

# Pleasant Grove



Utah's City of Trees

1  
2  
3 **PLEASANT GROVE CITY**  
4 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
5 **MAY 23, 2024**  
6

7 **PRESENT:** Chair Karla Patten, Commissioners Dustin Phillips, Jeffrey Butler, Todd Fugal, Jim  
8 Martineau, Alicia Redding, Kenna Nelson  
9

10 **STAFF:** Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Jacob Hawkins, City Planner;  
11 Aaron Wilson, City Engineer; Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant; Magali Acevedo,  
12 Administrative Assistant  
13

14 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Wendy Shirley, Denise Trickler  
15

16 Chair Karla Patten called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
17

18 **REGULAR SESSION**  
19

20 **Commission Business:**  
21

22 1. **Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Nelson led the Pledge of  
23 Allegiance. Commissioner Phillips offered the opening remarks.  
24

25 2. **Agenda Approval.**  
26

- 27 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Redding moved to APPROVE the agenda.  
28 Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously  
29 voted "Yes". The motion carried.  
30

31 3. **Staff Reports:**  
32

- 33 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports, with  
34 a correction to the name of the applicant as noted in Item 5. Commissioner Butler  
35 seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion  
36 carried.  
37

38 4. **Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.**  
39

40 There were no declarations or abstentions.  
41

1 **ITEM 1 - Public Hearing: Site Plan—Located at approximately 2067 West Pleasant Grove**  
2 **Boulevard**

3 **(Sam White’s Lane Neighborhood)**

4 Public Hearing to consider the request of St. John’s Properties for a site plan for a commercial  
5 building, located at approximately 2067 West Pleasant Grove Boulevard, in The Grove Zone –  
6 Interchange Subdistrict. (Administrative Item)

8 **ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Site Plan—Located at approximately 2093 West Pleasant Grove**  
9 **Boulevard**

10 **(Sam White’s Lane Neighborhood)**

11 Public Hearing to consider the request of St. John’s Properties for a site plan for a commercial  
12 building, located at approximately 2093 West Pleasant Grove Boulevard, in The Grove Zone –  
13 Interchange Subdistrict. (Administrative Item)

14  
15 The above two items were heard together but voted on separately.

16  
17 City Planner, Jacob Hawkins, presented the Staff Report and stated that the two items are  
18 Commercial Site Plans located in a large development area near the freeway. In addition to the  
19 hotel site plan heard previously, these are the second and third installments for the retail space of  
20 this overall development area that together provide an additional 15,000 square feet of commercial  
21 space. The zoning map was referenced which showed that the property is in The Grove-  
22 Interchange Subdistrict with the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay. The overlay provides  
23 additional amenities and different setback requirements than are typically required in The Grove  
24 Zone. The area is also covered by a Development Agreement that addresses additional design  
25 guidelines and requirements for the area.

26  
27 The following points were addressed about the displayed site plans:

- 28  
29
- 30 • Access to the two properties will be by Valley Grove Way from the north; however, there  
31 is no access from Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
  - 32 • Both buildings are intended for retail uses and require a minimum of 76 parking spaces.  
33 Eighty-six spaces are planned to be between the buildings.
  - 34 • A crosswalk is identified as part of the walkability design of the larger development which  
35 will extend in the future to the east to join with other commercial lots. The crosswalk, per  
36 the Development Agreement, must be delineated by the use of pavers, a change in texture,  
37 or be raised. Staff was still working with the applicant on that particular requirement and  
38 any necessary changes will be made before presentation to City Council.
  - 39 • The Landscape and Open Space Plan shows a combined open space area (marked in green)  
40 of 12.7% for both lots, which exceeds the 10% requirement. Twenty trees are to be planted  
41 within the boundaries of both lots but exclude evergreen trees, as requested by the  
42 applicant. The Design Review Board (“DRB”) approved not using any evergreen trees as  
43 the water table is too high for them to survive.
  - 44 • Renderings of both buildings were shown. The north elevation will be visible from  
45 Pleasant Grove Boulevard at an angle from the overpass. Retail building “N” is 29 feet tall  
at its highest point, and retail building “O” is 34 feet tall.

