

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**
4 **July 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers, 100 North
State Street, Lindon, Utah.

6 **REGULAR SESSION** – 7:00 P.M.

8 Conducting: Sharon Call, Chairperson
Invocation: Rob Kallas, Commissioner
10 Pledge of Allegiance: Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner

12 <u>PRESENT</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Sharon Call, Chairperson	Bob Wily, Commissioner
14 Rob Kallas, Commissioner	
Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner	
16 Ron Anderson, Commissioner – via Teleconference	
Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director	
18 Jordan Cullimore, Associate Planner	
Kathy Moosman, City Recorder	

20 **Special Attendee:**
22 Matt Bean, Councilmember

- 24 1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.
- 26 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – The minutes of the regular meeting of June 24, 2014
28 were reviewed.

30 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 24, 2014 AS AMENDED.
32 COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED
IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

34 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** –

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

38 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

- 40 4. **Site Plan** – *Northwest Fence, 240 S. 1060 W.* Aaron Judkins, of Judkins Enterprises,
42 requests site plan approval of a 3,000 sq. ft. addition to an existing industrial building
located at 240 South 1060 West in the Light Industrial (LI) Zone.

44 Jordan Cullimore, Associate Planner, led the discussion by giving a brief
46 summary of this agenda item stating the applicant, Aaron Judkins, of Judkins Enterprises
(who was in attendance) is requesting site plan approval of a 3,000 sq. ft. addition to an
48 existing industrial building (approximately 6,500 sq. ft.) located at 240 South 1060 West

2 in the Light Industrial (LI) Zone. Mr. Cullimore noted this 3000 ft. addition will trigger
an amended site plan and will need to bring the site into substantial compliance with
4 current code requirements. Mr. Cullimore explained that Northwest Fence is an existing
business operating out of the existing structure on the site. He noted this proposal amends
6 the existing site by increasing the square footage of the primary structure by over 30%.
The Code requires the site to be brought into substantial compliance with all current
8 ordinances for such an increase. He added the site is located within the Light Industrial
(LI) zone.

10 Mr. Cullimore then referenced aerial photos of the site and surrounding area,
photographs of the existing site and site plan and the architectural renderings followed by
some general discussion.

12 Mr. Cullimore stated then referenced the parking summary and analysis as follows:
14 The number and configuration of parking complies with Code requirements.

- 16 • Required: 16 spaces; 1 ADA
- Provided: 16 spaces; 2 ADA

18 Mr. Cullimore explained with the type of landscaping proposed, the location of
interior trees, and the total square footage of the proposed landscaping needs to be
20 addressed. He further explained that a 20' landscaped strip is required along street
frontage. The landscaped strip must include trees every 30' on center. He added that this
22 site has an existing landscaped strip. Mr. Cullimore stated that the only portion of the
strip that does not comply with current code requirements is the easternmost portion of
24 the strip, where there are no trees. The site plan indicates that trees will be installed along
this frontage.

26 Mr. Cullimore further discussed that presently the site does not have interior
landscaping. Forty square feet of interior landscaping is required per parking stall, for a
28 total of 640 square feet. The site plan proposes 600 square feet of turf block to satisfy this
requirement. The site plan needs to show an additional 40 square feet of landscaping and
30 that the interior landscaping be separated from the parking lot by 6" high concrete
curbing.

32 Mr. Cullimore went on to say that the Code requires that the landscaping consist
of 75% vegetation, including ground cover, trees, and shrubbery. The remaining 25%
34 may consist of non-vegetative materials. It appears that turf block provides 44%
vegetation and 56% non-vegetative. The code requires one additional tree for every 10
36 required parking stalls (for a total of 2 trees). The site plan proposes to add two (2)
additional trees to the landscaped strip to satisfy this requirement. The Code requires
38 these trees to be located within the interior landscaping and will need to be moved.

40 Mr. Cullimore commented that the Planning Commission needs to determine
whether the plastered concrete portion of the building meets the architectural treatment
42 requirement. The proposed architectural treatment mirrors the treatment applied to the
existing structure. The base of the exterior is plastered concrete and the upper portion of
44 the exterior is ribbed metal paneling. The code requires that 25% of the exterior be
covered with brick, decorative block, stucco, wood, or other similar material as approved
46 by the Planning Commission. He noted the plastered concrete will meet the 25%
treatment requirement if the Planning Commission determines it is similar to the listed
48 permitted materials.

