

Minutes of the **Regular Session** of the **Planning Commission Meeting** held Thursday, **September 11, 2025**, in the **Lehi City Hall** located at **153 North 100 East**.

Members Present: Gregory Jackson, Commission Chair
Brent Everett, Commission Vice Chair
Tyson Eyre, Commissioner
Nicole Kunze, Commissioner
Emily Lockhart, Commissioner
Beau Jones, Commission Alternate

Members Absent: Ken Roberts, Commission Alternate

Others Present: Kim Struthers, Community Development Director; Jacob Curtis, Planner;
Gary Ellis, City Engineer; Nate Purser, Assistant City Attorney; Kate Morgan, Deputy City Recorder.

Regular Session, 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Commission Chair Jackson welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Consent Agenda

2.1) Approval of minutes from the August 14, 2025 meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Eyre moved to approve the minutes as presented.
Commissioner Everett seconded.

Vote: Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. Regular Agenda

3.1) Consideration of Clyde Capital Group's request for approval of revisions to the Vistas at the Point Amenities removing the amphitheater from their required amenities (Tabled from the May 8th meeting).

Jacob Curtis presented the item. Two major updates have occurred since the last time Planning Commission heard this item: the amphitheater has been converted to a dog park, and a conceptual plan of the overlook park has been submitted.

Adam Ostler was present, representing Clyde Capital Group. He gave an overview of the plan.

Commissioner Lockhart asked what other amenities were considered for the spot. Ostler said they had looked at pickleball courts and playgrounds, among other options. It is a high-amenities area with the surrounding trails. Commissioner Lockhart asked why the amphitheater was being removed. Clyde Capital Group wanted to make sure the amenities that are put in are used. Their research indicates that amphitheaters require lots of community planning as opposed to dog parks which are more spontaneously used.

Commissioner Eyre asked for clarification on a box drawn on the development plan. It represented a pickleball court, pump track, and playground area that have already been put in.

Commissioner Everett asked about the monetary value of the dog park vs the amphitheater, as well as construction details for the dog park. The park will have a double-gated entry, and a fenced area for off-leash play. The prices are comparable.

Commissioner Kunze asked what the play area would be made of. Ostler wasn't sure.

Commissioner Lockhart read the listed required amenities as appears in city code and asked for clarification on which have been met. All amenities have been met according to the original agreement with City Council; the amphitheater will just be replaced with a dog park.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if a dog park would fulfil the need for a community gathering space that the amphitheater would provide. Jacob Curtis agreed that it is not a traditional meeting space, but that it is a space where people can gather and talk, rather than an event space like an amphitheater. Kim Struthers mentioned that many of the amenities have been aged up as they are expecting the demographic of the development to be older (a gym has been installed in place of playgrounds for example). He emphasized that the commission should only focus on the replaced amenity.

Commissioner Eyre stated that as the overlook park was always part of the planned community, he doesn't think of it as an additional amenity that makes up for the lack of an amphitheater. Struthers explained that the developers are planning on making the park nicer than previously planned. Commissioner Eyre expressed concern over taking value into consideration when numbers were not presented to the commission. Commissioner Jackson seconded his sentiment. He expressed frustration at the applicant not providing information to the commission.

Commissioner Eyre mentioned that he thinks that the exchange of a dog park for the amphitheater is a positive one, and he agrees that the dog park will likely get more use. He doesn't think it's possible to compare them one to one, but he sees it as an important part of a neighborhood where there are no yards.

Commissioner Lockhart said that she thinks the intent of a community gathering place should be met. She said it would be nice to zoom out and look at surrounding parcels to see where other amenities lie nearby.

Kim Struthers brought forth the original approved package presented by the applicant, which listed the amphitheater's price at \$250,000. Commissioner Lockhart asked if the commission had previously approved amenities that don't meet city standards. Struthers explained that there are amenities suggestions in the code, but that Planning Commission has the final decision on which amenities are approved.

Ostler returned to the stand to address some concerns. He clarified that the main concern of the commission should be the dog park, as the amenities standards have been met. Commissioner Lockhart clarified that the approved change originally included an amphitheater. She worries that the community is losing benefits if this is approved, as the trails are a city-run project. Ostler stated that \$200,000 has been budgeted for the dog park. Struthers explained that the trails are a big value for the city, and the developer put them in rather than the city having to.

Commissioner Eyre likes the idea of a dog park as an amenity. He thinks it would be a positive and attracting feature for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if the development would allow pets. It will.

Commissioner Jackson asked if any practical steps would be taken to make the park inviting to people without dogs. Ostler explained that the dog run area would be fenced off. It will be surrounded by trees to make it more of a green space, and there will be benches scattered around. He also clarified that the park itself would be made out of grass.

Commissioner Eyre mentioned that the dog park at Willow Park is the cheapest the city could build, but he still sees it heavily used at all times despite the fact that it isn't close to any homes. He feels the dog park would get a lot of utility in the area, especially with the proximity of the units. Commissioner Lockhart still felt that it would be an exclusionary amenity.

