Notice of Meeting
Lindon City Planning Commission

The Lindon City Planning Commission will hold a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday, November 26, 2019**, in the Council Room of Lindon City Hall, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah. The meeting will begin at **7:00 p.m.** This meeting may be held electronically to allow a commissioner to participate by video or teleconference. The agenda will consist of the following items:

**Agenda**
Invocation: By Invitation
Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of minutes**
   Planning Commission 11/12/2019

3. **Public Comment**

4. **Anderson Farms Plat E Major Subdivision Approval and Anderson Farms Boulevard road dedication – Ivory Development, LLC**
   Request for major subdivision approval of a 60-lot single family residential subdivision located in the Anderson Farms Planned Development (AFPD) zone. The request also includes the dedication of the north section of Anderson Boulevard from 500 N. to 700 N. The subdivision and road dedication are part of a master development agreement with Ivory Development. (20 minutes)

5. **New Business from Commissioners**

6. **Planning Director Report**
   - General City updates

Adjourn

Staff Reports and application materials for the agenda items above are available for review at the Lindon City Planning Department, located at 100 N. State Street, Lindon, UT. For specific questions on agenda items our Staff may be contacted directly at (801) 785-7687. City Codes and ordinances are available on the City web site found at [www.lindoncity.org](http://www.lindoncity.org). The City of Lindon, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services programs or events should call Kathy Moosman at 785-5043, giving at least 24 hours notice.

The above notice/agenda was posted in three public places within Lindon City limits and on the State [http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html](http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html) and City [www.lindoncity.org](http://www.lindoncity.org) websites.

*The duration of each agenda item is approximate only*

**Posted By:** Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder  
**Date:** 11/22/2019  
**Time:** 5:00 pm  
**Place:** Lindon City Center, Lindon Police Station, Lindon Community Center
Notice of Meeting
Lindon City Planning Commission

Item 1 – Call to Order

Sharon Call
Mike Marchbanks
Rob Kallas
Steve Johnson
Scott Thompson
Jared Schauers
Renee Tribe
The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday, November 12, 2019 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

**REGULAR SESSION – 7:00 P.M.**

Conducting: Rob Kallas, Vice Chair  
Invocation: Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
Pledge of Allegiance: Scott Thompson, Commissioner

**PRESENT** - Sharon Call, Chairperson  
Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner – arrived 8:10pm  
Rob Kallas, Commissioner  
Steven Johnson, Commissioner  
Scott Thompson, Commissioner  
Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
Renee Tribe, Commissioner  
Mike Florence, Planning Director  
Anders Bake, Associate Planner  
Kathy Moosman, City Recorder

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – The minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting of October 22, 2019 were reviewed.

   COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 22, 2019 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Chairperson Call called for comments from any audience member who wished to address any issue not listed as an agenda item. There were no public comments.

**CURRENT BUSINESS –**

4. **Public Hearing** – A recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend City Code 17.48 to increase the allowable building height limit for the Planned Commercial -1 zone – Miller Family Real Estate LLC. Miller Family Real Estate, LLC requests Ordinance Amendment approval to increase the allowable building height in the Planned commercial-1 zone from 48 feet to 60 feet and related technical amendments.
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Mike Florence, Planning Director, led this agenda item by explaining Miller Family Real Estate, LLC is proposing a new 51,112 square foot office building at 424 S. Lindon Park Drive. He noted the applicant is petitioning the planning commission for a recommendation to increase the allowable height in the PC-1 zone from 48 feet to 60 feet and to remove the requirement that mechanical height measurement be included in the overall height measurement of the building.

Mr. Florence stated the purpose of the request is that the applicant has a tenant that is requiring a specific amount of parking stalls for the site. He pointed out that due to the size of the site and building square footage, the applicant is proposing to meet the potential tenant’s parking requirement by constructing parking at ground level under the building with three stories of office above.

Mr. Florence explained the potential businesses parking demand meets city parking standards. The applicant is proposing parking at 5.30 stalls per 1,000 square feet of office floor area which is 263 stalls. For high density office uses the city parking code allows 4 stalls per 1,000 square feet of office space (204 stalls). The City parking code also allows an applicant to go up 130% (city code 17.18.078) of the minimum which would be 5.2 stalls per 1,000 square feet (265 stalls).