- 1 • Both buildings use similar building materials that deviate from the materials typically  
2 permitted by The Grove Zone, as the Development Agreement allows more flexibility in  
3 materials as long as the materials are durable and approved by the DRB. The approval  
4 requirement has been met. Building materials include primarily metal and untreated  
5 Cement Block (“CMU”) as shown. Staff recommended approval of both site plans with  
6 all Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements being met.  
7

8 Commissioner Redding asked how the two buildings fit into the overall development plan. It was  
9 noted that the two buildings are the first two retail spaces in the commercial area. As the developer  
10 moves forward with the rest of the overall plan, there will be a promenade, a couple of other  
11 commercial buildings, and a parking garage.  
12

13 As a change was noted from earlier plans about the parking garage placement, Commissioner  
14 Butler asked if the City has any parking space concerns. Planner Hawkins identified the area  
15 where the parking garage is to be located and noted that each commercial building lot will provide  
16 parking for the use of the building. Once they run out of room for parking, the parking garage will  
17 be constructed. The process is a step-by-step development. Commissioner Butler stated that if  
18 the City wants to maximize the retail portion of the development, some of the surface parking  
19 spaces allocated to retail buildings to meet the parking requirements could have been met using  
20 spaces from the parking garage and the City would receive the additional retail space desired.  
21

22 The applicant, Matt Villar from St. John Properties (“SJP”), was present and stated that this is the  
23 first phase of Valley Grove’s six phases that includes the two retail buildings. They will be located  
24 next to one another and share parking. It was noted that it is part of a larger concept plan. Mr.  
25 Villar confirmed that they have taken the Utah Department of Transportation’s (“UDOT”) future  
26 freeway widening plans into account in their development plans.  
27

28 Chair Patten opened the public hearing. There were no public comments, and the hearing was  
29 closed. The Chair invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the item  
30 or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.  
31

32 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved the Planning Commission forward a positive  
33 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of St. John’s Properties for a commercial site plan  
34 for a retail building, located at approximately 2093 West Pleasant Grove Boulevard on property  
35 zoned The Grove – Interchange Subdistrict; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of  
36 the staff report, and that all Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are  
37 met.  
38

39 Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “yes”. The  
40 motion carried.  
41

42 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved the Planning Commission forward a positive  
43 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of St. John’s Properties for a commercial site plan  
44 for a retail building, located at approximately 2067 West Pleasant Grove Boulevard on property  
45 zoned The Grove – Interchange Subdistrict; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of

1 the staff report, and that all Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are  
2 met.

3  
4 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “yes”. The  
5 motion carried.

6  
7 **ITEM 3 – Public Meeting: Preliminary Subdivision Plat–Located at 1408 North 670 West**  
8 **(North Field Neighborhood)**

9 Public Meeting to consider the administrative request of Scott Dent for a 1-lot preliminary  
10 residential subdivision plat, called Makin Dreams Plat ‘B’ on 0.52 acres, located at 1408 North  
11 670 West in the R1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. (Administrative Item)

12  
13 Planner Hawkins presented the Staff Report and stated that the request was from Scott Dent for a  
14 one-lot Preliminary Residential Subdivision Plat. The previous subdivision was called Makin  
15 Dreams Plat ‘A’ and was recorded in Utah County on June 30, 2022. Using both the aerial view  
16 and zoning map, he identified Lots 29 and 30, each of which is greater than 10,000 square feet in  
17 size. He reported that the applicant is seeking to combine them into one lot. This new lot will be  
18 22,600 square feet in size, which far exceeds the requirement of R1-10 Zone to have a minimum  
19 lot size of 10,000 square feet. The building envelope was shown and found to meet the minimum  
20 setback requirements. It was noted that the utility easement between the two lots will be released.  
21 There will be one home on the lot. Staff recommended approval of the request.

22  
23 It was reported that the applicant was not present. Chair Patten stated that because this is a public  
24 meeting, the Commission should continue the discussion regarding the item or put forward a  
25 motion if no further discussion was necessary.

26  
27 **MOTION:** Commissioner Butler moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
28 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Scott Dent for a subdivision plat called Makin  
29 Dreams Plat ‘B’ on property located at approximately 1408 North 670 West on property zoned  
30 R1-10, and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the Staff Report, and as modified by the  
31 condition below:

- 32  
33 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

34  
35 Commissioner Fugal seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Yes”. The  
36 motion carried.

