

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**  
3 **September 26, 2023 beginning at 6:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers,  
4 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

**REGULAR SESSION – 6:00 P.M.**

6 Conducting: Sharon Call, Chairperson  
8 Invocation: Scott Thompson, Commissioner  
9 Pledge of Allegiance: Jared Schauers, Commissioner

10 **PRESENT**

11 Sharon Call, Chairperson  
12 Rob Kallas, Commissioner  
13 Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner  
14 Steven Johnson, Commissioner  
15 Scott Thompson, Commissioner  
16 Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
17 Karen Danielson, Commissioner – arrived at 6:45 p.m.  
18 Brian Haws, City Attorney  
19 Mary Barnes, Associate Planner  
20 Britni Laidler, Deputy Recorder

**EXCUSED**

Michael Florence, Community Development Director

22 1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

24 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –The minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning  
26 Commission meeting of September 12, 2023 were reviewed.

27 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE  
28 REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTMEBER 12, 2023 AS PRESENTED WITH NOTED  
29 CHANGES. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT  
30 VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Chairperson Call called for comments from any audience  
member who wishes to address any issue not listed as an agenda item.

34 Shauna Bagley addressed the commission at this time, letting them know of a business  
happening in her neighborhood. The neighbor has been bringing in box storage containers and  
having diesel trucks come in and out of the cul-de-sac. Ms. Barnes, let the resident know she has  
previously reached out to the resident in discussion, and asked Ms. Bagley if anything has  
changed, she stated it has not changed. Ms. Bagley voiced her concern that there is a lot more  
going on than the city may know. Brian Haws, City Attorney let the resident know he is happy to  
talk with her about the process that can be taken to help with this issue. Ms. Bagley then asked  
for clarification on home businesses, and what is and is not permitted.

**CURRENT BUSINESS** –

2 **4. Miscellaneous Application Approval – Dorner Sports Court Setback Modification**  
 4 – **946 E. 25 S.** The applicant requests a sports court setback modification from the  
 planning commission, pursuant to Lindon City Code 17.44.150.

6 Mary Barnes, Associate Planner presented this item. She noted the applicant Rob Dorner is  
 present. Ms. Barnes began with presenting an aerial shot of the property stating the applicant has  
 8 started to build a pickleball court in the southeast corner of his property. She notes that city code  
 17.44.150 states when sports court fencing is taller than 7ft must maintain minimum of a 10 ft  
 10 setback from rear and side property lines, however, the Planning Commission has the authority  
 to modify that requirement when specific requirements are met. The applicant, Mr. Dorner is  
 12 requesting a modification to the requirement to allow the sports court and a 10’ fence to be  
 placed along the rear property line of 946 E 25 S. He has provided a document that outlines the  
 14 opinion of adjacent neighbors and states these neighbors have indicated that they are in favor of  
 the sports court.

16 Ms. Barnes let the commission know the sports court fencing posts have already been  
 18 installed and are 10 ft tall. This fencing is only along the south side/rear property line. She did  
 note that this is because the property slopes down in the backyard. She stated the applicant has  
 20 said that if he sees issued with sport equipment going into other yards, he will continue the  
 fencing around the perimeter or the sport court. She then went over the terms of the code and  
 22 noted they are in compliance on all terms.

**Code Compliance**

Requirement	Explanation	Compliant?
The proposed height and/or setback modification is necessary to provide privacy and protection of private property interests.	This court will be approximately 30 ft from the closest dwelling (961 E 70 S), approximately 40 ft from the closest dwelling to the south (957 E 70 S), and approximately 53 ft from the closest dwelling to the north (954 E 25 S). With the 10’ fence on the south side, this sports court will protect the neighboring properties to the south from any stray sports equipment. The applicant will install fencing on the east, west, and north sides if needed in the future. At this time, the slope should be able to take care of any issues. A complaint was filed regarding the possibility of too much noise. The applicant will have to follow the noise ordinance.	Yes
The appearance and/or setback of the fence will not detract or cause aesthetic damage to neighboring property owners.	At this time, adjacent neighbors have expressed that they are in favor of this sports court.	Yes
The proposed height and/or setback modification will not cause a public safety hazard.	None identified	Yes
The proposed additional height is necessary to provide an adequate buffer for the adjoining land owners’ use.	The 10’ fence is intended to help to protect the southern neighbors from stray sports balls, frisbees, etc.	Yes

