

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**
4 **May 14, 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 Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
Rob Kallas, Commissioner
16 Steven Johnson, Commissioner
Scott Thompson, Commissioner
18 Jared Schauers, Commissioner
Mike Florence, Planning Director
20 Anders Bake, Associate Planner
Kathryn Moosman, Recorder

22

Special Attendee:

24 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
Planning Commission meeting of April 9, 2019 were reviewed.

30

32 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 9, 2019 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER
MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR.
34 THE MOTION CARRIED.

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

38

40 Mr. Mark Weldon spoke on his application noting he is 40 days into the process
and they set a guideline for 60 to 90 days for an answer. They would like the fake road to
42 be moved off of their property as the timeline is almost up. He noted city staff has done
the process perfectly. They just wanted to say this is of large economic importance to
44 them to have the removal of the road. The drainage and detention go to that area so
without the road being removed it is a major problem for them. They have invested a lot
of time and money for the parking deck and if the parking isn't provided Global
46 Payments will not go in. So, they are now in consideration of spending 5 million for a
parking structure and they would ask that it not be taxed and are they are asking for
48 advice from the commission as to not get charged for property tax on the parking

2 structure or if there is a way to get abatement on the property taxes for the parking
3 structure. He is asking that the commission research the possibility of this issue.

4 Chairperson Call stated they could encourage additional research but that is not a
5 decision this body can make. Mr. Weldon stated this is a unique case and they are just
6 asking for staff to consider and research the issue. Mr. Florence stated that is something
7 the Utah County Assessor would have to answer. The mechanisms the city would have
8 access to is through a Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and there is not one set up in that
9 area; this would begin with the city council. He noted there may be incentive packages to
10 offset costs but that would also be a decision of the city council. Mr. Florence suggested
11 that Mr. Weldon contact himself and the city administrator to discuss the issue further.

12 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

- 13
- 14 4. **Public Hearing** – Recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend Lindon
15 City Code Chapter 17.51.130 to reduce landscaping requirements between
16 parking lots and the street in the Commercial Farm zone. Application is made by
17 Mike Jorgensen.
18

19

20 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC
21 HEARING. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
22 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.
23

24

25 Michael Florence, Planning Director, gave a brief overview of this item
26 explaining the applicant, Mr. Mike Jorgensen made application to amend Title
27 17.51.130(4) pertaining to proximity of parking to the street right-of-way in the
28 Commercial Farm zone. He noted City code currently prohibits parking spaces from
29 being located closer than thirty feet from a front property line or street side property line.
30 He indicated it was assumed by staff that the thirty-foot area was meant to be landscaped
31 and Staff clarified this requirement in the proposed ordinance language. The proposed
32 ordinance would allow a reduction in the thirty-foot requirement where a non-residential
33 use either abuts the property or is directly across the street. However, no net loss of
34 landscaping will be allowed. He added the reduced landscaping must be relocated to
35 either add additional interior parking lot landscaping or overall site landscaping.

36 Mr. Florence stated no required parking spaces can be within thirty feet (30') of a
37 front property line or street side property line. Also, a minimum thirty (30) foot landscape
38 buffer shall be required between parking areas and the front property line or street right-
39 of-way. A reduction in the thirty-foot landscape buffer may be approved where a non-
40 residential use either abuts the property or is directly across the street and the non-
41 residential use has less than the thirty-feet of landscaping between the parking area and
42 front property line or street right-of-way. He noted where approved, the applicant will
43 replace the reduced thirty-foot landscaping buffer with additional interior parking lot or
44 site landscaping.

45 Mr. Florence noted the thirty-foot setback for parking was probably adopted
46 because the minimum setback for a single-family residence in the R1 zone is thirty feet.
47 The applicant is proposing the change for two reasons: First, Rocky Mountain
48 Elementary has 9 ½ feet of landscaping between their parking and the street right-of-way.
The applicant's proposal shows reducing the landscaping from 30 feet to 19 feet. The

2 property is unique in that it sits well below grade. There is approximately 9 ½ feet of
4 landscaping between the rail fence and the sidewalk, with another two feet behind the
fence. The remaining landscaping will be below grade at the parking

6 Mr. Florence stated the applicant would like to relocate the reduced landscaping
to the interior of the parking lot. The site plan shows an interior sidewalk. If the reduction
8 in landscaping is approved, the applicant is proposing to relocate it to install landscaping
on both sides of the interior parking lot sidewalk. He noted the general plan has a land use
10 goal to carefully limit any negative impact of commercial facilities on neighboring land
use areas, particularly residential development.

Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits for discussion:

- 12 • Proposed Ordinance
- Planning Commission Minutes October 9, 2018
- 14 • City Council meeting minutes October 16, 2018
- Site Plan
- 16 • Landscape renderings provided by the applicant
- Current approved landscape plan

18 Commissioner Kallas commented that it makes a lot of sense for what they
20 requesting and would work very well and questioned if a variance would be better suited
than changing the ordinance. Mr. Florence stated a variance wouldn't apply to this
22 situation. Chairperson Call stated she doesn't want us to be put in a situation where a
determination has to be made every time an application is submitted. Commissioner
24 Thompson agreed stating he has the same basic concerns. He added the exceptions on
this is very specific and questioned if the wording could be changed to make it work so it
26 is not specific for this property; it looks like it will work well, but may be a little too
specific for him.

28 Commissioner Kallas commented we can't govern what schools do and he would
hesitate to change the ordinance just for this specific case. Mr. Florence said he would
30 like feedback tonight and then he can take another shot at the ordinance. Commissioner
Marchbanks pointed out there are only two locations in the city that meet the
32 requirements for a commercial farm zone (this property and Wadley Farms).

Mrs. Jorgensen was in attendance representing this item. She mentioned they feel
34 this is a pretty straightforward request and think this would look so much prettier and
would be better if they landscape down to where the elevation drops.

36 Following some general discussion Chairperson Call stated we need to work
something out with the ordinance. Commissioner Kallas asked Ms. Jorgensen if she
38 would be in agreement if this decision is postponed in order to figure out a tool to make
this work. Ms. Jorgensen stated they would be fine with that.

40 Chairperson Call asked if there were any public comments or discussion. Hearing
none she called for a motion to close the public hearing.

42
44 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT
VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

46
48 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the
Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.

2 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE ORDINANCE
4 AMENDMENT 2019-8-O TO ALLOW STAFF TO TAKE DIRECTION TO
6 INVESTIGATE HOW THIS SECTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT CAN BE
8 APPROVED TO MINIMIZE THE SETBACK TO 19 FEET WITHOUT CHANGING
10 THE ORDINANCE. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.
12 THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

8 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
10 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
12 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE

14 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

16 5. **Public Hearing** – Recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend Lindon
18 City Sign Code Chapter 18.03 to modify the allowable square footage for
directional signs. Application is made by Phil Haderlie on behalf of doTerra.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.
22 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT
VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

24 Mr. Florence led this discussion by stating the applicant, Phil Haderlie (who is in
26 attendance) made application on behalf of doTerra to amend Title 18.03.030 to allow for
increased directional signage in the Regional Commercial Zone. The ordinance
28 amendment application was filed to allow increased signage for the Regional
Commercial zone only. Staff feels that if the City decides to amend the sign code to allow
30 for increased sign area for directional signs then the City should consider, as well,
allowing increased signage for the Heavy and Light Industrial zones due to site visibility
for delivery trucks.

32 Mr. Florence explained Mr. Haderlie explained the purpose of the request for
increased directional sign area is to allow larger font size for ease of readability for large
34 delivery vehicles; A Directional Sign, as defined in Lindon City Code 18.03.020 means:
any sign used to direct traffic flow into or out of a parking lot through a City approved
36 drive approach; The sign code currently allows a maximum height of three feet and a
maximum sign area of 6 feet. He noted the applicants request is to allow a maximum
38 height of 3 feet and a maximum sign area of 12 square feet. These dimensions would
allow for a 3' x 4' directional sign.

40 Mr. Florence then presented the Proposed Ordinance Language as follows:

Directional Signs.

- 42 1. Directional signs require a sign permit from the City
- 44 2. Only one (1) Directional sign is allowed for each City approved drive approach.
- 46 3. Directional signs shall meet the following requirements:
 - a) Not exceed three feet (3') in height; and b. Not exceed six (6) square feet in area.
 - b) In the Regional Commercial, Heavy Industrial and Light Industrial zones, a maximum of three feet in height and twelve (12) square feet in area;

- 2 c) b. In all other commercial land use districts, a maximum of three feet (3') in
 height and six (6) square feet in area.
 4 4. Directional signs are permitted in all zones.

