



153 North 100 East  
Lehi, UT 84043  
(801) 768-7100

Minutes of the **Regular Session** of the **Planning Commission Meeting** held Thursday, **October 9, 2025**, in the **Lehi City Hall** located at **153 North 100 East**.

**Members Present:** Brent Everett, Commission Vice Chair  
Tyson Eyre, Commissioner  
Nicole Kunze, Commissioner  
Emily Lockhart, Commissioner  
Ken Roberts, Commissioner

**Members Absent:** Gregory Jackson, Commission Chair  
Beau Jones, Commission Alternate

**Others Present:** Kim Struthers, Community Development Director; Brittney Harris, Planner; Lorin Powell, City Engineer; Nate Purser, Assistant City Attorney; Kate Morgan, Deputy City Recorder.

---

**Regular Session, 7:00 p.m.**

### **1. Call to Order**

Acting Commission Chair Everett welcomed everyone to the meeting.

### **2. Consent Agenda**

#### **2.1) Approval of minutes from the September 4, 2025 meeting**

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

**Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes. Commissioner Roberts, 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 September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)**

Brittney Harris presented the item. She shared the minutes from the original approval meeting in 2021, and explained that the amphitheater was originally just relocated. The overlook park plan

has been updated and is now more detailed. She stated that regardless of what amenity is decided on, it will be a private amenity, not a city amenity.

Commissioner Everett asked for more information on the wind study. Harris explained that the wind study group worked with the developer and the flight park, and the information was then passed onto staff in the format found in the packet. Commissioner Everett expressed discontent with the format the wind study was presented in, as he felt it removed a lot of the necessary information.

Commissioner Kunze clarified that the amenity wouldn't be a city amenity even though it's located within a TOD. Harris explained that TOD amenities are a separate requirement in code from residential amenities.

Commissioner Eyre asked why the open air amphitheater was more problematic for the flight park than the buildings which are being built where it was originally planned. The applicant explained that the amphitheater was moved to replace a building that was causing problems; the amphitheater was never the problem for the flight park. Commissioner Eyre asked what the difference was between the current presentation and the previous presentations. The applicant has more data. It was not included in the packet.

Commissioner Everett asked if any other amenities were substituted. Harris stated that this is an adjustment of what was previously approved for the subdivision. Commissioner Everett asked if the amenity would be for both the apartments and the townhomes. Harris said that as far as she is aware, it will be for the apartments.

Commissioner Eyre asked why commercial development wasn't included in the plan. Harris said that it was in a previous concept plan. She let the Commission know that it is open to interpretation as to whether that meets the TOD standards. There currently isn't any transit in the area.

Clayton Rackham was present representing Clyde Capital Group. He is the development manager for this project. He clarified for the Commission that the wind study was an act of good faith, and not a requirement from the city. He explained that the main concerns weren't with wind patterns, but for beginner parasailers, who are generally the only ones landing at the bottom of the hill at the flight park. Rackham clarified that the amenities would be for the HOA. Clyde Capital Group has done some research on HOA run amphitheaters and doesn't think that it would be the best amenity for the area given the density. Rackham further explained that cost comparisons are based entirely on estimates, as no project has been approved, but either the dog park or the amphitheater can be built for approximately the same estimated cost of ~\$250,000.

Commissioner Eyre asked about irrigation. The information is included in the irrigation numbers.

Commissioner Everett asked if the apartments would allow animals. They will. He asked if they will be size limited. Rackham was uncertain. Commissioner Everett asked for Rackham's thoughts on whether a dog park is a true community space or if it is limited in its use to dog owners. Rackham agreed that a dog park would be limiting as an amenity to those without dogs but argued that it would still be an open green space in the community. Similarly, there would be residents that don't visit an amphitheater.

Commissioner Everett asked if the other amenities are installed. The overlook park and the clubhouse are under construction, and the trails have been put in. Rackham explained that the original approval was equivalent in cost to the suggested list of amenities in code.

Commissioner Kunze asked for more clarification on the wind study. Rackham explained that the major result of the wind study was the amphitheater moving to its current location. Clyde Capital Group want to replace it as they feel a dog park would be a better amenity for the community. Commissioner Kunze asked if the dog park would be easier to build. Rackham said that they would be about the same.

Commissioner Roberts asked for the acreage of the dog park and the overlook park. Rackham estimated that the overlook park would be about 6000 square feet. He didn't have an estimate for the size of the dog park but stated that it would be larger than the amphitheater. Commissioner Roberts asked what went in where the amphitheater originally was. It is now the clubhouse for the apartments. Harris pulled up the overlook park plan and showed that it would be closer to 8000 square feet.

Commissioner Eyre felt like the placement was not ideal, and that it should be more centralized. Harris clarified that that is not what the Commission is discussing tonight, as the placement has already been approved. Rackham emphasized that Clyde has been working to make the community walkable as they construct the project.