2 Ms. Barnes then let the commission know a neighbor had called staff on 9/21/23 to state that  
4 they are worried about this sports court and the possible noise that could become a nuisance  
6 during the night. She noted that the current noise ordinance states that it is unlawful for a person  
8 to make unreasonably loud or disturbing noises in the city, specifically noises that are  
substantially incompatible with the time where said noise is created, between the hours of 10:30  
PM and 7 AM. This has been added as a condition of approval for this noise ordinance and to  
work with the neighbors to ensure noise ordinance is upheld has been added.

10 Ms. Barnes noted that staff believes that this modification will not significantly affect the  
neighborhood, and it will not damage the image of the neighborhood as long as the noise  
12 ordinance is followed. Permitting this modification will allow Mr. Dorner to use his private  
property as he sees fit, and the conditions of approval will help to protect other private property  
14 interests. She also let the commission know that all 5 adjacent property owners have been sent  
notices.

16 Commissioner Kallas asked Mr. Dorner about screening. Mr. Dorner stated he has no  
18 plans of doing screening at this moment. Commissioner Kallas requested to add the condition  
that no restrictive netting being placed above 7 ft to avoid sight obstruction for neighbors.

20 Following some general discussion Chairperson Call called for any further comments or  
22 discussion from the Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.

24 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANTS REQUEST  
TO MODIFY THE SPORTS COURT SETBACK REQUIREMENT FOUND IN 17.44.150 FOR  
26 THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 946 E. 25 S. WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: A)  
THE APPLICANT WILL APPLY FOR A BUILDING PERMIT FOR ANY ADDITIONAL  
28 FENCING OR THE SPORTS COURT ABOVE 7 FT; B) THE SPORT COURT LIGHTING  
WILL NOT SHINE INTO ANOTHER'S PROPERTY; C) THE APPLICANT WILL  
30 CONTINUE TO WORK WITH NEIGHBORS, AND ENSURE THAT THE NOISE  
ORDINANCE IS UPHELD. THIS INCLUDES REDUCED SPORTS ACTIVITIES AND NO  
32 NOISE BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 10:30 PM TO 7 AM; D) NO SIGHT OBSCURING  
SCREENING ABOVE 7 FT LEVEL AND E) ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.  
34 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE VOTE. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS  
FOLLOWS:

36 CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
38 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS	AYE
40 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
42 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.	

44 **5. Conditional Use Permit – Collier Estates Duplex (R2 Overlay – 750 W 100 S.** The  
applicant requests conditional use permit approval for an R2 Overlay project for a  
46 duplex to be located at 750 W. 100 S. in the Residential R1-20 zone.

2 Ms. Barnes also presented this item. She noted the applicant Lucas Collier was present.  
 Ms. Barnes began with giving some background on this property stating this lot has a  
 4 nonconforming depth, however a variance was granted for the depth in 1997. On November  
 29th, 2022 the planning commission approved the Collier Estates Minor Subdivision and on May  
 6 17th, 2023 the board of adjustments approved a variance for the rear setback, reducing the rear  
 setback from 30' to 20'.

