

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**
3 **May 28, 2013** beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers,
4 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

5 Conducting: Sharon Call, Chairperson
6 Invocation: Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
7 Pledge of Allegiance: Carolyn Lundberg, Commissioner

8 **PRESENT**

ABSENT

9 Sharon Call, Chairperson
10 Ron Anderson, Commissioner
11 Del Ray Gunnell, Commissioner
12 Carolyn Lundberg, Commissioner
13 Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
14 Rob Kallas, Commissioner
15 Vaughan Austin, Commissioner
16 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director
17 Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder
18 Matt Bean, Councilmember

- 19 1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
20
21 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – The minutes of the regular meeting of May 14,
22 2013 were reviewed.
23

24
25 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
26 OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 14, 2013. COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG
27 SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION
28 CARRIED.
29

30 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** –

31 Chairperson Call called for comments from any audience member who wished to
32 address any issue not listed as an agenda item. There were no public comments.
33

34
35 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

- 36
37 4. **TRAINING:** *City Public Information Officer.* Lindon City Police Chief Cody
38 Cullimore will give a presentation and training on who the spokesperson is for the
39 City during different events and situations.
40

41 Chief Cullimore was in attendance and presented gave an overview to the
42 Commission on the policies for the dissemination of information to the public during
43 emergency events, including the designation of a PIO (public information officer). He
44 noted this is good policy to have in place especially in light of the recent fire at Patch's
45 Majestic Metals. He added this would include emergency and non-emergency events.
46 Chief Cullimore explained that this presentation was given to the City Council for the
47 purpose of designating a PIO. For anything that is administrative or non-emergency
48

2 events the PIO is City Administrator, Adam Cowie. For emergency Fire/EMS/Police
3 events the PIO is Chief Cullimore. These PIO's have the ability to appoint a designee
(someone who has more expert knowledge of an event) as needed.

4 Chief Cullimore stated that there should be one common point of reference and
5 point of information for the media to contact and that person needs to be up to date and
6 aware to address any questions correctly. He added that he has had a lot of training as a
7 certified PIO and has also seen some horrendous mistakes made over the years, made
8 innocently, by people who think they have the correct information. Chief Cullimore then
9 referenced the "Media Relations Guidelines" provided to the commission. He discussed
10 the major points as follows:

- 11 1. Designated Public Information Officer (PIO).
- 12 2. Information release should always be:
 - 13 a. Courteous and professional.
 - 14 b. Prompt and timely.
 - 15 c. Accurate and complete.
- 16 3. Major Incidents.
- 17 4. Crisis Incidents.
- 18 5. Media Release Content.
 - 19 i) What information must be released.
 - 20 ii) Prepare and beware.
 - 21 iii) What can never be released.
 - 22 iv) Protection of information at a scene or incident.

23 There was then some general discussion regarding the referenced guidelines by
24 the Commission. Chairperson Call asked if there were any further questions or
25 comments. Hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

26
27
28 **5. PUBLIC HEARING:** *General Plan Amendment – Street Master Plan: 98 North*
29 *400 West to 200 West 40 South.* This is a request by Kyle Honeycutt of Ivory Homes
30 for a new master planned road to be added to the Street Master Plan Map. The road
31 will connect at 98 North 400 West and 200 West 40 South by running east and then
32 south.

33
34 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.
35 COMMISSIONER AUSTIN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN
36 FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

37
38 Mr. Van Wagenen opened the discussion by stating this item is a request by Kyle
39 Honeycutt of Ivory Homes for a new master planned road to be added to the Street
40 Master Plan Map. The road will connect at 98 North 400 West and 200 West 40 South by
41 running east and then south (see attachment #1). Mr. Honeycutt brought this issue before
42 the Planning Commission on May 14th as a concept review.

43 Mr. Van Wagenen noted the new road would directly affect the following
44 property owners (see attachment #2):

- 45 ● RJ Cullimore Family LLC
- 46 ● Chad & Jennifer Fraughton
- 47 ● JMBC Partnership
- 48 ● Carol J. Croft, et al.

