Notice of Meeting
Lindon City Planning Commission

The Lindon City Planning Commission will hold a regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, May 28, 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 05/14/2019

3. Public Comment

4. Continuing Business - Public Hearing for a recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend Lindon City Code Chapter 17.51.130 to reduce landscaping requirements between parking lots and the street in the Commercial Farm zone. Application is made by Mike Jorgensen (20 minutes)

5. New Business from Commissioners

6. Planning Director Report

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. 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 and City www.lindoncity.org websites.

***The duration of each agenda item is approximate only

Posted By: Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder
Date: 5/24/2019
Time: 5:00 pm
Place: Lindon City Center, Lindon Police Station, Lindon Community Center
Item 1 – Call to Order
Sharon Call – Chair
Mike Marchbanks
Steve Johnson
Rob Kallas
Scott Thompson
Jared Schauers

Item 2 – Approval of Minutes
Planning Commission 04/09/2019
The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday, May 14, 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:** Sharon Call, Chairperson  
**Invocation:** Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
**Pledge of Allegiance:** Scott Thompson, Commissioner

**PRESENT**  
Sharon Call, Chairperson  
Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner  
Rob Kallas, Commissioner  
Steven Johnson, Commissioner  
Scott Thompson, Commissioner  
Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
Mike Florence, Planning Director  
Anders Bake, Associate Planner  
Kathryn Moosman, Recorder

**EXCUSED**

**Special Attendee:**  
Matt Bean, Councilmember

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 April 9, 2019 were reviewed.

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

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

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

**CURRENT BUSINESS –**

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

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

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

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

Mr. Florence noted the thirty-foot setback for parking was probably adopted because the minimum setback for a single-family residence in the R1 zone is thirty feet. The applicant is proposing the change for two reasons: First, Rocky Mountain Elementary has 9 ½ feet of landscaping between their parking and the street right-of-way. The applicant’s proposal shows reducing the landscaping from 30 feet to 19 feet. The
Mr. Florence stated the applicant would like to relocate the reduced landscaping to the interior of the parking lot. The site plan shows an interior sidewalk. If the reduction in landscaping is approved, the applicant is proposing to relocate it to install landscaping on both side of the interior parking lot sidewalk. He noted the general plan has a land use goal to carefully limit any negative impact of commercial facilities on neighboring land use areas, particularly residential development.

Mr. Florence then presented the following exhibits for discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chairperson Call called for any further comments or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none she called for a motion.
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5. **Public Hearing** – Recommendation to the Lindon City Council to amend Lindon City Sign Code Chapter 18.03 to modify the allowable square footage for directional signs. Application is made by Phil Haderlie on behalf of doTerra.

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

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

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

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

**Directional Signs.**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Allowable Square Footage</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Allowable Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>As per development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

Mr. Florence further explained as staff evaluated different directional signs, they were difficult to find and there was generally a lack of these signs installed by businesses in Lindon. The purpose in providing the above measurements is that the square footage...
may need to be increased for business areas with large delivery trucks so drivers can see the signs at a distance of at approximately 360’. The main increase that the applicant is requesting would be increasing the width from approximately two feet to four feet to allow a 3’x4’ directional sign.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIRPERSON CALL  AYE
COMMISSIONER KALLAS  AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS  AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON  AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON  AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS  AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
6. **Murdock Minor Subdivision – Murdock Auto Group.** Application for two-lot minor subdivision approval at 452 S. Lindon Park Drive. (Utah County Parcel # 46-871-0101), in the Lindon City Planned Commercial – 1 (PC-1) and Planned Commercial – 2 (PC-2) zones.

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

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

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

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

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

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

   **COMMISSIONER KALLAS** **AYE**
   **COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS** **AYE**
   **COMMISSIONER JOHNSON** **AYE**
   **COMMISSIONER THOMPSON** **AYE**
   **COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS** **AYE**

   **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

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

   Mr. Florence led this discussion by explaining Lee Johnson (who is in attendance) has made application for site plan approval for a new reception center located at 450 W. Gillman Lane, in the Lindon City General Commercial Storage (CG-S) zone. The
planning commission will be evaluating whether the site plan and building meet Title 17 development regulations and Commercial Design Standards. The applicant proposes to remodel an existing storage building at 450 W Gillman Ln. for use as a Reception Center. The building currently does not have any water or sewer utilities to the building. Utilities will be added to the building and property along with a fire hydrant at the entrance of the property. Mr. Florence stated the applicant’s site plan meets vehicle parking requirements of one stall per 3½ person capacity in the building of facility, based on maximum use of all facilities at the same time.