Commissioner Eyre clarified that the frustration over the wind study is due to its use as a finding for the moving of the amphitheater without being present in full for the Commission to research. Commissioner Lockhart shared frustration over the incompleteness and inconsistency of the information presented to the Commission each of the three times the item has been considered.

Commissioner Everett asked what more the Commission would want to justify the change in amenity. He shared that his only concern is the limited use. It would be a great marketing angle for the developer, but it wouldn't benefit everyone. He also wasn't sure that the amphitheater would be a correct choice either. He seconded Commissioners Eyre and Lockhart's comments and frustrations.

Commissioner Eyre argued that the dog park will be a benefit to everyone in the community, as it will provide a designated place for dogs to be. He also shared that public green space is a benefit to the community.

Commissioners Roberts and Everett discussed the differences between the original recommended amenities and what was developed and approved. Commissioner Roberts said that he liked the idea of having a place for dogs to go that isn't a park for people. Commissioner Eyre mentioned that Shadow Ridge Park is near the development.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roberts moved to approve the proposed site plan with the findings that the proposed amenities are equivalent in value to what is required by code, and that the proposed amenities meet the intent and requirements of the TOD zone. He included all DRC comments.

Commissioner Everett asked that the finding that the amenity meets the requirements of the TOD zone be struck from the motion, as the amenity is intended for the HOA. Commissioner Roberts argued that non-HOA residents would likely still use the dog park but removed the finding.

Commissioner Eyre asked for the term site plan to be removed from the motion.

**Amended Motion:** Commissioner Roberts moved to approve the proposed revisions with the findings that the proposed amenities are equivalent in value to what is required by code. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, no. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Kunze, no. Commissioner Roberts, yes.

Motion passed with three in favor, two against.

### **3.2) Public hearing and consideration of Thanksgiving Park's request for conditional use approval of a 70-foot flagpole located at 3401 North Thanksgiving Way.**

Brittney Harris presented the item. Any flagpole over 30 feet requires conditional use approval. A 70-foot flagpole is being requested as it would fly as high as or higher than the surrounding buildings.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if there were any similarly sized flagpoles in the city. Harris said that Macey's has a flagpole that is around 100 feet tall. There is also a flagpole at the Tag-N-Go carwash that is 70 feet.

Commissioner Everett asked if lighting for the flagpole would be included. It would. Flag lights are exempt from other lighting requirements in code.

Mark Ostovo was present representing Thanksgiving Park. He explained that the majority of the building is 70 feet tall, with portions going above that. They would like the flag to be seen from the freeway. He explained that he is ordering a customary height of flagpole, and that they typically come in units of ten feet.

Kim Struthers clarified that the tallest flagpole can be in a nonresidential zone without approval is 50 feet.

Ostovo clarified that they plan on lighting the flag in accordance with flag code.

Commissioner Everett asked if there was a flag currently on the lot, and why it is being asked for now. Ostovo explained that there is no flag currently, and that a tenant recently renewed their lease with the requirement that a flag be installed. The business park also thinks that it is an overall good idea. Commissioner Everett asked if there was any discussion of putting the flag on top of the building. Ostovo explained that it is envisioned as a business park amenity, not something for just one building or client. Commissioner Everett asked if any flags other than the U.S. flag would be flown. They will not.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if there was a business reason for flying the flag. There is not, it is a passion project.

Commissioner Roberts requested that any lights shine away from the freeway. Ostovo explained that the light wouldn't be seen from the freeway, and there was only a chance of it being seen from the frontage road. There are specifically designed flag lights that point directly up that they plan on installing.

Commissioner Everett opened and closed public comment.

**Motion:** Commissioner Eyre moved to approve the request for conditional use with the findings that the proposed use at the proposed location will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity, 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, and 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 in such a manner that it will not be detrimental to adjoining properties in the area. There is precedence for this throughout the city. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Kunze seconded.

**Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

### **3.3) Public hearing and recommendation of Lehi City's request for review of a Development Code Amendment to Chapter 4, adding an exhibit for General Plan, Zoning and Development Code Amendments.**

Brittney Harris presented the item. This would codify that applicants are allowed to submit an exhibit for general plan amendment to clarify what they want the amendments for. Exhibits are different than concept plans, as they would not receive feedback from the city in the way a concept plan would.

Commissioner Everett recommended modifying the language to clarify that exhibits can be provided at any point, rather than just after amendments were requested.

Commissioner Lockhart asked if this removes the requirements for the concept plan. Harris explained that concept plans aren't required for a General Plan amendment or zone change. Concept plans would still be required at a later date for any development to happen.

Commissioner Everett said that he doesn't see the necessity of the amendment, as applicants could already bring in exhibits. He thinks that leaving it out makes the code more concise and clearer. Commissioner Lockhart shared worries that putting this in code will signal to some developers that the city prefers exhibits over concept plans.

Commissioner Everett opened public comment.