- Scott Farrer Excavating Inc.
- Joan G. Williams (road is not proposed on this property, but the property would most likely have frontage along the new street, thereby affecting the buildable area of the lot)

Mr. Van Wagenen further explained that the adoption of this street plan amendment would accomplish several things as follows:

1. It would allow for development of the JMBC Partnership and Carol J. Croft, et al properties. These owners currently do not have sufficient access to develop their properties and are “land locked.” Additionally, these properties need an area to run utilities such as sewer, water, storm drain, etc. in order to develop, which is something the road could provide.
2. It would allow Ivory Homes to provide a street stub from the RJ Cullimore Family property, which Ivory is developing, to the JMBC and Croft properties for future access to those properties. Without the new street on the Street Master Plan Map, Ivory would not be able to provide a street stub access to the adjacent property due to Lindon City Code regulations (see LCC 17.32.120 (6)g, below).
3. The road would provide neighborhood connectivity and circulation, especially for pedestrian access, rather than having additional cul-de-sacs in the area.

Mr. Van Wagenen noted that several residents in the area have voiced concern over additional traffic that would spill to 40 South from the road. They have also expressed concern over the narrow width of 40 South, the sight limitations posed by 40 South’s hill and 40 South’s lack of improvements, such as sidewalks. Mr. Van Wagenen noted that Mark Christensen, Lindon City’s engineer, and Chief Cullimore will be in attendance to help answer any questions the Commission or public may have about the proposal.

Mr. Honeycutt noted that everyone is on board. He stated that all of the neighbors have been to the Development Review Committee meeting with the city staff with concerns about the drainage; he added that the knuckle and dogleg became a key to other properties developing. Mr. Honeycutt stated that he has done land deals for about 15 years now and everyone needs to be thanked for coming together, along with staff, on this issue. He noted that the Cullimore property was only going to be developed originally with a cul-de-sac, and added that Mrs. Fraughton was instrumental in making this happen to avoid a landlocked situation.

Mr. Honeycutt expressed his appreciation and thanked everyone for working so well together. He noted the code does need definition on where the road will be to get it on the master plan. Mr. Honeycutt pointed that this will be a standard residential street, not an arterial street.

Mark Christensen addressed the commission at this time. He addressed the issue of traffic coming out on 40 south. He commented that there has not been a traffic evaluation completed on 40 south as of yet, but as you look at the alignment of the road, people wanting to travel north will likely not get onto 40 south, and people who want to travel south may go to 40 south. No matter how the road is configured some will go to 40 south and some won’t, and no matter what happens with the development there will be more traffic on 40 south.

2 Chairperson Call asked Mr. Farrer if there was any new information about the
moving of the power poles on 40 south. Mr. Farrer mentioned that he has not had any
4 new information since the last email received from Utah Power & Light and noted as
before that there is expense involved in moving them and even more expensive to bury
6 the lines. He noted that Mr. Honeycutt has worked with UP&L a lot and maybe with
some help from the city it could feasibly done. He added that he has not looked at a lot
8 of options and there are some challenges to moving the poles because if they get out of
alignment it could change the guide wires.

10 At this time Chairperson Call asked if there were any public comments. Several
residents in attendance addressed the Commission as follows:

12 **Jeremy Wreckly:** Mr. Wreckly commented that he lives on 40 south and he wants to
know if he will still be able to put a road on his property. Mr. Van Wagenen stated that
14 this development will not have any detrimental effect on his property.

16 **Craig Carter:** Mr. Carter commented that he has lived on 40 south for 34 years. He
stated that the road has always been too narrow and nothing has been done to alleviate the
18 problem and the road is busier than ever and this new road will make it even busier. Mr.
Carter stated that when Lakeview Road was changed to not go directly through to State
20 Street, caused a lot more people use 40 South and now this will add more traffic and he
opposes this proposed plan based on these issues.

22 **Jared Prestwich:** Mr. Prestwich stated that the road will come out right in front of his
24 house. He added that he walks 40 South a lot and it is too narrow; two cars can't pass
comfortably, and this will be a safety issue for children.

26 **Gary Green:** Mr. Green commented that his mother owns property that will be affected,
28 and noted that she is not interested in this road going through at all at the present time.
He noted that there is a property line issue and there needs to be a feasibility study on
30 what the costs would be to move power lines and utility boxes. He noted that widening
the road will take millions of dollars if it were to happen on the north side of 40 south.
32 Mr. Green asked why has there been no consideration taken.

