

2 conditional use permit approval to operate an F45 exercise training gym in the
Commercial General zone.

4 Mr. Bake stated the applicants are proposing to use the property located at 259
North 290 West Lindon Utah for an exercise studio that will be offering small group
6 exercise classes by appointment only. The proposed use of the property is most similar to
the category “Gymnasium and Athletic Clubs” in the Lindon City Standard Land Use
8 Table; this use is listed as a Conditional Use in the General Commercial zone. He noted
the applicant will be required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning
10 Commission before they can receive a business license. Mr. Bake stated notices were
mailed on August 28, 2020 to adjoining property owners in accordance with Lindon City
12 Code and staff has received no public comments back at this time.

Mr. Bake explained the applicant will be using a previously constructed building
14 on a property that meets architectural and site requirements for the General Commercial
zone; the property is about one acre and has two commercial buildings. The applicant
16 will be using the East building closest to 290 West street and the other building behind it
is used as a dental studio. The applicant is not planning to do any construction on the
18 building exterior or site and they plan to add bathrooms and storage space to the interior
of the building. The applicant’s business will not exceed the parking requirements for the
20 property and they do not propose any changes to the parking lot at this time. The business
has 36 parking spaces allotted to their building which is shared with the other building on
22 the lot.

Mr. Bake indicated it is expected that this business will have a minimal impact on
24 surrounding properties and will be compatible with other uses in the General Commercial
Zone. The nature of the business and the by appointment only classes will limit the traffic
26 impact that this business will have on surrounding properties.

Mr. Bake then presented an aerial photo of the site showing parking locations,
28 proposed building floor plan and the business description followed by some general
discussion. He then turned the time over to the applicant for comment.

30 The applicants, Keith and Alicia Halladay addressed the commission at this time.
They stated they are applying for this conditional use permit to locate their F45 Training
32 Studio t 259 North 290 West in Lindon. They explained that F45 Training is a global
fitness franchise specializing in innovative, high-intensity group workouts. This location
34 will be a branded exercise studio offering small group classes by appointments only.
They plan to have 36 parking spaces allotted to their building and the neighboring
36 business, the dental studio. Their hours of operation will be from 5am to 9pm with all
training done inside the building. Chairperson Call stated she doesn’t have any questions
38 and this appears to be a pretty straightforward request.

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

42 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE
APPLICANT’S REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO USE THE
44 PROPERTY LOCATED AT 259 NORTH 290 WEST LINDON UTAH FOR AN
EXERCISE STUDIO WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. HOURS OF
46 OPERATION WILL BE LIMITED TO 5:00 AM TO 9:00 PM; 2. CUSTOMER
PARKING WILL BE LIMITED TO THE DESIGNATED STALLS ASSIGNED TO
48 YOUR BUILDING; AND 3. ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT.

2 COMMISSIONER KALLAS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS
RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

4	CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
	COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
6	COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
8	COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS	AYE
	COMMISSIONER TRIBE	AYE

10 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12 **5. Conditional Use Permit – Home Occupation Child Day Care – 1532 W.630 N.**

14 Norma Moreno requests conditional use permit approval to operate a home
occupation child day care in the Residential R3 zone.

16 Anders Bake, Associate Planner, led this agenda item by giving a brief overview
stating the applicant, Norma Moreno is requesting a conditional use permit to operate an
18 in home child care business at 1532 West 630 North in the Residential R3 zone. He noted
the Lindon City Standard land Use Table indicates that Child Day Care – 5 to 16 children
20 (4 or less not regulated) requires a conditional use permit in the residential (R3) zone.

22 Mr. Bake pointed out Ms. Moreno has been approved by the Utah Department of
Health for a Family Child Care License. The license permits the licensee a total capacity
of 16 children. He noted Ms. Moreno is required to maintain her state license in addition
24 to their Lindon City home occupation business license. He added Ms. Moreno has
applied for a home occupation business license which can be approved after Conditional
26 Use Permit approval is granted. He noted a home occupation business must follow the
regulations found in section 17.04.400 of the Lindon City Code. Mr. Bake stated notices
28 were mailed on August 28, 2020 to adjoining property owners in accordance with Lindon
City Code and staff have received no comments back at this time.

30 Mr. Bake went on to say the Home Occupation requirements in the Lindon City
Code section 17.04.400 state that “The purpose and intent of this section is to allow
32 gainful occupations, professions, activities, or uses that are clearly customary, incidental,
and secondary to the residential use of the property and which do not alter the exterior of
34 the property or affect the residential character of the neighborhood.” He then referenced
the table identifying the requirements in section 17.04.400 of the Lindon City Code and
36 whether or not the proposed business is in compliance with the requirements. He noted
all requirements are met but the applicant will need to adjust and coordinate drop off
38 times so that the business can be compliant with this requirement and staff will monitor
this as the business operation begins through any complaints received.

40 Mr. Bake indicated the Utah Department of Health regulates child care centers and
family child care providers in the state of Utah. Ms. Moreno currently holds a license
42 with the Utah Department of Health. This License allows for the following: Child care is
provided in a private home for up to 16 children (unless otherwise determined by the
44 city), including the provider's own children less than four years old; providers must be at
least 18 years old.

46 Mr. Bake indicated that two qualified caregivers are required when there are more
than eight children in care and when there are more than two children less than two years

2 old in care. With two caregivers, providers can care for up to (but not more than) four
4 children less than two years old; a compliant outdoor play area is required.

4 Mr. Bake stated Ms. Moreno’s business description shows that they will make
6 considerable efforts to minimize the impacts that this business may have on the
6 surrounding neighborhood.

8 Mr. Bake then presented the Business description, Utah Health Department
8 license, Interior Building layout and Aerial photo of the site and surrounding area
10 followed by some general discussion.

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

14 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT’S
14 REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO USE THE RESIDENTIAL
16 PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1532 WEST 630 NORTH FOR AN IN HOME CHILD
16 CARE BUSINESS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT
18 WILL COMPLY WITH THE HOME OCCUPATION REQUIREMENTS FOUND IN
18 LINDON CITY CODE SECTION 17.04.400; 2. NO MORE THAN 6 VEHICLES MAY
20 BE PARKED AT THE RESIDENCE AT ONE TIME; 3. THE BUSINESS WILL BE
20 OPERATED BY A RESIDENT OF THE HOME; 4. NO MORE THAN 500 SQUARE
22 FEET OR TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF THE TOTAL FLOOR SPACE,
22 WHICHEVER IS LESS, SHALL BE USED FOR THE CHILD CARE BUSINESS; 5.
24 THE APPLICANT WILL MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS TO MAINTAIN A CHILD
24 CARE LICENSE WITH THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH; 6. HOURS OF
26 OPERATION WILL BE LIMITED TO MONDAY TO SATURDAY FROM 7:30 A.M.
26 TO 5:30 P.M.; 7. PARENTS/GUARDIANS WILL BE REQUIRED TO SIGN A PICK-
28 UP/DROP-OFF CONTRACT WHICH REQUIRES THEM TO FOLLOW SPEED
30 LIMIT, NOISE LEVELS AND RESPECTING NEARBY RESIDENTS; 8. THE
30 APPLICANT WILL CONTINUALLY MAINTAIN A STATE OF UTAH CHILD
32 CARE LICENSE AND LINDON CITY HOME OCCUPATION LICENSE; AND 9.
32 ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED
32 THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

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

40 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

42 **6. Major Subdivision – Lindon Treasury Plat D – 200 West 110 South Jeremy**
44 Ackley requests Major Subdivision approval for a four-lot single family home
44 subdivision in the Residential R1-20 zone.

46 Mr. Florence explained the applicant, Jeremy Ackley, who is in attendance, is
48 requesting Major Subdivision approval for a four-lot single family home subdivision in
48 the Residential R1-20 zone. He noted the planning commission and city council recently
48 approved a previous phase of this subdivision which is being developed by a different

2 owner. He noted the proposed 4-lot subdivision meets the minimum lot size and
infrastructure requirements for the R1-20 zone.

4 Mr. Florence stated the lot requirements for the Residential (R1-20) Zone and the
Subdivision Requirements are met and in compliance. He noted the City Engineer is
6 working through any technical issues related to the plat and civil engineering plans and
will ensure all engineering related issues are resolved before final approval is granted.

8 Mr. Florence then read the listed conditions and presented an aerial photo, vicinity map
and the plat followed by some general discussion.

10 Following additional discussion, the commission agreed these look like very nice
lots in a nice area and it appears to meet all requirements.

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

14

COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL
16 TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF LINDON TREASURY PLAT D WITH THE FOLLOWING
18 CONDITIONS: 1. THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE CITY
STAFF TO MAKE ALL FINAL CORRECTIONS TO THE ENGINEERING
20 DOCUMENTS AND PLAT; 2. PRIOR TO PLAT RECORDING THE APPLICANT
WILL PROVIDE STAFF WITH A FINAL PLAT MYLAR TO INCLUDE
22 NOTARIZED SIGNATURES OF OWNER'S CONSENT TO DEDICATION, OBTAIN
SIGNATURE OF ALL ENTITIES INDICATED ON THE ATTACHED SUBDIVISION
24 PLAT; 3. COMPLETE (OR POST AN ADEQUATE IMPROVEMENT COMPLETION
ASSURANCE), WARRANT AND POST REQUIRED WARRANTY ASSURANCE
26 FOR ALL REQUIRED PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS; 4. THE
PLANS AND PLAT WILL MEET AND BE CONSTRUCTED AS PER THE
28 RELEVANT SPECIFICATIONS AS FOUND IN THE LINDON CITY
DEVELOPMENT MANUAL; 5. PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL THE APPLICANT
30 SHALL PLACE PERMANENT SURVEY MONUMENTS IN THE SUBDIVISION; 6.
ALL ITEMS OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER TRIBE SECONDED THE
32 MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

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

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

40

7. Public Hearing – R2 Overlay and Accessory Apartment Ordinance

42 **Amendment** – Lindon City Lindon City requests a recommendation to the city
council to amend Title 17.46 and amend sections pertaining to the R2 Overlay and
44 Accessory Apartments.

46 COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC
HEARING. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
48 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

2 Mr. Florence opened this agenda item by explaining at a joint planning
commission and city council meeting held on August 11, 2020 staff presented proposed
4 changes to the R2 Overlay and accessory apartment ordinance. He noted under the
current ordinance, an accessory apartment is identified under the R2 Overlay Zone. City
6 staff are proposing to divide the ordinance into two sections which will be the R2
Overlay and the Accessory Apartment sections. Under the R2 Overlay zone, the city is
8 divided into 18 districts and each district is allowed a specific number of R2 units
depending on acreage and calculation per district. He then referenced the map.

10 Mr. Florence indicated the R2 Overlay Zone also counts accessory apartments
towards the overall total unit count for each district. However, the number of accessory
12 apartments can exceed the district unit count with no limits to the number of accessory
apartments. Currently, all but five districts are full and don't allow additional R2 Overlay
14 developments. For the most part, the districts are full due to the number of accessory
apartments rather than R2 Overlay developments.

16 Mr. Florence then went over the Proposed R2 Overlay Changes as follows:

- 18 • Under sections 17.46.010 and 17.46.050 the ordinance calls out R2 Overlay
projects as conditional use. Staff is proposing to change 17.46.030 from permitted
to conditional to be consistent with other code sections.
- 20 • Staff is proposing to remove accessory apartments from the overall district
calculation since there is no limit and accessory apartments can exceed the district
22 limit.
- 24 • Staff is proposing to change how the number of units are calculated for each
district. Staff evaluated the number of R2 Overlay developments in each district,
the 750' required buffer between R2 Overlay units, and available parcels. The
26 proposal is to set a number of allowed R2 Overlay unit per district. There are a
few districts that staff are proposing to remain closed due to the number of
28 existing R2 Overlay developments.

