

2 Mr. Bake then reviewed the Lot Requirements (Lindon Village Commercial -
LVC) and Subdivision requirements noting all requirements have been met or met before
4 final approval. Mr. Bake stated Staff has determined that the proposed subdivision
complies, or will be able to comply before final plat approval, with all remaining
6 subdivision and 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.

8 Mr. Bake then presented an Aerial Photo, Subdivision Plat and Subdivision Plat
Detail followed by some general discussion. Mr. Bake noted the exact layout and use of
10 the property are still being determined. He also spoke on the easement to access lot #101
from Geneva Road. Chairperson Call commented this appears to be compliant and meets
12 all zone requirements.

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

16 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE
APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR TWO LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL
18 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE
TO WORK WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE ALL FINAL CORRECTIONS
20 ON THE ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS AND PLAT; 2. THE PLANS AND PLAT
WILL MEET RELEVANT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY
22 DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.

COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
24 RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| CHAIRPERSON CALL | AYE |
| 26 COMMISSIONER KALLAS | AYE |
| COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS | AYE |
| 28 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON | AYE |
| COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS | AYE |
| 30 COMMISSIONER TRIBE | AYE |

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

32
34 **5. Concept Review – Ivory Homes; Anderson Farms Planned Development.**

Ivory Homes requests concept review to propose increasing the number of
36 housing units as part of the Andersons Farms Planned Development and Master
Development Agreement. The increase in housing units would allow Ivory to set
aside a portion of units for affordable housing. A Concept Review allows
38 applicants to receive Planning Commission feedback and comments on proposed
projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but general suggestions or
40 recommendations are typically provided.

42 Mike Florence, Planning Director, invited the applicant, Ken Watson,
representing Ivory Development forward. Mr. Florence led this discussion by giving a
44 quick summary stating the City previously reached out to Ivory Homes to discuss
opportunities for affordable housing as part of their development. Subsequently, Ivory
46 Homes held a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and City Council on May 28,
2019 to discuss adding additional housing units to the Anderson Farms Development.

2 Mr. Florence explained Ivory Homes is desiring to set aside a number of housing
units as affordable units but will need a change in density and overall unit count for this
4 to happen. He then referenced a table that provides a summary of the housing unit
changes. With a majority of the units proposed for the apartment phase, the proposal adds
6 an additional 13 single family units which are reconfigured from different phases. A
couple changes to highlight are as follows:

- 8 • The overall housing unit count is proposed to increase from 867 to 930.
- 10 • 50 of the 63 additional housing unit would be part of the future multi-family
apartment phase.
- 12 • The future regional park increases from 10 acres to 12 acres. The homes adjacent
to the park were removed.
- 14 • Parcels A and C receive a reduction in housing units and larger average lot size.
Parcels E, G/H, and the Apartment phase increases in housing units and number
of lots
 - 16 • Lot sizes in Parcel A range from 7,500 to over 9,500 square feet. The
smallest lot size called out in the development agreement for this phase
18 was 6,720.
 - 20 • Lot sizes in Parcel E range from 3,700 square feet to over 8,000 square
feet. The smallest lot size called out in the development agreement for this
phase was 7,941.
 - 22 • Lot sizes in Parcel G/H range from 4,400 square feet to over 8,000 square
feet. The smallest lot size called out in the development agreement for this
24 phase was 6,651.

26 Mr. Florence further explained Ivory has not yet identified which units or how
many units would be designated as affordable. This would need to be further evaluated
28 and identified if there is support for the project. Any changes to the project will require
an amendment to the master development agreement and subdivision amendments to
30 those phases that that have previously been approved. He then presented the Concept
Plan, Approved Site Plan and Product Imagery followed by discussion.

32 Mr. Watson explained their concept plan and what they are trying to accomplish.
There was then some general discussion regarding the concept plan with changes for
34 affordable housing including workforce housing, deed restrictions, density and price
range. Mr. Watson made note that the city brought this to them and they are willing to do
36 this with minimal gain.