2 There was then some general discussion regarding the landscaping requirements,
3 particularly the turf block. Mr. Judkins commented that he would be willing to add
4 vegetation in his yard to meet the requirements. Mr. Judkins noted that they fill the
5 customer's orders where they park. Chairperson Call voiced her concerns about allowing
6 the same for everyone in the area as the purpose of the landscaping ordinance is to
7 beautify the building and the site. Commissioner Kallas commented that he does not
8 have a problem with the product but what makes him less flexible on the landscaping is
9 the shop in the front of the building on the cul-de-sac and he would like to see it softened
10 a bit if possible. Mr. Judkins commented that they will not have as much inventoried
11 (storage) with the new addition and stated that it is not too visible from the freeway.
12 Chairperson Call explained that the reason for the architectural guidelines and
13 landscaping ordinances (in the light industrial and commercial zones) is to dress those
14 areas up, so she can see the concerns with where the products are being warehoused.

15 Commissioner Marchbanks commented that he does not have a problem with
16 continuing the same look on the building, and noted he is not sure what help the
17 Commission can lend without an ordinance change on the landscaping. He noted the turf
18 pavers don't offend him at all and if the landscape ordinance is ever looked at he would
19 suggest having less irrigated landscaping and more zero scape. Commissioner Kallas
20 asked the applicant if he meets the requirements and finds a serious need to change it
21 would he then pursue an ordinance change. Mr. Judkins stated that he would agree to
22 work with staff and bring it into compliance.

23 Following some additional general discussion, Chairperson Call called for a
24 motion.

25 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S
26 REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL OF AN ADDITION TO THE EXISTING
27 STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 240 SOUTH 1060 WEST, WITH THE FOLLOWING
28 CONDITION 1. THE CURRENT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS ARE MET AND
29 THE EXISTING HARD SURFACE MATERIAL (25% TREATMENT) BE USED
30 THROUGHOUT THE REST OF THE ADDITION. COMMISSIONER
31 MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS
32 FOLLOWS:

33 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
34 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON AYE
35 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
36 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
37 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

38 5. **Concept Review** – *700 North Master plan, 700 N. Commercial Corridor*. David
39 Adams of Catalyst Development, LC requests review of a proposal to rezone and
40 master plan 42 acres along the north side of the 700 north commercial corridor. The
41 Commission will provide feedback on the proposal. No official motions will be
42 made.

43 Mr. Cullimore opened the discussion by explaining this is a request by David
44 Adams of Catalyst Development, LC, who is in attendance, to review a proposal to
45 rezone and master plan 42 acres along the north side of the 700 north commercial
46 corridor.
47
48

2 Mr. Cullimore explained that the applicant would like to present ideas and receive
feedback regarding potential development along the north side of the 700 North corridor
4 between Geneva Road and 1700 West. He noted that no motion is necessary as this is a
concept review for feedback only. Mr. Cullimore then referenced an aerial photo of the
6 700 North Corridor and the Concept Land Use plan. Mr. Cullimore then turned the time
over to Mr. Adams.

8 Mr. Adams gave a brief summary stating that he represents Providence Realty and
has been hired by a group of landowners to master plan and prepare the subject property
10 that is for sale. He noted the 42 acres is owned by three (3) different partnerships, but
the partnerships are all controlled by one manager, so there is an opportunity to do
12 something here that is cohesive and master planned in this one particular area. He noted
that these investors pulled their money together and bought the property (farm) from Mr.
14 Blackhurst sometime ago with the idea being for long term future capital gains. The
investors are now ready to do something with the property and hired him to prepare the
sale.

16 Mr. Adams stated that he began by visiting with city staff, city councilmembers
and with some of the best retail, commercial and office building sales representatives in
18 the state. He has now come back with some ideas, thoughts and conclusions to present
tonight and to receive feedback and input from the Commission. Mr. Adams stated that
20 when visiting with city officials, he has gotten the feeling that Lindon is perceived by
everyone as being an upscale community, and one that has prided itself on being unique
22 and high quality. He further noted that he has heard that the 700 North Corridor is an
opportunity for Lindon to create the kind of entrance, or gateway, to this community from
24 the freeway that is consistent with the rest of the community. In other words, something
very nice that says "Welcome to Lindon, we are a high quality, nice neighborhood and
26 we are glad to have you here". Mr. Adams stated that this is Lindon's entrance to the
freeway and there is a lot of attention on it and a lot of desire to make it very nice; he has
28 heard this very clearly.

