



2 Brandon Snyder, Associate Planner, led this discussion by stating this is a request  
by Matthew Blackburn (who was in attendance) for site plan approval for eight (8)  
4 office/warehouse units in a 24,000 square foot building to be located at approximately 40  
North Geneva Road in the Light Industrial (LI) zone. Mr. Snyder explained the intent of  
6 the Light Industrial (LI) zone is to provide areas in locations where light manufacturing,  
industrial processes and warehousing not producing objectionable effects may be  
8 established, maintained, and protected of which this request is in compliance. He noted  
that site plan review is required for all new development within non-residential zones per  
10 Lindon City Code.

Mr. Snyder mentioned that the Planning Staff, the City Engineer and the applicant  
12 are working through technical issues related to the site and City Staff will ensure all  
issues are resolved before final engineering approval is granted. Staff has also identified  
14 that the application indicates parcels: 14-065-0192, 0193, and 200 and it appears at this  
time that the three parcels will need to be combined into one. Previously the parcels were  
16 one and were divided in 2013. The parcels fail to meet the minimum acreage and frontage  
requirements of the LI zone and the division of property should also be done in  
18 accordance with subdivision regulations. Mr. Snyder stated the applicant has been asked  
to combine the three parcels back into one. He noted that third party notices were  
20 provided to the adjoining property owners in accordance with Lindon City Code and staff  
has received no public comment back at this time. He then referenced the table showing  
22 the property information indicating how this complies with the light industrial  
requirements.

Mr. Snyder mentioned that the LI zone requires that a landscaped strip, twenty  
24 (20) feet in width, shall be planted with grass, and trees planted every thirty (30) feet on  
center along all public street frontages. Thirty percent (30%) of the landscape strip may  
26 consist of decorative rock, bark, mulch, and/or other ground covers other than grass.  
Lindon City Code indicates, landscaping requirements concerning trees and landscape  
28 materials can be changed and/or altered (with regard to location and design) upon  
approval of the Planning Commission at the site plan review stage of an application.  
30

Mr. Snyder stated that no net loss of landscaping should occur with any approved  
32 alterations. Other landscaping layouts consistent with the Lindon City Commercial  
Design Guidelines may also be considered by the Planning Commission. Some of the  
34 design objectives included are: to enhance the visual environment by adding visual  
interest through texture, color, size, shape, etc., and enhance perspective by framing  
36 views complimenting architecture, screening and creating points of interest and activity;  
creating street identification by varying the species, height, and location of landscaping;  
38 minimize noise and glare; conserve energy; complement architecture by landscaping  
around buildings, screen areas of low visual interest.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that the Planning Commission previously discussed  
40 reducing the width of the landscaping strip for this site on October 13, 2015. The  
submitted plans indicate the required landscape strip is proposed to be 13 inches in depth  
42 (along Geneva Road). A total of 10 would be on-site and an additional 3 in the row. The  
applicant has also provided two (2) landscaping options for review. One meets the grass  
44 requirements, and the other utilizes low water usage and less maintenance plantings. The  
xeriscape option indicates planting coverage of 25%. Mr. Snyder mentioned the  
46 Commission may want to discuss if this percentage of coverage is adequate to meet the

2 intent of the ordinance. He noted the grass option does not show the requisite trees and  
street trees are required if that option is selected. Interior Landscaping per Lindon City  
4 Code indicates that interior landscaping must be provided at 40 square feet per stall with  
one tree per 10 stalls. Mr. Snyder then presented the two proposals on the screen for  
6 discussion.

8 Mr. Snyder stated the landscape materials must consist of at least 75% living  
vegetation including ground cover, trees, and shrubbery. The remaining 25% may consist  
10 of xeriscape (desert landscaping) materials. He pointed out that the plans do not indicate  
the percentage of living vegetation coverage in the parking lot islands and both  
12 landscaping options, as discussed above, show identical plantings within the parking lot.  
The required amount of interior landscaping (area) and trees are provided. He noted that  
14 no fencing regulations apply as the site is not adjacent to a residential use or residential  
zone. He added that Lindon City Code also indicates that all buildings in the LI and HI  
16 zone should be aesthetically pleasing, well-proportioned buildings that blend with the  
surrounding property and structures. He pointed out that this building exterior includes  
18 the use of insulated panels with an embossed stucco pattern and Modera dry stack block  
for columns and wainscot. The elevations also include metal trim and store front  
aluminum clad windows and metal awnings.

20 Mr. Snyder pointed out that the Planning Commission may approve ribless, metal,  
flat-faced, stucco embossed, metal sandwich panel buildings if they find that the building  
22 is aesthetically pleasing, adequately trimmed, contrasted with different colors, is well  
proportioned, blends in with surrounding property and structures. The exterior  
24 appearance of such buildings shall primarily be of earth tone colors. He noted the  
dumpster will be enclosed in CMU block walls with metal sight obscuring gates. Mr.  
26 Snyder then referenced the landscape plans, elevations and color chart followed by some  
general discussion. He then turned the time over to Mr. Blackburn for comment.

28 Mr. Blackburn pointed out at the bottom of the storm retention it is paved concrete  
and suggested using the xeriscape to conserve water and low maintenance. He noted they  
30 took the extra effort to include more bushes and landscaping. They would also be open  
to doing a combination of landscaping and xeriscape. Mr. Blackburn explained they are  
32 asking for the narrower landscaping requirement because they are putting in new curb  
and gutter (acceleration lane) by the Nicolson project. He then described the materials  
34 they will be using to add some different dimensions so it doesn't look like a typical  
warehouse (shown on rendering). Mr. Blackburn noted they will be happy to comply with  
36 any requirements the Commission decides. He added they have done some beautiful  
xeriscape projects and would be happy to provide photos and a color landscape plan. He  
38 pointed out that xeriscapes are more costly to do if done right but their investors favor  
xeriscapes because they feel it will draw people to their buildings and they are  
40 environmentally friendly.

Chairperson Call commented that it appears this project will blend with the  
42 property and adjacent structures and fits within what is required and meets the code.  
However, she does have a few concerns with the landscaping percentages.  
44 Commissioner Wily commented he likes the idea of a xeriscape and has seen some really  
nice xeriscape projects and he has no problem with the 25% and the plan as submitted.  
46 Commissioner McDonald commented he is in favor of xeriscape if it has the 5% increase  
in plant coverage and also includes the trees. Chairperson Call asked if the minor changes

2 in the landscaping would have to come back before the Commission. Mr. Snyder stated  
the changes could be included as conditions in the motion which would allow the  
4 applicant to move forward or it can be continued. Commissioner Kallas commented that  
he feels staff can ensure the changes and this can be approved with conditions.

6 Chairperson Call asked if there were any further questions or comments from the  
Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.

8  
10 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S  
REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL OF OFFICE/WAREHOUSE UNITS,  
APPROXIMATELY 27,300 SQUARE FEET TO BE LOCATED AT 40 NORTH  
12 GENEVA ROAD IN THE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI) ZONE, WITH THE  
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. RECOMBINE THE THREE PARCELS INTO ONE  
14 PARCEL AND 2. REQUIRE THE APPLICANT TO COME BACK WITH A  
LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR REVIEW. COMMISSIONER MCDONALD  
16 SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

18 CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
COMMISSIONER WILY	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
20 COMMISSIONER MCDONALD	AYE
COMMISSIONER KELLER	AYE
22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSENT.

- 24  
26 **5. Major Subdivision—Lakeview North Holdings Condo Plan A, 1396 West 200  
South.** Joel Pilling seeks preliminary approval of a twelve (12) unit condominium  
plat to be known as Lakeview North Warehouse Condominiums Plat A located at  
28 approximately 1396 West 200 South in the Light Industrial zone.

30 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director, led this discussion by stating this item is a  
request by Joel Pilling (who is in attendance) and seeking preliminary approval of a  
32 twelve (12) unit condominium plat to be known as Lakeview North Warehouse  
Condominiums Plat A located at approximately 1396 West 200 South in the Light  
34 Industrial zone (where there was an old trucking facility on the site).

36 Mr. Van Wagenen noted this property received site plan approval in May of this  
year and the two buildings are currently under construction. The owners have intended to  
record a condominium plat for the two buildings but they want to wait until the floors of  
38 the buildings were poured so exact property descriptions could be established from the  
actual building footprints. He noted Mr. Pilling is just following up on his intended plan  
40 in moving forward. Chairperson Call stated she doesn't have any questions as this  
subdivision appears to meet all requirements and is pretty straightforward. Mr. Van  
42 Wagenen stated staff has no concerns and feels it is in compliance.

44 Chairperson Call asked if there were any questions or comments from the  
Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.

46 COMMISSIONER WILY MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S  
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A TWELVE UNIT CONDOMINIUM PLAT TO BE

2 KNOWN AS LAKEVIEW NORTH WAREHOUSE CONDOMINIUMS WITH THE  
4 NO CONDITIONS. COMMISSIONER KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE  
VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
6 COMMISSIONER WILY	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
8 COMMISSIONER MCDONALD	AYE
COMMISSIONER KELLER	AYE
10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSENT.

12  
14 **6. Public Hearing—Street Master Plan Amendment (Approx. 1550 West 200  
North).** Bryan Stevenson requests approval of a proposed amendment to the  
Lindon City Street Master Plan Map to remove a master planned road connection  
16 located at approximately 1550 West between 200 North and 50 North in the Light  
Industrial (LI) zone.

18  
20 COMMISSIONER MCDONALD MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED  
IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

22  
24 Mr. Van Wagenen also led this discussion by stating this item is a request by  
Bryan Stevenson who is in attendance along with Lance Buhler and Andrew  
Bollschweiler as representatives of this agenda item. Mr. Stevenson is requesting  
26 approval of a proposed amendment to the Lindon City Street Master Plan Map to  
remove a master planned road connection located at approximately 1550 West  
28 between 200 North and 50 North in the Light Industrial (LI) zone. Mr. Stevenson  
has stated as part of this request, 20 South would be constructed and thereby  
30 complete a street connection between 1550 West and 1800 West. That connection  
would make the 1550 West road less necessary for street network connectivity in  
32 the area.

34 Mr. Van Wagenen explained the 1550 West connection falls on just one  
property at the moment. However, the 20 South connection requires road  
dedication from three property owners adjacent to the identified right of way. To  
36 date, only one property owner along the 20 South right of way has communicated  
directly with staff. Mr. Van Wagenen mentioned that Rick Miller of Fusion  
38 Development has stated that he needs more information in order to support the  
request, but he is open to the proposal. He noted that Mr. Miller's written  
40 submittal is included in the staff report. He also mentioned that Mr. Larry  
McColm (property owner) has expressed concerns and is in attendance tonight to  
42 address the Commission.

44 Mr. Van Wagenen noted the applicant has provided a development concept  
for the parcel where the road would be eliminated (included in the staff report).  
The street in question is designated as a major collector street on the Plan. The street was  
46 called out as a future road in the 2000 General Plan but may have been considered well

2 before that. Staff has received development inquiries on this property and the future road  
construction has been a sticking point for several interested parties.

4 Mr. Van Wagenen mentioned the Relevant General Plan policies to consider in  
determining whether the requested change will be in the public interest:

- 6 a. It is the “purpose of the transportation plan to balance future demands generated  
by the Land Use element with future roadway improvements, thereby developing  
8 a long-range transportation system plan which would efficiently support future  
land development.”
- 10 b. The Street Plan states the “inherent in a long-range projection is the potential for  
variation due to unforeseen economic, political, social, and technological  
12 changes.”
- 14 c. “The goal of the transportation plan is to have a balanced circulation system  
which provides for safe and efficient movement of vehicles”
- 16 d. “Planning shall minimize localized traffic congestion and operational problems  
and ensure adequate access to and circulation around commercial areas”

18 Mr. Van Wagenen stated the City should make changes to the General Plan if the  
public interest is being served and changes should not be made in order to further one  
20 individual’s or company’s interests. He noted the City Engineer has submitted his  
opinion (pros and cons) on the request (included in the staff report). If 1550 West is to be  
22 removed, it shouldn’t be done until all of the property owners along the 20 South right of  
way have given consent to that road being built and that it will be built in a timely  
24 manner. Mr. Van Wagenen then referenced an aerial photo of the proposed area where  
the applicant is requesting the street to be removed, the Street Master Plan Map, the  
26 Development options if the future road is eliminated, the City Engineer’s Comments and  
the Fusion Development letter followed by some general discussion. He then turned the  
28 time over to the applicant for comment.

Mr. Stevenson introduced themselves stating they have properties along I-15 in  
30 Utah County and have been approached about an available piece of property in Lindon.  
He explained the feasibility of the project is low because whoever develops this land  
32 would have to pay for a road and it becomes an issue on the plan and very costly (1.5  
million). They have talked to the landowners who cannot development the back of their  
34 lots until the road gets punched through to the west to get the connectivity. He noted this  
land has sat unsold because of these issues. Mr. Buehler described the current plan  
36 noting they have had positive feedback from the landowners because of the connectivity.  
He noted this doesn’t prohibit vehicular traffic but the connecting points are very close  
38 and is a logical connecting point. The main concern is if this goes away will we get  
connectivity from east to west and the answer is yes. They are just trying to get  
40 something to happen now rather than have to wait. There was then some general  
discussion regarding the project, the roadway, a possible traffic study and connectivity.  
42 Emergency vehicle access was also discussed.

Chairperson Call called for public hearing at this time. There were several in  
44 attendance who addressed the Commission as follows:

46 **Larry McColm:** Mr. McColm commented that he owns four buildings in the Lindon  
Business Park. He stated he is formally requesting a continuance of this item as this is an

2 extremely important issue to hundreds of tenants and employees (at least 300). Mr.  
4 McColm stated they have been waiting for the road to go through (1550 West) and this  
6 will be a major artery that will connect to the Vineyard Connector which is a key part. He  
8 pointed out that 20 South is too narrow and will not accommodate the large trucks  
10 coming in and out and will just not work. Mr. McColm stated he is in support of the  
12 development but it needs to incorporate 1550 West going through. He note this property  
14 is priced too high that is why it has not sold. Mr. McColm pointed out that they have not  
16 had time to review this as this will impact them greatly for years to come. They have  
18 been told the road would go through and it has been on the master plan for a long time  
they have been counting on the master plan. Mr. McColm concluded by asking the  
Commission to please make the right decision and continue this item as they need time to  
prepare as they just received the notice yesterday. He added that they all have to use 200  
south to get to the property which is in very horrible condition and in desperate need of  
repair. This proposal is an inexpensive alternative but not worth giving up the 1550  
connection. He also pointed out that Big D Construction has indicated they can do the  
connection for under \$400,000.

20 **John Barrow:** Mr. Barrow stated he is a Manager at the business park where they have  
22 over 70 tenants with many employees and they have all expressed concerns over this  
issue. Mr. Barrow indicated that they need more time to have more of a say in this matter.

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

26 COMMISSIONER WILY MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
28 COMMISSIONER KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN  
FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

30 Chairperson Call reminded the Commission when looking at this information we  
32 need to ask does this benefit the long range transportation plan, minimize traffic  
congestion and circulation and if the public is being served. The pros and cons in the  
Engineers report also needs to be considered. She would suggest we continue this item as  
34 to increase the circulation of the noticing so all businesses in that area have the  
information and additional time to prepare. She pointed out this is not urgent since it has  
36 been on the general plan since at least 2000. Chairperson Call expressed that this is a big  
decision because it affects a lot of people and we need to take the time to take everything  
38 into consideration. Commissioner McDonald agreed with that statement.

40 Commissioner Wily commented that many landowners rely on the master plan  
but that does not mean it's impossible to change a road (maybe with a little more time)  
42 but he doesn't feel it is ready now. Commissioner Johnson asked who the current owner  
of the vacant property is. Mr. Van Wagenen stated the owners are aware that it was on  
the plan. Commissioner Kallas stated he is in support of continuance of this item.  
44 Following discussion the Commission was in agreement to notify all property owners that  
enter or exit off of 1800 West to the freeway and 200 North down to 200 South and to  
46 continue this item.

2 Following some additional discussion Chairperson Call asked if there were any  
4 further questions or comments from the Commission. Hearing none she called for a  
motion to continue.

6 COMMISSIONER MCDONALD MOVED TO RECOMMEND  
CONTINUANCE OF THE APPLICANT’S REQUEST TO REMOVE THE STREET  
8 CONNECTION IDENTIFIED AT APPROXIMATELY 1550 WEST FROM 200  
NORTH TO 50 NORTH AS IDENTIFIED FROM THE ATTACHED MAP FROM THE  
10 STREET MASTER PLAN. COMMISSIONER KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION.  
THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

12	CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
	COMMISSIONER WILY	AYE
14	COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
	COMMISSIONER MCDONALD	AYE
16	COMMISSIONER KELLER	AYE
	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE

18 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSENT.

- 20 7. **Public Hearing—Ordinance Amendment, Title 18 LED Electronic Message**  
22 **Signs.** Lindon City is considering a City Code amendment to allow for electronic  
message signs in zones other than the I-15 Travel Zone Overlay.  
24 Recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for final approval.