Mr. Florence further explained that under the current code the PC-1 and PC-2 development standards are grouped together. The proposed amendment would separate the development standards for PC-1 and PC-2 zones in relationship to height requirements. He noted the PC-2 zone would remain at the existing 48’ height requirement. Currently, the surrounding zoning and areas have a combination of 1, 2 and 3 story buildings.

Mr. Florence went on to say the PC-1 and PC-2 zones require that mechanical appurtenances be included in measuring the overall height of the building. The PC-1 and PC-2 zones are the only two zones in the city where this development standard is required. All other zones call out a maximum height and then the code section 17.04.230 applies as follows:

- 17.04.230 - Height limitations – Exceptions.
  Penthouse or roof structures for the housing of elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans or similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building, and attached structures such as fire or parapet walls, skylights, towers, steeples, chimneys, wireless or television masts, theater lofts, or similar structures may be erected 10 (10) feet above the zone height limits, but no space above the height limit shall be allowed for purposes of providing additional floor space, nor shall such increased height be in violation of any other ordinance or regulation of Lindon City. A church may have architectural features, similar to those listed above, erected up to 50% of the building height or 20' above the zone height limit, whichever is greater.

Mr. Florence then referenced the height comparison table per zone followed by some general discussion. Mr. Florence mentioned the adjacent Canopy Business Park has been a very successful office development for Lindon City. The city is happy to see a proposal for this site that will bring new jobs and development to the area. Staff feels like
the increased height itself should not have a significant impact on the area. The PC-1 zone is not adjacent to residential zones and the increased height may be acceptable when closer to the 1600 South interchange.

Mr. Florence noted one of the main considerations that the commission should consider is what effect the proposed amendment will have on the building meeting the requirements of the commercial design standards. There are a number of constraints with the size of the property, tenant parking demands, and building size. With the exception of the southeast corner lobby and the northeast mechanical room, the rest of the building is open to parking and parking entrances under the building.

Mr. Florence commented while the planning commission is not giving site plan approval at this time, the ordinance amendment plays into future site plan review. He indicated the applicant has been made aware of the listed commercial design standard requirements (not an exhaustive list) and is willing to address those before site plan approval. If the commission makes a recommendation to the city council to amend the height then the applicant should be prepared to address the following Commercial Design Standard items (not an exhaustive list) pertaining to the ground floor and building architecture when the proposed development returns for site plan approval:

• 5.2.1 – Massing and Orientation
  o Give the greatest consideration in terms of design emphasis and detailing to the street facing façade.
  o Buildings on corner sites shall orient to both streets, these buildings are encouraged to have an entrance situated at or near the corner.

• 5.2.4 – Exterior Walls and Surfaces – Building Materials
  o Scale, texture, detailing, and fenestration should be greatest at the ground floor, where the level of visibility and adjacency to pedestrian activity is greatest.

• 5.2.6 – Windows and Doors/Fenestration
  o Avoid blank facades with no fenestration.
  o The ground floor of the primary façade shall be 60% fenestration at the pedestrian level.
  o A significant amount of the primary ground story façade facing public streets, easements and other right-of-way corridors should be transparent glazing, to enhance the pedestrian environment, to connect the building interior to the outside, and to provide ambient lighting at night.

Mr. Florence indicated in regards to removing the requirement that mechanical equipment be included in the overall height, staff feels that it would be best to be consistent throughout the code with the same requirements. However, any rooftop mechanical equipment will still need to be screened, meet the requirement of city code and be architecturally compatible with the design of the building. The proposed ordinance language is very similar to current ordinance requirements in the Commercial Design Standards and Regional Commercial zone.

**Commercial Design Standards:** Rooftop mechanical units are desirable where possible, and should be screened from view with integrated architectural elements (walls, parapets, etc.).
Regional Commercial Zone: All mechanical equipment incidental to any building, including roof mounted mechanical equipment, shall be screened so as to be an integral part of the architectural design of the building to which it is attached or related.