37  
38 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment–Section 10-12A-3: Design Controls**  
39 **(City Wide)**

40 Public Hearing to consider the request of Will Clark to amend City Code Section 10-12A-3: Design  
41 Controls in the Business Manufacturing Park to permit outdoor storage for retail uses in the  
42 Business Manufacturing Park Zone. (Legislative Item)

43  
44 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the Staff Report and expressed  
45 gratitude for what the Planning Commission does. He thanked them for their work. He reported  
46 that the above item is a Code Text Amendment for the Business Manufacturing Park (“BMP”)

1 Zone. Pleasant Grove, unlike other cities, does not have a standard manufacturing zone because  
2 of the configuration of its borders. On a zoning map displayed, he identified the General  
3 Manufacturing area as including the Manufacturing Distribution (“MD”) Zone and the BMP Zone.  
4 He reported that work done in the BMP zone is not as intense as in the MD Zone. An aerial  
5 comparison showed the differing appearance of the two manufacturing areas. It was noted that the  
6 design requirements are minimal for the Manufacturing Distribution Zone. The BMP Zone  
7 contains a lot of flex space and many of the uses take place indoors.

8  
9 Approximately eight years ago, the Code was amended to include additional design controls for  
10 the BMP Zone. Part of the additional requirements pertained to outside storage of displayed  
11 products and limited such storage to 25% of the square footage of the building. The applicant is  
12 seeking to have the Code allow for more outside storage in an orderly manner. Since the term  
13 “orderly manner” could be subjective, the applicant worked with staff to create the proposal  
14 brought to the Commission for consideration.

15  
16 The Commission was shown the applicable Code language and the applicant’s proposed changes.  
17 Staff has worked with the applicant and was comfortable with the proposal. Director Cardenas  
18 described the following changes:

- 19  
20
- The storage of materials in any designated outdoor storage area is to be secondary and subordinate to a permitted retail use. That requirement ensures that the outdoor material being stored is associated with retail uses only.
  - The maximum area that can be used for outdoor storage is not to exceed 25% of the lot area. If the lot area is four acres, then storage can cover one acre.
  - All of the materials are to be retained in a designated alcove area that is attached to or near a building and enclosed by a masonry wall that meets the same standards of The Grove Zone. The wall is to be not less than 10 feet in height. The material cannot be stacked above the height of the wall, as they are trying to keep everything behind a masonry wall. The requirements are simple and can be evaluated as an objective standard is being used.
  - Any gates to the outdoor storage area are to be screened with opaque materials.
  - The designated outdoor storage area shall be in an enclosed side or backyard lot or parcel area. No storage areas are allowed in the front of the building. This is important.
  - A landscape buffer of no less than 10 feet measured from the property line is required. Included should be a sufficient number of mature trees to the extent possible to surround the designated outdoor storage area on all sides not directly attached to or near the main building. The Code includes details about the size of the trees.
  - Any laydown area within the designated space shall be improved with asphalt or concrete.
- 37  
38

39 As the BMP is adjacent to The Grove Zone, it was thought that these standards would keep the  
40 area appropriate. Director Cardenas suggested that the storage space limitation could be the lesser  
41 of 25% of the lot or 1.5 acres, whichever is more restrictive. He confirmed that Sections A through  
42 C and E through G are unchanged. The current D section of the Code would be removed and  
43 replaced by the proposed amendment either identified as D-1 or H.

44  
45 There was discussion on specific lots, how the side and backyard restrictions will work with the  
46 various businesses, and the percentage of coverage to be considered. Director Cardenas was asked

1 how “nearby” was to be determined in relation to compliance. He stated that the applicant could  
2 address that issue as the idea comes up. He preferred to use the term “attached.” Commissioner  
3 Fugal stated that the term, as currently defined, is subjective and difficult to enforce. A change  
4 was made to the proposed wording to remove the word “nearby.” Additionally, there was a  
5 question about whether a solid door, for gating purposes, was acceptable. Such a door would be  
6 acceptable. The word “solid” was added to the proposal. There was brief discussion about the  
7 size of the lots and maximum storage areas. It was noted that the largest lot in the area is nearly  
8 six acres in size.

9  
10 {0:43:10} The applicant, Will Clark, was present representing Dakota Pacific. He reported that  
11 the proposed change was triggered as a result of his company working with Vinyl Industries which  
12 is currently located in Lehi and they are excited to have a project come to this area of Pleasant  
13 Grove. He recognized the sensitivity of being on a lot next to The Grove Zone and wanted to have  
14 changes in the design control for the area that will enhance curb appeal versus how some currently  
15 approved uses look in the MD Zone. The change would apply to all the businesses in the BMP  
16 Zone; however, there are only eight parcels in the zone of which he owns three. Although some of  
17 the design controls are very costly, the number of businesses that will be affected is small, which  
18 reduces the impact. He stated that having the storage attached to, instead of nearby, may not work  
19 for all; and, using an overhead showing two buildings, he noted that storage placement becomes  
20 more difficult because of odd lot shapes and the use of small buildings.