6 Mr. Florence noted staff reviewed a number of codes from different
 municipalities to analyze how other communities address allowable square footage for
 8 directional signs. Below is a list of the findings.

City	Allowable Square Footage	City	Allowable Square Footage
Provo	6	American Fork	As per development
Orem	4	Salt Lake City	8
Pleasant Grove	4	West Valley	16
Lehi	6	Sandy	4

10 Mr. Florence stated Mr. Haderlie also provided some detailed information on their
 site plan from the United States Sign Council Foundation (USSCF) and the Federal
 12 Highway Administration sign manual. Staff reviewed the USSCF material and it appears
 that the 360-foot visibility recommendation provided is consistent with USSCF data
 14 calculations. USSCF recommends that with any signage the viewer reaction time, viewer
 reaction distance, letter height, copy area and negative space be considered. One thing
 16 that staff did notice was that while USSCF did recommend a 360' distance for readability
 for a road like 400 North and speeds at 30 MPH, their model sign code had a
 18 recommended directional sign area of six square feet.

Mr. Florence indicated that Mr. Haderlie also provided information from the
 20 Federal Highway Administration (FHA) sign manual. FHA recommend “a minimum
 specific ratio of 1 inch of letter height per 30 feet of legibility distance.” While the FHA
 22 standards are designed for such signs as “railroad crossing”, “road closed,” and “stop”
 signs to name a few, they act a good reference for determining appropriate sign. Staff
 24 measured a number of “public” warning and information signs around Lindon, and for
 example, a “stop” sign has 9” lettering, a “dead-end” sign has 5” lettering and an
 26 “address street sign” has 6” lettering.

Mr. Florence commented that staff also evaluated a few existing directional signs
 28 at different businesses in the area. The Comcast sign is 4’10” tall by 3’ wide sign (12 sq
 ft) with 2.5” lettering. The lettering could not be seen visibly from 360 feet but an
 30 adjacent “dead end” sign with 5” letter could be seen just fine. Along with the size of the
 letter, as per USSCF, the copy area and negative space have a lot to do with the visibility
 32 of the sign. “Dead end” and “stop” signs work well because of the contrasting colors and
 dark lettering. Staff also evaluated the existing delivery sign at doTerra in Pleasant Grove
 34 (that sign is 4.5’ tall and 3’ wide with 4-inch lettering). The doTerra sign was somewhat
 easier to see at a distance under 300 feet but the lettering was difficult to read.

Mr. Florence indicated an additional item for the planning commission to consider
 36 is that directional signs are allowed for each drive approach and in addition to other
 38 allowable monument signs. Monument signs, at a minimum, are allowed to be at least 36
 square feet and 6 feet in height.

Mr. Florence further explained as staff evaluated different directional signs, they
 40 were difficult to find and there was generally a lack of these signs installed by businesses
 42 in Lindon. The purpose in providing the above measurements is that the square footage

2 may need to be increased for business areas with large delivery trucks so drivers can see
the signs at a distance of at approximately 360'. The main increase that the applicant is
4 requesting would be increasing the width from approximately two feet to four feet to
allow a 3'x4' directional sign.

6 Mr. Florence then presented some examples provided by doTerra of the types of
signage they are looking to install. While the sign measurements are not compliant with
8 their proposals, the commission can evaluate the type of sign they are considering. He
noted the General Plan has a land use goal to "build upon existing commercial site design
10 and development standards, including architectural design guidelines and guidelines for
landscaping and signage, to express the desired overall image and identity as outlined in
12 the Community Vision Statement. Mr. Florence then referenced the following exhibits
for discussion: Proposed Ordinance, Typical directional type signs, Site Plan, and
14 doTerra sign examples.

16 Commissioner Thompson commented this makes a lot of sense and coordinates
with standards already in place. Commissioner Kallas asked if there shouldn't be some
kind of percentage of open space on the sign so it doesn't become too busy. Mr. Florence
18 then gave some examples of signage in the city.

20 The applicant, Mr. Haderlie, explained they are proposing this because they want
to give drivers time to see the sign as to be able to stop in time to make the turn. He
indicated the entrance and exit signs look identical so there could be potential public
22 safety issues involved; they are just trying to make sure they get the right size of sign to
allow a meaningful and readable message.