38 Councilmember Vanchiere was in attendance and pointed out the idea here is to
have something that is managed and controlled. He went on to say Ivory Homes has done
a great job and reconfigured housing lots and taken measures not to have unintended
40 consequences. He also gave kudos to Ivory Development for being willing to bring back
new ideas. Commissioner Kallas expressed his concerns with lot size and density and
42 unintended consequences; he is not sure interspersing throughout the city is a good idea
he would rather have it dedicated to certain areas as it may stigmatize the larger lots.
44 Commissioner Schauers stated he would hope the Council would ask if the extra 50
apartments are aligned with our goals and if it needs to be a packaged deal with the
46 single-family lots. Commissioner Marchbanks stated he believes Ivory has given some
deep thought on how to do this and help facilitate affordable housing; he also pointed out
48 they are not obligated.

2 Following discussion, Mr. Watson indicated what he is hearing is that their plan is
somewhat acceptable with questions on the number of apartments.

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

- 6
- 8 **6. Concept Review – Kirk Williamson. 114-122 N Main St.** Kirk Williamson
requests concept review to amend the Lindon City Development Manual to allow
for an alternative street cross-section for the Sensitive Land Overlay Zone. A
10 Concept Review allows applicants to receive Planning Commission feedback and
comments on proposed projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but
12 general suggestions or recommendations are typically provided.

14 Chairperson Call invited the applicants, Kirk Williamson and Mark McCann
forward. Anders Bake led the discussion by giving a summary stating the applicant is
16 requesting feedback before applying for an amendment to the Lindon City Development
Manual. The Development Manual Amendment will include a new street cross section
18 for property in the Sensitive Area District and an amendment to the Hammerhead Turn
Around requirements. He noted the City does not allow for private streets so the
20 developer and City worked on a proposed public road cross-section that reduces the right-
of-way requirements of a typically public street. The proposed amendment will allow the
22 applicant to build a public road that will serve three lots in a new subdivision and may be
more compatible with the Sensitive Area.

24 Mr. Bake stated the applicant would like to subdivide their property at
approximately 122 N Main street to reconfigure four lots into six. Lindon City Code
26 requires that residential lots in subdivisions front on a public street. In the proposed plans,
three of the new lots will have frontage on Main Street and three will have frontage on a
28 new public street. The applicant is proposing modifications to the city’s public street
requirements for property in the Sensitive Area District to better preserve their property.
30 The property is located in the “Lindon Hollow” area.

32 Mr. Bake further explained the applicant is seeking concept review to discuss an
amendment to the approved street cross sections in the Lindon City Development
Manual. This amendment would add a new street cross section that can only be used in
34 designated Sensitive Area Districts. It includes two fourteen-foot travel lanes with two
feet of curb and gutter on both sides of the street. The curb to curb width of the street will
36 be thirty-two feet. He pointed out that sidewalks are not included and property lines will
be two feet behind the curb and parking will be permitted on one side of the street unless
38 restricted by the City.

40 Mr. Bake further stated the applicant is also seeking to discuss an amendment to
the Hammerhead Turn Around regulations in the Lindon City Development Manual.
Currently the use of a Hammerhead Turn Around must have a minimum length of 200
42 feet from the centerline of the intersection to the center of the hammerhead. The proposed
amendment would increase the minimum length when used in the Sensitive Area District.
44 The exact length will be determined when the applicant applies for an ordinance
amendment to the Development Manual. He added the city Fire Inspector has given
46 approval for both of these concepts.

48 Mr. Bake went on to say the Sensitive Area District “designates and describes
those areas within the city that possess physical or environmental characteristics that

2 require special public consideration.” The Lindon City Code places regulations on
4 properties in the Sensitive Area District that are intended to “permit a reasonable latitude
6 in the use of property, while at the same time requiring design solutions which will avoid
8 detrimental impacts on sensitive natural areas, as well as provide protection from adverse
10 natural forces and hazards.” One of the General Provisions for this district is to
“encouraging retention of natural landmarks, prominent natural features, wildlife
habitation, and open space.” Lindon City Code (17.56.050) establishes three Sensitive
Area Districts in the city. Sensitive Area District 3 includes “all property in the area
commonly referred to as ‘the Hollow’.” The applicant’s property lies almost completely
within the Sensitive Area District 3.

12 Mr. Bake then referenced the Proposed Lot configuration and street location,
Lindon City Environmental Features Map, Proposed Sensitive Area District street cross
14 section and Hammerhead Turn Around requirements with proposed changes followed by
discussion.

