP, but the setbacks were different at the time. If they were

1 allowed to build with the same requirements as Wildcat, they would not need a zone change. Chair
2 Blake stated that the problem with the development is that it is a corner lot.

3
4 Mr. Preece stated they did not have a problem with the BMP Zone. They had been working with
5 Ms. Hall for a long time on the project. The primary issue was the front yard requirement. The
6 height of the proposed building requires them to have a setback of 38 feet. That setback is too
7 large, and because their lots are not as big as the neighboring ones, the requirement puts a huge
8 encumbrance on the property. Their interpretation of the Code differs from the City's. They
9 believe that a 25-foot setback is what is required and would be like other areas including
10 doTERRA. In discussing the available options with staff, they settled on applying for a zone
11 change, which would result in similar-looking buildings.

12
13 Commissioner Clyde pointed out that zoning changes affect both inside and outside activities,
14 which makes this not just a front yard issue. Further, other setbacks are affected if the zoning were
15 changed, and they could go to zero. He asked what the applicant's main concern was. Mr. Preece
16 stated that they were not allowed to have parking in the front of the building but rather would be
17 required to landscape the 38 feet in the front yard. This would eventually mean, for them,
18 decreasing the size of the building. When asked what would be lost on the building, Mr. Preece
19 stated that they would lose 13 feet from the building's length. They assumed that they could build
20 the project like other buildings in the area. When asked about the height of the proposed building,
21 Mr. Preece stated that the building is 28 feet to the roof but there is a façade that goes five feet
22 above the roofline. The City's interpretation was that the higher level should be used with respect
23 to the setback determinations. They could eliminate the façade, but the building would look
24 different. In discussions with Director Cardenas, the zone change seemed like the best approach.
25 He agreed that they could have appealed the decision with the Hearing Officer but the City's
26 position on the matter appeared firm.

27
28 Commissioner Butler, in looking at the two parcels, asked how the applicant would feel if only the
29 larger parcel, which is surrounded on two sides by the M-D Zone was changed rather than both.
30 His concern was that the smaller parcel has residences across the street and in-and-out traffic
31 related to Spectrum Academy, which makes it a busy area. He was also concerned with two
32 monoliths being placed close to the road which might create a visual block creating a safety issue
33 for the Academy and nearby residents. His thought was to rezone the larger parcel to the M-D
34 zone and leave the smaller parcel in the BMP zone. Mr. Cree said they might consider such but
35 said they were here now on an application for a zoning change.

36
37 There was discussion regarding building heights and placement considering the nearby school and
38 residences. Chair Blake asked if rezoning the property would allow for the additional uses allowed
39 in the M-D zone. Director Cardenas indicated that it would allow the additional uses.
40

1 Chair Blake opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the
2 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or
3 she would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.
4

5 Chair Blake expressed concern with the proximity of the project to a residential zone on the smaller
6 lot, the closeness of the school, and the potential for additional uses with the MD zone. A comment
7 was made that there are buildings next to the subject parcel, which has uses that are allowed in the
8 MD zone. It was noted that the residences are across the street.
9

10 Commissioner Fugal stated that they should encourage more industrial properties. The area
11 allowed for such a use is already too small. He further did not see an adverse impact on the
12 residential area. He commented that the setback requirements are already too large and a waste of
13 land.
14

15 Commissioner Phillips commented that if the zoning was changed here, it might encourage the
16 next developer to ask for a similar change, creating a domino effect. There was discussion
17 regarding the pros and cons of sightlines, building heights, setback requirements, and school and
18 safety issues. Concerns were expressed regarding the use requirements for the zones and the
19 impact on nearby residents. The Commission also discussed changing the setback limits, including
20 heights on the BMP Zone.
21

22 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission forward a
23 recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the request of Galloway and Company,
24 Inc. for the rezone of approximately 7.8 acres for property located at 749 West Sam White Lane,
25 from Business and Manufacturing Park ("BMP") Zone to Manufacturing Distribution ("M-D")
26 Zone, and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report. Commissioner Clyde
27 seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Fugal-Aye, Commissioner Clyde-Aye,
28 Commissioner Coombs-Nay, Chair Blake-Nay, Commissioner Steele-Nay, Commissioner
29 Phillips-Aye, Commissioner Butler-Aye. The motion carried 4-to-3.
30

31 **ITEM 10 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the November 18, 2021, Planning**
32 **Commission Meeting.**
33

34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved to APPROVE the minutes from the November 18,
35 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The
36 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
37

38 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. Commissioner
39 Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
40
41
42

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Jodi Blah
Planning Commission Chair

Kara Kresser
Kara Kresser, Planning Tech

1/13/22
Date Approved