24 Chairperson Call asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none she
called for a motion to close the public hearing.

26
28 **COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC
HEARING. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**

30
32 Following some additional discussion regarding signage and lettering size, the
commission was in agreement that this is a reasonable request and will be self-governing.
There was also some discussion on limiting the lettering to 9 inches.

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

36
38 **COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE
AMENDMENT 2019-9-O AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON
SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:**

40 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
42 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
44 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
46 **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

2 6. **Murdock Minor Subdivision – Murdock Auto Group.** Application for two-lot
minor subdivision approval at 452 S. Lindon Park Drive. (Utah County Parcel #
4 46-871-0101), in the Lindon City Planned Commercial – 1 (PC-1) and Planned
Commercial – 2 (PC-2) zones.

6
8 Anders Bake, Associate Planner, explained the applicant is seeking minor
subdivision approval to split one lot into two. At the June 12, 2018 Planning Commission
Meeting, Murdock Auto Group received Plat Amendment approval to combine their two
10 parcels into one. Now they would like to subdivide their property back to its original two
lots. He noted the Murdock Auto Group was originally going to turn the existing
12 building into a repair facility however another dealership will be taking the existing
building.

14 Mr. Bake explained the lot requirements (planned commercial 1 & 2) and
subdivision requirements are met. Staff has determined that the proposed subdivision
16 complies, or will be able to comply before final plat approval, with all remaining
subdivision and land use standards. He noted the City Engineer is addressing engineering
18 standards and all engineering issues will be resolved before final plat approval is granted.

20 Mr. Bake then presented an Aerial Photo, Zoning Map, and Subdivision Plat
followed by discussion. Chairperson Call stated this appears to be a pretty
straightforward minor subdivision request.

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

24
26 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT’S
REQUEST FOR TWO LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL WITH THE
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK
28 WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE ALL FINAL CORRECTIONS TO THE
ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS AND PLAT; 2. THE PLANS AND PLAT WILL
30 MEET RELEVANT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY
DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.
32 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

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

42 7. **The Wild Oak - Site Plan Approval - Lee Johnson.** Application for site plan
approval for a new reception center located at 450 W. Gillman Lane. (Utah
44 County Parcel # 14-067-0051), in the Lindon City General Commercial Storage
(CG-S) zone.

46
48 Mr. Florence led this discussion by explaining Lee Johnson (who is in attendance)
has made application for site plan approval for a new reception center located at 450 W.

2 Gillman Lane, in the Lindon City General Commercial Storage (CG-S) zone. The
3 planning commission will be evaluating whether the site plan and building meet Title 17
4 development regulations and Commercial Design Standards. The applicant proposes to
5 remodel an existing storage building at 450 W Gillman Ln. for use as a Reception Center.
6 The building currently does not have any water or sewer utilities to the building. Utilities
7 will be added to the building and property along with a fire hydrant at the entrance of the
8 property. Mr. Florence stated the applicant's site plan meets vehicle parking
9 requirements of one stall per 3½ person capacity in the building of facility, based on
10 maximum use of all facilities at the same time.

11 Mr. Florence went on to say the site plan provides adequate site circulation for the
12 proposed use. A hammerhead turn-around is proposed and has been approved by the fire
13 marshal. The proposed reception center shares a west and south property line with a
14 residential uses and zone. He explained the applicant is also requesting Planning
15 Commission approval to use an eight-foot-high wooden fence and a row of trees along
16 the South residential boundary line in lieu of a masonry or concrete fence that is required.
17 They also propose using a landscaping screen in Lieu of this requirement on the West
18 residential boundary line as shown in the attached landscaping plan.

19 Mr. Florence indicated Lindon City Code 17.48.040 requires that a masonry or
20 concrete fence seven feet (7') high shall be constructed and maintained along any
21 property line between a nonresidential development and a residential use or a residential
22 zone. The fence shall be constructed and maintained by the owner of the nonresidential
23 development. In all commercial zones the planning commission may approve a
24 landscaping screen in lieu of a fence, a fence other than a masonry fence or approve a
25 fence height greater than eight feet (8') if it makes the following findings:

- 26 a) The proposed fence/landscape screen provides an adequate buffer for the
27 adjoining residential use.
- 28 b) The appearance of the fence/landscape screen will not detract from the residential
29 use and/or nonresidential use of the property.
- 30 c) The proposed fence/landscape screen will shield the residential use from noise,
31 storage, traffic or any other characteristic of the nonresidential use that is
32 incompatible with residential uses.

