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

Minutes of the Regular Session of the Planning Commission Meeting held Thursday, December 4, 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
Ken Roberts, Commission Alternate

Members Absent: Emily Lockhart, Commissioner
Beau Jones, Commission Alternate

Others Present: Kim Struthers, Community Development Director; Brittney Harris, Planner; Gary Ellis, City Engineer; Craig Chambers, 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. Review and acceptance of the Planning Commission meeting schedule for 2026

> **Motion:** Commissioner Kunze moved to approve 2026 schedule as presented. Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion.
>
> **Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.
>
> Motion passed unanimously.

3. Consent Agenda

3.1) Approval of minutes from the October 23, 2025 meeting.

3.2) Approval of minutes from the November 13, 2025 meeting.

Commissioner Everett noted a correction that needed to be made to the November 13th minutes in which the vote was misrecorded, listing Commissioner Roberts as voting on an issue rather than Commissioner Everett.

Motion: Commissioner Everett moved to approve the minutes with the clarifying addition. Commissioner Eyre seconded.

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

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Regular Agenda

4.1) Public Hearing and consideration of Boyd Stewart Plat A, a Plat Amendment of the Steward Subdivision located at 406 West 600 North.

Brittney Harris presented the item. Lot 2 is narrower than what would currently be allowed, but it has been grandfathered into code. The plot line is being adjusted so that the home on lot 1 is only on one lot and so lot 2 can be buildable.

The applicant, Boyd Stewart, was present but had no additional comment.

Commissioner Jackson opened public comment.

James Hall is a neighbor of Stewart. He heard that the back fence was being moved and wanted to know if that was true. Moving the back fence will not be required from the city, and there is nothing in the plans that indicate it.

Kent Grover owns property to the east. He asked why the lot line jogs into lot 2 and reduces the front yard. He has heard that the plan is to keep the property in good shape. He worries that the lot division will restrict the number of people willing to purchase the property. He also has concerns about a home business in the area that is storing salvage and excess in the front yard and has become a “junkyard” as well as certain properties that have too many cars parked in front of them.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Commissioner Jackson urged Grover to bring the home business and overparked areas to the attention of city code enforcers if they are a persistent nuisance.

Kim Struthers explained that the jog in the property line is due to an addition built onto the home and is needed to meet frontage requirements. A home can be built on lot 2 as long as it was set further back on the property or designed to have a narrower footprint to meet the side yard setbacks.

Motion: Commissioner Roberts moved to approve the item with the findings that it meets all requirements of the development code. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Everett seconded.

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

Motion passed unanimously.

4.2) Public hearing and consideration of the Final Spur Ranch concept plan, a 14-lot residential development located at 2424 West 900 North.

Brittney Harris presented the item and explained that the concept plan was submitted for feedback from the Commission on the layout and lot sizes. The lot is currently zoned TH-5, so rezoning would need to occur before any construction can take place. Based on the submitted lot sizes, the zone that best matches is RA-1, which does not match the general plan. The design was based on the surrounding properties in Colledge Farms, which is a PRD.

Commissioner Kunze asked if there were any plans for an adjacent TH-5 zoned area. There have been no plans or proposals submitted for the plot.

Commissioner Eyre asked why a stub road wouldn't be required into the development. A home has been built where the road would stub in, making it impossible to include in the development. The general plan has the area designated at 1/2 acre lots, while the concept plan has lots closer to 1/3 acre.

Jaren Davis was present, representing the Bishop family who own the land. He shared the history of the property. He also explained the difficulty in developing a 12-lot development as opposed to the 14-lot plan submitted. They feel that a 12-lot plan makes the lots too wide and therefore less desirable to customers. The Bishops have no interest in developing more than 14 lots. They plan on widening the roads by two feet. The primary purpose of bringing this before Planning Commission is to work with the city to make a development that everyone likes.

