- The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday**, **January 22, 2019 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center, City Council
- 4 Chambers, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.
- 6 **REGULAR SESSION 7:00 P.M.**
- 8 Conducting: Sharon Call, Chairperson

Invocation: Mike Vanchiere, Commissioner

- 10 Pledge of Allegiance: Rob Kallas, Commissioner
- 12 PRESENT EXCUSED

Sharon Call, Chairperson Scott Thompson, Commissioner

- 14 Rob Kallas, Commissioner Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
- 16 Charlie Keller, Commissioner Steven Johnson, Commissioner
- 18 Mike Vanchiere, Commissioner Jared Schauers, Commissioner
- 20 Mike Florence, Planning Director Anders Bake, Associate Planner
- 22 Kathy Moosman, Recorder

28

46

- 1. <u>CALL TO ORDER</u> The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
- 26 2. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u> –The minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting of January 8, 2019 were reviewed.

COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES

- 30 OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 8, 2019 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED
- 32 IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.
- 3. <u>PUBLIC COMMENT</u> 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** –
- Site Plan Approval Lindon's Edge, Castle Park Properties, LLC and Davies Design Build 126 South Main. The applicants request site plan
- approval for a fourteen (14) building business park to be constructed on approximately 5.5 acres located in the General Commercial zone. Parcel #'s
- 44 45:424:0001, 14:069:0264, 14:069:0295, 14:069:0304, 14:069:0303, 14:069:0302.
- Mike Florence, Planning Director, led this discussion by stating the applicants are requesting site plan approval for a fourteen (14) building business park to be constructed

- on approximately 5.5 acres located in the General Commercial zone. The planning commission will be evaluating whether the site plan and buildings meet Title 17
- 4 development regulations and the Commercial Design Standards. He explained the applicant proposes 14 buildings consisting of 42 individual office spaces on 5.89 acres.
- He noted each building is two stories and has an average square footage of approximately 900 square feet per floor; certain units will also have a basement for office storage. The reception center building at the northeast corner of the property will remain and will

continue in business.

Mr. Florence further explained the developer is proposing a shared parking plan, which is recommended by the Commercial Design Standards between the new business park and the reception center. He noted the parking analysis from the developer that describes the shared parking plan is included in the staff packet. He then referenced the table identifying the required parking for the business park. The reception center would use the business parking weekly after 6:00 p.m. and on weekends. He noted that currently, all of the property and parking will be under the same ownership.

Mr. Florence indicated the developer will need to meet the requirements for lighting installation and separation along Main Street. He added the developer has provided a lighting photometric study for the interior of the development to ensure lighting does not affect the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Florence went on to say the General Commercial zone requires 20% of the site to be landscaped and the applicant is providing 28%. The Commercial Design Standards require a park strip for new development, however, due to the alignment of the utilities along Main Street staff does not recommend installing the park strip. The developer will also be installing the required amount of street trees behind the sidewalk.

Mr. Florence commented the development will be constructed in three phases. First, the developer will demo the houses along Main Street and possibly the shed on the south side. Any building or landscaping that isn't in the way of construction will remain intact, until that corresponding phase starts.

Mr. Florence indicated the site plan provides adequate traffic circulation and two means of ingress and egress from Main Street. He noted there is an existing emergency access at the southwest corner of the property that has a chain across it limiting access. This access was required in a 2011 approval by the fire department due to not having sufficient site circulation. With this development proposal, the applicant is proposing that the emergency gate on the southwest corner remain. However, the main concern with the emergency access is that it opens into a single-family residential neighborhood.

Mr. Florence mentioned that the Commercial Design Standard 3.2 states to "avoid access to parking from/through residential areas." He indicated staff is reviewing with the fire department whether this emergency access can be closed. With the new development plan, there will be two means of ingress and egress from the site from Main Street. If this area is required to remain open then the fire department will want to have "Knox" key access and staff would recommend that a new gate be installed instead of the existing chain.

Mr. Florence reminded the Commission that buildings in the General Commercial zone are required to meet the Lindon Commercial Design Standards. Under the commercial design standards commercial development should pick one of three building forms: one-part commercial block, two-part commercial block, and central block buildings. The proposed buildings most align with the two-part commercial block

- 2 building. He then referenced the standards for such buildings in the Commercial Design Standards.
- 4 Mr. Florence indicated the business park is currently situated with all buildings facing each other internally. The developer has provided a good design that identifies the
- 6 entrance as to create attractive buildings. Lindon City Commercial Design Standards require at least the buildings along a public street to be oriented with the front façade and
- 8 entrance toward the street. Staff could not find a section that allows the rear of the building to face the street. He noted the following sections apply:
- 2.2 Orient and align the street-facing façade of buildings to the street to help define and shape the street.
- 2.2 Orient primary entrances to streets and other public spaces, such as plazas, courtyards, and pathways, that have higher levels of pedestrian activity.
- 5.2.1 Building placement and orientation should also reinforce the connection to primary and secondary streets, contributing in a positive manner to the streetscape of the commercial area.
 - 5.2.1- Orient buildings to the main street, either parallel to the street or at a maximum angle of 45 degrees. If a building is on a corner lot, it may have a corner orientation. This is not to preclude entrances or façade detailing to other orientations, such as a side parking lot.
 - 5.2.1 Give the greatest consideration in terms of design emphasis and detailing to the street facing façade (or façades if a corner site). Clusters of buildings in a single planned development may utilize common or compatible building forms and/or architectural styles, with a secondary emphasis on the internal relationships of buildings around a shared parking facility, interior court, landscaped yard, or plaza.
 - 5.2.6 Facades that front on to public ways should contain functional windows and doors, with a balance of solids and voids.
- Mr. Florence then referenced the submitted color board noting the colors vary from copper (metal), light grey (EIFS), Manganese Iron Spot (brick), clear aluminum
- 32 (storefront and canopies). Mr. Florence stated the City Engineer is working through technical issues related to the site and will ensure all engineering related issues are
- resolved before final approval is granted. He added the new Lindon's Edge business park will be a new attractive amenity to the commercial and employment core of Lindon City.
- He stated the developer has done a good job in trying to contextually fit the development in with the surrounding neighborhood. The items of building materials, access and
- building orientation should be further evaluated and considered by the planning commission.
- 40 Mr. Florence then read the conditions to include in the motion if approved as follows:
 - 1. The applicant will finalize engineering reviews;
- 42 2. A plat amendment be approved by the planning commission prior to construction beginning;
- 3. Shared parking be approved as outlined in the developers parking analysis. If the shared parking becomes an issue where insufficient on-site parking is not provided due to incompatible shared uses or vehicle parking overflows into the surrounding neighborhood the project property owners will secure additional parking through purchase or agreement. Upon complaint, the City may require

18

20

22

24

26

28

- changes to hours of operations for the shared uses, an updated shared parking analysis, or other requirements to provide sufficient parking;
 - 4. A deed or other legal instrument will be recorded guaranteeing access to parking as per Lindon City Code Title 17;
 - 5. Due to the development being constructed in phases and the need to share parking between uses, a minimum of one hundred (100) parking stalls will be constructed and available for phase one;
 - 6. The buildings along Main Street will be oriented with the front façade and entry doors that face the street as required by Lindon City Commercial Design Standards;
 - 7. All items of the staff report

4

6

8

10

12

18

20

22

24

26

28

30

32

34

36

38

40

42

44

46

48

Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits: aerial photo, site pictures, site plan, landscaping plan, architectural renderings, color board, and parking analysis followed by discussion.

Chairperson Call then turned the time over to the applicant, Edward Axley for comment. Mr. Axley spoke on the uses for this property stating they feel this proposal is the least intrusive product with daytime type of businesses and services and this footprint is not much different than a residential structure in height; this will be a beautiful project.

Chairperson Call stated her biggest concern is the two buildings with a main street building orientation and to meet the commercial design guidelines; it appears the orientation needs to be turned. Mr. Ackely stated they will maintain as much of the access and use on the inside parking area (on the parking lot side). He indicated they can give it two fronts and "dress" it so it is extremely attractive on both sides (one aesthetic and one functional). Also, they will encourage parking on the inside and not on the street. Mr. Florence stated it will need to meet the architectural changes to meet the guidelines.

Commissioner Kallas asked Mr. Florence to read the code again. Mr. Florence then read the code. Commissioner Marchbanks suggested making the back look like the front with no parking as to shy away from people parking on main street.

Architect, Kory Harris, spoke on the building materials and the 85% requirement and 60/40 split. He indicated he feels the code contradicts itself. There was then some general discussion on the building façade requirements.

Chairperson Call allowed public comment at this time. There were several in attendance who addressed the commission as follows:

Richard Gale: Mr. Gale read a prepared statement. He stated he is a neighbor to this project. They love that Lindon is quiet and diverse. They abut a large event center which has been good with good events in the past, however, they do have issues with parking. They are concerned this proposal will affect the ambience of the neighborhood. He then gave several reasons as follow:

- 1. Noise every day.
- 2. Traffic main street will be the main artery with no sidewalks and is not lit. A traffic study should be done before approval; this is a primary concern for everyone.
- 3. Parking (shared parking model). There is not enough parking now for the event center. This needs to be examined more closely
- 4. Safety (who will buy these) and the zoning.

| 2 | 5. Ambiance of the neighborhood. This will affect the site line and view of the mountains. | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 4 | | | |
| 6 | Mr. Gale stated this is zoned commercial as a family owned business and is not what this was originally intended for. They respect property and owner's rights, but they hope that the rights of the families are not affected by this proposal. | | |
| 8 | nope that the rights of the families are not affected by this proposal. | | |
| O | David Lee . Mr. Lee stated he owns neighboring property to this proposal. He echoed | | |
| 10 | Mr. Gales comments. He noted traffic will be a big issue as there is only one light. The road is not big enough to support a complex like this and to have it be accessible. This is | | |
| 12 | a big problem with the citizens who live in the neighborhood. They would also like to know if these units will be owner occupied or rentals and if they will have an elevator | | |
| 14 | and if there will be an HOA. He supports the development, but the big issue is traffic problems. There will be people parking on the street and there is no way around that. | | |
| 16 | problems. There will be people parking on the street and there is no way around that: | | |
| _ | Jeremy Ackley . Mr. Ackley stated he is a neighbor to this proposed development. He | | |
| 18 | stated he is comfortable with the height but his main concern is the emergency crash gate and mixing commercial with residential. Residents don't know who is going in them etc. | | |
| 20 | and this is going to pose safety issues. He feels there is no need for a crash gate as it creates and inlet of people (strangers) coming in and walking through the residential | | |
| 22 | neighborhood. The other concern is the dance studio on the corner with no sidewalk curb and gutter which poses a huge safety hazard; this got through because previous city staff | | |
| 24 | did not do a good job. This proposed project will facilitate so much more traffic and there has to be more of separation. He also asked about phasing and to make sure the exteriors | | |
| 26 | are what actually happens. He would ask that this issue comes back to the Planning Commission. | | |
| 28 | | | |
| 30 | Patrice Breschstettler : Ms. Breschstettler stated it appears that there doesn't seem to be a buffer or landscape zone. She added she does not like the architecture and it does not | | |
| 32 | fit in with their neighborhood. She also mentioned her concerns with the landscaping. | | |
| 34 | Brittney Underwood: Ms. Underwood expressed her concerns that this cannot support all the additional traffic. | | |
| 36 | Eric Barzeele: Mr. Barzeele spoke on the actual width of the road and pointed out that | | |
| 38 | the road is not finished. | | |
| 40 | Steve Davies: Mr. Davies stated he believes the subject of the ratios should be decided now. | | |
| | | | |
| 42 | Chairperson Call stated as far as the commercial zoning this is a permitted use. Mr. Axley stated there is plenty of parking beyond what is asked for the use and as far as | | |
| 44 | the emergency egress it is the Fire Marshal who is requesting it; they would be happy to put in an impenetrable wall. They also have concerns of people or kids coming through | | |
| 46 | the gate/wall to come into a commercial development and vandalism. | | |

Commissioner Vanchiere commented Mr. Lee's points are well taken but the

challenge is how things may impact the surrounding neighborhoods. If it is zoned

48

accordingly with the code, he believes there is really nothing the planning commission has the ability to do if it meets the zone and the design standards, they don't have any recourse; the only control they have is over the materials etc.

Commissioner Marchbanks asked if the breakaway gate is non-passable only to emergency personnel adding he doesn't want to see parking on the street or in the neighborhood. Mr. Florence stated the Planning Commission has the ability to have a traffic study. They can also give direction to the applicant to provide updated renderings of the façade, a traffic study, the trees/landscaping and the type of gate to be installed.

Also, a development agreement with construction timelines and setting maximum heights is a possibility; we can go that direction if the Commission so chooses. Commissioner

12 Vanchiere commented he feels this doesn't rise to the level of a development agreement as this is not that complex.

Mr. Axley stated they would be happy to redistribute the trees. He pointed out they are not asking for a zone change which is costly, time consuming and an unfair burden to put on the developer. They are not asking for a change in zone and this is not a high-density project.

Commissioner Kallas spoke on the issues of the required curb, gutter and sidewalk on main street and where we stand on that. Mr. Florence stated they will be required to put in curb gutter and sidewalk. Commissioner Kallas feels we need to look into how to finish the road to allow for the traffic and what options are open to the city to finish off the road.

Commissioner Kallas listed his concerns with the road, heights of the parapets, lighting in the parking lot and the gate needs to be installed/fixed so no one can get through. Commissioner Marchbanks stated he agrees with Commissioner Kallas' comments. He doesn't see parking as an issue as there is a similar event center down the street that hasn't had any concerns. He also feels the gate should be included in Phase 1.

Mr. Axley stated they are not condo-minimizing these so they can control what businesses go in. The applicants will be service type scenarios and they are going to rent them. He pointed out the phasing timeline is market driven.

Chairperson Call stated the Commission wants to make sure that we get a development that will meet all requirements and guidelines; she added she would like to see this item come back before the Commission rather than staff. Mr. Florence stated the city engineer and public works director can be here at the next meeting for further discussion if this item is continued. Commissioner Kallas stated he would like interpretation on the code (percentages). Mr. Florence stated he can research that to provide to the applicant and commission before the next meeting. Commissioner Johnson stated his personal opinion is that the code is a little outdated (on building materials) and needs further discussion.

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

COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO CONTINUE THE MEETING
TO THE NEXT MEETING. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION.
THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

46 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
48 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE

6

8

14

16

18

20

22

24

26

28

30

32

34

36

38

40

| 2 | COMMISSIONER JOHNSON | AYE | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE | AYE | |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS | AYE | |
| | THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUS | LY. | |
| 6 | | | |
| | 5. Luxury Motorsport Conditional U | Jse Permit - Jared Janson, 1070 W. 400 N. | |
| 8 The applicant requests conditional use permit approval to operate an a | | | |
| | business and tow yard. Parcel # 45:1 | 11:0003. | |
| 10 | | | |
| | Anders Bake, Associate Planner led t | his discussion by explaining the applicant, | |
| 12 | • 1 0 11 | | |
| | vehicles and towing services. The proposal | | |
| 14 | zone. | • | |
| | | ose of the Light Industrial (LI) district is to | |
| provide areas in appropriate locations where light manufacturing, industrial processing provides areas in appropriate locations where light manufacturing, industrial processing provides areas in appropriate locations where light manufacturing, industrial processing provides areas in appropriate locations where light manufacturing, industrial processing provides areas in appropriate locations. | | | |
| | warehousing not producing objectionable en | C 1 | |
| 18 | | designed to protect environmental quality of | |
| 10 | the district and adjacent areas. He noted the | | |
| 20 | • | 95 after a previous building was destroyed by | |
| 20 | | building at this time. Notices were mailed on | |
| 22 | | ers in accordance with Lindon City Code and | |
| 22 | Staff has received no public comment at thi | | |
| 24 | <u> </u> | ing strip 20-foot landscaping strip with grass 2 | |
| 2 4 | trees (1 tree every 30 feet) 4 trees. There is | | |
| 26 | • | | |
| 26 | applicant does not propose any changes to t | | |
| 20 | He then went over the staff analysis as follows. | | |
| 28 | . | red 13 parking stalls. Staff recommends that | |
| 20 | the stalls be designated with striping | | |
| 30 | | ts in the chain link fence along 400 North to | |
| 22 | | irements for a view-obscuring fence. | |
| 32 | | may only store inoperable vehicles outdoors | |
| 2.4 | - | umber of inoperable vehicles outdoors is 10. | |
| 34 | | ove specific conditions allowing vehicle | |
| 2.5 | | ehicles beyond ten vehicles and for longer | |
| 36 | than seventy-two hours when appro- | ved as part of a conditional use permit. | |
| | | | |
| 38 | | ts for discussion as follows: Description of | |
| | <u> •</u> | unding area, Site Plan, Photos of the property | |
| 40 | and building. | | |
| | <u> </u> | ports started in 2018 with the goal to turn from | |
| 42 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | first full exotic car experience in Utah. It also | |
| | wants to provide service to those exotics wh | nile also allowing all makes & models. With | |
| 44 | its unique color of lime green, it wants to se | erve the public with towing operations | |
| | throughout Utah county. It is one of the few | that offers automotive sales, repair, and | |
| 46 | towing. Besides the clear goal of making a | profit it strives to provide the best customer | |
| | experience possible always wanting positive | e, appreciative, and high reviews. Luxury | |
| | | | |

- Motorsports will do whatever is necessary to keep that standard. He then turned the time over to the applicant for comment.
 Mr. Jared Janson stated he has complied with all requirements and will continue to improve the site. Chairperson Call stated she feels this is pretty straightforward request and has no other questions.
 - Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.
- 10 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR AN AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR
- AND TOWING BUSINESS TO BE LOCATED AT 1070 WEST 400 NORTH, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. ALL VEHICLES MUST BE STORED WITHIN
- 14 THE BUILDING OR WITHIN THE REAR FENCED AREA. 2. NO AUTOMOBILE PARTS WILL BE STORED OUTSIDE OF THE BUILDING. 3. THE APPLICANT
- 16 WILL PROVIDE STAFF WITH A LIQUID WASTE STORAGE AND MANAGEMENT PLAN. 4. VEHICLES MAY ONLY BE STORED OUTDOORS FOR
- 18 LONGER THAN 72 HOURS WHEN WAITING ON DELIVERY OF PARTS. 5. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED
- 20 THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE

8

28

30

32

34

36

38

40

42

44

46

48

- 24 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE AYE
- 26 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING -** A recommendation to the Lindon City Council for an ordinance amendment to Title 17.44.090 regarding allowed deck projections into required corner side yard setbacks - Lindon City.

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

Mr. Florence gave an overview of this discussion item stating Lindon City is proposing to amend Titles 17.02.010 and 17.44.090 pertaining to definitions and deck projections into residential corner side yard setbacks. The proposed amendment would allow a deck projection of up to twelve feet into a corner side yard setback. He noted for a deck to be approved, the deck could only be constructed on the corner side yard facing the street, can only be accessible from the first story or below, and the home must have a minimum side yard setback of thirty feet. Currently, Title 17.44.090 allows a four-foot projection into the corner side yard setback. Residential rear yards allow a deck projection of twelve feet with a thirty-foot rear setback.

Mr. Florence indicated the City is also proposing to add and amend definitions to Title 17.02.010 so it is clear which story the deck can be constructed from as to not disrupt the privacy of surrounding neighbors. The definitions to be amended and added

| 2 | are basement, first-story, story, and ground floor. Mr. Florence then went over the ordinance draft followed by discussion. | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 4 | • | | |
| 6 | Proposed Ordinance: "Basement" means a floor level below the first story in a building which floor is more than tracked in the a (12") below the groupe a level of the final and the division account but | | |
| 8 | than twelve inches (12") below the average level of the final grade adjoining ground, but where no more than one half (½) of its floor-to- ceiling height is below the average contact level of the final grade adjoining ground. A basement shall be counted as a story | | |
| 10 | for purposes of height measurement and as a half-story for the purpose of side yard determination. | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 14 | First Story – The ground floor level and lowest Story, not including basement, in a building provided the floor level is not more than twelve inches (12") below Final Grade for more than fifty percent (50%) of the perimeter. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 18 | Second Story - That portion of a building included between the upper surface of any floo and the upper surface of the floor next above, except that the topmost story shall be that portion of a building included between the upper surface of the topmost floor and the | | |
| 20 | ceiling or roof above. | | |
| 22 | Ground Floor – The first story of a building other than the basement. | | |
| 24 | 17.44.090 Projections into Yards. | | |
| | 1. The following structures may be erected on or project into any required yard | | |
| 26 | setback: | | |
| 28 | a. Fences and walls in conformance with the Lindon City Code and other City codes or ordinances; | | |
| 20 | b. Necessary appurtenances for utility service. | | |
| 30 | 2. The structures listed below may project into a minimum front, side, or rear year | | |
| 22 | not more than the following distances: | | |
| 32 | a. The following may project into a minimum front, side or rear yard not more than twenty-four (24) inches: Cornices, eaves, belt courses, sills, | | |
| 34 | buttresses, or other similar architectural features; fireplace structures and bays (provided that they are not wider than eight (8) feet, measured | | |
| 36 | generally parallel to the wall of which they are a part), awnings and | | |
| 38 | planting boxes or masonry planters.b. The structures listed below may project into a rear yard not more than | | |
| | twelve (12) feet: A shade structure or uncovered deck (which does not | | |
| 40 | support a roof structure, including associated stairs and landings) | | |
| 42 | extending from the main floor level and/or ground level first story of a | | |
| 42 | building, provided such structure is open on at least three (3) sides, except for necessary supporting columns and customary architectural features. | | |
| 44 | c. The following may project into a front, side or rear yard (above or below | | |
| | grade) not more than four feet as long as they are uncovered (not | | |
| 46 | supporting a roof structure): unenclosed stairways, balconies, landings, and fire escapes. (Ord. 2009-3, amended, 2009; Ord. 2003-15, amended, | | |
| 48 | 2003; Ord. 111 §1, amended, 1985; Prior code §12-111-8) | | |

| 2 | d. Properties with a corner street side yard setback of at least thirty (30) feet, | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 4 | an uncovered deck located at and accessible from the first story or below the first story, inclusive of stairs, may project not more than twelve (12) feet into a required corner street side yard setback. | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 8 | Chairperson Call called for any public comments. Hearing none she called for a motion to close the public hearing. | | |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC | | |
| 12 | HEARING. COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED. | | |
| 14 | Following some additional general discussion regarding the ordinance amendment the Commission was in agreement to approve the recommended changes to the City | | |
| 16 | Council. | | |
| 18 | Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the commission. Hearing none she called for a motion. | | |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL ORDINANCE 2019-1-O AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER | | |
| 22 | KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS: | | |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE | | |
| | COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE | | |
| 26 | COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE | | |
| • • | COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE | | |
| 28 | COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE AYE | | |
| • | COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE | | |
| 30 | THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. | | |
| 32 | 7. This item was noticed for a public hearing but will be continued to a future | | |
| 34 | meeting. A recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend ordinance 17.64 and removing unrestricted habitation time limits in a Recreational | | |
| | Vehicle Parks and amending definitions, adding Recreational Vehicle Parks | | |
| 36 | as a conditional use under the RMU-W land use district in the Appendix A Standard Land Use Table and adopting a new ordinance section 17.78 titled | | |
| 38 | Recreational Vehicle Parks. – Ron Madsen | | |
| 40 | COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. | | |
| 42 | COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED. | | |
| 44 | Mr. Florence stated this item was noticed for a public hearing but will be continued to a future meeting. He then recommended a motion to continue. | | |
| 46 | commed to a fature meeting. He then recommended a motion to continue. | | |
| 48 | COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL ORDINANCE 2019-1-O AS PRESENTED. | | |

| 2 | COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 4 | RECORDED AS FOLLOWS: CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE | |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE | |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE | |
| Ü | COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE | |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE AYE | |
| | COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE | |
| 10 | THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. | |
| 12 | Chairperson Call asked if there were any further public comments. Hearing none | |
| | she moved called for a motion to close the public hearing. | |
| 14 | | |
| | COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. | |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN | |
| 10 | FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED. | |
| 18 | Chairperson Call asked if there were any further comments or discussion. | |
| 20 | Hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item. | |
| 20 | Treating none she moved on to the next agenda item. | |
| 22 | 8. New Business: Reports by Commissioners – Chairperson Call called for any | |
| | new business or reports from the Commissioners. | |
| 24 | | |
| | Chairperson Call and the Commission congratulated Mike Vanchiere for his recent | |
| 26 | appointment to the City Council. Mr. Vanchiere was also presented with a plaque for his service. Commissioner Vanchiere expressed his appreciation for the Commission and | |
| 28 | how much he has enjoyed working with everyone and for the friendships made. Commissioner Kallas mentioned the corner on main street from the discussion | |
| 30 | item tonight. Mr. Florence stated that this issue is on the enforcement end of things and | |
| 50 | they will be working with the city attorney to resolve the issue. Mr. Florence then went | |
| 32 | over the city email setup process with the commissioners. Commissioner Marchbanks | |
| | mentioned he as long as colors are on the color palette that colors are not debated in the | |
| 34 | | |
| | meeting unless they are asking for a change. He would like to add this issue as a | |
| | meeting unless they are asking for a change. He would like to add this issue as a discussion item for approval at the next meeting. | |
| 36 | discussion item for approval at the next meeting. | |
| 36 38 | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more | |
| 38 | discussion item for approval at the next meeting. 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships | |
| | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more clarification to update the code. | |
| 38 | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more | |
| 38 40 | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more clarification to update the code. Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion. Hearing none she | |
| 38 40 42 44 | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more clarification to update the code. Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion. Hearing none she called for a motion to adjourn. ADJOURN – | |
| 38 40 42 | 9. Planning Director Report – Mr. Florence mentioned the car dealerships ordinance noting it will need to be addressed at a future meeting for more clarification to update the code. Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion. Hearing none she called for a motion to adjourn. | |

| 2 | | Approved – February 12, 2019 |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 4 | | |
| 6 | | Sharon Call, Chairperson |
| 8 | | |
| 10 | Michael Florence, Planning Director | |