Commissioner Eyre asked if the HOA would cover the maintenance of the dog park. Ostler confirmed it would. Michelle Grow, Ostler's coworker, came to the stand to explain that the amphitheater had to be relocated to an area that wouldn't have as much appeal due to the wind study from the flight park. She mentioned that there is intent to put more amenities in the park than are required, like a pet wash station, intentional shading, and high quality turf. Both the overlook park and the dog park would be connected to the trail system, which would establish a good pedestrian flow.

Commissioner Lockhart felt as though a dog park wouldn't meet the intent of a TOD, and she worried about losing the spirit of a TOD in the area, as no commercial development has gone in. Kim Struthers explained that there is opportunity for commercial development nearer to the station in the TOD, but only residential has been put in so far.

Commissioner Jackson asked if staff had any input on the intent of the amenity as a community gathering place. Struthers emphasized that it is up to commission to decide if the dog park meets the amenity criteria.

Motion: Commissioner Everett moved to approve the proposed request to create a dog park in lieu of amphitheater, using an equivalent value as justification being placed into the clubhouse and the overlook park to be consistent with the

amenities requirement as required by code, recognizing that at face value the dog park as a gathering place may not meet a TOD requirement for a gathering place, but could, depending on use of the trail system, that the amphitheater in its proposed location was unable to be constructed due to the flight park, and that this allows development in that space for a use consistent with the parameters of the wind study. He included all DRC comments.

Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion with the stipulation that the clause about the dog park not meeting the definition of a meeting space be struck, as there is no definition in code for a community meeting space. Commissioner Everett agreed.

Commissioner Lockhart asked the commission if they thought people would ride Trax to get to the dog park. She clarified that the amphitheater wasn't an impossibility, just that the amphitheater in one specific location was not possible. The amphitheater could still be built.

Commissioner Everett withdrew his motion. He appreciated Lockhart's comment on location and said that the burden of proof should be on the applicant, not the commission, to justify the replacement.

Michelle Grow returned to the stand to explain that where the amenity would be located, the aesthetic and noise from surrounding commercial development would be less than ideal for an amphitheater. Additionally, parking would be an issue. Commissioner Jackson asked where the amphitheater was originally supposed to be. Grow didn't know. Commissioner Kunze asked how tall the buildings were in the development. Grow was uncertain but knew that they were shorter than planned due to the wind study. Struthers shared that according to his memory they've gone down to three stories from the original five. Commissioner Kunze asked if the wind study took buildings into consideration. It did. Commissioner Eyre wondered why two four story buildings, or even one story buildings, would have a different effect on the area than an open space like an amphitheater.

Commissioner Kunze said that the planned amphitheater was a small, sixty seat venue. She didn't think that at that size it would be a good gathering space. Jacob Curtis clarified that when the plan was originally approved, there were no other amphitheaters in the city.

Commissioner Everett expressed frustration at having to dig out answers as a commission rather than being presented with pertinent information by the applicant.

Commissioner Lockhart stated that the TOD is supposed to be both an origin and a destination point. She doesn't know if a dog park would be a destination people traveled to. She explained that she is cautious about swapping out amenities due to previous issues in Traverse Mountain. She also wanted to preserve the TOD as it has been a big city project, and she didn't want to undermine it. Commissioner Eyre argued that a dog park would bring out more people than a sixty-seat amphitheater would.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if the HOA would allow public access to the dog park, as it is supposed to be a private amenity. Ostler explained that the intent is for the park to be maintained by the HOA and used as a public space. Commissioner Lockhart asked staff if this was a normal

arrangement. Struthers explained that the amenities being discussed are meant to serve the community living in the TOD according to his understanding of code.

Commissioner Lockhart asked what parts of the planned commercial development will bring people in. The commercial development is being worked on, but residential has been the priority. The commission discussed how commercial development could be a draw.

Commissioner Lockhart asked why the dog park is closer to transit than to residential development if its intended to be for residents.

Commissioner Kunze mentioned that the trail ends at the dog park. The commission asked to see the trail system. The commission expressed discomfort with Mountain Point Boulevard. Struthers explained that it is a one-lane each way road with train tracks in the middle. It is a low traffic road with protected bikeways on both sides.

Commissioner Lockhart said that she made the motion to table this item in May in order to help the developers avoid the 12 month resubmittal period. She didn't want to give a negative recommendation at this meeting for the same reason. She explained that she doesn't like the location of the park and suggested that the commission table the item again in order to give the developers another shot.

Commissioner Jackson clarified that the burden of proof is on the applicant. He shared concerns that it wasn't clear whether this was an HOA amenity or a TOD amenity.

Motion: Commissioner Lockhart moved to table the item to give the applicant an opportunity to provide the burden of proof for the amphitheater and wind study, and why the amphitheater can't go where the dog park is being suggested, to provide additional support for the evidence of the dog park being for the residents and potentially moving it closer to the residents. The commission would like to see other design options, and to see the intent of the code being met. Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, no. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.

