

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**
3 **April 24, 2018 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: Rob Kallas, Vice Chair
9 Invocation: Mike Vanchiere, Commissioner
10 Pledge of Allegiance: Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner

12 <u>PRESENT</u>	<u>EXCUSED</u>
13 Rob Kallas, Vice Chair	Sharon Call, Chairperson
14 Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner	
15 Charlie Keller, Commissioner	
16 Steven Johnson, Commissioner	
17 Mike Vanchiere, Commissioner	
18 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director	
19 Brandon Snyder, Associate Planner	
20 Kathy Moosman, Recorder	

22 1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

24 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –The minutes of the regular meeting of the
25 Planning Commission meeting of April 10, 2018 were reviewed.

26
27 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
28 OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 10, 2018 AS PRESENTED.
29 COMMISSIONER KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN
30 FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Vice Chair Kallas called for comments from any
33 audience member who wished to address any issue not listed as an agenda item.
34 There were no public comments.

36 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

38 4. **Site Plan — Elite Energy Solutions (EES) Addition, 162 South 1900 (1800)**
39 **West.** Elite Energy Solutions (EES) requests site plan approval for a 7,000 sq. ft.
40 building addition to the existing facility. The property at 162 South 1900 (1800)
41 West, is in the Light Industrial (LI) zone.

42
43 Vice Chair Kallas invited the applicants, Chet Stevens and Brandon Robbins
44 forward. Brandon Snyder, Associate Planner, gave a brief background of this item
45 stating the applicant is proposing to construct an addition to the south of their existing
46 warehouse. The addition will include office/warehouse space, which is permitted subject
to site plan review. He noted that amended site plans with over a 30% increase in

2 building square footage are required to be brought into substantial compliance with all
current city codes.

4 Mr. Snyder explained the existing site was approved by the Planning Commission
on December 9, 1998. The proposal will be adding additional parking and a new drive
6 approach along the south property line with no sidewalks being required in the LI zone
west of Geneva Road. Third party notices were provided to the adjoining property owners
8 and Staff has received no public comment back at this time. He then referenced the
following property information followed by discussion:

10 *Table Property Information (LCC 17.49)*

	Minimum Requirement	Site
Lot area	1 acre	1 acre
Lot frontage	100 feet	195 feet
Building height	Max: 48 feet	27 feet
Onsite parking stalls and bicycle stalls	22 stalls 2 bicycle stalls	22 stalls 2 bicycle stalls
Building setbacks		
Front	20 feet	36 feet
Rear	0 feet (& no PUE or easement)	22 feet
Side (interior)	0' (20' if without 1-hour firewall)	37 feet

12 Mr. Snyder stated City Staff (Planning, Engineering, and Fire) and the applicant
are working through the technical issues related to the site and will ensure all issues are
14 resolved before final approval of the plans is granted. He noted the Fire Inspector is also
currently reviewing the submitted plans.

16 Mr. Snyder explained the LI zone requires that a landscaped strip twenty (20) feet
in width shall be planted with grass and trees (every 30' on center) along all public street
18 frontages. There is no minimum percentage of landscaping requirement in the LI zone.
The five stalls being added to the south do not trigger any additional interior parking lot
20 landscaping and these requirements are met. No fencing regulations apply as the site is
not adjacent to a residential use or residential zone and the existing chain link fencing to
22 side and rear of the building will remain. Site obscuring gates are being added to the
existing dumpster enclosure.

24 Mr. Snyder further explained that City Code requires that all buildings in the LI
Zone must be "aesthetically pleasing, well-proportioned buildings which blend with the
26 surrounding property and structures." The applicant is proposing to construct the exterior
of the buildings out of metal siding with EIFS (stucco) treatment. All buildings in the LI
28 zone are subject to the following standards:

- Twenty-five percent (25%) minimum of the exterior of all buildings shall be
30 covered with brick decorative block, stucco, wood, or other similar materials as
approved by the Planning commission.