Commissioner Everett asked what wasn't functional about the 12-lot plan. Davis explained that they want the lot sizes to match those of the surrounding area. Commissioner Everett clarified that the surrounding development included 10% open space, which this plan doesn't include. Davis explained that planned open spaces ended up in a poor location near the top of the lot. He argued that the residents in these new lots would be able to participate in the existing open spaces in the area, while maintaining consistent lot size which is more appealing to the market space. Davis clarified that the applicants would be willing to develop under a development agreement if needed. The plan is presented as it exists, but they welcome suggestions and changes from the Commission.

Commissioner Jackson opened public comment.

Bob Dale Clement lives to the east of the plot. He owns and trains livestock on his property. He would like a 6-foot fence put in on the North side of the development to keep children away from his animals. He thinks the lack of green space is acceptable with the limited amount of space the applicants have to work with.

Terry Bishop, one of the applicants, explained that five or six of the lots conform to the general plan's designated lot size. The lots on the southwest corner of the property doesn't have many alternatives other than being sold as a 0.9 acre lot, due to the roads that currently exist. The

Bishop family was originally intending to develop the stub road through, but the built home changed those factors. He is happy to install the fence requested by Mr. Clement.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Commissioner Eyre shared his view that the increase in units isn't an unreasonable ask, unless animal regulations are taken into consideration. Larger animals would be allowed on the general-plan's designated 1/2 acre lots, but not on the lots presented in the concept plan. He thinks that this concept plan is reductive to the heritage of the land in that way.

Commissioner Kunze asked if an eight-foot fence could be requested. Clement stated that he only wanted a six-foot fence.

Commissioner Everett shared that he doesn't think the argument that wider lots aren't functional in the economy holds water. He would prefer a 12-lot subdivision.

Commissioner Roberts asked about the buildings on the southwest corner of the property. They will be removed.

Commissioner Jackson reopened public comment.

Bob Dale Clement returned to the stand. He explained that the planned eastbound road went through the garage on his property in the General Plan. It wasn't in the General Plan when he built his house.

Terry Bishop returned to the stand to emphasize that none of the development around them was in the General Plan when they purchased the property. He stated that all the homes in the area are large, and that he hasn't seen a single large animal in the subdivision. There are currently three horses and six cows on the property. As far as he can tell there is no other interest in having large animals in the development.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Commissioner Kunze feels that the Bishops shouldn't be punished for being the last to sell in the area.

Commissioner Jackson discussed the change Lehi has gone through over time. He said that the General Plan comes up for debate every ten years, if not more frequently. He doesn't see any arguments compelling enough to justify what the applicant is asking for.

Commissioner Roberts thought that the lots created should match the existing surrounding lots and was in support of the 1/3 acre lots.

Commissioner Everett argued that the justification for the smaller lots seem to be based off of marketability, which doesn't meet his bar for amending the General Plan.

Davis explained that the design is already dealing with an off-center road coming in, which is causing hardship. He reemphasized that lots wider than they are deep aren't popular in the market.

> **Motion:** Commissioner Eyre moved to deny the concept plan with the findings that the proposed concept is not consistent with the Lehi City development code and that the proposed concept does not conform to the goals and policies of the General Plan. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Everett seconded.
>
> **Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, no.
>
> Motion passed four in favor, one against.

4.3) Public hearing and consideration of Richard Thurman's request for preliminary subdivision approval of Epiphany Point, a 3-lot residential development located at 913 and 939 East Cedar Hollow Road.

Brittney Harris presented the item. Previously this property has come before Planning Commission as a conditional use flag lot in the fall of 2024. All three planned lots meet code requirements.

Richard Thurman, the applicant, was present online. His only concern was the possibility of ending up with a 40-foot driveway. He plans to move it to the west to adjust this. He will also be rewiring the 100 year old farmhouse on the property from the new easement.

Kim Struthers explained that the frontage on lot 1 must be maintained, which is what is pushing the driveway so close to the home on lot 3.

Thurman thanked city staff for their help.

Commissioner Jackson opened and closed public comment.

> **Motion:** Commissioner Eyre moved to approve the item with the findings that the proposed subdivision does meet the frontage and size requirements of the R-1-Flex zone and the previously proposed flag lot. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Everett seconded.
>
> **Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.
>
> Motion passed unanimously.

4.4) Public Hearing and recommendation of Stack's request for review of the Thanksgiving Station Development Agreement, located on approximately 26 acres in the Thanksgiving Point area.

Brittney Harris presented the development agreement. It is one of the required elements to get HTRZ funding. Staff has some unaddressed concerns, and the agreement gets into some deep legalese.

Mark Murdock was present, representing the applicant and Gardener Group, along with his associates Ryan Thomas and Dave. This development agreement has been in the works for about 18 months.

Commissioner Everett noted that there was no definition for HTRZ, despite the document saying it would be defined in definitions. Thomas agreed to add the definition in and clean up the text. Commissioner Everett then asked if the city would be developing Clubhouse Drive. Thanksgiving Point has been asked to assist in the city's Clubhouse Drive project. Commissioner Everett asked why there was a ten year timeframe on the agreement, when it would be better for the city to shrink the window. Thomas was under the impression that it was a five year window and is happy to take a recommendation to change that. They want to start the project as soon as possible and are waiting on the development agreement to begin any construction.

Thomas shared a presentation on the project. It has been in the work for seven years, and almost seven million dollars have been invested in water rights purchases and pursuit costs.

Commissioner Jackson opened public comment.

Willy Merith lives in Pointe Meadows. He is excited to see things moving. He wants to commend the city on the work done so far and is excited to see how it moves forward. He supports the project.

Rachel Freeman is speaking for her sister who lives in the area. She said that many residents are opposed to Clubhouse Drive, as there was a MAG meeting that received a lot of negative feedback from the public. There are concerns over transferring the taxing authority to an unelected body. There are also worries over vague wording and property taxes not going towards schools that would have an influx of new students.

Kenneth Glade came to the stand to share concerns over confusing legal language.

Jean Rivera moved to Lehi in 2018 from Provo because she didn't like the amount of development happening. She has concerns over property taxes being raised by the new school board. She wants to ensure that everyone understands the project before it is approved.

Cody Black is against the project. He shared worries about the legalese of the document as well.

Bradley Andersen moved to Lehi from Salt Lake City. He doesn't like the growth that has happened in the last few years. He has concerns over water usage as well.

Jean Rivera returned to the stand to read a comment from Laura Stevens. She argues that it is confusing to residents, and that there are a lot of financial concerns.

James Harrison had concerns about the taxing authority. He also has concerns over the city asking Stack to promote Clubhouse Drive. He would like to see more research on the impact of development on water. He thinks that the school board should be looped in, and analysis done on whether it can hold extra students.

Harris shared the two online comments.

LaRell Stephens is against the financial and tax authority aspects of the plan. He worries about the PID taking authority away from the city.

Steve Stringham has concerns over the financial and tax authority aspects of the plan.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Thomas returned to the stand and explained that there have been several meetings and previous approvals that indicate that the project is supported. He also argued that the increased density would counteract the taxing authority shift. After the designated 25 year period, the tax authority will shift back to the city. The 50 year window is based on the phases of the transit plan. The roads created will be private and not the city's responsibility to maintain. Murdock further explained that the project will only be reimbursed for the taxes they pay. After the 25 year period, the taxing money will go to the county which will pay the city. The development agreement lasts for 50 years, and each piece of development will have its own 25 year timeline for the tax authority. The project is limited to the 50 year window for financial reimbursement for construction projects.

Commissioner Jackson asked about the 80% of taxes that will be reimbursed to the developer. That money will go into infrastructure and parking structures. The market wouldn't normally support these projects, so the financial agreement allows them to be frontloaded and developed ahead of the need. Stack will be installing utilities. The remaining 20% of taxes that will go to the city would be approximately equivalent to what a normally developed area would provide.

Commissioner Jackson asked what would happen in the worst case scenario. The money to complete the project would come from bonds purchased by investment banks specifically for that purpose. A certain percent of the bonds will be put aside as a rainy day fund. Thomas also explained that Lehi City can lever up property taxes to cover costs if it's necessary. There are seven layers of financial protection. Thomas offered to spend as much time as needed with residents explaining the project.