30 Mr. Florence also explained the way the below calculations works, for example, is
District 1 currently has two units and the City would allow two additional units for a total
32 of 4 in that district as follows:

District 1: 4 (+2)	District 7: 11 (+0)	District 13: 12 (+2)
34 District 2: 24 (+2)	District 8: 4 (+2)	District 14: 13 (+2)
District 3: 2 (+2)	District 9: 4 (+2)	District 15: 17 (+2)
36 District 4: 26 (+0)	District 10: 6 (+2)	District 16: 30 (+2)
District 5: 15 (+2)	District 11: 54 (+0)	District 17: 4 (+0)
38 District 6: 2 (+0)	District 12: 10 (+0)	District 18: 54 (+0)

40 Mr. Florence then went over the Proposed Accessory Apartment Changes. He
noted to ensure the proper code references are made throughout the code, staff has
42 referenced section 17.14.150 which does not allow accessory apartments in the Anderson
Farms Planned Development Zone. See 17.46.100(2)(a)

- 44 • Allows that one accessory parking stall be located within the front setback. See
17.46.100(2)(c)
- 46 • Removes the requirement that the path, sidewalk or walkway have to be hard
surfaced 17.46.100(2)(c)

- 2 • Removes the noticing and appeal requirement prior to an accessory apartment
4 being approved. Replaces the language with a requirement that the city will send a
6 notice to surrounding property owners once the accessory apartment has been
approved. See 17.46.100(5)

8 Mr. Florence indicated City staff has tried to simplify both the R2 Overlay
10 requirements for the district calculations as well as requirements for accessory
12 apartments. Particularly, since the City does not have a limit on the number of accessory
14 apartments, staff finds it better to clearly state how many R2 Overlay units are allowed
per district. He noted this will allow some additional units in districts that were otherwise
closed due to accessory apartments. He then presented the Exhibits Draft 17.46
Ordinance change, the Current R2 Overlay Map and the Proposed R2 Overlay Map
showing districts.

16 There was then some general discussion including discussion on the whether the
city attorney should be consulted regarding the CC&R's as there may be some legal
issues. Mr. Florence stated this item can be continued as it is city-initiated item.

18 Following the information presented, Mr. Florence directed the commission to
20 study the ordinance over the next week and get back to him with any issues with the
numbers or any changes or feedback prior to the next meeting. He noted he will also
22 confer with the city attorney and obtain a legal opinion regarding the CC&R's and the
corresponding section of the code.

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

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

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

32 COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE ORDINANCE
34 AMENDMENT 2020-14-O IN ORDER TO OBTAIN A LEGAL OPINION FROM THE
CITY ATTORNEY REGARDING THE CC&R'S. COMMISSIONER TRIBE
36 SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

38 CHAIRPERSON CALL	AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS	AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS	AYE
40 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON	AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS	AYE
42 COMMISSIONER TRIBE	AYE

44 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

46 **8. Concept Review – Approximately 550-570 North State Street (Norton
Property).** Amy Johnson requests concept review for residential and commercial
48 development for the property located at approximately 570 N. State Street. A
Concept Review allows applicant to receive planning commission feedback and

2 comments or proposed projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but
4 general suggestions or recommendations are typically provided.

6 Mr. Florence explained the applicant, Amy Johnson, who is in attendance, is
8 requesting concept review approval for a residential and commercial development for
10 property located at approximately 570 North State Street. He noted a Concept Review
allows applicant to receive planning commission feedback and comments or proposed
projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but general suggestions or
recommendations are typically provided.