8  
 Ms. Barnes went on to state the R2 overlay only permits multifamily units if there is  
 10 room within a “District”, as outlined in the R2 overlay map. She then presented the district  
 breakdowns to the commission. Additionally noting that any new projects must be at least 750'  
 12 away from an existing project. She let the commission know this project would be within District  
 15, which currently allows 17 units, but currently only has 15. Ms. Barnes stated that if this is  
 14 approved it would close the entire district for anymore R2 overlay projects. This Overlay zone  
 establishes a place where limited multifamily dwelling units can be constructed. The purpose of  
 16 this ordinance is also to establish a means whereby multi-family housing can be distributed  
 throughout the City and throughout the individual R2 Overlay planning districts. Ms. Barnes  
 18 presented the project requirements of this potential permit.

<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Provided</b>	<b>Compliant?</b>
Setbacks: The setbacks are the same as the R1-20 zone, with the exception of the rear yard setback variance. Front: 30 ft Side: 10 ft Rear: 20 ft	Front: 30' West side: 35' East side: 70' Rear: 20'	Yes.
Fences: A 6' high sight obscuring fence shall be erected on the perimeter, except for the front yard setback	A 6' chain link fence is existing. The applicant is proposing to add slats.	Please see discussion below.
Security Lighting: All R2 overlay projects must include a security lighting system.	A note has been added to the front page of the plans stating “Security lighting system to be installed as per 17.46.060 (8)”	Yes, this project will include security lighting.
Parking: At least 2 off-street parking stalls each, not within the front yard.	Both units have two-car garages.	Yes.
Storage Areas: Exterior storage for boats, RVs or other misc. items must be enclosed with at 6' sight obscuring fence, and are only permitted on the side or rear of the duplex.	No storage area has been designated. This is a requirement that will need to be followed if this type of storage is needed in the future.	N/A
Architectural Style: The intent is to maintain the single-family appearance. The building colors shall be earth tones, and the building shall have only 1 front door and garage facing the street. The materials used must be traditional residential architectural materials.	The exterior materials are going to be Hardie board, with a stone chimney feature. The color will be “Apple Peel”, which is a slightly creamy color. The front door and garage for Unit 1 will be facing west, and the front door and garage for Unit 2 will be facing the road.	Yes.

2 Ms. Barnes stated this project meets the requirements for an R2 overlay project within  
District 15. Additionally, this project will provide much needed moderate-income housing within  
4 Lindon. With this project, two new families will be able to locate with Lindon City and  
experience the friendliness and country values that Lindon is known for. Ms. Barnes let the  
6 commission know Mr. Collier has already signed and notarized the moderate-income home  
agreement.

8  
10 Following some general discussion Ms. Barnes went on to address the commission on  
terms of fencing on this property noting staff believes that with their direction on the fencing  
matter, this project could be a great use for this property. Current code does require a 6ft high  
12 sight obscuring fence on property perimeter, noting that the applicant is planning a chain-link  
fence with slats, however at a prior meeting on another property this was found to not fulfill the  
14 sight obscuring requirement. Ms. Barnes then presented and went over terms of fencing  
requirements and then presented recent R2 overlay properties along with the fences they have  
16 installed on those properties. She then reminded the commission to be careful what they decided  
because it may set a precedence for future and other properties. General discussion followed.

18  
20 Commissioner Thompson voiced concern of not sticking to the code requirements stating  
they have set a precedence of what a sight obscuring fence is; changing things could be a  
slippery slope. Mr. Haws, City Attorney stated that in these terms it would only be for R2  
22 overlay and would not be setting a precedent for other areas that are not within the R2 overlays  
in this particular case. Commissioner Johnson stated that he is fine making an exception for this  
24 property because it matches what this property needs.

26  
28 Commissioner Kallas voiced his concern with this property and putting a duplex in a  
residential area. He let the commission know that he has heard from neighbors in that area with  
concerns with having a duplex in that area. Mr. Haws stated this project has met all requirements  
to allow for this duplex in that location. Chairperson Call stated she thinks this project would be  
30 an improvement to the property. She then stated she is not opposed to putting slats in the fencing  
that is already there. However, she thinks slats on the property should all be the same color to  
32 keep the appearance nice for the neighborhood. Commissioner Thompson stated he feels  
comfortable with allowing a chain-link fence with slats of the same color.