32 Mr. Snyder indicated the applicant has shifted the EIFS (stucco) to the more
34 visible south and east elevations; no net loss of treatment occurs and these requirements
are met. Mr. Snyder stated the applicant is proposing the EIFS to be dark tan and the
36 metal roof and siding will also be tan. He then turned the time over to the applicant for
comment.

2 Mr. Stevens explained their business noting they do retrofit residential insulation
 4 and work through the Dominion Energy Thermwise program. He also explained where
 the stucco and brick will be on the building noting they will meet all requirements. He
 6 added they have been at this site since 2014 and the additional building will be used as a
 rental. Commissioner Keller stated it appears this application meets all standards and the
 requirements are met and staff will ensure all remaining issues are addressed with the
 8 City Engineer. Following discussion, the Commission agreed this looks like it will be a
 nice addition to the area.

10 Vice Chair Kallas asked if there were any further comments or discussion.
 Hearing none he called for a motion.

12
 14 COMMISSIONER KELLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT’S
 REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ELITE ENERGY SOLUTIONS TO BE
 16 LOCATED AT 162 SOUTH 1900 (1800) WEST, IN THE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
 ZONE, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT ADDRESS REMAINING
 PLANNING, FIRE, AND ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS. COMMISSIONER
 18 VANCHIERE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS
 FOLLOWS:

20 VICE CHAIR KALLAS AYE
 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
 22 COMMISSIONER KELLER AYE
 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
 24 COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE AYE
 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

26
 28 5. **Site Plan — RAM Exteriors, 1925 West 200 North.** RAM Exteriors requests
 site plan approval for a 9,000 square foot office/warehouse in the Light Industrial
 (LI) zone. The subject property is located at 1925 West 200 North.

30
 32 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director, led this discussion by giving some
 background of this item noting the applicant, Christopher McCoy, who is in attendance,
 is proposing to construct a 9,100 s.f. building, primarily warehouse with some office
 34 space. The majority of the 2.9 acres will be a gravel storage yard for the construction
 company; the lot is located in the Light Industrial zone.

36 Mr. Van Wagenen stated the parking standards are based on the zone and the
 different uses in the building and their respective square footage as follows:

<i>Required</i>	<i>Provided</i>
Warehouse, 1 stall per 1,000 s.f. (7,529/1000=8	8 spaces
Office, 1 stall per 350 s.f. (2,575/350=8 spaces)	8 spaces
ADA stalls, 1 to 25 spaces require 1 ADA stall	1 ADA
2 per first 50 spaces (2)	2 bike stalls

38
 40 Mr. Van Wagenen explained the Light Industrial zone requires a 20’ landscaped
 strip along all street frontages with trees planted within the strip every 30’ on center. He
 42 noted this lot is a corner lot and requires a landscape strip along both frontages; however,
 only 400 North is shown with the landscape strip on the plans.

2 Mr. Van Wagenen further explained the submittal that the landscape plan meets
the requirements is a recommended condition of approval. He pointed out that 2000 West
4 does have a unique landscaping requirement due to the ditch along the roadway.

6 Mr. Van Wagenen reminded the Commission that City Code requires that all
buildings in the Light Industrial Zone must be “aesthetically pleasing, well-proportioned
8 buildings which blend with the surrounding property and structures.” He stated Mr.
McCoy is proposing to use a split-faced block wainscoting of four feet with stucco
10 finishes for the remainder of the walls; elevations meet the code requirement. He also
pointed out that twenty-five percent (25%) minimum of the exterior of all buildings shall
12 be covered with brick decorative block, stucco, wood, or other similar materials as
approved by the Planning Commission.

14 Mr. Van Wagenen stated the Code also requires buildings in the LI zone to be
earth-tone colors. The new building will be a light gray stucco with metallic blue
banding with the split faced block being grey. The proposed structure also satisfies
16 setback (20 feet front and 0 feet all others) and height requirements (48 feet) in the LI
zone. Mr. Van Wagenen noted the City Engineer is working through technical issues
18 related to the site and will ensure all engineering related issues are resolved before final
approval is granted.