12 Mr. Florence stated the Ms. Johnson is requesting concept review feedback as a
mixed commercial site for commercial business and residential uses as follows:

- 14 • The applicant participated in many of the public meetings on the Planned
Residential Development Overlay ordinance.
- 16 • Specifically, the applicant is requesting concept feedback on the below bullet
points:
 - 18 ○ The applicant would like to decrease the commercial depth requirement
from 300 feet to 250 feet for two reasons:
 - 20 ▪ The commercial tenants that the applicant is trying to attract to the site
only needs a 250-foot commercial depth. For a majority of the lost
22 commercial space the applicant is proposing a 50-foot landscape buffer
and amenity space to be used by the residential development.
 - 24 ▪ The south portion of the project is irregularly shaped because the
applicant does not own all of the State Street commercial frontage. The
applicant is proposing a decrease of this commercial depth.
 - 26 ○ The applicant is proposing decreased front setbacks on the townhomes.
 - 28 ▪ The ordinance requires 25-foot front setbacks.
 - 30 ▪ The proposed setbacks are between 10-20 feet.
 - 32 ▪ The ordinance allows decreased front setbacks when common open
space is proposed.
 - 34 ▪ The purpose for the request is that the applicant would like to construct
larger townhome buildings on the property and due to site constraints is
having difficulty meeting the front setback requirement.
 - 36 ▪ Parking on driveways less than 20' feet won't be allowed. The
applicant is providing 23 visitor stalls for those buildings that don't
have 20-foot driveways. The roads that are 29 feet in width will be
38 public streets and will allow parking on one side of the street.

40 Mr. Florence then presented the Planned Residential Ordinance Requirements
17.76.080(4)(b) State Street Setback noting it is to preserve the commercial intent, use
and zoning along State Street, a three hundred (300) foot setback shall be required and
42 residential uses are not allowed within this setback, unless a reduction is grant as follows:

- 44 1) The Planning Commission and City Council may consider a reduction in this
depth upon evaluating the following:
 - 46 a) Viable commercial options remain for the site;
 - 48 b) A commercial lot is irregularly shaped;
 - c) The reduction does not limit future redevelopment opportunities of the
commercial property.

2 17.76.080(6)

4 Front: 25 feet. The front setback may be modified by the land use authority where design
6 items such as common open space, paseos or similar design feature is proposed. He then
8 presented the Proposed Concept Plan and the Planned Residential Development
10 Ordinance followed by discussion. He then turned the time over to the applicant for
12 comment.

14 Ms. Amy Johnson then presented her concept review to the commission. She
16 explained the setbacks, common roads, street parking, common open space, amenities,
18 green space, sidewalks, driveways, landscaping, floor plans, configurations and
20 elevations.

22 Ms. Johnson stated they are trying to coincide with the open front commercial
24 spaces. She noted this will be a whole mix with diversity of people and they believe
26 they have made a design the community will be happy with. She pointed out one of the
28 main things that was an issue in the community meetings was the traffic. They have also
30 created roads from commercial into the community with traffic calming medians, so
32 there is not a lot of burden into the surrounding streets. They are also working hard and
34 have all intention of making sure the commercial have tenants in place.

36 Chairperson Call mentioned her concerns on decreasing commercial space to
38 only 250 ft. depth. In the past commercial along state street has been 500 ft. and going to
40 300 ft. is a big change; she would like to keep the 300 ft. depth. Ms. Johnson stated they
42 are building at 300 ft. they are just trying to use that extra 50 ft. to create more open
44 space and greenery. They are still providing the tax base and not diminishing that and it
46 still allows for the tax base. She added there is plenty of parking in the commercial
48 space.

Commissioner Johnson expressed his concern that the feedback from one set of
residents are being favored over another; on 500 North and 570 North. He has a hard
time with the traffic concerns.

Mr. Florence stated they did a traffic study on 500 North and the capacity
operates very efficiently; capacity needs to be considered. He added we need to look at
the traffic generated and how it affects the streets. Mr. Florence stated the front setback
is 25 ft. If you provide common open space then you can reduce that front setback
requirement. Chairperson Call expressed her concerns on the setbacks. Ms. Johnson
pointed out she is going way and beyond the amount of required green space.