Candice Clark lives off of Pioneer Crossing. She shared that she may be under the wrong assumption as to what the amendment is meant to do. She asked the Commission to be mindful of what is allowed to be developed in the city.

Chase Clark expressed his gratitude to live in Lehi and thanked the Commission and city staff.

Commissioner Everett closed public comment.

Commissioner Everett shared his stance of not wanting to create unnecessary code. He worries that exhibits will be used as a bait-and-switch by applicants. He advised the Commission that if the code passes, they should see exhibits as something that is a possibility, not a certainty. He recommended that staff simply let people who apply for the applicable changes know that they are allowed to bring in exhibits. Commissioner Lockhart suggested putting it in the application documents rather than the city code. Kim Struthers explained that the goal of the code is to make a definitive statement that exhibits are allowed.

Nate Purser explained that the way city code is written currently, the Commission wouldn't be able to consider exhibits if they were brought in. The added code would allow them to be considered. Commissioner Lockhart shared that she likes the ideas of having more examples for the public to see during discussions. Commissioner Everett asked if this could be exploited later on when site plans were brought in.

Commissioner Eyre expressed confusion over whether concept plans were binding documents or not.

Commissioner Lockhart suggested striking the last line to distinguish between exhibits and concept plans.

Commissioner Eyre clarified that the code only confirms that applicants can bring in exhibits. The only things that will be voted on for the applicable amendments would be land uses.

Brittney Harris explained that part of the problem is that due to State legislation, the Planning Commission is now the end stage for concept plans. Applicants would be allowed to use an exhibit in future meetings, rather than having them finish at Planning Commission.

Commissioner Eyre asked staff if they were worried that exhibits would come forward primarily for controversial items. He sees it as potentially problematic. Commissioner Lockhart worried that exhibits would be confusing for the Commission, the Council, and for the public. Brittney Harris explained that development agreements could be utilized by the City Council to make things in exhibits enforceable. The Commission still expressed worries over potentially getting the rug pulled out from under the city.

The Commission and staff discussed different examples of development agreements being paired with General Plan amendments.

Kim Struthers recommended another option of codifying that the Commission will only look at land use rather than considering other aspects and concurrent applications. General Plan amendments and concept plans can be submitted concurrently.

Commissioner Eyre and Lockhart both expressed concern over residents being misled by exhibits that never come to pass.

Lorin Powell explained that exhibits would be another aspect to deal with for engineering. They would feel obligated to make comments on them in DRC. Commissioner Eyre worried that exhibits would be brought into meetings the night of and wouldn't have a chance to be reviewed in DRC.

Commissioner Eyre asked if the code was unfairly in favor of big developers, as they would have more resources to dedicate to exhibits. Commissioner Lockhart questioned if the code was changing anything.

Lorin Powell mentioned that the code would mix density issues with commercial issues.

Commissioner Everett said that he could see the use of an exhibit, and if they were currently prohibited, then the code language should be cleared up to allow people to bring them. However, if there is nothing in code preventing exhibits from being brought in, then it's best to leave it out of code.

Commissioner Kunze asked if questions about exhibits are asked frequently enough to be a problem. Commissioner Roberts supported the idea of putting it only on the application papers. Brittney Harris explained that as far as she is aware, everything on application paperwork has to tie back to code. Kim Struthers confirmed this and mentioned that staff has gotten in trouble before for having information in paperwork that didn't connect back to code.

Commissioner Eyre shared that he thinks the clarification the amendment provides clouds the actual issue of land use. Commissioner Lockhart argued that the most transparency comes from pairing General Plan amendments with concept plans.

Commissioner Everett asked for advice from legal. Nate Purser explained that the core of the issue is whether the Commission wants to consider an exhibit as a factor or not. He assured the commission that factors can be weighted differently in considerations.

Commissioner Kunze echoed the feelings of Commissioner Eyre that the code is in favor of wealthier applicants.

**Motion:** Commissioner Lockhart moved to table the item to allow the applicant to pursue language that would maximize transparency of intent for the residents, Commission, and Council to consider, while also streamlining the process in such a way that the applicant's entitlements to the final outcome of the development of their property is clear at time of hearing. Commissioner Kunze seconded.

**Vote:** Commissioner Everett, no. Commissioner Lockhart, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes.

Motion passed four in favor, one against.

#### **4. City Business**

The Downtown Revitalization Plan and Station Area Plan has gone out for public input on engage Lehi, and the public hearing will be posted for the next meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Changes have been made since the last time it was presented.

City Staff is starting to update design standards at the behest of City Council. It will be going up for public feedback soon. Commercial zones will be consolidated to some degree.

Commissioner Everett thanked the public for coming to the meeting.

#### **5. Adjournment**

With no further business to come before the Planning Commission at this time, Commissioner Eyre moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Kunze seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Approved: November 13, 2025

Attest:

---

Gregory Jackson, Commission Chair

---

Kate Morgan, Deputy City Recorder