20 Mr. Van Wagenen then referenced an aerial photo of the site and surrounding
area, Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Elevations of the Proposed Building Addition, and the
22 2000 West profile (with ditch) followed by discussion. He then turned the time over to
the applicant for comment.

24 Mr. McCoy addressed the Commission at this time. He noted they have currently
outgrown their one-acre parcel in Lindon and need to expand to a bigger building. He
26 also explained their business noting they cater to problem stucco and roofing repair
(mostly residential). Mr. McCoy commented they will ensure that all requirements are
28 met and that the building looks very nice. He added they plan to break ground as soon as
the permits are approved.

30 Vice Chair Kallas asked if there were any further comments or discussion.
Hearing none he called for a motion.

32
34 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE
APPLICANT’S REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH THE CONDITION
36 THAT THE APPLICANT PROVIDE REQUIRED STREET TREES AND
LANDSCAPE STRIP ALONG 2000 WEST AS DIRECTED BY STAFF.
38 COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

40 VICE CHAIR KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
42 COMMISSIONER KELLER	AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
44 COMMISSIONER VANCHIERE	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

46
48 **6. Concept Review — Norton Retail and Self-Storage, 570 N. State Street -**
Steve Tobias and Patrea Marolf request concept review of the proposed Norton

2 Retail and Self- Storage and associated rezoning, to be located at 570 N. State St.
(identified by Utah County Parcel ID #'s 14-067-0123 and 14-068-0001),
4 currently in the General Commercial (CG) zone.

6 Mr. Snyder opened this agenda item by giving an overview noting this property is
located at approximately 570 North State Street and is currently in the General
8 Commercial (CG) zone (the General Plan Land Use Map identifies this area as
Commercial). He noted the property is currently used for agricultural purposes and the
10 keeping of animals and livestock.

The applicants, Steve Tobias and Patrea Marolf (who are in attendance) are
12 requesting feedback on a proposal to rezone the property from the CG to the General
Commercial Storage (CG-S) zone for storage units. He noted the Lindon City Land Use
14 Table indicates that storage units (Vault Security Storage – Mini-Storage (outdoor
storage by Conditional Use only and is limited to 15% of total storage space and limited
16 to personal recreational vehicles) are only permitted in the Light Industrial (LI), Mixed
Commercial (MC), and General Commercial Storage (CG-S) zones. This concept also
18 indicates the potential for retail/restaurant along State Street.

Mr. Snyder further explained that 570 North currently dead ends into the east side
20 of the property and according to the Street Master Plan Map, 570 North is planned to
continue out to State Street and this proposal would prohibit 570 North directly
22 connecting to State Street. He noted the City Council and Planning Commission
previously heard a request for residential units on this property in 2016 (DR Horton). At
24 that time, it was recognized that this property is important as it is zoned commercially
and has State Street frontage and also has a very deep lot.

Mr. Snyder stated the public works department has previously indicated that there
26 is currently a temporary storm water basin at the end of 570 North (street). He also
questioned if 570 North should continue to either State Street or to 500 North. He noted
28 another option would be to develop 570 North into a cul-de-sac with an improved
turnaround. He added that additional residential lots may or may not be appropriate to
30 plan for at the end of the cul-de-sac and regardless, the temporary storm basin will need
to be addressed. He pointed out an item to consider is how to best reserve or restrict the
32 area along State Street for more desirable commercial uses such as the proposed
retail/restaurant. If the proposal and associated rezoning/master plan changes are
34 considered, the following City Codes (17.48 Commercial Zones) are important for future
design consideration.