33 Mr. Florence stated the Planning Commission may waive or adjust this
34 fence/screening requirement upon findings that the fence is not needed to protect adjacent
35 residential uses from adverse impacts and that such impacts can be mitigated in another
36 appropriate manner. The planning commission will also need to determine if they are in
37 agreement to allow an 8' wood fence and trees on the south property line and just trees on
38 the west property line as per Mr. Johnson's request. He pointed out the planning
39 commission required that Dastrop Auto to the north to install a 7' concrete masonry fence
40 on their west property line. He noted Mr. Johnson will be providing a minimum of 20 feet
41 of landscaping along Gillman Lane and the landscape plan meets all other landscaping
42 and open space percentage requirements

43 Mr. Florence pointed out buildings in the General Commercial Storage zone are
44 required to meet the Lindon Commercial Design Standards. Under the commercial design
45 standards commercial development should pick one of three building forms: one-part
46 commercial block, two-part commercial block, and central block buildings. The proposed

2 building most aligns with the one-part commercial block building. He then referenced the
standards for such a building in the Commercial Design Standards.

4 Mr. Florence noted the City Engineer is working through technical issues related
to the site plan and will conduct a final review if the planning commission grants final
6 site plan approval. He indicated the Wild Oak Reception Center is a permitted use in the
General Commercial Storage Zone. He noted the main concern that staff has is the
8 appropriate buffers between the reception center use and the existing residential uses.
Staff feels that the number of trees will help to reduce some noise levels and impacts on
10 surrounding neighbors. Mr. Florence then presented an Aerial photo, building elevations,
Site Plan, and Landscaping Plan followed by discussion.

12 Chairperson Call commented this appears to be a really ambitious project and
would certainly be a nice aspect to the area, but there are also some concerns from
14 neighboring residents. Chairperson Call then invited the applicants forward for
comments.

16 Mr. Johnson stated this is simply a family run business and they are passionate
about putting together a nice event center. They are hoping to have a lot of events and
18 want to beautify the area and make it very nice. Chairperson Call pointed out the impacts
it creates to the residential area are the concerns. She has concerns with the building
20 façade. The applicants then explained the building materials and landscape on the wall.

22 At this time Chairperson Call called for any public comments.

24 **Angie Neuwirth:** Ms. Neuwirth commented in looking at this site plan there is a
residential use on the east side near the entrance. She has concerns that the lighting will
26 shine into the residential properties. She also has concerns with traffic and the approach
onto Gillman Lane as it can pose safety issues.

28 **Gary Thornton:** Mr. Thornton stated he owns a welding shop and home on Gillman
30 Lane and there are residences on both sides of the road (east and west side). His other
concern is the lighting and he will not tolerate lights shining into his residences and they
32 will not park cars pointing into his residences without some kind of a block. He pointed
out Gillman Lane is just that, a lane. He noted he understands they are planning a
34 beautiful place and these centers can do very well, but they infringe on residents; we need
to consider these infringements and concerns of the residents.

36 **Mischa Park:** Ms. Park stated she lives on Gillman Lane. She is also familiar with event
38 centers and questioned the maximum capacity of the proposed center. Mr. Johnson stated
the capacity is 214 persons. She also has concerns with noise issues, renter's safety and
40 traffic patterns and potential accidents. She would like to see a traffic study be done.

42 **Derek:** Stated he is the husband of the applicant. He indicated Dastrup Auto said they
could possibly use their entrance for traffic flow and also for overflow parking on the
44 backside of their property which would alleviate some of the traffic flow onto Gillman
Lane. They can do their part to hold events at times to help alleviate potential traffic
46 issues.

2 **Doyle Christensen:** Mr. Christensen stated the exit off of Gillman Lane onto the
highway is dangerous and you can't see when turning. He noted there used to be red
4 markings on the concrete and the signs don't alleviate people parking on the street. This
poses a real safety issue.

6
8 **Ms. Jimenez:** Ms. Jimenez stated she also has concerns with the parking issues and
potential increased traffic and safety issues. She lives in the new cul-de-sac and there
could be upward of 10-12 families in their cul-de-sac. So, there will a lot of children in
10 the area and that poses a safety concern. She also has concerns with the potential noise
issues. The "Little Bit of Country" city motto should be considered.

12
14 **Gloria Estevan:** Ms. Estevan stated she lives two houses west of this proposal. She
indicated she sent a letter to the commission regarding her concerns. She also agrees with
the concerns addressed tonight. She has concerns with the increased parking and
16 traffic/safety issues and she doesn't believe there is near enough adequate parking for this
proposal. She has Dastrup Auto in her backyard and it is noisy etc.; she believes they
18 should have to build a masonry wall and landscaping as well for a sound barrier.

20 **Kevin Gillman:** Mr. Gillman pointed out once you come off of State Street the traffic
will funnel down Gillman Lane.

22
24 **Lawrence Packer:** Mr. Packer feels the role of the planning commission is to roll things
out in a proper order. If you don't have the proper infrastructure in place to handle the
traffic that should happen first and be in place before anything else happens.

26
28 The applicant indicated they are using non-high LED lighting in the parking lot
(not like what is in a car lot). They also plan to have minimal outdoor music as most of
the events with dancing will be indoors.

30 Commissioner Kallas commented this sounds like this could be a good project
noting it would be beneficial if they could make an arrangement with Dastrup Auto for
32 additional/overflow parking. He also pointed out it would be easy to mitigate the lighting
but it may be more difficult to mitigate the noise. There was then some discussion
34 regarding the block wall noting a wood fence will not meet the ordinance. The
commission agreed the building looks great but the lighting and parking will need to be
36 mitigated and there are some concerns of the noise.

38 Chairperson Call indicated the noise and traffic patterns are her concerns noting
the parking can be mitigated and her other concern is the large block wall without any
breakup and the fencing needs to meet the ordinance. She stated if some of these things
40 can be mitigated it will be a beautiful addition to the city.

42 Mr. Florence pointed out the current commercial zone ordinance prohibits
excessive or offensive noise, dust, odors, smoke or light shall be omitted discernible
beyond the site or parcel boundary.

44 The applicant commented she understands the concerns but they will work hard to
mitigate any issues. She would hope that people are good drivers as there are tough roads
46 everywhere and they make it work. This is zoned commercial for a reason. And there
will only be one or two events a week and it will not have the traffic a restaurant will
48 bring and will not have constant traffic flow.

2 Commissioner Thompson commented he is hearing the concerns, but he is
hesitant to move forward with approval without having a traffic engineering study done.
4 There was then some general discussion regarding the block wall and the architectural
guidelines. Commissioner Johnson commented he is also hearing the concerns but our
6 role as a commission is if it meets the standards and the code, we can't change that. As
long as they meet the standards in the code he believes we cannot deny this; he does not
8 believe we need to get hung up on architectural design and we need to consider that.

Chairperson Call commented she feels we need to bring the fence/wall into
10 compliance as it doesn't currently comply with the guidelines. She also asked how a
traffic study would fit together for this facility as she does not want to see an unsafe
12 condition; that is her biggest concern.

Commissioner Kallas commented traffic studies are expensive and he thinks they
14 would come to the conclusion that the street is insufficient; so how do we come to a
resolution. Until the master planned street is resolved in the future, he thinks we have to
16 deal with what we've got and make it as safe as we can. He also agrees with
Commissioner Johnson that we need to look at the ordinance and if it meets the code, we
18 have to approve it.

Chairperson Call asked staff if the police department and city engineer can
20 provide input on the traffic issue. Mr. Florence stated they can give the numbers of
accidents etc. and the city engineer could give his recommendations. Mr. Florence stated
22 he will contact them and check into that possibility.

Commissioner Thompson pointed out the commission has to determine if it
24 complies or not, but they want to do their due diligence. Commissioner Kallas stated he
is leaning towards requiring the masonry wall so it meets the code. Commissioner
26 Marchbanks was in agreement with that statement.

Chairperson Call would suggest continuing this item in order to address the
28 following concerns:

- Proposal for architectural guidelines and how the wall is broken up.
- Have the City Engineer and Police Chief look at the traffic patterns.
- Whether to require a masonry or wood fence.
- Lighting standards.
- Parking plan (overflow).

34 Commissioner Marchbanks questioned how the additional parking would come in
36 from Dastrup Auto. He also asked about the lighting standards they are proposing and if a
photometric study would be needed from a lighting company.

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

40
42 **COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICANT'S
REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO ALLOW STAFF AND THE
APPLICANT TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED
44 AS FOLLOWS: 1. HAVE THE CITY ENGINEER LOOK AT TRAFFIC PATTERNS
AND THE SAFETY CONDITIONS ON GILLMAN LANE AS IT PERTAINS TO
46 THIS PROJECT; 2. HAVE A PHOTOMETRIC STUDY DONE ON THE LIGHTING ;
3. LOOK AT THE ORDINANCE IN RESPECT TO THE FENCING AND WORK
48 WITH THE NEIGHBORS FOR AN AGREEMENT; 4. REVIEW THE**

2 ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES WITH STAFF TO ENSURE THEY MEET THE
CODE. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE
4 WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
6 COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON	AYE
10 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12
14 **8. Maxfield Hollow Major Subdivision Approval – Jake Davis**

Request for major subdivision approval of a seven-lot single family residential subdivision located at approximately 800 W and Lakeview Road. (Utah County Parcel #s 14:067:0162; 14:067:0164; 14:067:0178; 14:067:0181; 14:067:0177), in the Lindon City R1-20 zone.

18
20 Mr. Florence explained the applicant Jake Davis is in attendance and seeking Major subdivision approval for a seven-lot residential subdivision. Maxfield Hollow Subdivision will reconfigure five existing lots into seven. The subdivision plan also includes the extension of 250 North to 800 West which will be a public street.

22 Mr. Florence stated Staff has determined that the proposed subdivision complies, or will be able to comply before final plat approval, with all remaining land use standards. He noted the City Engineer is addressing engineering standards and all engineering issues will be resolved before final plat approval is granted. Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits for discussion: Aerial Image, and the Plat Map.

28 Following some general discussion, Chairperson Call stated this appears to be a pretty straightforward request and meets all requirements.

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

32
34 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR A SEVEN LOT MAJOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1.
36 THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE ALL FINAL CORRECTIONS TO THE ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS AND
38 PLAT; 2. THE PLANS AND PLAT WILL MEET RELEVANT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 3. THE APPLICANT
40 WILL COMPLY WITH ALL BONDING REQUIREMENTS; 4. 250 W. WILL BE DEDICATED TO THE CITY AS A PUBLIC STREET; 5. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF
42 REPORT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

44 CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
46 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
48 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON	AYE

2 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4

9. **Maxfield Meadows Minor Subdivision Approval – Patti Maxfield**

6 Request for minor subdivision approval of a two-lot single family residential
subdivision located at approximately 200 N. 800 W. (Utah County Parcel # 14-
8 064-0140), in the Lindon City R1-20 zone.

10 Mr. Bake explained the applicant is seeking Major subdivision approval for a
seven-lot residential subdivision and will reconfigure five existing lots into seven. The
12 subdivision plan also includes the extension of 250 N to 800 W., which will be a public
street. Mr. Bake then referenced the Lot Size Requirements (Residential) and Subdivision
14 requirements noting the requirements have been met.

16 Mr. Bake stated staff has determined that the proposed subdivision complies, or
will be able to comply before final plat approval, with all remaining land use standards.
He noted the City Engineer is addressing engineering standards and all engineering issues
18 will be resolved before final plat approval is granted. Mr. Bake then presented and aerial
Image and plat map followed by some general discussion.

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

22

COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S
24 REQUEST FOR TWO LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL WITH THE
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK
26 WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE ALL FINAL CORRECTIONS TO THE
ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS AND PLAT; 2. THE PLANS AND PLAT WILL
28 MEET RELEVANT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY
DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 3. THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH ALL
30 BONDING REQUIREMENTS; 4. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.

COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
32 RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

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

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

40

10. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Chairperson Call called for any
42 new business or reports from the Commissioners. Commissioner Johnson asked
about the procedure for re-appointment to the commission. Mr. Florence
44 explained the procedure to the commission.

46 11. **Planning Director Report** –

- Landscaping on 700 north
 - Commercial design guidelines
- 48

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

4 **ADJOURN** –

6
8 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
MEETING AT 10:15 PM. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE
MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

10
12 Approved – May 28, 2019

14
16 _____
Sharon Call, Chairperson

18
20 _____
Michael Florence, Planning Director