34  
36 Shauna Bagley, a resident in the area voiced her concern with the project due to traffic flow  
in the area and the potential impact this could have on property value. She stated however, she  
thinks the project looks nice, and just wants to make sure the impact on traffic wouldn't be too  
38 high.

40 After some general discussion, chairperson Call called for any further comments or  
discussion from the Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.

42  
44 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S  
REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE COLLIER ESTATES DUPLEX  
R2 OVERLAY PROJECT LOCATED AT 750 W 100 S WITH THE FOLLOWING  
46 CONDITIONS : 1. THIS PROPERTY WILL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH CHAPTER 17.46;  
2. A WATERWISE LANDSCAPING PLAN PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 17.19 WILL BE

2 PROVIDED AND APPROVED BY STAFF BEFORE A BUILDING PERMIT IS RELEASED;  
3. THAT A MODIFICATION TO THE FENCING REQUIREMENT OF BEING SIGHT  
4 OBSCURING WILL BE ALLOWED, AND ALL SLATS SHALL BE THE SAME COLOR IN  
A CHAIN-LINK FENCE AND 4. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER  
6 DANIELSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:  
CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE  
8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE  
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE  
10 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE  
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE  
12 COMMISSIONER KALLAS NAY  
COMMISSIONER DANIELSON AYE  
14 THE MOTION CARRIED 6 TO 1

16 *Commissioner Kallas noted the reason for his nay vote is that he believes there are other areas  
that the R2 overlay could be put.*

18  
20 **6. Amended Site Plan Approval – Lindon Tilt Addition – 730 N. 2800 W.** The applicant  
requests amended site plan approval to construct a 24,072 sq ft addition to the existing  
building at 730 N. 2800 W. The lot will also be brought into substantial compliance with  
22 City Code.

24 Mary Barnes presented this item nothing that the applicant Scott Dee is present. Ms.  
Barnes stated the applicant is seeking amended site plan approval for a new 24,072 square foot  
26 addition to the existing building. The current area is a vacant dirt lot. On the site there is  
currently a 36,156 sq ft warehouse building which is occupied by a furniture company. This  
28 building received site plan approval from the planning commission on February 9, 2016.  
According to city records, the original site plan approved by the planning commission 2016 had  
30 a 58,000 square foot building with storage units along the east property line. However, the  
building was later reduced to 36,156 square feet and the storage units were never constructed.  
32 The applicant, Mr. Dee is now proposing to construct a 24,072 square foot addition on the east  
side of the existing building that would a warehouse.

34  
36 Ms. Barnes noted Lindon City Code 17.17.130 Amended Site Plans states that when an  
addition results in a 30% increase in building square footage, it will trigger the requirement for  
the property to come into substantial compliance with City Code. This addition is a 66.5%  
38 increase in square footage. Ms. Barnes then went over the requirements for the amended site  
plan.

<b>Code Issue/Requirement</b>	<b>Compliant with an amended site plan?</b>
Landscaping;	Mostly. Please see the landscaping section below.
Storage and exterior displays;	Yes. This accessory building will improve the storage situation for this property. There are no existing code issues with exterior displays on this lot.
Off-Street Parking;	Yes. Please see the parking section below.
Vehicular access and circulation;	Yes. Please see the traffic circulation section below.
Off-street loading and unloading;	Yes. The engineers have not found any issues with the current loading and unloading situation.
On-site surface water drainage;	The engineers have requested an updated Stormwater Maintenance Agreement from the applicant, which is required to be signed before a building permit is issued.
Off-site curb, gutter, and sidewalk;	Yes. All public improvements on the road were installed in 2016, when the existing warehouse was built.
Piping of irrigation ditches;	N/A. This code requirement does not apply to this project, there are no open irrigation ditches in this area.
Solid waste containers (trash enclosures);	Yes.
Street Lights;	Yes. Street lighting was installed in phase 1.
Fencing and/or screening;	N/A. This property does not border residential; therefore, it does not have a fencing/screening requirement.
Architectural standards applicable to the zone in which the site is located;	Yes. Please see the design standards section below.