16 Mr. Williamson gave a brief history noting they have spent three years discussing
this issue with the city. Their desire has been to have a private lane which most cities
18 offer. They have high ground and elevation change (sensitive areas) and their desire is to
cluster with four homes. With a typical road profile, it is so wide that the homes are
20 pushed down the hill; they have struggled with this and believe this concept is finding the
“middle road”. He added they believe this is a good compromise for them and also a
22 good thing for the city and neighboring properties.

24 Commissioner Marchbanks commented that the “hollow” has unique
circumstances, adding this accomplishes future goals as far as a storm drain management
program as the water flow should be maintained. He pointed out there are reasons to
26 move forward with something like this proposal and there is value in creating a cross
section that could be used for more than one spot in the city that would solve these issues
28 and also be built to the city’s specs and standards yet have the feel of a private lane.

Following some additional discussion regarding the concept plan, Chairperson
30 Call stated she is hearing the Planning Commission is not opposed to this and it could
work out may turn out to be a positive thing. She also suggested they go before the City
32 Council for review and consideration of this concept plan.

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

36 **7. Concept Review – Dynamic City Capital; Approximately 550-570 N State St.**

38 Dynamic City Capital requests concept review to propose an amendment to
decrease the setback requirements from a residential zone or use for storage units
40 in the Commercial Storage Zone as well as modifications to landscaping
requirements. A Concept Review allows applicants to receive Planning
42 Commission feedback and comments on proposed projects. No formal approvals
or motions are given, but general suggestions or recommendations are typically
provided.

44 Mike Florence, Planning Director, led this discussion by explaining the applicant
46 is requesting concept review feedback before applying to develop the property at 570 N.
State as a mixed commercial site for retail, office and storage units. With the 2018
48 concept plan the real estate agents for the property held a neighborhood meeting

2 regarding the proposed use of storage units. Specifically, the applicant is requesting
concept feedback on the below bullet points below regarding the zone change,
4 development standards for the storage units and recreational vehicle parking:

- 6 • Amending the back 6.8 acres to Commercial General Storage. The only other
property zoned Commercial General Storage is the property on Gillman Lane that
was recently purchased for the Wild Oak reception center. This would be the first
8 development constructed under the Commercial General Storage zoning.
- 10 • The applicant would like to amend the requirement that commercial buildings be
setback 40' feet from any residential use or zone. (17.48.020). Specifically, for
12 the storage units the applicant is looking at the area adjacent to the chapel owned
by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. The applicant is seeking
14 feedback if the ordinance should be modified when the adjacent use is a church or
other use located in a residential zone but is not a residential use. The applicant
would like to position at least one storage unit building on or adjacent to the south
16 property line. The building could take the place of the required wall.
- 18 • The applicant would also like to construct carports to cover the recreational
vehicle parking which would be subject to the same 40' setback requirement.
However, the carports would be adjacent to both a residential zone and residential
20 use. See concept plan. The applicant believes the recreational vehicle parking will
be more attractive with covered parking.
- 22 • The applicant would like feedback on the parking code that requires 10' of
landscaping between parking areas and a residential use or zone. The ordinance
24 requires landscaping between the recreational vehicle parking and the 7' screen
wall. City Code 17.18.085 states:
 - 26 ○ (17.18.085). "Any off-street parking lot adjacent to a residential use or
residential zone shall provide a minimum 10' landscaped buffer from the
28 parking lot to the adjacent residential use or zone. Trees shall be planted at
least every 10' along the landscaped strip adjacent to the residential use or
30 residential zone. Trees must be a minimum of 2" caliper measured one
foot off the ground and at least 6' tall when planted. In addition to any
32 required fencing, trees shall be of a variety that will mature to a height of
at least 20' tall in order to provide a visual barrier between the non-
34 residential use and the residential use. The Planning Commission has
flexibility to grant exceptions to this landscape screening standard if
36 existing vegetation or other existing screening is found to meet the intent
of the screening requirements found in this section."
 - 38 ○ While interior ground landscaping will not be viewed from the residence
due to the 7' wall, the planning commission will need to provide feedback
40 if trees are still appropriate as a visual barrier. Staff feels that there is some
value to having the trees not only for screening but also to decrease light
42 or noise spill over. If the commission's recommendation is to allow the
removal of interior landscaping then staff recommends that there not be an
44 overall net landscaping loss for the site.
 - 46 ○ The Commercial General Storage Zone limits the amount of outdoor
recreational vehicle parking to 15% of the total building storage area. The
applicant would request that the ordinance be amended to allow 15%

2 recreational vehicle parking based off of the overall site storage area. The
3 planning commission should evaluate how much additional
4 recreational vehicle parking this would allow to determine how to best
5 plan the site and meet the intent of the ordinance to limit outdoor
6 recreational vehicle storage in the zone.

8 Mr. Florence noted a similar concept review was considered by the Planning
9 Commission in 2018 with a number of questions posed by staff at that time. He noted it
10 would be appropriate for the commission to review those questions as well as the meeting
11 minutes from those meetings.

12 Mr. Florence added there are a number of entitlement processes that the applicant
13 will need to go through as part of the development review process. They include the
14 following and some may be reviewed in conjunction with other applications:

- 15 • Zone change for the back property from Commercial General to Commercial
16 General Storage
- 17 • An amendment to the General Plan Streets Master Plan Map. The map shows a
18 future alignment going through the property to connect to 570 N. The applicant
19 proposes to terminate 570 in proximity to where it is currently ends. The applicant
20 is asking for changes to the cul-de-sac regarding curb, gutter and sidewalk. Those
21 will be addressed by the city engineer.
- 22 • Conditional use permit for outdoor recreational vehicle storage.
- 23 • Possible subdivision approval depending on how the lot is divided.
- 24 • Ordinance amendments depending on feedback from the planning commission
25 and city council.

26 Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits for discussion: Concept Plan,
27 Key points of discussion by applicant, 2018 city concept staff report, 2018 Planning
28 Commission meeting minutes for previous concept review, 2018 City Council meeting
29 minutes for previous concept review and the Street Master Plan Map section.

30 Tom Jacobson, representing Dynamic City Capital addressed the Commission at
31 this time. He stated this is pretty much the same discussion from 2018 but with a little
32 more property involved. He indicated they own and operate a lot of assets throughout the
33 country and the west; this is a mixed-use project. He explained their proposal including
34 the current zoning, buffers, and property lines. They are proposing a code amendment to
35 the 40 ft. buffer zone specifically around the church; not the residential and they would
36 like to consolidate the tower office buildings that will be dictated by parking. There
37 would most likely be strip commercial pads. They would like help on a zoning change
38 from CG to CGS and to talk about the buffer zone.

39 Chairperson Call asked for clarification that the property where the storage units
40 will be will be rezoned. Mr. Jacobson confirmed that statement. He added there will be an
41 8 ft. masonry wall over every portion that is changed and a 10 ft landscape buffer with
42 trees and then the building. This should please the residents as to have a clear delineation.
43 Mr. Jacobson explained they are asking if they should treat the church different or the
44 same as the homeowner.

45 Chairperson Call stated the big questions are where this is a rezone is this the type
46 of development we want in the city and when this was presented before, one of the
47 concerns was putting the commercial development in front. Commissioner Kallas stated
48

2 he recalled it was because the commercial development was too shallow the way it was
4 laid out and he believes this layout is much better. Mr. Jacobson stated there is a lot of
6 demands for pads and they would sell those pads to developers. Their intent is to be a
good neighbor, but they are buying land that needs to make a rate of return. They are
willing to be flexible and they feel consistency is key.

8 Commissioner Johnson stated he lives in this neighborhood and his thoughts are
that in the neighborhood meetings there are some concerns of those with second story
10 homes, however, they do feel this is better than high rise buildings and it is zoned
commercial.

12 There was then some general discussion regarding landscaping, zone change,
buffers and setbacks. At this time Chairperson Call asked residents to voice their
concerns. Several residents in attendance spoke on this proposal with most being in favor
14 and would prefer to keep the trees and the put in a masonry wall.

16 Mr. Jacobson also mentioned their request of not continuing on the road master
plan as that is not a city certified cul-de-sac, so we don't want to impede the property
owner value but it would require some changes to the existing cul-de-sac to meet city
18 standards. There are also some stormwater issues where it collects and stores at the cul-
de-sac with some concerns of sanitation issues with too many jogs in the lines that has
20 caused some blockage in the past. They would propose to fix these issues as part of the
exchange for the road. They are asking for the flexibility to work with the neighbors and
22 to come back with a better solution.

24 Chairperson Call asked for additional feedback from the Commissioners at this
time. Commissioner Marchbanks stated he feels a lot of the elements with the applicant
interfacing with the neighbors is good and he would prefer to see a plan to consider as an
26 adoption for the GCS zone and this neighborhood becomes a "melting pot" for this to
happen. It sounds like everyone is on the same page understanding that this proposal may
28 be the best fit; we need give input that we are on board for them to come up with an idea
that works for them and the neighborhood and move forward from there.

30 Commissioner Johnson thinks the neighbors are open to buildings close to the
setbacks if it works within the realm of the neighborhood.

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

- 34
- 36 8. **Public Hearing** - For a recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend
the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the Lindon City General Plan.
Application is made by Lindon City.

38

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

42

44 Mike Florence, Planning Director was in attendance to present an overview of the
draft General Plan update for Moderate Income Housing. Mr. Florence explained the
Lindon City Moderate Income Housing Plan provides a look into the current
46 demographic trends and also provides estimates into future housing needs.

2 Mr. Florence made mention that this is a large document and there may be a need
to continue this item. This has been presented to the city council for informational
4 purposes only before any approval is given.

6 Mr. Florence then began his presentation stating in 2019, the Utah Legislature
passed Senate Bill 34 which made changes to Utah Code 10-9a. These changes required
8 municipalities of the first, second, third and fourth classes to develop a “plan for
moderate-income housing” to be adopted by December 1, 2019 as part of a general plan
10 amendment. Beginning December 1, 2020 and annually thereafter, the City shall
complete an annual moderate-income housing report form and submit it to the State.

12 Mr. Florence went on to say the State will then monitor the ongoing yearly
progress of meeting affordable housing goals within the municipality. Housing progress
will be evaluated by the State and tied to future State Road capacity projects with State
14 Transportation Funding (TF) and State Transportation Investment Funds (TIF) through
the Utah Department of Transportation.

16 Mr. Florence then presented information on the following bullet points:

- 18 • Utah Code Requirements – Planning for Moderate Income Housing
- SB 34 – Affordable Housing Strategies
- 20 • Utah County is Where Growth is Happening
- Lindon’s Housing Stock
- Support for Moderate-income Housing
- 22 • Income Distribution
- Land Use
- 24 • Lindon Housing Cost Burdens
- Utah Dept. of Workforce Services Gap Analysis and Housing Forecast
- 26 • Regulatory Review
- Moderate Income Strategies – SB 34
- 28 • Lindon City Moderate Income Goals

30 Mr. Florence noted the State is asking cities to look at six criteria items in the plan as
follows:

- 32 1. Plan for moderate income housing which means a written document adopted by the
municipality legislative body that includes:
- 34 2. An estimate of the existing supply of moderate-income housing located within the
municipality.
- 36 3. An estimate of the need for moderate income housing in the municipality for the
next five years.
- 38 4. A survey of total residential land use.
- 40 5. And evaluation of how existing land uses and zones affect opportunities for
moderate income housing and
- 42 6. A description of the municipality program to encourage an adequate e supply of
moderate-income housing.

44 Mr. Florence then referenced the 23 Affordable Housing Strategies of which he
picked five points as follows:

- 46 1. Create or allow for; and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling
units residential zones.
- 48 2. Reduce impact fees related to low-and moderate-income housing.

3. Preserve existing moderate-income housing.
4. Utilize strategies that preserve subsidized low to moderate income units on a long-term basis.
5. Allow for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial and mixed-use zones, commercial centers, or employment centers.

Mr. Florence then went over the moderate-income goals as follows:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the R2 zone and if any regulations should be modified.
- Evaluate whether the City will allow moderately higher density developments as part of a mixed commercial development that will be located in strategic commercial areas or centers to help with development potential.
- Discuss if impact fees reductions should apply to all affordable housing options, not just accessory apartments, as an incentive to help reduce housing barriers and promote affordable housing.
- Review the Standard Land Use Table to evaluate currently allowed housing options if there are additional opportunities for housing within each land use district.
- Meet with the Housing Authority of Utah County and discuss housing needs and partnership opportunities at an upcoming City Council work meeting. Also discuss with the housing authority future opportunities for new affordable housing units.
- Further evaluate the inclusion of moderate-income housing as part of new development for municipal employees or other qualifying individuals.
- Discuss opportunities in working with developers to provide mortgage assistance programs for city employees and other qualifying individuals.
- Discuss opportunities to work with nonprofit housing groups to purchase homes as they become available on the market for affordable housing.