30 Mr. Adams commented that in discussion with the Coldwell representatives, they
brought up several issues and opportunities that he would like to share. He noted that one
of his concerns while analyzing the property, is that this commercial property wouldn't
32 be valuable or desirable and not developed for many years because of the distance from
the freeway and the number of acres that exist between the freeway entrance and the
34 subject property; he found that he was wrong. In their discussion they also indicated that
much of the land right off of the freeway exit has been "chopped up" with interior roads,
36 which was done with good intention, but many of the parcels are too small for some of
the more desirable uses. They also indicated that the Lindon entrance is very desirable
38 because of its large acreage and low number of owners and because of its depth.

40 Mr. Adams also stated they are very optimistic about the desirability and
merchant ability of this property. He noted one of the drawbacks that they mentioned
was the lack of rooftops in the area and the lack of density of rooftops. Another issue
42 that they would like to discuss is the possibility of putting in cul-de-sacs or at least design
a transportation plan that would have the traffic, particularly residential shopping traffic,
44 follow more of a parking lot pathway to get to the shopping locations. Another important
feature in the area is the potential for a Trax line that would run north and south; it
46 appears the potential location would be on the easterly side of the project (the most
logical location). This provides a very desirable potential for a Trax station and they
48 would like to look at this and capitalize on it in some manner. He noted that many

corporations are now “green conscious” and mass transit is a big part of that and utilizing a plan that would provide walkable pathways to the station and perhaps bike share etc. to get to work would be beneficial. Mr. Adams went on to say that the Coldwell representatives also mentioned the possibility of waiving impact fees, which would get corporate attention and send signals that a city is workable and willing to sit down and bring in the best tenants and make it possible for them to be there. He realizes that this is a concern, but over time the increased value of the property creates additional tax revenue that goes back in to replenish those future facilities that must eventually be constructed. He noted this key component signals the city’s willingness to work with these higher end tenants that every city may be competing for (which could be done on a case by case basis). He added that when conceptualizing the allowed uses of the property it is their hope to be very open minded in their approach and they would like to do something better and more creative than what is typically seen along the I-15 corridor.

Mr. Adams explained that they would also suggest drafting a master plan and actually laying out pathways and conceptualizing roads as to be able to see a physical representation of the vision they would like to create. He noted the conceptualized plan would have a lot of flexibility as we do not know the future. He commented that Lindon is known as an upper scale community and certainly has the possibility of attracting the upper scale developments. With the quality of housing here, the friendly atmosphere and the workability from staff and city leaders are all great assets. He added this is also the best timing for a commercial development and Utah is one of the leading states in the nation for development. Mr. Adams stated that he would strongly encourage putting the vision into place along with the ordinances, the process, and the incentives as quickly as possible as they cannot market the site to potential users until they know the vision and the clear rules of the game. Mr. Adams commented they could go out with the current zoning and market to the Walmart’s and Lowe’s etc., which would be easier and less complicated, but that is not what he has been hearing what the city wants for a nice entrance to Lindon City. They can do more and are willing to hold themselves to a higher standard for a more upscale development, and to do this they will need some help from the city; they will need some incentives to attract these upscale businesses.

Mr. Adams further discussed they would like to propose creating some type of an overlay zone in the current commercial zone that would be an option for the commercial zone. This would create higher residential density and would also allow for some mixed residential. He noted that in this case they are asking that 20% of the land be used for townhomes and about 12% of the land be used for apartments. This would allow for flexibility of use including business, retail, corporate campus, and mixed commercial; very much an open zoning. It would waive impact fees to be replenished by “tiff” financing and also have the opportunity, if the business was desirable in the city’s eyes, to go even further than that. At the same the time the city would retain strong control over building design, road layout, landscaping, pathways, open space, site lines, signage, parking, and entrance monuments etc. Mr. Adams explained that any concepts coming in to the city would be planned with the Planning and Zoning staff and would receive approvals all the way to the City Council; it would be a joint and coordinated planning and approval process so the city would have more control. Mr. Adams stated with this type of overlay tool he can go back to the investors and owners and assure them their long term value will be maintained and even enhanced. It would also give them some residential zoning that is very marketable today and would allow them to hold the commercial for a longer term. Mr. Adams mentioned that this would also give him the

2 ability to approach higher quality commercial, business and retail and inform them they
3 would be allowed in this zone and offer them some incentives that are in place, i.e., good
4 design, excellent structure and great landscaping to make it work for them here. This
5 would create housing for employees, customers for the shops, be transit oriented, less
6 development costs and also city staff assistance in the planning and approval process.
7 Mr. Adams asked if there were any questions at this time.