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

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

a) The proposed fence/landscape screen provides an adequate buffer for the adjoining residential use.

b) The appearance of the fence/landscape screen will not detract from the residential use and/or nonresidential use of the property.

c) The proposed fence/landscape screen will shield the residential use from noise, storage, traffic or any other characteristic of the nonresidential use that is incompatible with residential uses.

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

Mr. Florence pointed out buildings in the General Commercial Storage zone are required to meet the Lindon Commercial Design Standards. Under the commercial design standards commercial development should pick one of three building forms: one-part commercial block, two-part commercial block, and central block buildings. The proposed building most aligns with the one-part commercial block building. He then referenced the standards for such a building in the Commercial Design Standards.
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Mr. Florence noted the City Engineer is working through technical issues related to the site plan and will conduct a final review if the planning commission grants final site plan approval. He indicated the Wild Oak Reception Center is a permitted use in the General Commercial Storage Zone. He noted the main concern that staff has is the appropriate buffers between the reception center use and the existing residential uses. Staff feels that the number of trees will help to reduce some noise levels and impacts on surrounding neighbors. Mr. Florence then presented an Aerial photo, building elevations, Site Plan, and Landscaping Plan followed by discussion.

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

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

At this time Chairperson Call called for any public comments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER KALLAS MOVED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICANT’S REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO ALLOW STAFF AND THE APPLICANT TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED AS FOLLOWS: 1. HAVE THE CITY ENGINEER LOOK AT TRAFFIC PATTERNS AND THE SAFETY CONDITIONS ON GILLMAN LANE AS IT PERTAINS TO THIS PROJECT; 2. HAVE A PHOTOMETRIC STUDY DONE ON THE LIGHTING; 3. LOOK AT THE ORDINANCE IN RESPECT TO THE FENCING AND WORK WITH THE NEIGHBORS FOR AN AGREEMENT; 4. REVIEW THE ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES WITH STAFF TO ENSURE THEY MEET THE
CODE. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Maxfield Hollow Major Subdivision Approval – Jake Davis

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER KALLAS AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Planning Commission
May 14, 2019
9. Maxfield Meadows Minor Subdivision Approval – Patti Maxfield

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER KALLAS        AYE
COMMISSIONER MARCHBANKS      AYE
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON         AYE
COMMISSIONER THOMPSON        AYE
COMMISSIONER SCHAUERS        AYE

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

11. Planning Director Report –
   - Landscaping on 700 north
   - Commercial design guidelines

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

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

Approved – May 28, 2019

Sharon Call, Chairperson

Michael Florence, Planning Director
Item: 4 - Ordinance Amendment  
Lindon City Code 17.51.130

Date: May 28, 2019  
Applicant: Mike Jorgensen  
Presenting Staff: Michael Florence  
Type of Decision: Legislative  
Council Action Required: Yes, the planning commission is the recommending body on this application.

MOTION  
I move to (approve, deny, continue) ordinance amendment 2019-9-O (or as presented, with changes).

Overview:  
Mike Jorgensen made application to amend Title 17.51.130(4) pertaining to proximity of parking to the street right-of-way in the Commercial Farm zone.

- The Planning Commission held a public meeting on this item on May 14, 2019.
- The Planning Commission requested staff research whether the change could be made without modifying the ordinance. After further review, it is staff recommendation that the Commercial Farm ordinance needs to be amended and that there is not another ordinance that would allow the change without a code amendment.

Proposed Ordinance Language

4. No required parking spaces shall be within thirty feet (30') of a front property line or street side property line unless approved by the Land Use Authority. The Land Use Authority may reduce this requirement where an alternative plan is proposed that meets the design intent of the Commercial Farm Zone while also maintaining appropriate setbacks and buffers compatible with surrounding properties. There shall be no overall net loss of landscape percentage for the site.

