

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting beginning at  
7:00 p.m. on **Tuesday, April 12, 2011** in the Lindon City Center, City Council  
Chambers, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

4 Conducting: Matt Bean, Chairperson  
6 Invocation: Angie Neuwirth  
Pledge of Allegiance: Matt Bean

8 **PRESENT**

**ABSENT**

10 Matt Bean, Chairperson  
12 Ron Anderson, Commissioner  
Sharon Call, Commissioner  
14 Angie Neuwirth, Commissioner  
Carolyn Lundberg, Commissioner  
16 Adam Cowie, Planning Director  
Woodworth Mataele, Assistant Planner  
18 Debra Cullimore, City Recorder

Christian Burton, Commissioner  
Mark Johnson, Commissioner

20 The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

22 Mr. Cowie welcomed Commissioner Lundberg to the Commission. He noted that  
she has been involved in other community projects, and expressed appreciation for her  
24 willingness to serve the community.

26 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – The minutes of the meeting of March 22, 2011 were  
reviewed.

28  
30 COMMISSIONER CALL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING OF MARCH 22, 2011. COMMISSIONER NEUWIRTH SECONDED THE  
MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32 **PUBLIC COMMENT** –

34 Chairperson Bean called for comments from any audience member who wished to  
36 address an issue not listed as an agenda item. There was no public comment.

38 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

- 40 1. **Continued Public Hearing** – *General Plan – Comprehensive Review*. This item  
42 was continued from the March 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting. This is a  
City initiated review of proposed changes to the General Plan. The Commission  
will review a comprehensive update to the new 2011 General Plan including;  
44 Land Use, Moderate Income Housing, Public Facilities, Parks and Trails,  
Environmental and Transportation Elements. Recommendations will be  
46 forwarded to the City Council for final action.

2 COMMISSIONER NEUWIRTH MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT  
4 VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

6 Mr. Cowie explained that a Public Hearing is required prior to adopt General Plan  
7 amendments. The Commission discussed procedural issues related to Public Hearing  
8 which extend to multiple meetings. Mr. Cowie explained that when review of proposed  
9 General Plan amendments by the Planning Commission is complete, recommendations  
10 will be forwarded to the City Council for final action.

11 Mr. Cowie explained that survey results of the community survey conducted  
12 during the fall of 2011 were considered by the General Plan Committee. The Committee  
13 considered long term visioning for development of the community. He reviewed the  
14 proposed Community Vision Statement. He noted that the statement is intended to  
15 generally guide development and preserve the quality of life in Lindon for an extended  
16 period of time.

17 Commissioner Call noted that the vision statement refers to maintaining the  
18 quality of neighborhoods. She observed that the City currently has no landscaping or  
19 architectural standards for residential neighborhoods. She suggested that the City  
20 consider implementation of some type of guidelines for residential neighborhoods. Mr.  
21 Cowie noted that the vision statement refers to specific elements, such as maintenance of  
22 animal rights, community beautification and development of parks and trails to maintain  
23 the quality of neighborhoods. Chairperson Bean noted that compliance with nuisance  
24 ordinances is required in residential areas. Commissioner Call suggested a time limit for  
25 installation of front yard landscaping. Commissioner Neuwirth noted that planned  
26 developments can impose landscaping requirements in specific developments, but those  
27 requirements are not typically enforced by the City. Commissioner Call also expressed  
28 concern regarding the absence of any architectural standards in residential zones. She  
29 noted that the Council has not been inclined to impose standards in residential areas in  
30 the past, but felt that the question should be raised again.

31 Chairperson Bean noted that #6 – which refers to a utility service plan for culinary  
32 water, secondary water, sewer, storm drainage and waste removal is an implied intent of  
33 all municipalities. He felt that it was not necessary to include this statement in the  
34 Community Vision Statement section. Mr. Cowie observed that this particular statement  
35 may have been included in the vision statement since its creation prior to completion of  
36 water and sewer systems and other infrastructure.

37 Commissioner Anderson noted that the General Plan is typically a five year plan,  
38 and that Mr. Cowie has explained that the General Plan Committee considered long range  
39 planning for 20 to 50 years. Commissioner Anderson inquired as to whether it would be  
40 appropriate to add a section indicating that the General Plan is a long range 20 to 50 year  
41 planning tool. Mr. Cowie noted that there is a reference on page #2 that the plan has a 5  
42 to 20 year lifespan, which will include periodic updates and amendments. He observed  
43 that particularly west side development should have a broader vision than the typical five  
44 year plan.