8 Commissioner Kallas asked for an example of the “step above” the Walmart,
9 Lowes developments etc. that Mr. Adams mentioned. Mr. Adams stated they would like
10 to hold all of the uses to a higher standard regarding landscaping, signage, etc. so
11 whatever comes in would be planned better and look nicer. He added that there has to be
12 a balance with the income revenue and a nicer, higher design standard; creating this kind
13 of design and higher standard could attract nicer types of uses to the area. Commissioner
14 Kallas commented that 700 North is revenue for the city in the future and to date no one
15 has been able to do a “Meadows” type of development in the area. Commissioner
16 Marchbanks said he doesn’t feel that anyone would be opposed to a “Meadows” type
17 development because of the tax revenue that would be generated, but he agrees the
18 demographic are vital to justify the types of businesses that are in there; but he would
19 have a hard time with any “kickbacks” on impact fees and incentives. Commissioner
20 Kallas commented that the proposed 30% high density housing may get some resistance
21 from residences in the city. Commissioner Marchbanks stated that he likes some of the
22 vision presented tonight but the tax deferrals does not sit well with the residential high
23 density. He added that he is in support of things that will bring tax revenue and he is open
24 minded to some higher density to help bring the demographics that are essential to make
25 this happen.

26 Mr. Adams commented that the impression he received from the City Council is
27 that they want quality uses to raise the look and feel as you drive into Lindon to a higher
28 level. The question is how do we work together to make this happen and create this
29 vision. Chairperson Call expressed her concerns, along with that of the City Council,
30 about giving up commercial property along the 700 North Corridor because of the value
31 to the city. She noted that one of the biggest concerns seems to be that the city is trying
32 to put into place how they would like it developed, and the plan really isn’t in place yet
33 so the concern is having other developers take this and do it in a “piece mill” fashion
34 until a holistic plan is in place. She added that another concern is the tax base and the
35 higher density which is a difficult thing to manage.

36 Commissioner Marchbanks expressed that we do need to master plan this to
37 something that will work and he suggested looking to the private sector, not the city, to
38 bring the architecture; he feels we could ask for a higher standard. Chairperson Call
39 asked Mr. Adams if he is going to be developing or just selling the property for the
40 investors. Mr. Adams replied that he will be selling the property to the developer that is
41 why putting the controls and rules in place is so important. Chairperson Call commented
42 that would be a concern because he won’t have anything to do with how it actually
43 develops other than having the overlay in place. She commented on the residential aspect
44 stating that it will be swept to someone else. She expressed her biggest concern is that
45 700 North Corridor is not “piece mill” developed and that there is a general plan in place.
46 Mr. Adams pointed out that at some point the property needs to be sold and future
47 developers will need to know what the rules are.

48 Chairperson Call stated that a lot of what has been presented tonight are very
49 good ideas. She noted that the feedback from the councilmembers she talked to is that

2 they would like to see the city determine how they would like that to develop before
3 giving individual investors and developers that opportunity. Commissioner Kallas
4 inquired, hypothetically speaking, what the investors would think if the city did not allow
5 high density housing. Mr. Adams stated that the investors would probably “piece mill” it
6 out and see what happens. Commissioner Kallas asked why the investors feel that high
7 density is so critical to their development. Mr. Adams replied that they feel it enhances
8 the overall desirability of the commercial area; they can afford and desire to hold on to
9 the commercial longer for a nicer and better development. Commissioner Anderson
10 commented that we should not be supplying roads for Pleasant Grove’s heavy industrial.
11 He added that he does not see a problem taking those roads off of our master plan. He
12 can see that the market is for residential and mixed commercial and that does make sense
and may be more palatable to the City Council.

13 Councilmember Bean commented that he feels there is more openness on this
14 council to do some mixed development in the area even though it is currently zoned
15 commercial. He commented that a planned community approach with higher end office
16 space, some retail and some commercial has been brought up by Councilmember
17 Lundberg and he feel it bears discussion. Commissioner Marchbanks asked how feasible
18 is the option of a transit stop in the area? Mr. Van Wagenen replied that it is a possibility
19 and depends on what ordinances and zoning the city is willing to put into place in order
20 to attract a Trax station and to qualify to get the federal funding. Chairperson Call
21 commented that she heard that where the residential area is being proposed is where one
22 of the key transit hubs would be located. Mr. Adams noted this would probably be a
smaller transit site than some of the other sites.