Analysis

At the May 14, 2019 meeting, the planning commission had some reservations about the proposed ordinance being too specific to the subject property owned by Mr. Jorgensen. Staff has proposed ordinance language that hopefully accomplishes the same intent to allow Mr. Jorgensen to reduce the landscaping along 500 E. while also making the ordinance less specific to one property. The ordinance does however require the applicant to provide an alternative plan for reducing the landscaping and the land use authority must consider whether the changes would be compatible with surrounding properties. Finally, the ordinance requires that there be no net loss of the overall landscape percentage. If landscaping is reduced in one area, the same percentage needs to be relocated to another.
Exhibits

- Proposed Ordinance
- Site Plan
- Landscape renderings provided by the applicant
- Currently approved landscape plan
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-9-O

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF LINDON CITY, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH, AMENDING TITLE 17.51.130 AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City Council is authorized by state law to enact and amend ordinances establishing land use regulations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment is consistent with the Lindon City General Plan goal carefully limit any negative impact of commercial facilities on neighboring land use areas, particularly residential development; and

WHEREAS, on ____________________, the Planning Commission held a properly noticed public hearing to hear testimony regarding the ordinance amendment; and

WHEREAS, after the public hearing, the Planning Commission further considered the proposed ordinance and recommended that the Council adopt the attached ordinance;

WHEREAS, the Council held a public hearing on ____________________, to consider the recommendation and the Council received and considered all public comments that were made therein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Lindon, Utah County, State of Utah, as follows:

SECTION I: Amendment. Amend Lindon City Code Section 17.51.130 as follows:

17.51.130 Parking.

1. Each use in the CF zone shall have, on the same lot or conglomeration of parcels as defined in Section 17.51.020, off-street parking sufficient to comply with the number of spaces required by Chapter 17.18.

2. Parking spaces in a CF zone are exempted from the surfacing, striping, and interior landscaping requirements as found in Chapter 17.18, but shall be provided with a dustless, hard surface material such as compacted gravel, asphalt, or concrete and shall be provided with a similar hard surfaced access from a public street.

3. Notwithstanding Subsection (2) of this section, any off-street parking lot adjacent to a residential use or residential zone shall provide a minimum ten-foot (10') landscaped buffer from the parking lot to the adjacent residential use or zone. Trees shall be planted at least every ten feet (10') along the landscaped strip. Trees must be a minimum of two-inch (2") caliper measured one foot (1') off the ground and at least six feet (6') tall when planted. Trees shall be of a variety that will mature to a height of at least twenty feet (20') tall in order to provide a visual barrier between the parking lot and the residential use/zone.

4. No required parking spaces shall be within thirty feet (30') of a front property line or street side property line unless approved by the Land Use Authority. The Land Use Authority may reduce this requirement where an alternative plan is proposed that meets the design intent of the Commercial Farm Zone while also maintaining appropriate setbacks and buffers compatible with surrounding properties. There shall be no overall net loss of landscape percentage for the site.

5. All required ADA parking stalls shall be provided with smooth, hard surface asphalt or concrete paving with a
similar surface provided as an ADA accessible pedestrian route between the parking spaces and any public buildings being accessed from the spaces. (Ord. 2017-16 §1, amended, 2017)

SECTION II: The provisions of this ordinance and the provisions adopted or incorporated by reference are severable. If any provision of this ordinance is found to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, the balance of the ordinance shall nevertheless be unaffected and continue in full force and effect.

SECTION III: Provisions of other ordinances in conflict with this ordinance and the provisions adopted or incorporated by reference are hereby repealed or amended as provided herein.

SECTION IV: This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its passage and posting as provide by law.

PASSED and ADOPTED and made EFFECTIVE by the City Council of Lindon City, Utah, this _________day of __________________________, 2019.

_______________________________
Jeff Acerson, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Kathryn A. Moosman,
Lindon City Recorder

SEAL
Lindon Utah
Site Plan - Alternate
Sheet No. C - 2.0A

Walker Farm Reception Center (Events Barn)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception Center Area</strong></td>
<td>84,900</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing House</strong></td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulation Table**

- Hatched area notes area used for parking
- Landscaping= 1,672 sq.ft.
- Provided landscaping = 3,918 sq.ft.

**Pasture**

- Provided landscaping from 50 ft. to 75 ft.