Craig Chambers clarified that PIDs are in Utah Code and are legally allowed.

Thomas explained that bonds would be issued by project. They would each be in the 3-5 million range.

Commissioner Jackson asked what the city's obligations would be. The developer is only asking for due process on site plans, and help making sure the project and process is predictable. The roadways will be private and will be plowed and paved by the developer. Lehi City will still take care of police and fire needs of the area.

Commissioner Eyre asked how the project reconciled with existing school systems. Thomas explained that the school district was present at the HTRZ meetings and has shared that they feel they will be able to absorb the student body created by the project. Commissioner Eyre asked for specific figures from the examples presented. Thomas explained that at least ten of this type of project have been approved and more are being added. The 80/20 tax split is due to Utah State Code. HRTZ is a city application.

Commissioner Jackson asked city staff about Clubhouse Drive. It is needed for the ultimate buildout of the Thanksgiving Point Area Plan. It is one of the last needed roadways based on the transportation study. Clubhouse Drive isn't planned to be completed until after 2031, but it is still an expected and needed road for when the city reaches full build out.

Commissioner Jackson asked for the math from the school district that explained how the population would be absorbed. Thomas didn't have that information available, as the school district is a completely separate entity. He emphasized that they had been present at all previous meetings and had no concerns.

Commissioner Jackson asked about the water for the project. Thomas argued that ultra-high-density housing is the most efficient and waterwise development, as there are small or minimal yards. Outside studies have been done, and water rights have already been purchased.

Commissioner Jackson asked about traffic's lack of comment. Kim Struthers explained that all the needed infrastructure has already been decided and addressed in previous DRC meetings and are contained in the area plan. The development is not being reassessed. The "no comment" is specifically for this development agreement. Harris added that this is the second version presented, so comments have been addressed since then.

Craig Chambers explained Utah legislation regarding development agreements.

Commissioner Eyre asked about the staff's concerns. Harris explained that most concerns have been addressed in DRC. The language concerns focus around accidentally binding the city's hands or tying the city to a project for longer than they want to be. Craig Chambers explained that there is a fair amount of legal language in the agreement and that he is doing his best to make it accessible to city officials.

Commissioner Jackson asked if there was anything left unclear in the development agreement. Chambers explained that it is clear by now, and that red flags have been addressed as they are found.

Commissioner Roberts shared that he is uncomfortable about the clauses requiring Stack to support Clubhouse Drive. He asked if HOAs would be a part of the development. They will be. Commissioner Roberts asked that the taxing authority transfer be gone over again. Thomas explained that the tax authority transfer only affects the projects being constructed. Taxes will be paid to the county, who will then give 80% back to the RDA, which will funnel the money into the PID, which will pay off the bonds. This is being done to "supercharge" the site. The method is similar to that of a non-profit business.

Commissioner Kunze asked if this project would help Lehi achieve its attainable housing mandate from the state. Harris explained that this helps with the goal to create an HTRZ zone around a station. Commissioner Kunze clarified that all the previous meetings are available for the public to peruse on the Lehi City website. She also mentioned that they were covered by the Lehi Free

Press. She encouraged everyone present to look into them if they have questions. She emphasized that this is a project that has been seen before and has been discussed before at length. She also mentioned that the station does exist, so this is likely the best use of the land around a station the city will get for a while. She asked what would happen if the project wasn't proposed. The developers would still be allowed to develop, but it would be on a much smaller scale, and it wouldn't assist with the State mandates. Commissioner Kunze noted that people will be moving into Lehi whether the city prepares for it or not and having a place to put them right next to a transit station would be in the city's best interest.

Commissioner Jackson added that the math presented by the developer makes sense to him and went over another example for the benefit of those gathered. He emphasized that the supercharging of the infrastructure is appealing to him as it would allow the city to get ahead of demand instead of lagging behind.