21  
22 Chair Patten opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was  
23 closed. The Chair invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the item  
24 or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

25  
26 There was continued discussion of the proposed changes specifically related to “attached” versus  
27 “nearby,” storage locations, design standards, and landscape issues. The makeup and requirements  
28 of the masonry wall were also discussed with possible modifications raised.

29  
30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved the Planning Commission recommend that the City  
31 Council APPROVE the request of Will Clark for a Code Text Amendment to City Code Section  
32 10-12A-3: Design Requirements, to permit Outdoor Storage for retail uses in the Business  
33 Manufacturing Park Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report as  
34 modified by the condition below:

- 35  
36 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements be met.  
37  
38 2. The wording “nearby” be added back into the language, and the word “solid” remain  
39 in the language, making the proposal as is what is being shown on the screen.

40  
41 Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Phillips-Yes;  
42 Commissioner Butler-Yes; Commissioner Fugal-No; Commissioner Martineau-Yes;  
43 Commissioner Redding-Yes; Commissioner Nelson-Yes; Chair Patten-Yes. The motion passed  
44 6-to-1.

1 **ITEM 5 –Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment–Section 10-9B-9: Building Height**  
2 **(City Wide)**

3 Public Hearing to consider the request of Jory Walker to amend City Code Section 10-9B-9:  
4 Building Height in the R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone to permit graduated setbacks for  
5 single-family residential structures. (Legislative Item)  
6

7 Director Cardenas presented the Staff Report and stated that the Code Text Amendment pertains  
8 to building heights in the R-1 Single-Family Residential zones. In Pleasant Grove, the height of a  
9 structure is measured from the finished grade. Most cities measure from original grade. Currently,  
10 the maximum building height in the single-family residential zone is 35 feet. Where a slope is  
11 present, the highest point of the slope and the lowest point of the slope are measured, and the  
12 middle point or an average is used for the measurement. Citizens complained about building  
13 heights, and he did not claim that all the single-family residential buildings fall within the requisite  
14 height requirements. Mistakes in measurements have been made and/or variances obtained. Also,  
15 sometimes the home, although within Code appears to be out of sync with the ones surrounding it.  
16 It may meet the requirement but appears odd. When the structure is also large, there will be  
17 complaints from neighbors regarding interference of view. The applicant proposes to increase the  
18 maximum height.  
19

20 Chapter 9 of the Code currently addresses the height requirements for single-family residential  
21 zones and limits homes for human occupancy to a height of no more than 35 feet, as measured  
22 from the peak of the roof. Excluded from this requirement are chimneys, flagpoles, church towers,  
23 and similar architectural structures not used for human occupancy. The proposed amendment  
24 increases that maximum height under certain conditions.  
25

26 The applicant's proposal set forth the typical height limitation of 35 feet but then provided an  
27 incremental scale for buildings that might exceed that height requirement as follows:  
28

- 29 • Where the property is a gross aggregate of 2.5 acres or more and has one main structure of  
30 the building exceeding a maximum height, for every five feet or less, the front and back  
31 setbacks are each increased by 20 feet and the side yard is increased by an additional 10  
32 feet. In effect, a skyscraper would be allowed.  
33

34 Director Cardenas concluded that the language needs to be simplified. He provided an example of  
35 how that might appear. For example, in an R-1 Zone where the normal setback is 25 feet in the  
36 front and back and 10 feet on each side, a home that is 40 feet tall would require setbacks of 45  
37 feet in the front and back and 20 feet on each side. There is no height limitation.  
38

39 Director Cardenas reported that based on staff review, he identified the following two main points:  
40

- 41 • There should be a limit on the height requirement. He referred to the Staff Report, which  
42 identifies what neighboring cities provide as maximum heights on residential property. Of  
43 the six cities listed, the tallest structure was found to be 45 feet. Staff proposed to keep the  
44 first paragraph but change the maximum height limit to 45 feet.
- 45 • Staff proposed different incremental requirements to include that buildings in legally  
46 subdivided lots with a minimum area of 2.5 acres may exceed the maximum height of 35