23 Mr. Adams concluded by stating he just wants to be a catalyst for thought and to
24 begin the process. He mentioned one thing that is hard is that they have to wait for all of
25 the other property owners to join together and come up with a plan. They thought they
26 could go forward with a specific overlay and have all of the discussion and plans with
27 keeping in mind and envision the entire area, but not have to wait for everyone to agree;
28 that is why they took this approach. There was then some additional general discussion
29 by the Commission. Chairperson Call commented that she feels the Commission has
30 given Mr. Adams sufficient input and there are some concerns with creating an overlay
31 and applying it. Commissioner Marchbanks suggested that Mr. Adams present his
32 concept to the City Council. Mr. Adams stated the next step is to move the discussion
33 forward to the City Council with a concept review. He then thanked the Commission for
34 their time. Chairperson Call thanked Mr. Adams for the presentation and information.

35 Chairperson Call asked if there were any further comments or discussion. Hearing
36 none she moved on to the next agenda item.

- 37
38
39 6. **Concept Review** – *White Horse Subdivision, Approximately 97 North 400 West.*
40 Krisel Travis of DR Horton requests review of a proposed subdivision in the R1-20
41 zone at approximately 97 N. 400 W. The Commission will provide feedback on a
42 proposal to create and apply to this subdivision an overlay zone that would provide
43 for flexibility in lot size while still maintaining overall density of two (2) dwelling
44 units/acre. No official motions will be made.

45 Mr. Cullimore led this discussion by explaining this is a request by Krisel Travis
46 of DR Horton who is requesting a review of a proposed subdivision in the R1-20 zone at

2 approximately 97 N. 400 W. He noted that the Commission will provide feedback only
3 on a proposal to create and apply an overlay zone that would provide for flexibility in lot
4 size while still maintaining the overall density of two (2) dwelling units per acre. He
5 noted that no official motions will be made as this is a concept review only.

6 Mr. Cullimore stated that the applicant presented an alternative configuration to
7 the Planning Commission in a meeting held on May 13, 2014. He noted this new
8 configuration does not comply with minimum lot size requirements in the R1-20 zone,
9 but it does maintain an average density of two (2) dwelling units per acre in accordance
10 with the General Plan. Mr. Cullimore re-iterated that the applicant would also like to
11 discuss a proposal to create and apply an overlay zone that would permit lot size
12 flexibility in infill situations while maintaining an overall average density in the R1-20
13 zone. Mr. Cullimore then referenced aerial photos of the land involved in the proposed
14 development, the new concept plan, and the concept plan that was presented at the
15 previous meeting held on May 13th. Mr. Cullimore then turned the time over to Ms.
16 Travis to address the Commission.

17 Ms. Travis gave a brief overview of DR Horton and stated that they are anxious to
18 build in Lindon as they have not had the opportunity to build here and they know that
19 Lindon is a great community and they would like to help it grow. She noted that DR
20 Horton builds everything from million dollar homes to townhomes, so they can hit every
21 price range and every buyer. In the Lindon project, they would hope to have homes that
22 start in the \$350,000 range and go up from there. They plan to build high quality homes
23 with many options with a “bumper to bumper” warranty. She noted that this property can
24 give them a unique opportunity.

25 Ms. Travis then presented the new concept prepared since the last meeting,
26 including approximately 18 acres. Ms. Travis note they also approached the two (2)
27 neighbors as directed by the commission. She stated they are proposing an overlay zone
28 in the R1-20 zone only and the initial concept is that they don’t exceed any of the
29 densities that would be R1-20 zoned. They are also asking for consideration on lot sizes
30 so they can get things to work with the odd shapes and sizes of the existing homes. She
31 noted there are eight (8) property owners involved in this transaction.