Commissioner Everett shared his concern that this item should have been presented in a work session rather than a regular session. Commissioner Jackson argued that the public will be able to continue sharing their thoughts and opinions when the project goes on to the City Council. Commissioner Everett explained that he is in favor of the agreement but feels uncomfortable with the timing of it.

The commission discussed the possibility of a neutral recommendation.

> **Motion:** Commissioner Everett moved to give a neutral recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the findings that, as a body, the Planning Commission feels as though they were not given a lot of time to review this agreement, but that this was held at the requirement of State Code to come before the Planning Commission as a public comment opportunity, and with the recommendation that there be changes to the text including the removal of clauses that require the support of Clubhouse Drive, and with the change of the duration of the project to five years from ten years, with the findings that a development agreement is between a developer and the city council and it is not required of the Planning Commission to approve or disapprove, noting discontent at State requirements for Planning Commission to weigh in on what is a City Council issue. The Commission has fulfilled its obligation by having a hearing, and thus State code is met.

Commissioner Jackson asked that the motion be started again for clarity's sake.

> **Amended Motion:** Commissioner Everett moved to give a neutral recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the recommendation that the aspects of the text pointed out by Commissioners Roberts and Everett be addressed, with the finding that this hearing tonight meets the requirements of State Code, and that the final decision is up to the City Council. He included all public and DRC comments.

Craig Chambers explained that Lehi City Code only allows for positive or negative recommendations. He explained that the language of the neutral recommendation would be given to the council, but that legally, it would be counted as a negative recommendation.

Amended Motion: Commissioner Everett moved to give a neutral recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the recommendation that the aspects of the text pointed out by Commissioners Roberts and Everett be addressed, with the finding that this hearing tonight meets the requirements of State Code, and that the final decision is up to the City Council. He included all public and DRC comments. Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion.

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

Motion failed with one in favor, four against.

Craig Chambers explained that a second motion could be put forth, but that if no new motion is put forward it will go as a negative recommendation.

Motion: Commissioner Everett moved to give a negative recommendation to the City Council with the findings that based on public comment received, there is overwhelming concern over the timing and opportunity to get questions answered from the public that are being affected by the decision, while knowing that this will not halt or stop the developer from being able to move forward with an approved project. He recommends that aspects of the text pointed out by Commissioners Roberts and Everett be addressed. He included all DRC comments and all public comment with an emphasis on questions of understanding the TIF/PID structure and recommends giving the public an opportunity to have those questions answered.

Motion failed due to lack of a second.

Motion: Commissioner Jackson moved to give a positive recommendation to the Lehi City Council, including all DRC comments, with the recommendation that the city clarify why the city is requiring the developer to support Clubhouse Drive, as well as addressing the city's requirement to support projects similar to these for the benefit of the city, to shorten the window from ten years to five years, and to reevaluate recital C. Commissioner Kunze seconded.

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

Motion passed three in favor, two against.

4.5) Public hearing and consideration of Stack's request for review of the Stack Soccer Field Property Development Agreement, located on 3.64 acres at 3197 North Ashton Boulevard.

Motion: Commissioner Eyre moved to take a five minute recess. Commissioner Roberts seconded.

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

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:06 P.M.

Meeting reconvened at 10:12 P.M.

Brittney Harris presented the item. It is a similar item to the last. It is within the same HTRZ but has different owners.

Ryan Thomas, the applicant was present. This agreement is based entirely after the last one, with the exception of there being no language relating to Clubhouse Drive.

Commissioner Roberts asked about the ten year period being shifted to a five year period. The applicants are happy to make the same changes suggested in the last item.

Commissioner Jackson opened public comment.

Kenneth Glade came to the stand. He is against the item. He made some disparaging remarks about the applicants. He accused the Planning Commission of running the meeting in an erroneous and inappropriate way. He called the Planning Commission and their actions "disgusting." He demanded the item be tabled.

Rachel Freeman acknowledged that the area will be developed whether this item is approved or not. She worries that the growth of the student body wasn't taken into consideration. She feels as though the agenda was planned strategically and wanted that to be noted.