1 feet to a limit of 45 feet. If all of the following conditions are met, for every foot of height  
2 beyond 35 feet, an additional five feet on the front and back setbacks is added and three  
3 feet on each side. This option would address what staff identified as the main issues  
4 pertaining to building heights that include complaints of blocked view, blocked air and  
5 space, blocking of the sun, or that the structure differs from the surrounding structures. He  
6 also noted that the phrase, "similar architectural structures," should be added.  
7

8 Director Cardenas reported that he and Planner Hawkins came up with a factor that would help  
9 quantify visual interference problems. He described how to identify a distance-height ratio that  
10 will provide an adequate amount of space between structures to protect adjacent property owners'  
11 rights to view, light, and air. (See staff report, using a cite triangle to measure rise-to-run ratio.)  
12 For every foot of distance, there can be .7 feet in height. What the applicant and staff are proposing  
13 to do results in a factor that is less intrusive than the .7. It was noted that the ratio is calculated  
14 from the ground level. The setbacks being contemplated as the home heights exceeding 35 feet  
15 were found to be adequate only if there is a maximum height restriction.  
16

17 In response to a question raised, he stated that it is likely that there are homes over 35 feet tall in  
18 Pleasant Grove. If, however, there are such heights, they are due to a variance being approved or  
19 an error. The issue of the impact of larger yards on irrigation was raised and briefly discussed.  
20

21 The applicant, Jory Walker, Principal Architect for Beecher Walker Architects was present along  
22 with Drew Armstrong who was present representing a friend who wants to build a home taller than  
23 35 feet. Mr. Armstrong commented on what occurred at a prior hearing on the variance where it  
24 was being opposed. There was inadequate or misinformation when the configuration of the lot  
25 and the location of the building had not yet been established. He noted that the height restriction  
26 is limited in that there are not many lots where the exception would apply. Mr. Walker described  
27 his educational background and stated that he does historically correct structures. He was asked  
28 to create a historically correct home from the 1840-1850 time period. The home, including the  
29 roof pitches, is designed to be historically accurate for the period. For that reason, he was willing  
30 to fight this battle. Mr. Armstrong stated that they know the Code is to be applicable to the  
31 community and they want it to protect neighbors and the entire community. Mr. Walker added  
32 that estate lots of 2.5 acres or more are allowed additional height because there is more coverage.  
33 For other cities with sites that have larger land masses, the height requirements are increased. He  
34 commented that he did construct a home in Pleasant Grove that had a height of 45 feet. He was  
35 not opposed to a maximum height requirement.  
36

37 Chair Patten opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The hearing was  
38 closed. The Chair invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the item  
39 or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.  
40

41 The impact of increasing the building height was discussed. Director Cardenas asked that a  
42 requirement be added that the provision be reviewed by legal counsel and that the limitation on  
43 the height requirement be added.  
44

45 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City  
46 Council APPROVE the request of Jory Walker for a Code Text Amendment to City Code Section



1 10-9B-9: Building Height, to permit an increase in height for single-family residential structures  
2 with a respective graduated setback; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff  
3 report, and as modified by the conditions below:

- 4  
5 1. The adopted language is subject to review by the City Attorney.  
6  
7 2. Any material changes should be brought back to the Planning Commission for  
8 approval.  
9

10 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Phillips-Yes;  
11 Commissioner Butler-Yes; Commissioner Fugal-Yes; Commissioner Martineau-Yes;  
12 Commissioner Redding-No; Commissioner Nelson-Yes; Chair Patten-Yes. The motion passed 6-  
13 to-1.  
14

15 **ITEM 6 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the May 9, 2024, Meeting.**

16  
17 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved to APPROVE the minutes from May 9, 2024.  
18 Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Phillips-Yes;  
19 Commissioner Butler-Yes; Commissioner Fugal-Yes; Commissioner Martineau-Yes;  
20 Commissioner Redding-Abstained; Commissioner Nelson-Yes; Chair Patten-Yes. The motion  
21 passed unanimously with one abstention.  
22

23 **MOTION:** Commissioner Butler moved to ADJOURN. The Commissioners unanimously voted  
24 “Yes”. The motion carried. The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately  
25 8:52 p.m.  
26

27  
28   
29 \_\_\_\_\_  
30 Planning Commission Chair

31  
32   
33 \_\_\_\_\_  
34 Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant

35 6-27-2024  
36 \_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved