

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**
4 **February 12, 2019 beginning 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: Jared Schauers, Commissioner
10 Pledge of Allegiance: Scott Thompson, Commissioner

12 **PRESENT** **EXCUSED**

Sharon Call, Chairperson
14 Rob Kallas, Commissioner
Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
16 Steven Johnson, Commissioner
Scott Thompson, Commissioner
18 Jared Schauers, Commissioner
Mike Florence, Planning Director
20 Anders Bake, Associate Planner
Brian Haws, City Attorney
22 Kathy Moosman, Recorder

24 **Special Attendee:**
Matt Bean, Councilmember

- 26
1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
 - 28 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –The minutes of the regular meeting of the
30 Planning Commission meeting of January 22, 2019 were reviewed.

32 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 22, 2019 AS PRESENTED.
34 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED
IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

- 36
- 38 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – 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.

40 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

- 42
- 44 4. **Lindon’s Edge Site Plan Approval — Castle Park Properties, LLC and
Davies Design Build 126 S. Main.** Continued from January 22, 2019. The
46 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
48 zone. (Parcel #'s 45:424:0001, 14:069:0264, 14:069:0295, 14:069:0304,
14:069:0303, 14:069:0302)

2 Mike Florence, Planning Director, led this discussion by stating this item was
continued from the January 22, 2019 meeting. He explained for site plan approval,
4 tonight the planning commission will be evaluating whether the site plan and buildings
meet Title 17 development regulations and Commercial Design Standards. Mr. Florence
6 noted since the meeting on January 22, 2019 the developer has made the following
updates:

- 8 a) Façade materials for the two buildings along Main Street now include 85% brick
and glass
- 10 b) The buildings along Main Street are oriented towards the street with a front
entrance
- 12 c) Landscape islands were added as an option in the parking lot adjacent to the
single family. *The applicant has provided site plans with and without the*
14 *landscape islands.*

16 Two stalls would be lost but the parking would still be in compliance.

18 Mr. Florence stated the applicant proposes 14 buildings consisting of 42 individual
office spaces on 5.5 acres. Each building is two stories and has an average square footage
20 of approximately 90 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
22 remain and will continue in business.

Mr. Florence then referenced the list of items reviewed at the January 22nd
24 meeting and explained the updated changes made. He explained the proposed buildings
most align with the two-part commercial block building. He then referenced the standards
26 for such building in the Commercial Design Standards followed by discussion.

Mr. Florence noted the City Engineer is working through any technical issues
28 related to the site and will ensure all engineering related issues are resolved before final
approval is granted. Mr. Florence stated the development will be constructed in three
30 phases. The developer will demo the houses along Main St. first and possibly the shed on
the south side. Any building or landscaping that isn't in the way of construction will
32 remain intact until that corresponding phase starts.

Mr. Florence then referenced an aerial photo and site pictures, site plan, site plan
34 with landscape islands, and architectural renderings followed by discussion. Mr.
Florence also read the recommended conditions to be included in the motion.

Chairperson Call stated it appears the applicants have made some really good
36 changes and addressed some concerns however they have also received information
38 regarding concerns from some neighbors. Commissioner Kallas asked staff about the
issue with the street and if that was resolved. Mr. Florence replied when the street is
40 completed it will follow the same curb, gutter and sidewalk profile as on main street.
There was then some discussion on the street width (asphalt), right of way and
42 improvements. Mr. Florence noted he is still looking into the history of the home on the
corner (dance studio).

44 There was then some discussion regarding the landscaping buffer and island
adjacent to the residential neighborhood. Mr. Richard Gale, resident, stated he would
46 prefer as much landscaping as possible to block the building, but they really don't want
tall trees that will block the view of the mountains. He would prefer a hedge perhaps 12
48 ft. as the wall is 8 ft. tall.

2 The applicant, Mr. Axley stated they are happy doing either one and mentioned a
flowering pear tree may be a good choice and is a preferred decorative tree in the valley.
4 Patrice Brettschneider, neighboring resident, stated she would prefer trees that would
block the buildings so it still feels like a residential neighborhood. She added they have
6 personally planted five trees there and would like to see more trees planted as a buffer.

8 Commissioner Marchbanks stated is important to acknowledge they should be
given credit if they put landscaping on the outside of the wall property where it is not
required. Mr. Axley agreed stating they have complied above and beyond the amount of
10 landscaping that is required by city code. Ms. Brettschneider stated she is just asking for
a few more trees on the landscaping strip (on their side) to break up the buildings, she is
12 not asking to remove parking stalls. Mr. Axley stated they would be willing to re-
distribute some of the trees and landscaping to be good neighbors. Commissioner
14 Marchbanks mentioned Castle Park has been a good neighbor up to this point.

Chairperson Call stated aside from the area discussed, there are concerns with
16 traffic noting the commission received a letter requesting a traffic study. She then turned
the time over to public comment at this time.

18 Mr. Gale expressed the concerns of himself and his neighbors with this
development. They don't think Main Street and 200 South (intersection) can handle the
20 scope of this project and the amount of traffic this development will bring. They would
like to have a traffic study done and believe it is a reasonable request before the project
22 starts. Mr. Axley said typically they are not required to do a traffic study as they are not
doing a zone change and they are expensive and a financial burden and it is not
24 necessary; this property is zoned for what it was approved for and can handle what the
use could be; that burden should not be put on the property owner.

26 Mr. Florence said the city doesn't look at the zone but looks at the substantial
impact that will deteriorate the level of service to require a traffic study and there must be
28 a burden to show that will happen and he is not sure that has happened yet; we don't
know if the intersection is failing so that burden has not been met. Councilmember
30 Kallas stated he thinks a traffic study would say the curb, sidewalk and gutter should be
installed. He can't see that we can reject this project because the sidewalk, curb and
32 gutter isn't finished.

Mr. Gale stated there is already a congestion problem in the neighborhood at that
34 intersection with a tremendous influx of cars and with a new development coming in and
adding more businesses it will just get worse. He feels the project may be too big for the
36 existing street location. Eric Barzeele pointed out 800 West in Orem is the same width
when the road is finished and he doesn't think the traffic percentage increase will be
38 more than 2%.

40 Commissioner Marchbanks pointed out that businesses in business parks aren't
the enemy for traffic as residents usually generate a lot more traffic. He pointed out that
staff would recommend a traffic study report if they thought it was warranted. He
42 believes the residents will be amazed at how nice a neighbor this project will be rather
than more homes or retail space. Mr. Axley agreed stating this will not have the
44 movement of a residential neighborhood.

Chairperson Call mentioned the concerns of the landscaping and traffic study
46 noting the building materials issue has been resolved. Mr. Axley indicated they would be
happy to meet with the affected neighbors regarding the landscaping trees.

2 Following some additional discussion, the Commission agreed to require trees on
the North side of the East side (to work with the neighbors) and the landscape island. The
4 Commission also agreed that a traffic study is not warranted.

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

8 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT’S
REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
10 1. THE APPLICANT WILL FINALIZE ENGINEERING REVIEWS; 2. A PLAT
AMENDMENT BE RECORDED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION BEGINNING; 3.
12 SHARED PARKING BE APPROVED AS OUTLINED IN THE DEVELOPERS
PARKING ANALYSIS. IF THE SHARED PARKING BECOMES AN ISSUE WHERE
14 INSUFFICIENT ON-SITE PARKING IS NOT PROVIDED DUE TO INCOMPATIBLE
SHARED USES OR VEHICLE PARKING OVERFLOWS INTO THE
16 SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD THE PROJECT PROPERTY OWNERS WILL
SECURE ADDITIONAL PARKING THROUGH PURCHASE OR AGREEMENT.
18 UPON COMPLAINT, THE CITY MAY REQUIRE CHANGES TO HOURS OF
OPERATIONS FOR THE SHARED USES, AN UPDATED SHARED PARKING
20 ANALYSIS, OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT PARKING;
4. IF THE BUSINESS PARK AND THE RECEPTION CENTER WERE EVER TO
22 HAVE DIFFERENT OWNERSHIPS THEN A DEED OR OTHER LEGAL
INSTRUMENT WILL BE RECORDED GUARANTEEING ACCESS TO PARKING
24 AS PER LINDON CITY CODE TITLE 17; 5. DUE TO THE DEVELOPMENT BEING
CONSTRUCTED IN PHASES AND THE NEED TO SHARE PARKING BETWEEN
26 USES, A MINIMUM OF ONE HUNDRED (100) PARKING STALLS WILL BE
CONSTRUCTED AND AVAILABLE FOR PHASE ONE; 6. LIGHT POLES ALONG
28 MAIN STREET WILL BE INSTALLED THAT MEET LINDON CITY
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS; 7. MEET LANDSCAPING AS DISCUSSED BY
30 PUTTING TREES INTO LANDSCAPING ISLANDS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE
EAST END OF THE FENCE AND A FEW TREES ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE
32 FENCE ON THE WEST END 8. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
34 RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
36 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
38 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON	AYE
40 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

42
44 **5. Lindon’s Edge Plat Amendment – Castle Park Properties, LLC and Davies
Design Build 126 S. Main.** The applicant’s request Subdivision Plat Amendment
46 approval of the Lindon’s Edge Plat A Subdivision to consolidate existing parcels
into one lot located in the General Commercial zone. (Parcel #'s 45:424:0001,
14:069:0264, 14:069:0295, 14:069:0304, 14:069:0303, 14:069:0302).

2 Mr. Florence led this discussion by explaining the applicant, Castle Park is asking
to consolidate existing parcels into one lot. He explained that Lindon City Code 17.32.00
4 references Utah Code for requirements amending a subdivision plat. Mr. Florence noted
under Utah Code 10-9a-608, an applicant may petition the Land Use Authority (Planning
6 Commission) to join two or more of the petitioner fee owner's contiguous lots.

8 Mr. Florence indicated this is just cleaning up the site so it's all under one
ownership so there is one lot. He noted the City Engineer is working through any
10 technical issues related to the plat and will conduct a final review if the planning
commission approves the plat amendment. He indicated Castle Park owns all parcels that
12 will be amended as part of the application for one lot; the proposed plat amendment is
located in the General Commercial (CG) zone and meets minimum lot size and frontage
requirements.

14 Mr. Florence then presented an aerial image with parcels, parcel map, and plat
followed by discussion. Chairperson Call stated she has no further questions.

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

18
20 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S
REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF LINDON'S EDGE PLAT "A"
22 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE
TO WORK WITH CITY STAFF TO MAKE ALL TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AS
NECESSARY TO THE PLAT PRIOR TO RECORDING; 2. PRIOR TO PLAT
24 RECORDING AND OCCUPANCY OF ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THIS
PLAT, THE APPLICANT MUST UPDATE THE FINAL PLAT MYLAR TO
26 INCLUDE NOTARIZED SIGNATURES OF OWNERS' CONSENT TO
DEDICATION CONSISTENT WITH ITEM ONE ABOVE; AND OBTAIN
28 SIGNATURES OF ALL ENTITIES INDICATED ON THE SUBDIVISION PLAT
ATTACHED HERETO; 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER
30 MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS
FOLLOWS:

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

- 40 6. **Site Plan Approval for Lot 3 of Mountain Tech South approximately 400 N.
2800 W.** Continued from December 11, 2018. Mark Weldon, on behalf of WICP
42 West Mountain Tech South, requests site plan approval for a 158,000 square foot
office building in the Regional Commercial zone. (Parcel #14:059:0040).

44
46 Mr. Florence gave an overview of this discussion item stating at the December
11th Planning Commission meeting the Planning Commission gave subdivision approval
48 for the three-lot development and site plan approval for the two office/warehouse
buildings; the planning commission continued site plan approval of the office building to

2 review a traffic circulation plan, traffic study, and updated renderings of the parking
4 structure. He noted parking standards are based on the zone and the different uses in the
building and their respective square footage.

6 Mr. Florence explained the Regional Commercial zone is specific regarding
architectural design of buildings in the zone. The applicant's proposal includes a three-
8 story parking structure for 673 vehicles. At the last meeting, the planning commission
continued the review of the parking structure for the applicant to return with a design that
10 is more architecturally similar to the office building. The applicants design has removed
some of the concrete supports and replaced them with steel supports and vegetation
12 screens. He then referenced a picture from a different project of what those screens may
look like. He also referenced for discussion the following code section:

Lindon City Code 17.54.060 (1)(a)

- 14 • *Any parking structure above the finished ground elevation shall have the same
16 setback requirements as outlined for buildings, and shall be architecturally
integrated through use of the same or similar materials, colors, rhythm,
18 landscaping, etc. Interior parking lot landscaping, as outlined in Section
17.18.085, must be provided for any parking stall in a parking structure that is
20 visible from a "bird's eye view."*

22 Mr. Florence stated at the last meeting, the planning commission continued the
site approval of the office building and requested that the applicant provide a traffic
circulation plan and traffic study. The site plan shows that the north/south access road is
24 blocked in the middle with basketball courts. This was to limit traffic from other
properties using this road as a cut through to the Pleasant Grove Interchange. He then
26 presented a circulation plan that isn't much different than what the commission saw last
time but they are more supportive of the updated plan. Regarding the traffic study and
28 feedback from city staff and UDOT, the major items that came out of the study are as
follows:

- 30 • The intersection at 2800 W. 600 N. already fails due to the amount of traffic
during evening peak hours (4-6 p.m.)
- 32 • UDOT has determined that the intersection warrants a traffic signal but Lindon
and American Fork Cities will need to ensure that the right-of-way is provided
34 and the improvements installed prior to UDOT installing the traffic signal.
Installing the traffic signal improves the level of service from a level F to a level
36 C
- 38 • By 2024 the level of service at the intersection decreases to a level D
- 40 • 2800 W. and 400 N. needs to be improved to a 66' right-of-way that would
include two drive lanes and a center turn lane
- 42 • UDOT would like to see deceleration and acceleration lanes built for the
development on 600 N.
- 44 • When the intersection improvements are constructed, vehicles will no longer be
able to do Uturns where they currently turn on 600 N. and will only be able to
turn at the intersection
- 46 • The traffic engineer determined that the internal circulation is sufficient to
accommodate the anticipated traffic flows

Developer Improvements

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

8 **7. Concept Review – Mountain Tech South Lot 4. Approximately 400 N. 2800**

10 W. Mark Weldon requests concept review for Lot 4 to orient the proposed
building towards the interior of the business park. A Concept Review allows
12 applicants to receive Planning Commission feedback and comments on proposed
projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but general suggestions or
recommendations are typically provided. (Parcel #14:059:0040)

14 Mr. Florence led this discussion by stating the Regional Commercial zone
16 requires under code 17.54.050 (1)(b) that buildings be oriented to the main street. Mr.
Weldon is requesting feedback before applying for site plan approval whether the
18 proposed building for Lot 4 can be oriented to the interior of the development with the
back of the building oriented to 400 North. He noted concept reviews are to provide
20 general feedback only and no decisions will be made or voted on tonight. He pointed out
that the DoTerra warehouse building is oriented with the rear of the building towards 400
22 North.

24 Mr. Florence indicated from staff's research, it appears that the planning
commission allowed the DoTerra warehouse to be oriented towards I-15 and to be
oriented to the call center office building to create a campus type design. Because the
26 warehouse was not oriented towards the street it appears that the planning commission
required an increased amount of landscaping area and planting as well as a solid fence
28 along 400 North. The DoTerra plan shows 158' of landscaping behind the meandering
sidewalk for the portion screening the loading docks. The areas screening the parking lots
30 are between 28' and 44'. The developer of Mountain Tech South is requesting that the
proposed building on Lot 4 be oriented with the back of the building oriented towards
32 400 North and the side of the building to 2800 West.

34 Mr. Florence stated Mr. Weldon is proposing an increased amount of landscaping
and a solid masonry wall to screen the back of the building. From the back of the
meandering sidewalk to the north edge of the landscaping measures about 77'. However,
36 there is a significant stormwater detention pond as part of this area that will receive
detention for a large portion of the development. The current plans for lots 1, 2, 3 shows
38 the detention area as rock but the site plan that the developer has provided shows the area
as a "green" color that may indicate landscaping.

40 Mr. Florence stated Mr. Weldon is asking that the planning commission clarify if
the detention area will be landscaped or if it will remain as rock. He noted the
42 commission should also consider the width of the landscaping and how the sites function.
He noted Mr. Weldon is also providing an increased amount of architectural detail and
44 windows that will face 2800 West to help make the façade more attractive from the street.

46 Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits: Site Plan, building renderings,
Landscape plan, DoTerra landscape plan, and DoTerra rendering followed by discussion.

2 Mr. Weldon explained this project will be located next to the sewer treatment
4 plant and next to the curvature of the road. He stated they would like to flip the building
for two reasons:

- 6 1. So it doesn't face the sewer or the radius of the road
- 8 2. Offices are facing the other direction which will help alleviate the smell
from the sewer plant
- 10 3. They will share the parking lot and have a wonderful view and they won't
see truck wells.

12 Mr. Weldon then spoke on the building materials, landscaping and associated
14 costs to ensure it is a nice building that meets all standards. Following some general
16 discussion regarding landscaping comparison with DoTerra and the building positioning,
the planning commission was in agreement that they are comfortable with flipping the
building as there are compelling reasons due to the proximity to the sewer treatment plant
and when the Vineyard Connector comes in; it appears this is the right way to situate the
building and will add to the look of the campus.

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

20 **8. Lindon Ridge Plat Amendment – approximately 45 S. Main Street**

22 The applicant requests Subdivision Plat Amendment approval of the Lindon
24 Ridge Subdivision to consolidate existing parcels into one lot located in the
General Commercial zone. (Parcel #'s 14:070:0249, 14:070:0254, 14:070:0036,
14:070:0124, 14:070:0090, 14:070:0092, 14:070:0229, 14:070:0126,
26 14:070:0125, 14:070:0320)

28 Anders Bake, Associate Planner, gave an overview of this discussion item stating
Lindon Ridge Apartments is petitioning to consolidate existing parcels into one lot. He
30 noted the City Council gave final site plan approval for the Lindon's Ridge Senior
Apartments in December 2018. He explained that Lindon City Code references Utah
32 Code for requirements amending a subdivision plat. Under Utah Code 10-9a-608, an
applicant may petition the Land Use Authority (Planning Commission) to join two or
34 more of the petitioner fee owner's contiguous lots. He stated a mix of commercial and
residential surround this parcel.

36 Mr. Bake stated the City Engineer is working through all technical issues related
to the plat and will conduct a final review if the planning commission approves the plat
38 amendment tonight. He indicated the applicant owns all parcels that will be amended as
part of the application for one lot. A site plan including the development of three
40 apartment buildings on this property has previously been approved by the Planning
Commission and City Council. He noted the proposed plat amendment is located in the
42 Senior Housing Facility Overlay (SHFO) zone and meets minimum lot size and frontage
requirements.

44 Mr. Bake then presented an Aerial photo, Parcel map, previously approved
Lindon's Ridge Site Plan and plat followed by discussion. Mr. Bake also read the
46 proposed conditions to include in the motion. Chairperson Call stated this appears to be a
pretty straightforward request.

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

4
6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S
REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE LINDON'S RIDGE PLAT
8 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE
TO WORK WITH CITY STAFF TO MAKE ALL TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AS
10 NECESSARY TO THE PLAT PRIOR TO RECORDING; 2. PRIOR TO PLAT
RECORDING AND OCCUPANCY OF ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THIS
12 PLAT, THE APPLICANT MUST UPDATE THE FINAL PLAT MYLAR TO
INCLUDE NOTARIZED SIGNATURES OF OWNERS' CONSENT TO
14 DEDICATION CONSISTENT WITH ITEM ONE ABOVE; AND OBTAIN
SIGNATURES OF ALL ENTITIES INDICATED ON THE SUBDIVISION PLAT
16 ATTACHED HERETO; 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER
THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS
FOLLOWS:

18 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
20 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
22 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
24 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

26 9. **Beany's to Go Site Plan Approval. Mike Penn and Laura Goldfinch, 531 N.**
28 **State Street.** The applicants request site plan approval for a beverage drive-thru
building located in the General Commercial zone. Parcel #45:244:0001)

30 Mr. Florence stated this item has been pulled from the agenda as the applicant
is working through some issues with UDOT and it will be discussed at the next
32 meeting.

34 Chairperson Call called for any comments or discussion from the commission.
Hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

36 10. **DoTerra Plat Amendment – 2400 West 400 North.** The applicant requests
38 Subdivision Plat Amendment approval of the DoTerra Lindon Subdivision Plat A
to consolidate two existing parcels into one lot located in the Regional
Commercial zone. (Parcel #'s 14:059:0026 and 14:059:0048)

40
42 Mr. Florence gave an overview of this discussion item stating DoTerra
International is petitioning to consolidate two parcels they own into one lot (this project is
44 currently under construction). He noted Lindon City Code references Utah Code for
requirements amending a subdivision plat. Under Utah Code 10-9a-608, an applicant may
46 petition the Land Use Authority (Planning Commission) to join two or more of the
petitioner fee owner's contiguous lots. Mr. Florence stated the applicant is not in
attendance but is fine with what is in the staff report.

2 Mr. Florence noted the City Engineer is working through all technical issues
related to the plat and will conduct a final review if the planning commission approves
4 the plat amendment. Mr. Florence stated DoTerra International, owns both parcels which
will be amended as part of the application for one lot. A distribution warehouse and a call
6 center building are currently under construction on the two lots. The proposed plat
amendment is located in the Regional Commercial zone and meets minimum lot size and
8 frontage requirements.

Mr. Florence then referenced an Aerial Image, Parcel Map, the previously
10 approved DoTerra Site Plan and the Plat followed by some general discussion.
Chairperson Call stated this appears to be a straightforward plat amendment request.

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

14
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE
16 APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT
TO THE DOTERRA PLAT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION: 1. THE
18 APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH CITY STAFF TO MAKE ALL
TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AS NECESSARY TO THE PLAT PRIOR TO
20 RECORDING; 2. PRIOR TO PLAT RECORDING AND OCCUPANCY OF ANY
NEW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THIS PLAT, THE APPLICANT MUST UPDATE
22 THE FINAL PLAT MYLAR TO INCLUDE NOTARIZED SIGNATURES OF
OWNERS' CONSENT TO DEDICATION CONSISTENT WITH ITEM ONE ABOVE;
24 AND OBTAIN SIGNATURES OF ALL ENTITIES INDICATED ON THE
SUBDIVISION PLAT ATTACHED HERETO; 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF
26 REPORT. COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE
WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

28 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
30 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
32 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
34 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

36 11. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Chairperson Call called for any
new business or reports from the Commissioners.

38
Chairperson Call suggested doing some design standards training when a full
40 Commission is in place. Councilmember Bean mentioned they have about six people
they will be interviewing for the planning commission vacancy. There was then some
42 discussion regarding street improvements and landscaping at the corner of 200 south and
main street. There was also some discussion regarding a future review of the sign
44 ordinance.

46 12. **Planning Director Report** –
• City email review update
48

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

4 **ADJOURN** –

6 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
8 MEETING AT 9:25 PM. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION.
ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

10 Approved – February 26, 2019

12
14 _____
Sharon Call, Chairperson

16
18 _____
Michael Florence, Planning Director

20