Councilmember Vanchiere commented the city council will be reviewing this
item and these comments from the commission are good things to consider. He added
many first-time home buyers cannot afford ½ acre lots and there are many elderly, who
want to stay in Lindon but don't want a ½ acre lot any longer. What we are trying to
bring in is a quality development that is affordable and allow opportunities for those to
live in Lindon.

Ms. Johnson stated she is hearing the largest issue is the driveways that need to
be at least 20 ft.

Chairperson Call called for any comments from the public at this time. She
pointed out they are not taking any action tonight. There were several in attendance who
addressed the commission as follows:

Patrick Leichty: Mr. Leichty stated he lives on 500 North. He noted they were not part
of the neighborhood meeting so this was quite a surprise to them. He expressed his

2 concerns with increased traffic, home values etc. He also spoke if property behind the
300 ft. line can be turned to residential so ½ acre homes could come in and because the
4 taxes are so high is that why this is allowed. Mr. Florence explained at some point the
city council approved this entire property to commercial. The property owners were
6 trying to get commercial value. They felt this was a better transition from commercial to
residential.

8
Chrystal Bagley: Ms. Bagley stated she lives on 500 North. She appreciates that a
10 traffic study was done, but feels it isn't indicative and doesn't give a good reading as it
doesn't allow for people working from home, church, and school. With normal life and
12 normal conditions there is a lot more traffic. There is a lot of kids on their street and she
has concerns with safety issues. They are also worried about home values; this amount
14 of density in their neighborhood will devalue their homes and that is not why they
moved to Lindon and for the "little bit of country" feel. She also spoke on the number
16 of units being allowed and the high density.

18 **Steve Patton:** Mr. Patton stated he likes the commercial side on state street and there
should be no exception to the rule, but he has concerns with the number of units. There
20 are already 90 plus homes in their neighborhood with a limited number of outlets and
proposing this would cause a public safety issue.

22
Jeremy Ackley: Mr. Ackley commented is there anything in place for the rest of the
24 deep lots for the future; how do these keep being deemed commercial.

26 **Riley Braught:** Mr. Braught stated he is a home builder and business owner who lives
on 500 North. He pointed out the city has set standards and rules they want developers
28 to follow and he is just asking that the city follow those same rules they set in place.

30 Chairperson Call expressed appreciation for everyone being here tonight and for
the comments heard. She also thanked Ms. Johnson for her presentation. Chairperson
32 Call called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none
she moved on to the next agenda item.

34
36 **9. New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Chairperson Call called for any
new business or reports from the Commissioners.

38 Chairperson Call mentioned the second proposal for the snake business was not on
the agenda. Mr. Florence stated Mr. Brady Anderson has submitted an application and
40 filed for a home occupation, but it was after the notice was sent out so it will be on the
September 22nd meeting agenda. He noted legal counsel has indicated that the conditional
42 use is not binding and he is not grandfathered in and will have to file a new application.

44 Commissioner Johnson asked for an update on the process of 700 North. Mr.
Florence stated he will take the residential numbers off and move forward with the master
46 plan. They will bring it to the September 22nd meeting for a public hearing. Mr. Florence
also asked if the commission would like a city-wide meeting on the master plan or has it
48 been sufficient. He noted we should probably look at other options and not just big box.
Commissioner Johnson stated he believes we should have more input especially when it

2 is something this important and to have more transparency moving forward as it is our
job to be more open to the community.

4 Commissioner Kallas commented he feels we are being transparent as we know
6 that the residents don't like multifamily housing and now there is a movement where
7 developers want multi-family housing as that is where the money is. Most citizens don't
8 want it and we have tried infill etc. He believes we are trying to cure a problem created in
the 90's and times have changed. Commissioner Marchbanks stated he sees this as a
transition from commercial.

10 Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the
commission, hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

12

10. Planning Director Report –

14

- General City updates

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

18

ADJOURN –

20

22 COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE
MEETING AT 8:32 PM. COMMISSIONER TRIBE SECONDED THE MOTION.
24 ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

24

Approved – September 22, 2020

26

28

Sharon Call, Chairperson

30

32

Michael Florence, Planning Director