34 **Gayle Walker:** Ms. Walker stated that the new road would come through on the edge of
her property line. She asked if there would be any type of barrier for protection between
36 her property and the new road.

38 **Emma Lou Foreman:** Ms. Foreman would like to see a stone wall or fence installed for
protection and privacy issues. She added that there could be a lot of traffic with lights
40 shining right in her windows. She noted that there are a lot of small grandkids in their
neighborhood and there are safety issues involved. Ms. Foreman noted that in winter
42 months there is the possibility of cars sliding off and hitting her house.

44 **Dennis Wheeler:** Mr. Wheeler commented that there are people that are making a profit
off of this development and Ms. Walker's property will be greatly impacted with nothing
46 to gain. He added that there are elevation and safety issues involved. He stated that it
makes more sense to be backyard to backyard instead of the road right next to the houses.
48 This road will be putting the Walkers in a very bad position. Mr. Wheeler noted that

2 there is already one dog leg and now another will just hurt more people. Mr. Wheeler
3 added that nothing has ever happened on 40 South in 40 years. Mr. Wheeler stated that
4 this is something that works for developers and not for the residents and the residents
5 need to be considered and looked after.

6 **Amy Wilson:** Ms. Wilson commented that vehicles coming off of State Street are
7 traveling 40 to 50 miles per hour off of State Street and speed down 40 south. She added
8 that the road has gotten busier and more dangerous and safety is an huge issue.

10 **Grant Wilson:** Mr. Wilson suggested that the road should go up to State Street which
11 would take the load off of 40 south. He noted that he has the smallest lot on 40 south and
12 would lose 10 ft. off of the front of his property if the road is widened. Mr. Wilson stated
13 that he is opposed.

14 **Don Willett:** Mr. Willett mentioned a turkey shed that is being torn down and inquired if
15 it is for the potential of development or is it just ready to fall down. Mr. Van Wagenen
16 sated that staff has not information on that. He also mentioned the dogleg by the Walker
17 property and inquired if that is that because property couldn't be a property trade to move
18 the cul-de-sac further east to make a straight line.

20 **Lynn Croft:** Mr. Croft stated the property owners have gotten together and worked
21 things out and noted that Mr. Honeycutt has done a magnificent job and has solved a lot
22 of problems. He added that he understands the property owner's issues and noted these
23 are ½ acre lots with low density. Mr. Croft commented that his is a good proposal and it
24 solves a lot of problems.

26 Mr. Honeycutt stated that the fallback is the double cul-de-sac situation where the
27 Crofts would remain landlocked. He noted there are some benefits to the dogleg. Mr.
28 Honeycutt stated that Ivory Homes will do whatever they need to do to mitigate and
29 noted that there is also a benefit for storm water and a potential flooding situation.

30 Mark Christensen stated the issue before the Planning Commission right now is
31 only the master plan road right with no construction any where and he is not aware of any
32 applications to divide other parcels. He added that the alignment on the master plan can
33 be changed if property owners are in favor of it. Mr. Christensen stated that from an
34 engineering standpoint going straight north as long as it slopes downhill the whole way
35 would be great. Mr. Christensen stated that the city can't require a developer to buy
36 property to make a road go through. Mr. Van Wagenen then handed out a police study on
37 traffic violations on 40 south from Chief Cullimore.

38 Chairperson Call asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none she
39 called for a motion to close the public hearing.

42 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC
43 HEARING. COMMISSIONER AUSTIN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
44 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

46 Chairperson Call asked if there were any further discussion or comments from the
47 Commissioners. Hearing none she called for a motion.

2 There was then some general discussion amongst the Commissioners including
4 discussion of a Special Improvement District to widen 40 south, a traffic calming study to
4 implement speed bumps for safety and a barrier for the Walker property and the two cul-
de-sac issue.

6 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED
8 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE STREET MASTER PLAN MAP AS
8 SHOWN ON THE PROVIDED MAP WHICH SHOWS A NEW ROAD CONNECTING
10 98 NORTH 400 WEST WITH 200 WEST 40 SOUTH WITH THE FOLLOWING
10 CONDITION: FORGO THE REQUIREMENT OF A STUB FOR NOW.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
12 RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON AYE
14 COMMISSIONER GUNNELL AYE
16 COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG AYE
16 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
18 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
18 COMMISSIONER AUSTIN AYE

20 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 22 6. **REVIEW AND ACTION:** *Major Subdivision: Cullimore Court – 98 North 400*
24 *West.* This is request by Kyle Honeycutt of Ivory Homes for approval of a 17 lot
24 subdivision located at 98 North 400 West in the Single-Family residential (R1-20)
26 zone. Recommendations will be made to the City Council at their next available
meeting after review by the Planning Commission.