26 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
COMMISSIONER MCDONALD SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT  
28 VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

30 Mr. Van Wagenen gave some background of this item stating as Lindon City has  
tried to inform citizens about events, meetings, etc., and they realize it is somewhat  
32 difficult and they also realize that local businesses may also have the same issues under  
the current sign restriction. He noted that allowing electronic changeable copy signs may  
34 be good for anyone wanting to advertise, promote, or inform the public regarding  
services, products or news. Mr. Van Wagenen explained when it comes to electronic  
36 changeable signs there must be a balance between effectiveness of the method and the  
safety and also the look of that method. He noted that the City is considering a new  
38 monument sign at the entrance of the City Center Campus and if this ordinance is  
adopted the city would utilize an electronic changeable copy sign. He noted this is an  
initial proposal and not an urgent matter.

40 Mr. Van Wagenen then gave an overview of the proposed ordinance amendment  
pointing out it would allow electronic changeable copy signs in the Commercial, Mixed  
42 Commercial, Research & Business, and Light Industrial zones. He noted these types of  
signs would need to be part of an allowed monument sign and be restricted in size to six  
44 (6) feet in height or 36 square feet. Mr. Van Wagenen then discussed the purpose of sign  
regulations included in the Lindon City Code Section 18 as follows:

- 2 1. Reduce potential hazards to motorists and pedestrians by providing adequate  
4 signage in order to identify a business or facility while eliminating excessive,  
obtrusive, and confusing sign displays and excessive illumination.
- 6 2. Encourage sign owners to integrate signs with buildings and sites through use  
of similar building materials and moderate sign proportions.
- 8 3. Preserve and improve the aesthetic appearance of the City as a place in which  
to live and work by reducing or prohibiting signage that is overbearing, creates  
10 visual clutter or excessive illumination, or is not consistent with the design  
guidelines of Lindon City.
- 12 4. Allow each business to clearly identify itself and the goods and services which  
it offers.
- 14 5. Safeguard and enhance property values by allowing for aesthetically pleasing  
signage that will help to promote economic development and attract quality  
businesses to the City.
- 16 6. Protect public and private investment in buildings and open space.
- 18 7. Preserve freedom of speech.
- 20 8. Promote public health, safety, community standards, public morals and the  
general welfare of the citizens of Lindon City.

22 Mr. Van Wagenen then showed examples of sign sizes and photos to the  
Commission followed by discussion.

24 Chairperson Call called for any public comments at this time. Mr. Joel Warden  
with Young Electric Sign Company was in attendance and addressed the Commission at  
this time. Mr. Warden referenced studies regarding changeable copy signs specifically  
26 regarding safety issues. He argued that electronic signs are in fact very safe. Mr. Warden  
stated they, as a company, have a vested interest in these conversations. Mr. Warden  
28 went to reference three studies in detail indicating that changeable copy signs are safe.  
There was then some additional general discussion by the Commission regarding  
30 electronic message signs including safety, aesthetics and effectiveness and restrictions.  
The Commission also agreed to continue this item for further discussion.

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

34  
36 COMMISSIONER KELLER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.  
COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN  
FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

38  
40 Chairperson Call asked if there were any further questions or comments from the  
Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion to continue.

42 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO RECOMMEND CONTINUANCE  
OF ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2016-15-O FOR STAFF TO GATHER MORE  
44 INFORMATION. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE  
VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

46 CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE  
COMMISSIONER WILY AYE

2 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE  
COMMISSIONER MCDONALD AYE  
4 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE  
COMMISSIONER KELLER AYE  
6 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSENT.

8 8. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Chairperson Call called for any new  
business or reports from the Commission at this time. Chairperson Call mentioned  
10 that a resident asked her about the “snake house” as there are some strong odors  
coming from the home. She also asked how often it is inspected. Mr. Van  
12 Wagenen stated he will check into this issue. Commissioner McDonald mentioned  
the impact fee study noting City Inspectors can vote on code changes as well as  
14 Planning Commissioners noting he would like to be able to vote. Mr. Van  
Wagenen stated he will check into this issue and get back to him.

16 9. **Planning Director Report** – Mr. Van Wagenen reported on the following items  
18 followed by discussion:  
• Training through Land Use Academy  
20 • UT-APA Fall Conference

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

24 **ADJOURN** –

26 CHAIRPERSON CALL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING  
28 AT 10:20 P.M. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL  
PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

30 Approved – September 13, 2016

32  
34 \_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Call, Chairperson

36  
38 \_\_\_\_\_  
Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director