45 Commissioner Neuwirth inquired to future plans for retirement housing within the  
46 City. Mr. Cowie stated that there are existing pockets of retirement housing throughout

2 the City, and that there is potential for additional a small number of additional units in  
3 specific areas. The Commission discussed the potential of development of retirement  
4 care facilities in the CG zone. Commissioner Call noted that in the Land Use element of  
5 the General Plan, one of the six goals is to provide for the unique community needs of the  
6 elderly. Mr. Cowie reiterated that there is potential for future development of retirement  
7 housing areas. Large projects would not be permitted based on current zoning however.

8 Mr. Cowie went on to review proposed changes to the Land Use Element. He  
9 noted that the land use element defines three residential categories, including residential  
10 low, residential medium and residential high, which includes the R2 Overlay zone and  
11 the R3 Overlay zone. Goals of the Land Use Element are currently written to consider  
12 flexibility in housing development design and density in the R3 Overlay zone. The R3  
13 was established as an overlay zone with underlying commercial and industrial zoning.  
14 He noted that the existing R3 zone would require expansion to allow additional higher  
15 density development. Chairperson Bean observed that there has been some discussion  
16 regarding some higher density housing on the west side of the City in the area of 700  
17 North, and expansion of the R3 zone may be feasible in that location. Mr. Cowie  
18 outlined an expanded R3 zone or medium density housing area as recommended by the  
19 General Plan Committee. He noted that the Mountainland Association of Governments  
20 2040 transportation plan shows light rail stops in the area of Geneva Road, as well as bus  
21 rapid transit stops on State Street and 700 North. The Committee discussed creation of  
22 higher density transit oriented development in the areas adjacent to future transit stops,  
23 with medium density development similar to the Creekside Meadows Fieldstone Homes  
24 development further out from the transit stops.

25 Mr. Cowie also noted that the Committee discussed long range planning for open  
26 space on the west side with the intent of maintaining the rural look and feel of the  
27 community. He observed that funding sources for park space is a consideration, but that  
28 it is not necessary to identify funding sources for this long range planning.

29 Mr. Cowie explained that the map under review at this time is based on the  
30 recommendations of the General Plan Committee, as well as recommendations from the  
31 City Council. The Council made specific recommendations regarding west side  
32 development, including removal of the large park area and high density transit oriented  
33 development. He noted that the Council considered potential development limitation and  
34 financial impact on properties if the large park area was shown on the General Plan and  
35 shown as a public facility without funding to purchase the property. The Commission  
36 discussed existing parks and future parks currently shown on the General Plan.  
37 Commissioner Anderson noted that development of a large park would be a significant  
38 financial investment for the City.

39 Chairperson Bean felt that transit oriented development options are very forward  
40 thinking. He noted that he lived near Sugarhouse Park in Salt Lake City, and that the  
41 large park area is great asset to the community. Mr. Cowie noted that development of the  
42 large park area is not likely to take without the higher density transit oriented  
43 development which could have facilitated the park space through clustering and density  
44 bonuses for developers. Commissioner Neuwirth felt that the large park area would be  
45 very beneficial to the community as a gathering place. Commissioner Lundberg  
46 commented on a California development built using the clustering concept. She observed  
47 that clustering does have the effect of creating a feeling of open space. The development

2 includes mixed density housing, educational institutions, commercial businesses and  
research and development uses. Transportation corridors and traffic flow were also  
4 planned for the entire area. Mr. Cowie noted that the City is considering a requirement to  
show a master plan for large development areas rather than small parcels to avoid  
6 potential traffic flow or other issues as future development occurs.

6 Commissioner Anderson observed that a Master Plan for the west side area of the  
City could be problematic due to the amount of land and the number of property owners,  
8 as well existing industrial development which may be incompatible with proposed future  
uses. He felt that changing zoning to comply with proposed General Plan amendments  
10 may be problematic for existing property owners and uses. Mr. Cowie explained that  
zone changes do not have to be done concurrently with General Plan amendments, but at  
12 some time in the future it would be necessary to amend zoning to avoid development of  
incompatible uses with planned future residential or commercial uses.

14 Commissioner Anderson asked if the City has sufficient sewer facilities and other  
infrastructure to accommodate proposed residential development. Mr. Cowie stated that  
16 with the exception of connection to the secondary water system, other infrastructure  
should be sufficient to meet the needs of proposed development. Mr. Cowie explained  
18 that the General Plan Committee discussed west side redevelopment at length during  
review of the General Plan, noting the example of Geneva Steel and the fact that 20 years  
20 ago it was almost inconceivable that Geneva would ever be gone. Commissioner  
Lundberg observed that in addition to potential future redevelopment of existing uses, it  
22 would be reasonable to appropriately plan development to preserve the future rail  
transportation corridors, which could include some type of transit oriented development  
24 in the areas adjacent to the rail corridors. She noted that access to transportation routes is  
one element which will attract future high end business development.

26 Commissioner Anderson felt that transit oriented development would make more  
sense if there were a commitment from UDOT regarding specific locations for rail and  
28 rapid transit bus stops. Mr. Cowie explained that the transit stops are shown on the  
Mountainland Association of Governments 2030 to 2040 transportation plans.

30 Commissioner Anderson also noted that Lindon has extensive commercial areas,  
and that it may make sense to expand some residential development on the west side of  
32 the City. Commissioner Lundberg agreed that some type of residential development  
would be appropriate, including some type of higher density development to meet  
34 moderate income housing needs. She stated that she does not envision typical residential  
development on the west side of the City.

36 Commissioner Neuwirth asked whether the General Plan Committee was more in  
favor of the original concept showing a large park area and transit oriented development,  
38 or if they felt the current proposal was more reasonable. Mr. Cowie stated that the  
General Plan Committee felt that the large park area with transit oriented development in  
40 specific locations was a long range forward thinking plan. However, after those concepts  
were presented to the City Council for their review, the plan was amended based on  
42 concerns expressed by the Council regarding potential negative impacts of higher density  
residential development. He encouraged the Commission to give an honest  
44 recommendation to the Council whether or not they were in agreement with the Council's  
opinions.

2 Commissioner Neuwirth asked if the City Council was concerned specifically  
4 about extremely high density housing, such as the apartment complex developments  
6 found nearby in Pleasant Grove. Mr. Cowie explained that the proposed plan which  
8 included some higher density housing did not include any extremely high density areas,  
and that the population of the proposed plan would be a maximum of approximately  
1,000 residents. He clarified that the concern of the Council was generally based on a  
change to the overall demographics of Lindon if higher density development were  
permitted as proposed.

10 Commissioner Anderson inquired as to the logistics of implementing higher  
12 density housing which meets moderate income housing requirements. Mr. Cowie  
14 explained the process of providing and qualifying for high density housing, and the  
methodology used in the Creekside Meadows moderate income housing component. He  
noted that implementation of moderate income housing is somewhat difficult, but that it  
can be done effectively.

16 Mr. Cowie went on to discuss preservation of open space. He explained that the  
18 General Plan Committee has recommended that all open space in the City be inventoried  
and that a plan be put in place to preserve key locations to maintain the rural look and  
20 feel of the community. Open space preservation will create some expense for residents.  
However, the community survey showed the majority of respondents would be willing to  
22 financially support open space preservation if fees are minimal. Survey results also  
indicated a willingness to participate financially in beautification projects such as  
24 flowers, trees and streetscapes, particularly on 700 North and State Street. Revenue  
could also be generated through the creation of an RDA and use of merchant fees or sales  
26 tax revenues. The General Plan Committee also recommended increasing landscaping  
requirements associated with development on commercial corridors. Future UDOT  
projects could impact and minimize existing landscaping.

28 Commissioner Call observed that the east side of the City does not have a large  
community park. Mr. Cowie reviewed existing parks as well as future parks which will  
30 be developed as property owners are willing to sell the property and the City has funding  
to purchase the property. Open space on the east side of the City includes the hillside  
32 preservation area. Parks and open space will be discussed in greater detail during review  
of the Parks and Trails section of the General Plan.

34 Mr. Cowie stated that west side development will be discussed in greater detail  
36 during the next regular Planning Commission meeting. Chairperson Bean called for a  
motion to continue the Public Hearing.

38 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON MOVED TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC  
HEARING. COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL  
40 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

42 **NEW BUSINESS** – Reports by Commissioners

44 Commissioner Call inquired as to action taken by the City Council regarding the  
46 RS-Overlay ordinance amendments. Mr. Cowie stated that the Council continued their  
discussion pending an opinion from the City Attorney regarding the City's authority to  
impose architectural restrictions on private residential development.

Commissioner Anderson reported that some residents of Creekside Meadows have expressed concern regarding standing water in the playground area at the neighborhood park. Residents have also expressed a willingness to participate in completing the necessary work to install a drain or otherwise correct the situation. Mr. Cowie will follow up with the Parks and Recreation Department. Commissioner Anderson noted that residents in the same area have also expressed concern regarding potential safety issues related to the open water way in the park, and have offered to participate in installation of fencing. Mr. Cowie suggested that Commissioner Anderson have the residents contact the Planning Department to discuss their concerns.

**PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT** –

Mr. Cowie reported that the City Council approved the CSB Nutrition Conditional Use Permit Application and the Temporary Site Plan Ordinance. Provo River Constructors will be required to post a bond to cover site restoration after the project is complete.

**ADJOURN** –

COMMISSIONER CALL MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:31 P.M. COMMISSIONER NEUWIRTH SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Approved – May 10, 2011

---

Matt Bean, Chairperson

---

Adam Cowie, Planning Director