2

4

Ms. Barnes went on to discuss parking requirements. She noted when phase 1 was approved the City Code required 136 stalls. The applicant provided a parking study and city staff and planning commission approved phase 1 with only 93 total stalls. However, after planning commission approval the applicant further reduced the size of the building in phase one the final reduced parking stalls was 58 stalls. The new addition would require an additional 48 parking stalls, she pointed out the applicant has put 49 stalls bringing total on that property if approved to 107 on the total property.

10

12

Landscaping requirements were presented to the commission and discussed as follows:

<b>Required Site Landscaping</b>	<b>Provided</b>	<b>Compliant?</b>
15% of the entire lot must be maintained in permanent landscaping.	15.2% of the entire lot is will be landscaped with this amended site plan.	Yes
20' landscape berm along the street, with street trees planted every 30'	Yes, the landscape strip and street trees were installed with phase 1.	Yes
A perimeter landscape strip at least 5' wide shall be placed around all buildings	Yes, the site plan shows 5' dedicated for landscaping but the landscape plan only show rock in this area. This will need to be corrected before final approval	No, see conditional of approval.
For every parking spot, 40 sq ft of parking lot landscaping is required. 40*49=1,960 sq ft.	Due to the nature of this site, most of the landscaping is parking lot landscaping. 4,126 sq ft has been provided	Yes.
1 tree is required in the parking lot per 10 parking spaces. 49/10=4.9 or 5 trees required	5 trees have been provided.	Yes.

2 Ms. Barnes noted that on the landscaping plan, it shows no plants or trees in the north  
 4 landscaped area. Staff will ensure that this area is properly landscaped before final approval is  
 given and noted the applicant will be required to add a landscaped end island on the west side of  
 the most southwest parking stall.

6 Ms. Barnes then presented to the commission the Building and Architectural standards as follows:

<b>Design Element</b>	<b>Applicants Proposal</b>
Building Height: Max 48 ft	37 ft
All structures in the MC zone shall have finishes of brick, decorative block, stucco, wood, concrete tilt-up, or other materials and designs approved within the Lindon City Commercial Design Guidelines, or as otherwise approved by the Planning Commission	This building will be a concrete tilt up to match the existing phase 1 building.
Concrete tilt-up buildings shall comply with the following standards: a. Painted or colored concrete exteriors are permitted. The shade of each color must be consistent. b. Bare concrete exteriors are not permitted. c. The exterior of a concrete tilt-up building shall be finished with additional architectural details such as entrance canopies, wrought iron railings and finishes, shutters, multi-level porches, metal shades, and metal awnings.	a. The concrete exterior will be painted to match the existing phase 1 building which is a gray color. b. No bare concrete exterior is proposed. c. The applicant proposes steel canopies over each overhead door. In addition, the applicant is proposing decorative windows on the corner and main eastern front façade. There is also building articulation on the two eastern corners.

8  
 10 Commissioner Schauers asked for clarification on the landscaping standards and where it  
 12 needs to be changed to be in compliance with the vegetation requirements. Ms. Barnes then  
 presented more in depth the areas in question.

14 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission.  
 Hearing none she called for a motion.