Motion passed four in favor, one against.

3.2) Public hearing and consideration of Colby Anderson's request for approval of revisions to the Moto United Site Plan to include an 8-foot fence located at 405 South Millpond Drive

Jacob Curtis presented the item and clarified that the fence would actually be located at 411 Millpond Drive. He explained that there are no grade elevation issues or safety concerns. This is a personal request for security purposes. There is a space on the lot used for loading, and the applicant wants to protect inventory.

Andrew was present, representing Colby Anderson. He had no additional comments.

Commissioner Everett asked what CMU security fence was. It is a masonry block. The purpose is solely for security; there are no noise concerns.

Curtis clarified that this is a light industrial zone that is not adjacent to residential.

Commissioner Jackson opened and closed public comment.

Motion: Commissioner Kunze moved to approve the item with the findings that the proposed use at the proposed location will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity, and will not be detrimental to public health, safety, general welfare, or convenience, the proposed use will be located and conducted in a manner in compliance with the goals and policies of the Lehi City General Plan and the purposes of this code, that the property on which the use building or other structure is proposed to be established is of adequate size and dimensions to permit construction of the facilities and conduct of the use that it will not be detrimental to adjoining properties in the area. She included all DRC comments. Commissioner Everett seconded.

Vote: Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

3.3) Public hearing and consideration of Adam Albrecht's request for preliminary subdivision approval of Garden Park, a 4-lot residential development located at 500 South Center Street.

Jacob Curtis presented the item. The request meets all the requirements of the R-1-Flex zone.

Commissioner Everett asked if this has come before commission before. Adam Albrecht, the applicant, was present. He said that a concept was shown a few years ago, but that the layout was slightly different.

Commissioner Jackson opened and closed public comment.

Commissioner Everett asked if all the lots used to front Center Street. They did, but two have been changed to face 500 South in order to come into compliance with code. The southmost lot has been made as wide as possible to put distance between the driveway and the railroad crossing.

Commissioner Eyre asked about the name of the subdivision. The applicant clarified that it is supposed to be "Garden Park," not "Albrecht Subdivision."

Motion: Commissioner Eyre moved to approve the preliminary subdivision with the findings that the proposed subdivision does meet the requirements of the Lehi City Development Code in regard to subdivision approvals. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Everett seconded.

Vote: Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

3.4) Public Hearing and Recommendation of Lehi City's request for a review of a Development Code Amendment to Chapter 37, Connectivity Standards.

Jacob Curtis presented the item. This is primarily Mike West's project. Many minor changes are being implemented so that city code matches UDOT terminology, as well as other specific details being reevaluated. Some changes have been influenced by recent projects.

Commissioner Everett asked if the ten foot wide path for culs-de-sac included landscaping. Kim Struthers explained that the paths themselves would be ten feet wide, and that landscaping would be included in the requirements.

Struthers explained that the major change to connectivity standards would allow developers the opportunity to supplement a bike or pedestrian trail rather than connecting a stub road.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if this would allow the city to demand traffic-calming features on streets not part of the parcel if overspill traffic comes into neighborhoods. It would be more of a negotiation than a demand. Commissioner Lockhart asked if the Fire and Police Departments had weighed in. Garion Rowett, the fire marshal, looked over the plan in DRC. He wants to use the shared-use paths for emergency vehicles.

Commissioner Eyre asked if there is anything in the new code discussing curb cuts from a path onto a road, as he has concerns for cyclists. Kim Struthers explained that they were included in the most recent update to the city's design standards. Struthers went on to say that the city has looked into different indicative tiles for crossings that would make moving around easier for blind residents.

Commissioner Lockhart shared that she sees the low traffic neighborhood circulation improvements clause as a great example of putting residents first. She worried about not being specific enough on the requirements for the multi-use paths, which would allow developers to cut corners and result in the paths being unusable by emergency vehicles. Mike West has added this note already.

Commissioner Jackson opened public comment.

Peter Ovord approves of the suggested changes. He thinks they make sense, and he agrees with Lockhart on the implementation of item 6.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Motion: Commissioner Lockhart moved to give a positive recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the findings that it is in line with the intent of the city's code in that it adds and updates definitions, it adds provisions to the circulation plan requirement that the city may require modal filters, street closures, or access

management improvements, it's changing "trail" to "shared use path" throughout the traffic to be more specific and match UDOT terminology, and it removes the hard maximum block length requirements for the optional master plan trail and greenway exceptions. She included all DRC comments. Commissioner Eyre seconded.

Vote: Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

4. City Business

Jacob Curtis reminded the commission about the assigned work from the September work session. The meeting on the 25th will have some General Plan amendments, as well as the SHAR.

5. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Planning Commission at this time, Commissioner Kunze moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Lockhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Approved: October 23, 2025

Attest:

Gregory Jackson, Commission Chair

Kate Morgan, Deputy City Recorder