Willy Merith is in support of the project. He lives in the area and likes the idea of new density around the train station.

Commissioner Jackson closed public comment.

Commissioner Jackson explained that the Commission operates based on *Robert's Rules of Order*, which provide specific times at which public comment is allowed.

Commissioner Roberts asked why the following City Council meeting was moved back. Kim Struthers explained that the new City Hall building was initially anticipated to be finished in October. Mayor Johnson wants to hold his final meeting in the new chambers, so City Council was postponed to increase the chances of that happening. Commissioner Eyre asked why the Planning Commission meeting was moved to the 4th rather than being held on the 11th as was planned at the beginning of the year. Harris explained that item 4.6 has a hard deadline of the end of 2025 set by the state, which was a consideration in shifting the dates.

Motion: Commissioner Eyre moved to extend the meeting until all items had been heard and voted on. Commissioner Kunze seconded.

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

Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Roberts doesn't agree that the development agreement accomplishes everything it claims to accomplish, but he noted that the clarifying motion helped with the last item.

Motion: Commissioner Eyre moved to give a negative recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the findings that the item was brought up last minute without the time needed to digest and understand the implications of what is being voted on. He included all DRC comments, as well as the previous recommended changes regarding the window of time shrinking from ten years to five years, and to evaluate recital C, should the City Council choose to pursue this Development Agreement. Commissioner Everett seconded.

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

Motion fails with two in favor, three against.

Kim Struthers clarified that the change in meeting dates was noticed on November 10.

Craig Chambers explained that the Commission is not required to take another vote, but that a failed motion would progress to the City Council as a negative recommendation.

Motion: Commissioner Kunze moved to give a positive recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the findings that that the item was brought up last minute without the time needed to digest and understand the implications of what is being voted on. She included all DRC comments, as well as the previous recommended changes regarding the window shrinking from ten years to five years, and to evaluate recital C, should the City Council choose to pursue this Development Agreement. Commissioner Everett seconded.

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

Motion passes with three in favor, two against.

4.6) Public hearing and recommendation of Lehi City's request for review of the Water Use and Preservation Element of the General Plan.

Brittney Harris presented the item. This is now required to be an element of the General Plan based on state legislation from the 2022-2023 session. The deadline for implementing it is at the end of the year. The section contains data on tracked water usage and drinking water connections. It also contains projections of water use that are above the city's reliable water supply. Existing waterwise design standards have been integrated into the chapter, and sections have been added that offer insights on potential ways to make the city more water efficient.

Commissioner Roberts asked who created the numbers and recommendations. Harris explained that the study was conducted by the Public Works department in conjunction with a hired consultant. It was a local endeavor and was tailored to Lehi and the surrounding area. Struthers clarified that Hansen Allen Luce did the study, who is one of the top water organizations in the state.

Commissioner Eyre asked if the city had any data for heavy winters, and if more water was used when more snowpack was available. The city did not gather that data.

Commissioner Jackson opened and closed public comment.

> **Motion:** Commissioner Everett moved to give a positive recommendation to the Lehi City Council with the findings that it is compliant with state code requirements, that it seeks to increase the long-term sustainability of water in Lehi by measuring use and proposing goals to reduce water usage, that the proposed amendment is not detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of Lehi City. He included all DRC comments. Commissioner Kunze seconded.
>
> **Vote:** Commissioner Everett, yes. Commissioner Roberts, yes. Commissioner Eyre, yes. Commissioner Jackson, yes. Commissioner Kunze, yes.
>
> Motion passed unanimously.

5. City Business

There will be a joint dinner with the Lehi City Council on the 16th.

This was Commissioner Everett's final meeting on the Planning Commission. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity to serve his community and was presented with Lehi's history books as a thank you from the city.

6. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Planning Commission at this time, Commissioner Everett moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Eyre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:52 p.m.

Approved: January 22, 2026 Attest:

____________________________________ ______________________________________

Gregory Jackson, Commission Chair Kate Morgan, Deputy City Recorder