- 36 • Landscaping and setbacks in the commercial zones will need to be addressed.
38 Setbacks required from residential: Side or rear yard setback when adjacent to a
residential use or a residential zone = 40'.
- 40 • The site would also be required to have a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of
42 each lot maintained in permanent landscaped open space (in addition to the
landscaping strip along State St.).
- 44 • A masonry or concrete fence, seven feet (7') high shall also be constructed and
maintained along any property line between a nonresidential development and a
residential use or a residential zone.
- 46 • Architectural design standards would also apply. Those codes would help in
48 addressing how to be good neighbors to and transition into the existing
residential.

2 Mr. Snyder then referenced the Lindon City General Plan that indicates the following:

- 4 • Methods of protecting residential areas by providing transitions and buffers
6 between residential and commercial areas include increased setbacks,
8 landscaping, restricted land uses, diversion of traffic, controlled noise or light,
10 height limitations, and transitional land uses such as research and development
office uses.
- 8 • Transitions between different land uses and intensities should be made gradually
10 with compatible uses, particularly where natural or man-made buffers are not
available.

12 Mr. Snyder then turned the time over to the applicants for comment. Mr. Tobias
14 addressed the Commission at this time noting he represents the Norton family who has
16 owned the property for many years. The current use is an equestrian center with part
18 agricultural use. Mr. Tobias explained essentially, with this concept plan they are
20 proposing that the road (570 N.) would remain as is and the private roadway would be
used for the self-storage facility; he noted it would also meet the required setbacks. Mr.
Tobias also spoke on the proposed landscaping and trees they would use every 30 ft.
(Hackberry trees) that would provide a lot of coverage and they would also have a
masonry fence to provide a good buffer. He noted this would be all around the perimeter
and would be very neighborhood friendly.

22 Mr. Tobias pointed out this proposed concept would also lend itself to not taxing
24 Police and Fire resources and would allow frontal commercial use on State Street. He
then gave a background of the changing evolution/nature of self-storage units (including
two-stories, climate control, elevators, gated entry, 24 hr. security etc.). He noted there
would be approximately 600 units (100,000 sq. ft. of storage).

26 At this time Vice Chair Kallas asked the Commissioners to give their thoughts on
28 the presented concept review as follows:

30 Commissioner Johnson commented that the city is struggling with what to do with
the small parcels left on State Street. He noted he has a particular interest with this
32 concept as this is in his neighborhood. He stated the concept looks nice but is this where
we want it. He pointed out this is a very difficult piece of land and zoned commercially.
34 He is not sure what will happen there but he doesn't have strong feelings either way. The
question is how to mitigate the concerns as there are some really nice homes in the area
36 and the neighbors may be impacted.

38 Commissioner Marchbanks stated he doesn't think it's a stretch to compare this to
the applicant's existing Ogden facility with the residential component next to it and the
40 street frontage. He thinks this proposed project will look nice with pads for potential
other retail on the front. He would also suggest that the applicants do their due diligence
42 with a feasibility study etc. His only concern is with the street drainage issue and the need
for a proper turnaround for emergency.

44 Commissioner Keller commented that he personally agrees with a lot of what has
46 been said but pointed out a lot of storage units have been recently approved in the city
and questioned if another storage complex located on State Street is warranted. He also
48 has concerns with a two-story building at that location. He does agree it appears to be a

2 nice project but he would hope for commercial use on State Street; he would not be
opposed but feels there are a lot of storage units in the city as well.

4
6 Commissioner Vanchiere commented he has mixed feelings about this concept but
added he looks at projects on their merit. He believes there are two council members that
may resist storage units in this particular area on State Street; the harder sell is the rezone.
8 He has concerns about screening and outdoor RV storage. He would rather see other uses
there, but he does like the retail in front concept and feels it would push it more to
10 favorability; he would consider this proposal after seeing some good concept plans and
renderings and hearing the advice of staff.