17.54.030

Mr. Florence then presented the zoning map of PC-1 and PC-2 districts, an aerial photo, pictures of the site and area, proposed ordinance language, proposed building renderings and the zoning map followed by discussion. He then turned the time over to the applicant for comment.

Mr. Greg Flynn with Larry Miller Real Estate Group was in attendance as representative of this item. Mr. Flynn stated they have had this land for quite a while and they have wanted to put a dealership in but now they are taking this opportunity to take the vacant land and build an office building that is allowed in that zone. He noted they are essentially looking at what the market is looking for and how to meet the needs. He noted as they were looking at the parking, they want the additional parking underneath that gets the parking ratio up. They are competing with Lehi and Draper for the same tenants and realize they need to be a little higher with the higher density. They are constrained with this lot at this point and if they raise it up, they can get to the number that can attract the type of tenant they are looking for and that will make sense there. Mr. Flynn noted the rough rendering and conceptual drawing has been shifted a little because of the easements and pushed a little to the west but it gets close to the generic building look. He stated they will bring a better rendering when they come back with the site plan.

Commissioner Thompson asked what the intent of the property across the street is; was it for an auto dealership as well. Mr. Florence stated he is not sure of the intent of that property but it is zoned PC1 as well.

Chairperson Call commented as far as the higher height goes, she doesn’t question that because it’s not adjacent to a residential zone and close to I15 and it doesn’t block the views of other businesses. Her biggest concern is the first story where you drive in because it doesn’t meet the architectural icons and also because that is the view from Lindon Park Drive. She also brought up that the building materials and fenestration on the first floor don’t meet the architectural guidelines the city has set up with the ambient lighting and those kinds of things. She realizes what we are approving tonight is just the ordinance amendment for the increased height.

Vice Chair Kallas mentioned when the applicant comes back with a plan all these things will be closely looked at. Mr. Flynn commented this is at a very early stage and it is hard to tell and the exact materials haven’t been fully vetted. Mr. Florence clarified that the PC1 zone is only located in that area and roof antennas have a maximum height of 10 ft.

Vice Chair Kallas asked if there were any further public comments or discussion.

Hearing none he called for a motion to close the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER CALL MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER TRIBE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chair Kallas called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none he called for a motion.
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO
THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2019-20-O AS
PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE
VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

CHAIRPERSON CALL AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE
COMMISSIONER TRIBE AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Site Plan Amendment – Doterra Warehouse – approximately 2300 W. 400 N.
Doterra International requests Site Plan Amendment approval to allow the
Planning Commission to review proposed changes to the external design of the
Doterra Warehouse. Parcel #14:059:0048. Continued from October 22, 2019
Planning Commission meeting.

Mike Florence, Planning Director, led this discussion by stating the applicant Phil
Hadderlie representing Doterra International is in attendance for this application. He
explained that Doterra International is completing their warehouse and call center for
their new site in Lindon. Doterra changed the exterior colors and paint design from what
was originally approved by the planning commission. Since the planning commission
was the land use authority on this item, it is staff’s recommendation that the planning
commission should provide approval of the change in color and fence design. He noted at
the October 22, 2019 meeting the planning commission requested that the architect for
Doterra update the renderings for commission review as follows:

17.54.050 Texture, Colors, Finishes.
   a) Avoid large areas of the same color and/or materials with no relief. Conversely,
      avoid the use of too many materials and/or colors, which may create busy or
      incongruous façades.
   b) Earth tones are generally preferred over harsh or loud colors, except where more
      vibrant colors are used as accents to the primary colors. A color palette of Utah
      earth tones as found in the Lindon City Commercial Design Standards is to be
      used as a reference guide to color selections in developments.
   c) Simplicity is encouraged regarding color. Excessive amounts of different colors
      should not be used. Brighter colors are recommended for use as accents only.
   d) Vary colors and materials to break up the monotony in larger developments.