28 Mr. Van Wagenen opened the discussion by giving a summary of this agenda
30 item. He explained this is a request by Kyle Honeycutt of Ivory Homes for approval of a
30 17 lot subdivision located at 98 North 400 West to be known as Cullimore Court. He
noted there are existing homes on two of the lots that will remain in place. The remainder
of the land is currently vacant.

32 Mr. Van Wagenen mentioned the code requirements at this time. He stated these
34 lots require a minimum of 20,000 square feet per lot as required by the zone. The smallest
34 lot on the plat is 20,271 square feet with the largest being 34,326 square feet; all lots meet
36 the minimum requirement. He went on to say that all lots meet the minimum frontage
36 requirement of 50 feet. This subdivision will install improvements to help alleviate storm
38 drainage problems on 400 West and install curb, gutter and sidewalk along that frontage.
Street dedication to the City along 400 West will also occur. Mr. Van Wagenen noted this
subdivision design shows a “knuckle” turn-around that has a stub on the easterly portion
40 of the property. For the stubbed road to be approved by the City, a master planned road
that the stub will connect to has to be adopted as part of the General Plan. Otherwise,
42 Lindon City ordinances do not allow for permanent cul-de-sac roads longer than 650 feet
(17.32.120 (7)) or for a stub road to be built (17.32.120 (6)g).

44 Mr. Van Wagenen commented if a master planned road is adopted and assuming
46 development of the adjacent property would happen at a future date, the knuckle
46 turnaround would act as an appropriate turnaround until the road is extended. If a master
planned road is not adopted, Ivory Homes will have to re-design the subdivision to meet
48 City ordinances. As a reminder, Planning Commission and City Council approval of

subdivisions is preliminary in nature. He noted that final approval and details are worked out at the staff level.

Chairperson Call asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none she called for a motion.

COMMISSIONER AUSTIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE 17 LOT MAJOR SUBDIVISION KNOWN AS CULLIMORE COURT WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT A CITY UTILITY EASEMENT EXTEND FROM THE TURN-AROUND TO THE EAST PROPERTY LINE AND THE TRIANGLE PIECE ON LOT 8 BE DEDICATED TO THE CITY AND THAT THE MONEY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE "DOG LEG" PORTION OF THE ROAD BE GIVEN TO THE CITY RATHER THAN THE ROAD BEING CONSTRUCTED AT THIS TIME. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

VICE CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER GUNNELL	AYE
COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER AUSTIN	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING:** *Ordinance Amendment: Senior Housing Facility Overlay.*

This is a request by Matt Gneiting for approval of a land use ordinance amendment to allow for a Senior Housing Facility Overlay Zone. The ordinance will govern high density, independent living housing for individuals ages 55 and older. Recommendations will be made to the City Council at their next available meeting after review by the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Van Wagenen gave a brief overview noting that this is a continued item of a request by Matt Gneiting for approval of a land use ordinance amendment to allow for a Senior Housing Facility Overlay Zone. He explained the ordinance will govern high density, independent living housing for individuals aged 55 and older. Mr. Van Wagenen mentioned that Mr. Gneiting presented a concept review for this type of facility on 65 South Main Street before the Planning Commission at a meeting earlier this year. The applicant is now submitting applications to move from conceptual project to actual project.

Mr. Van Wagenen further explained that reviewing and adopting an ordinance allowing this type of facility is the first step in this process, and an ordinance allowing for this type of density is new to Lindon City. He went on to say that some of the more notable sections of the ordinance are as follows:

1. Allowance of 30 units per acre, requiring 1.1 parking stalls per unit.
2. Only allowing residents aged 55 and older (with minimal exceptions for spouses and others over 18 years of age).