12
14 Commissioner Kallas pointed out this is just a rough layout. He also likes
Commissioner Johnson's comment that this is a difficult piece of property because it is
16 deep and narrow and regardless it would need a mixed use to make it work; he also has
concerns with a rezone. He also feels it should be a finished cul-de-sac. He does not like
18 the design of this and feels it should be deeper for him to feel good about it. He pointed
out that Lindon doesn't have much commercial property available and to put storage
units on this piece is unsettling and he would suggest reducing the size. He also has
20 concerns about the west end and what type of commercial development could locate
there. He suggested a redesign would be conducive for him to consider this concept.

22
24 Vice Chair Kallas suggested that the applicant take this concept to the City
Council. Mr. Tobias stated they will make some changes and bring it before the Council.
They also thanked the Commission for their time and valuable input.

26 Vice Chair Kallas asked if there were any further comments or discussion.
Hearing none he moved on to the next agenda item.

- 28
30 **7. Discussion Item — Lindon City General Plan, Parks and Trails.** Heath
Bateman, Parks & Recreation Director, and Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning &
32 Economic Development Director, will review the Parks and Trails section with
the Planning Commission. This is an informative discussion item only. No
motions will be made.

34
36 Mr. Van Wagenen led this discussion by explaining Heath Bateman, Parks &
Recreation Director, is in attendance to present information regarding the Lindon City
38 General Plan update by reviewing the Parks and Trails section. He noted no formal action
will be taken as this is an informational discussion only. He went on to explain that parks
should be provided to allow for a variety of recreational opportunities to meet the needs
40 of all areas of the community. He pointed out that the planned park locations shown on
the Lindon City Parks & Trails Master Plan Map (provided in the staff report) are
42 generalized and will require additional consideration for final site determination. He then
turned the time over to Mr. Bateman for comment.

44 Mr. Bateman then gave his presentation to the Commission. He noted the parks
in the community are separated into three main classifications as follows:

46 **Community Parks:** Concentrate a broad range of recreational activities for

2 major portions of the City. Community parks typically contain destination amenities such
4 as pavilions, ball fields, rodeo arenas, tennis courts, etc. and are usually 4 acres or larger
6 in size. Community Parks should be located so as to promote accessibility from the entire
community but should be designed so as to not have adverse impacts to residential areas
(i.e., lighting, noise, etc.)

8 **Neighborhood Parks:** Provide basic recreational opportunities, such as grassy areas,
picnic, and playground facilities that are easily accessible to local residents.

10

Trail Head Facilities: Should provide year-round water and trail access for trail
12 users. Some parking locations at trail heads should be considered. Also, after considering
the surroundings and proposed use of the facilities, amenities such as benches, location
14 markers, drinking fountains, or a small restroom may be provided.

16 Mr. Bateman also referenced the future Park Property and Park Property Under
Development including Future Community Parks, Future Neighborhood Parks, and
18 Future Trailhead Facilities. Mr. Bateman then went over the Park and Recreation
Guidelines noting the City should be proactive in expanding, developing, and
20 maintaining its park system. He noted the City should plan for four (4) acres of parks and
trails for every 1000 residents. Mr. Bateman also covered the Trails System Plan
22 Guidelines followed by some general discussion.

24 Following discussion, Mr. Van Wagenen thanked Mr. Bateman for addressing the
Commission with this good information pertinent to the general plan update. Vice Chair
Kallas asked if there were any further comments or discussion. Hearing none he moved
26 on to the next agenda item.

28 8. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Vice Chair Kallas called for any
new business or reports from the Commissioners. There was no new business or
30 reports at this time.

32 9. **Planning Director Report** – Mr. Van Wagenen reported on the following item
followed by discussion.

34

- May is National Bike Month. Bike to Work!

36

Vice Chair Kallas called for any further comments or discussion. Hearing none he
38 called for a motion to adjourn.

40 **ADJOURN** –

42 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
MEETING AT 8:45 PM. COMMISSIONER KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION.
44 ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

46

Approved – June 12, 2018

2

Rob Kallas, Vice Chairperson

4

6

Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director