Mr. Florence stated Mr. hadderlie has provided a lot of updated renderings for this
application and they have been working to get this situation corrected. He then turned the
time over to Mr. Hadderlie for comment.

Mr. Hadderlie commented one thing they talked about was a way of softening the
top of the building and to bring the band back so it will tie the whole building together
and soften some things and that is what they have done. He pointed out on the renderings
the top is painted all the way around. He mentioned it cost Doterra about $35,000 to
make that change but Doterra is committed to doing that. He then explained the colors noting they are recommending just the gray color (showed color) that is different than all the other grays and they feel this will cap the building off. He also referenced the updated second rendering with the new colors that shows the new color scheme. This is what they are seeking approval for.

Following some general discussion, the Commission expressed their appreciation on the work Doterra has done in complying with their requests noting it looks much nicer than it did before and it is a change for the better.

Vice Chair Kallas called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none he called for a motion to continue.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANTS REQUEST FOR AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH THE CHANGE IN COLORS AND FENCING MATERIALS AS PRESENTED, COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAIRPERSON CALL</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER KALLAS</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER JOHNSON</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER THOMPSON</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER TRIBE</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**6. Concept Review – South Haven Development – 531 N. State Street**

South Haven Development requests concept review of a proposal to allow for 99 residential units on approximately 6 acres of the Linden Nursery property. Parcel #45:244:0001. *A Concept Review allows applicants to receive Planning Commission feedback and comments on proposed projects. No formal approvals or motions are given, but general suggestions or recommendations are typically provided.*

Anders Bake, Associate Planner, led this discussion by giving a brief overview of this item explaining the applicant is seeking concept review feedback for a proposed multifamily project on the Linden Nursery property at 531 North State Street. He noted the concept plan includes 99 residential units in mostly 12-plex and 6-plex buildings on about 6 acres. The plan also provides 209 parking stalls and amenities that include sports courts, a pool, a clubhouse, a tot lot, and open space.

Mr. Bake noted staff has reviewed this proposal and found that the City currently does not have a zone that would support this development proposal. In addition, the commission and council should carefully consider how the proposed use would be compatible as a transition from commercial to low density residential. He pointed out the City has a number of deep commercial lots on State Street where commercial may not fully develop and should be studied further for the correct development types.
Mr. Bake indicated if the Council and Commission decide to give direction to move forward with this development the applicant, at a minimum, will need to apply for the following entitlements as part of the development review process as follows:

1. An Ordinance Amendment to create a new zone, or modify an existing zone, that will allow for several multifamily buildings on a single property. The Ordinance Amendment will also need to include regulations regarding lot dimensions, setbacks, landscaping, parking, and other relevant aspects of multifamily developments.

2. A Zone Map amendment to apply a new multifamily zone to the subject property.

3. Subdivision Approval.

4. Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Bake then presented the Concept Plan and an Aerial Image followed by some general discussion. He then turned the time over to the applicants for comment.

Mr. Jeff Southard and Mr. Ben Platt (Lindon Nursery) were in attendance representing this item. Mr. Southard noted they are here looking for feedback. He explained as they looked at this parcel and as the market has shifted and changed, we are not building a lot of homes in Lindon so all of that property west of the frontage was used to grow and store their landscaping materials. So, as things have shifted it doesn’t make sense (tax wise) to keep the back of the property to grow trees and shrubs. He pointed out this commercial zone applied to that parcel is significantly deeper than the parcels around it.

Mr. Southard stated they are basically asking for the back portion (if it had been done on a 500 ft depth or similar) that this probably would have been zoned residential. But when the zoning was applied along state street it was just applied based on how the parcel shapes were. All of the front would stay nursery and would be retail use by the nursery, but they don’t need everything in the back.

Mr. Southard stated this would have to be a mix of density to make it worthwhile to development it. They need to sell it at a certain price, but they can’t build it without a certain density. He noted these would be market rate, for sale housing not apartments. They would not be low income tax credit or anything like that it would just be whatever the market would bear. But they would be affordable compared to the single family residential that is typical in Lindon; something that younger couples and families could afford. This would be a mix of townhomes and condos. They are just trying to figure out what would make sense density wise; this can be a lengthy process but this is how it starts and they are just looking for feedback.

Commissioner Tribe asked if the townhomes will be two-story. Mr. Southard confirmed they will be two-story with garages. These will also have a private fenced backyard to provide some personal space. These would be managed by an HOA, but individually owned. Commissioner Thompson asked about the use of the Red Barn as an event center and if that will continue as the city recently updated the noise ordinance.

Mr. Platt stated they were leasing the barn out but now they have taken over ownership. They know they want to remain as Lindon Nursery but looking at development and strategy being a 12-acre nursery on state street is not sustainable. They can shift the inventory to match what homeowners are asking for. But they have to look at their property to see what the highest best use of the property is. The barn is such a
historical and iconic part that they want the barn to stay for sure, but how they use the barn they are still debating that as a family.

Mr. Southard stated this is probably the 5th concept plan he has had with them where we didn’t have the barn, or moved the barn so it is his understanding they want to keep the barn so they have tried to incorporate that into the concept plan.

Mr. Southard stated today the condos would be in the $235,000 to $240,000 range and the townhomes would be in the $265,000 to $270,000 range; what it would be tomorrow is hard to tell.

Chairperson Call expressed her concerns with the high density. She noted the candidates that just won election have indicated that this is exactly what they don’t want. They want in-fill areas to go in, and they are not opposed to having some spread throughout the city to fill that requirement, but they don’t want a lot of density in one specific area; they are not opposed to in-fill areas. When the Ivory Development was approved it was on the basis that it would be that one area only with that type of product.

She can’t imagine residents would be happy with this type of development in their neighborhood. Maybe twin homes or 4-plexes spread throughout would work better so it wouldn’t have the impact. She is not saying we don’t need to put some things in Lindon but to have them scattered was a big issue with the Council. However, she is not saying this isn’t a nice concept just not in that area. Mr. Southard stated he will be meeting with the Council with this concept.

Commissioner Thompson commented that 99 units will bring a lot of traffic and the neighbors will not be happy with the additional traffic without a traffic signal there. They will also be overlooking an elk farm and this may pose an issue with noise etc.; there are a variety of issues. However, he does like the idea of more affordable housing.

Commissioner Tribe suggested some nice twin homes for less density may work. Mr. Southard stated that doesn’t pencil out (highest and best use) and this is not a good location for high end homes; it’s really not a great piece of property.

Mr. Platt stated one of the reasons they reached out to Mr. Southard is because they had been studying this proposal as they want to define who their neighbors will be. Lindon Nursery is still a long-term strategy for his family. They love the nursery business and they want to stay in it but they want to define who their neighbors are. So, it is highly in their best interest to help shape and define this, so they are proactively working through proposals etc.

At this time, Vice Chair Kallas asked the commissioners to give their comments on this concept.

Commissioner Johnson commented that he is probably a little different than the other commissioners. He feels we don’t have the rooftops to support retail on state street. In his opinion we need something like this so state street will develop otherwise business won’t be viable. His personal opinion is we need something like this and it makes perfect sense. It may be a little higher density than he would like, but these are weird shape properties; he is in favor of the concept but the density is a little high for him. Lindon needs more rooftops as we are out of land.

Commissioner Schauers commented he is generally in favor to develop in this area and he is okay with the higher density. He questioned the road going in and out. Mr. Southard explained the entrances and exits noting the road would be wide enough to have a left-hand turn.
Commissioner Tribe mentioned this may be a lifestyle place where younger people can live and build their careers. She appreciates that the applicants are conscientious of Lindon as they live here and are conscience of how we want it to look and feel. However, she does feel the density is a little high.

Commissioner Thompson likes the fact that this is off of state street and he is not opposed with something coming off of state street. He likes the concept if the city says they want the density; there would be issues to deal with.

Commissioner Marchbanks commented in concept he is open to the idea and feels this is an option that should be explored.

Commissioner Kallas stated he has concerns with all the traffic on the one road that would be a real safety and traffic issue with 99 units. He thinks this may be an uphill battle. Personally, he doesn’t like to see code amendments just to make something work.