3. Limiting the location of the overlay zone.

Mr. Van Wagenen further discussed after a healthy discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting and further staff review, some changes have been made to the proposed language. He noted that these changes include the following:

- Limiting the project size to 5 acres.
- Limiting the minimum age of any occupant to 18 years of age.
- Limiting the occupancy of any unit to three persons.
- Limiting ownership of a development to a single entity.
- Requiring a deed restriction to be recorded on the property regarding occupancy restrictions.
- Clarifying permitted uses.

Mr. Van Wagenen added the ordinance in its current form is attached. Mr. Van Wagenen further noted that in addition to the ordinance language, a matrix displaying other cities' codes on senior housing is attached. He stated that not all of these examples can be compared apples to apples, but they are good reference points regarding density and parking requirements as found in other cities. Mr. Gneiting has worked with staff to provide the information. He pointed out that specific examples of senior housing along the Wasatch Front have been mentioned as listed:

1. Thornberry in Pleasant Grove has about 43 units per acre, if you only count the senior housing, with approximately 1.3 parking stalls per unit. The whole complex is 24 units per acre.
2. Rosegate Facility in Sandy is 48 units per acre with 1.25 stalls per unit and was just finished recently.

Mr. Van Wagenen mentioned even though this application is only dealing with the ordinance language itself, concerns were expressed regarding the amount of traffic at the site. Mark Christensen, City Engineer, has expressed confidence that necessary traffic mitigation measures can be achieved at the project's location. Also, after the Commission expressed hesitancy to approve 30 units per acre, staff informed Mr. Gneiting of that concern. Mr. Gneiting responded by saying that 30 units per acre justifies fulltime, on-site management and fewer units per acre would not necessarily support full-time staff.

Mr. Van Wagenen commented that this trade-off between density and staffing is important to weigh, especially as concerns over enforcement are discussed. Mr. Van Wagenen encouraged the Commissioner's to have candid discussion with the applicant is at this time. There was then some general discussion among the Commissioners regarding the draft language of the overlay zone.

Chairperson Call asked if there were any public discussion or comments at this time. Several residents in attendance addressed the commission as follow:

Val Killian: Mr. Killian commented that the city needs to make sure the ordinance covers the whole population and not just the population from age 70-80. He referenced page 3 paragraph two line one of the draft. He noted that there needs to be language added that states the dedicated amount of street frontage to allow for this type of development to go in on a public accessible road. Mr. Killian noted that the city needs to

2 also set some limits in regard to density and that the requirements are residential and not
3 commercial. He also stated that the density needs to be limited. Mr. Killian stated that
4 the Commission needs to deal with the ordinance. He stated that he is opposed to a 4-
5 story building in Lindon's downtown area, this development would be better served in
6 another area, perhaps on the 700 north corridor. He also commented that this will
7 essentially be an apartment building and you cannot control who lives there.

8 **Susan Fisher:** Ms Fisher commented that one of the neighbors involved that is forgotten
9 is the Lindon Elementary School. Ms. Fisher stated that she is adamant that this
10 development does not come in. Ms. Fisher noted that this is invasive as a citizen because
11 there isn't any commercial or businesses in the area. She noted that adding something
12 like this development to the middle of a neighborhood would not be a wise decision and
13 they do not want a 4-story building in the middle of the town.

14 **Craig Carter:** Mr. Carter noted that the Thornberry facility in Pleasant Grove does not
15 have a school right next to it. He noted the traffic issue would increase with the elderly
16 residents along with all of their family members that would come and visit.

17
18
19 Mr. Gneiting stated that the zoning ordinance discussed is the correct model (site
20 specific) A lot of other neighboring cities are using the same approach. He added when it
21 comes to the issue of dedicated of frontage he disagrees that as it is very common to use a
22 this type of development as a buffer between commercial and residential. The property
23 would be fully ADA compliant and designed accessibility for the elderly to have
24 flexibility and access. He went on to say there is not a lot of traffic at other facilities, and
25 the elderly typically do not drive and are low key and they contribute to the
26 neighborhood. Mr. Gneiting pointed out that the property is currently zoned commercial.

27
28 Chairperson Call asked for input from Councilmember Bean who was in
29 attendance. Councilmember Bean commented that the City Council thought that one of
30 the major factors was the aging population that is going to need housing. The council
31 was also favorable to seeing some good planning in place in Lindon for the aging senior
32 population. The current council is a bit more open to some higher density projects in the
33 city than some prior council members, even on the State Street corridor. Councilmember
34 Bean noted that another factor is the applicant has had a fair amount of experience with
35 these developments. There was then some additional discussion by the commission
36 regarding setbacks, frontages, flag lots, and traffic issues. Chairperson Call stated that the
37 Commission has continued this issue to ensure that there is sufficient discussion and
38 information presented to make sure the ordinance is correct and tight.

39
40 Chairperson Call asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none she
41 called for a motion to close the public hearing.

42
43 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
44 COMMISSIONER GUNNELL SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED
45 IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

46
47 Chairperson Call asked if there were any further comments. Hearing none she
48 called for a motion.

COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE THE LAND USE
ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TITLED LCC 17.75, SENIOR HOUSING FACILITY
OVERLAY IN ORDER TO INCORPORATE THE SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE
DRAFT. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE
VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

VICE CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER GUNNELL	AYE
COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG	NAY
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER AUSTIN	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. **PUBLIC HEARING:** *Zoning Map Amendment: Senior Housing Facility Overlay – 65 South Main Street.* This is a request by Matt Gneiting for a zoning map amendment for property generally located at 65 South Main Street. The amendment would place a Senior Housing Facility Overlay Zone on the subject property which is currently zoned General Commercial (CG).

COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.
COMMISSIONER GUNNELL SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED
IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Van Wagenen explained that this is a continued item for a zoning map amendment for property generally located at 65 South Main Street. The amendment would place a Senior Housing Facility Overlay Zone on the subject property which is currently zoned General Commercial (CG). He noted that Mr. Gneiting presented a concept review for this type of facility on 65 South Main Street before the Planning Commission at a meeting earlier this year. The applicant is now submitting applications to move from conceptual project to actual project. Mr. Van Wagenen stated a zone change will need to occur before the project can move forward. However, the ordinance language governing the zone is also under review.

Mr. Van Wagenen stated that staff does not recommend approving the zoning map amendment until the Senior Housing Facility Overlay ordinance language has been approved by the Planning Commission and recommended to the City Council. He added the Planning Commission continued this item from the last meeting because the ordinance language was not approved at that time. He went on to say that additionally, the map showing the proposed area for the zone change may need to be modified as the applicant consolidates parcels for the project.

There was then some general discussion regarding the zoning map amendment for the senior housing facility overlay.

Chairperson Call commented on the need for senior housing. She then noted that the following issues need to be considered:

1. Setbacks
2. Minimum Square footage
3. Full time management
4. Building elevation

- 5. Amount of recreation space (1 outdoor)
- 6. Survivorship

Chairperson Call asked if there were any further public comments. Hearing none she called for a motion to close the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER AUSTIN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Chairperson Call asked if there were any further discussion or comments. Hearing none she called for a motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON MOVED TO CONTINUE THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR THE SENIOR HOUSING FACILITY OVERLAY TO BE APPLIED ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 65 SOUTH MAIN STREET, ACCORDING TO THE MAP. COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

VICE CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER GUNNELL	AYE
COMMISSIONER LUNDBERG	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER AUSTIN	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. **NEW BUSINESS** – Reports by Commissioners.

Chairperson Call called for any new business or reports from the Commissioners. Chairperson Call noted that a resident complained to her about people living in a home with multiple families at 916 E 140 North. She stated that the owner does not live there and the neighbors do not feel safe letting kids walk in the neighborhood. Mr. Van Wagenen will check into the issue.

Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the Commissioners. Hearing no further comments she moved on to the next agenda item.

10. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT** –

Mr. Van Wagenen reported on City Council updates as follows:

- City Council Items:
 - Bishops Corner Plat B
 - Marian Estates Plat A
- Murdock Canal Trail Opening
- Aquatics Center Open
- Linda Nelson Signatures
- June 4, 2013 Special Meeting
- Tablets in July:
 - Google Docs for files; email

- Transition to all digital within a few months

2

Chairperson Call asked if there were any other comments or discussion from the Commissioners. Being none she called for a motion to adjourn.

4

6 **ADJOURN** –

8

COMMISSIONER AUSTIN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:55 P.M. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

10

12

Approved – June 11, 2013

14

16

Sharon Call, Chairperson

18

20

Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director

22