Following the presentation there was some general discussion regarding the five housing strategies, the listed bullet points, medium incomes, percent AMI breakdowns, average housing cost burden, multi-family housing, transit, density, zoning, overlays, accessory apartments, in-fill, land use, deed restrictions, and the data and numbers points included in the presentation.

Chairperson Call mentioned she attended the city council meeting when this plan was presented and what she heard from the council was they would like to encourage accessory apartments to come into compliance. They were also open to some areas for in fill and possibly some housing in the commercial zones if done appropriately. Also, as far as expanding or decreasing the 750 ft. buffer so that more of the R2 overlay zones could be put into place, but they don't want to have big apartment complexes in the city but would rather they be scattered throughout the city rather than have big pockets of high-density housing; the Council wants to maintain the character of Lindon.

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

Jeff Southard: Mr. Southard commented he developed the Avalon Senior Apartments. He would like to see how much developable land is in Utah County to determine the density. He would be interested to know what that number is to accommodate all these

2 people. With the current density and with the growth he would like to know what the
numbers are for density. Chairperson Call mentioned that it was her understanding that
4 Avalon was restricted to 55 and older and she has concerns that some residents at the
facility are younger than 55. Mr. Southard clarified that is not true and all residents
6 living at the facility are in fact 55 and older; per Federal Regulations it is age restricted
and at least one resident has to be 55 and older. No one younger than 18 is allowed to live
8 at the facility. Commissioner Marchbanks commented he lives in the Avalon
neighborhood and has not heard that the age restrictions are being violated.

10
Ben Platt: Mr. Platt had a question on population growth and if the state is going to
12 continue to raise the requirement of housing proportionate to the growth. Mr. Florence
said they are just telling us what the shortage is; you are never done because the
14 population is always growing.

16 **Mr. Southard:** Mr. Southard further spoke on accessory apartments and what the city
can do to offset the dollars to bring them into compliance with the current codes and
18 safety standards. Mr. Florence stated the council will be meeting with the building
official in the near future to discuss this issue. Mr. Southard noted one reason he is here
20 tonight is because he sees the land on state street to our southern border with a lot of
parcels for sale. It is not good retail commercial land as it is too deep to be of value for
22 pure commercial or for retail space; he feels density space on state street may be an
option. He would be interested in working with staff on a density option with deed
24 restrictions on state street and if that is something staff would be interested in looking at.

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

28
30 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT
VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32
34 Chairperson Call thanked Mr. Florence for the great job on the plan and his work in
getting the city in compliance with state regulations and for working in the parameters. Mr.
Florence stated there will be further discussion regarding this issue.

36 Commissioner Kallas stated he feels we should let supply and demand dictate
moderate income housing instead of trying to spread things out where they don't work.
38 How do you put an affordable house on land that is going for \$250,000 for a building lot
without deed restrictions etc. This is the governments way to try and force things into their
40 unnatural conditions. Commissioner Marchbanks feels this is an age-old problem; the best
remedy is by bringing accessory apartments into compliance and with infill options etc. Mr.
42 Florence pointed out we are making progress with the goals we have and we don't have to
change the character of Lindon.

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

46

2 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO A
4 FUTURE MEETING. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE
6 MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
6 COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
10 COMMISSIONER TRIBE AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12
14 9. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Chairperson Call called for any
new business or reports from the Commissioners.

16 Chairperson Call stated she would like to have some Architectural Guideline
18 training as there are some new commissioners. She also mentioned the ULCT Fall
Conference will be held on October 3rd and 4th.

20 10. **Planning Director Report** –

- General City updates

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

26 **ADJOURN** –

28 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
30 MEETING AT 10:55 PM. COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION.
ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32 Approved – September 10, 2019

34
36 _____
Sharon Call, Chairperson

38
40 _____
Michael Florence, Planning Director