32 Ms. Travis commented this would also provide the opportunity to encourage
33 connectivity with existing roadways through the city and also the assembly of parcels.
34 This would also help with some of the “in-fill” areas left to develop in those R1-20 areas
35 that are not big enough to come in and do a master planned community, but would also
36 discourage people from purchasing or selling ½ acre lots and creating flag lots. Ms.
37 Travis stated they would meet the criteria for the R1-20 zone and the setbacks, the only
38 difference is the flexibility in the lot sizes (ranging from 13,000 to 20,000 sq. ft.). She
39 noted that on average the lots would meet the general plan concepts and criteria and
40 would not exceed the density. She added that the look and feel of the development will
41 be the same it will just give some diversity in the market for those people who want to
42 live in Lindon but do not necessarily want to maintain a ½ acre lot. Ms. Travis went on
43 to say this concept includes the existing homes on the larger lots, which does make it a
44 little harder for them to work with the interiors they are assembling; that is why the
45 overlay would become necessary with the flexibility in the lot sizes.

46 Commissioner Kallas inquired how many lots are laid out on this parcel. Ms.
47 Travis stated there are 35 with 6 existing homes (29 net new households). Chairperson
48 Call asked what the minimum lot size would be. Ms. Travis replied in this concept the
49 smallest lot is 13,200 sq. ft. Chairperson Call mentioned her concerns with the animal

rights and possible conflicts. Ms. Travis commented that they will have full covenant's to ensure they are in full compliance with animal rights and they will disclose this upfront. Commissioner Kallas asked staff if we were to do an overlay zone what would be the city's rights to limit animal rights within that overlay. Mr. Van Wagenen stated within this context, right now, the current animal ordinance does distinguish between lots that are 20,000 sq. ft. and those below, so things are in place. He added if there are concerns with this proposed community and the possible conflicts with animal rights, it could be added to the animal ordinance. Commissioner Marchbanks commented that one reason the animal ordinance was revisited is because even within a completed R1-20 development it poses problems with issues with neighbors and animals which can be very subjective. He noted the animal ordinance is very specific regarding different lot sizes and animal rights.

Commissioner Kallas expressed that he is favorable to this concept especially with Lindon developing the way it is. He feels the city is going to end up with some odd size pieces of property and this proposal would allow us to use them without having flag lots or a weed patch behind a house. Commissioner Marchbanks agrees that this looks like a nice development and he is open to the idea of some density stacking, but he is also concerned about ending up with "weed patches." Ms. Travis stated they will be open to working with staff so it works with not only this parcel but other smaller areas in Lindon. Commissioner Kallas noted that he is not saying he is not in favor of changing the city code to allow small lots, but with this development, where the average is the same, he feels it makes for better use of land.

Chairperson Calls stated that this is not a public hearing but she will take public comment at this time. Steve Smith, landowner in attendance, had a question with regards to the calculations of the density for clarification, whether it was done on net or gross density. Ms. Travis commented that the calculations are based on gross acreage. Mr. Smith noted this happened 15 years ago in the Pheasant Brook subdivision.

Chairperson Call mentioned that people do look to Lindon for acreage and animal rights which makes Lindon unique, and she has some positive feelings towards the proposal. However, we need to be careful that if someone moves to Lindon because they want a ½ acre lot, they would need to know that next door is a 12,000 sq. ft. lot with a much smaller home. Ms. Travis commented that it would not be a smaller home as they can build the same size home on a 6,000 sq. ft. lot because it is a choice from the market (they want the bigger home without the maintenance of a ½ acre lot). She noted that this overlay can be worked to appeal to both of these people and hopefully they can accommodate everyone.

Councilmember Bean asked Ms. Travis, outside of the financial reasons, what is the most compelling reason to do this development in Lindon? Ms. Travis stated that the connectivity is important to them and the market demand for the different lot sizes; they want to be able to offer more choices and to hit all of the demographics who want to live in Lindon. Chairperson Call commented that it appears that DR Horton is a reputable company and she feels they will make a great addition to Lindon. She also thanked Ms. Travis for her presentation. Ms. Travis thanked the Commission for their time and consideration in the matter.

Following additional discussion Chairperson Call asked if there were any further comments or discussion. Hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

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

2 Chairperson Call called for any new business or reports from the Commissioners.
Hearing no comments she moved on to the next agenda item.

4 8. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**–

6 Mr. Van Wagenen reported on the following items followed by some general
discussion by the Commission.

- 8 • National Packaging Update
• Planning Commission Vacancy Update
10 • Tithing House Update

12 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion. Hearing none she
called for a motion to adjourn.

14 **ADJOURN** –

16 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
18 MEETING AT 9:36 P.M. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE
MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

20 Approved – July 22, 2014

22
24 _____
Sharon Call, Chairperson

26
28
30 _____
Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director