Vice Chair Kallas stated he hopes the comments have helped the applicants tonight and reminded them the council will have further questions.

Vice Chair Kallas called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none he moved on to the next agenda item.

5. **New Business: Reports by Commissioners** – Vice Chair Kallas called for any new business or reports from the Commissioners.

Chairperson Call mentioned an email received from Jeremy Washburn with information on the proposed storage units. Concerned that no more storage units are allowed. Commissioner Johnson mentioned and email about building rentals for employees followed by discussion.

6. **Planning Director Report** –

   - General City Updates

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

**ADJOURN** –

COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 PM. COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Approved – November 26, 2019

__________________________
Sharon Call, Chairperson

__________________________
Michael Florence, Planning Director
**Item 4: Anderson Farms Major Subdivision Approval – Parcel A and Plat dedication for Anderson Boulevard**

**Date:** November 26, 2019

**Project Location:** Parcel A, Anderson Farms Planned Development Zone

**Applicant:** Ivory Development, LLC

**Property Owner:** Ivory Homes

**General Plan:** Residential High

**Current Zone:** Anderson Farms Planned Development Zone

**Size:** 14.87 acres

**Type of Decision:** Administrative

---

**Summary of Key Issues**

1. Ivory Development, LLC is seeking Parcel A/Plat E preliminary subdivision approval for a 60-lot single family home development;
2. Ivory Development, LLC is petitioning for preliminary plat approval to dedicate the remaining portion of Anderson Farms Boulevard from 500 N. to 700 N.

---

**Overview**

1. Parcel A will be the 5th phase of the Anderson Farms development;
2. In 2016, the City Council signed a Master Development Agreement with Ivory Development;
3. As a summary, the development agreement addresses items such as the total number of units, types of units for each phase, setbacks, park space and development infrastructure;
4. The Anderson Farms development has a maximum residential count of 500 single family homes (detached single family and townhomes), and 380 multi-family units;
5. As the planning commission is aware, the City and Ivory Development have been in discussions regarding amending the master development agreement which would increase the overall development density in order to dedicate units for affordable housing. If negotiations workout, then the subject parcel, Parcel A/Plat E, would be reduced to 49 lots and lot sizes increased. Staff and the developer are asking the commission to review Plat E at 60 lots but knowing there may be a change to 49 lots before the council gives preliminary approval for Parcel A/Plat E. The final number of lots will need to be decided before the city council gives preliminary approval. If not, then the developer could request an amendment to the plat in which typically the planning commission and city council would need to provide approval.
Motion
I move to recommend (approval, denial, or continue) of the applicant’s request for preliminary approval of Anderson Farms subdivision Plat E. with 60 lots and the Anderson Boulevard road dedication plat with the following conditions:
1. The applicant will continue to work with the City Engineer to make all final corrections to the engineering documents and plat;
2. Developer submittals shall meet requirements found in the Lindon City Land Development Policies, Standards Specifications and Drawings unless otherwise specified in the master development agreement;
3. The applicant will comply with all bonding requirements;
4. Plat E be approved at 60 lots unless otherwise reduced by the City Council;
5. Side yard lot line configurations are approved as proposed in Plat E;
6. Detention basin #2 that services Parcel A and the roundabout will be landscaped with this phase;
7. All items of the staff report.

Surrounding Zoning & Land Use
North: Lindon Village Commercial Zone – agriculture
South: Anderson Farms PD zone and R1-12 – Single family residential and agriculture
East: Anderson Farms PD zone – agriculture
West: R3 zone – Single family residential