16  
 18 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S  
 20 REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE  
 APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE ALL  
 22 FINAL CORRECTIONS TO THE ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS; 2. THE PLANS WILL  
 MEET DEVELOPMENT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY  
 DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 2800 WEST 3. IF REQUIRED, COMPLETE (OR POST AN  
 ADEQUATE IMPROVEMENT COMPLETION ASSURANCE), WARRANT AND POST  
 24 REQUIRED WARRANTY ASSURANCE FOR ALL REQUIRED PUBLIC  
 INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS; 4. FINAL BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN WILL  
 26 MEET THE MIXED COMMERCIAL ORDINANCE AND LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS;  
 5. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE  
 28 MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL                                 AYE  
 30 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON                         AYE



2 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE  
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE  
4 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE  
COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE  
6 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON AYE  
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8

10 **7. Public hearing for a recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend the  
Nuisance, Building, Zoning Violation Fines (8.02.090, 15.04.050, 17.04.410,  
12 17.62.170).** Lindon City requests a recommendation to the Lindon City Council bring  
the penalties imposed by the city for nuisance, building, and zoning violations into  
harmony with State standards for the imposition of fines and fees.

14

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
16 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN  
FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

18

Mary Barnes presented this item noting that Utah State Code section 10-3-703 imposes  
20 limits and conditions on the fines and penalties that a municipality can impose for violations on  
city ordinances. It also states that a municipality may not impose a criminal penalty greater than  
22 an infraction for a violation pertaining to an individual's use of the individual's residence. It also  
states that a governing body may prescribe a civil penalty for the violation of any municipal  
24 ordinance by a fine not to exceed the maximum Class B misdemeanor fine, and a municipality  
may not issue more than one infraction within a 14-day period for a violation that is ongoing.

26

She explained this ordinance amendment would change the code violation fines from the  
28 current \$200 or \$400 a day to \$1000 per violation for every 14 days that the violation continues  
in non-residential areas, and \$500 per violation for every 14 days that the violation continues in  
30 residential areas. This ordinance amendment will clean up the violation fines language to ensure  
that the City Code matches the code enforcement process. This ordinance amendment would  
32 amend everywhere in the code where it mentions the \$200/\$400 a day fine which is in 4 areas: 1)  
8.20.090, or the nuisance code; 2) 15.04.050, of the building code; 3) 17.04.410, or the zoning  
34 violation code and 4) 17.62.170, or the floodplain code within the zoning chapter.

36 Ms. Barnes stated this is an ordinance amendment that has been needed for a while. Code  
enforcement is already a delicate process, so ensuring that the code matches with the process and  
38 state code is of utmost importance. The city attorney was able to lend help with the draft  
ordinance to ensure it covers all of our bases. With this ordinance amendment, there will be a  
40 little more direction for code enforcement in the city, and it will help to eliminate confusion for  
any Lindon residents or staff.

42

44 Following some general discussion, Chairperson Call called for any public comments or  
discussion. Hearing none she called for a motion to close the public hearing.

2 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
3 COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN  
4 FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

6 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission.  
7 Hearing none she called for a motion.

8  
9 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF  
10 ORDINANCE 2023-20-O AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS  
11 SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

12 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE  
13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE  
14 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE  
15 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE  
16 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE  
17 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE  
18 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON AYE  
19 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

20  
21 **8. Planning Director Updates – General city updates**

- 22
  - Training with Cedar Hills Planning Commission on October 24 potentially
  - Next meeting October 10<sup>th</sup> - outlook of agenda items

24  
25 **NEW BUSINESS**

26  
27 Commissioner Johnson asked for an update on the Tim Clyde property. Mr. Haws gave  
28 update in regards to the ombudsman advisory process. Chairperson Call then asked about the  
29 property at 400 N and State Street. Mr. Haws let the commission know that Code Enforcement  
30 has been working on that particular property. Chairperson Call then asked Ms. Barnes to update  
31 the commission on how the city council voted on the Weldon Property of Mountain Tech 3 and  
32 Mike Coutlee’s permit. Ms. Barnes gave the commission an update on those items.

33 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the commission.  
34 Hearing none she called for a motion to adjourn.

35  
36 **ADJOURN –**

37  
38 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT  
39 8:21 PM. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT  
40 VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

41  
42 Approved, October 10, 2023

43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Sharon Call, Chairperson

46 \_\_\_\_\_  
47 Michael Florence, Community Development Director