Lot Size Analysis

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lots sizes</td>
<td>6,720 to 16,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average lot size</td>
<td>8,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>4 units per acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subdivision Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No single lot shall be divided by municipal or county boundary lines,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads, alleys, or other lots.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All residential lots shall front on a public street.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side lot lines shall be at right angles to street lines unless approved</td>
<td>No. Not all lot lines are at right angles. Staff has included approval of this item in the conditions of approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by planning commission and/or city council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The street layout shall conform to the master plan</td>
<td>Yes. The proposed street matches the road cross-sections of the development agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum right-of-way width for Minor streets:</td>
<td>Yes. meets development agreement. Anderson Blvd ROW is 85’. Interior residential streets are 55’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor streets maximum grade: 12%</td>
<td>Yes. 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks, curbs and gutters shall be provided on both sides of all</td>
<td>Yes. The improvements on the westside of Anderson Blvd will go in with Parcel E. The eastside improvements will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets to be dedicated to the public</td>
<td>go in with Parcel E. The eastside improvements will go in with Parcel G. All interior street improvements will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be installed with Parcel A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easements shall follow rear and side lot lines whenever practical and</td>
<td>Yes. Easements are narrower for this development but are provided on the plat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall have a minimum total width of 15 feet apportioned equally in</td>
<td>Provided as shown in engineering plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abutting properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground utilities and piped sanitary sewerage shall be provided by</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the subdivider.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Streetlights: Yes. Plans will need to be updated with calls out per city development manual.

### Development Agreement Requirements for Parcel A/Plat E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(a) Recording of the first plat will require the following concurrent improvements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Anderson Blvd. from 700 North to the 500 North connection including all curb and gutter and improvements and Landscaping within the right of way identified as the “North Anderson Blvd Improvements” on Exhibit J;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The connection from 500 North to Anderson Blvd. as shown in Exhibit J;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Full northern roundabout improvements, including landscaping, will be completed;</td>
<td>Yes. Roundabout is in but the landscaping has not been installed. Landscaping will be required as part of this phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Full storm water basin detention improvements, including landscaping, will be completed for the basin that will serve this Parcel; and</td>
<td>Yes. The detention basin has been installed but not landscaped. Landscaping will be required as part of this phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Pressurized irrigation system, including source, for the Project and a connection to the existing City pressurized irrigation system subject to Section 9.8.</td>
<td>No. Developer is still working on the pressurized irrigation system. Most if not all of the construction is complete but the system was not functioning when the city turned off the water for winter. A functioning PI system will be required as part of this phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Staging area for the Anderson Farm equipment cannot impede construction of street improvements and utility infrastructure.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Sewer will be designed to allow flow to the future Sewer/Ground Water Lift Station when that facility is online. Sewer connection in 500 North is only temporary until future lift station is online.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) If Developer elects not to temporarily connect Parcel A units to Lindon’s existing sewer system, building permits may be issued prior to the construction of the Sewer/Ground Water Lift Station, but certificates of occupancy for any Single Family Unit will not be issued until the Sewer/Ground Water Lift Station, with its associated Off-Site improvements, is substantially completed and functional.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibits
Aerial photo
Parcel A/Plat E subdivision plan
Anderson Farms road dedication plat
Anderson Farms development layout
Road Cross-section
BOYD ANDERSON AND SONS COMPANY INC.
PARCEL #: #0510090

BOYD ANDERSON AND SONS COMPANY INC.
PARCEL #: #0510091

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

MATCHLINE
SEE SHEET C2.1

NOTES
1. #5 X 24" REBAR & CAP (FOCUS ENG) TO BE SET AT ALL LOT CORNERS. NAILS OR PLUGS TO BE SET IN TOP BACK OF CURB AT EXTENSION OF SIDE LOT LINES, IN LIEU OF REBAR AND CAPS AT FRONT LOT CORNERS.
EXHIBIT J-2, STREET CROSS SECTIONS

1. 72' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   SOUTH ANDERSON BOULEVARD

2. 64' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   CONNECTION TO 1700 WEST

3. 47.5' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   ANDERSON LANE

4. 66' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   500 NORTH CONNECTION TO ANDERSON BOULEVARD

5. 53' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   ANDERSON BLVD AT THORNE PROPERTY

6. 28' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   TOWNHOMES

7. 58' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   PARCEL I CONNECTION TO ANDERSON BLVD

8. 55' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   INTERIOR ROADS

9. 54' ROAD CROSS SECTION
   500 NORTH INDUSTRIAL AREA