



Planning Commission Work Session

MINUTES JANUARY 17, 2012 6:03 PM-9:02 PM LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM

<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Chairman Gregory Day
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Judy Merrill
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Kenneth Hellewell, Tyler Bodrero, Dale Rackham, Gary Pratt, T.J. Jensen, Braxton Schenk, Curt McCuistion, Michael Eggett, Kent Andersen, and Robert Whiteley

Gregory explained that Kenneth requested a change in the order of agenda items, which he approved, and that commissioners would be discussing agenda items 1, then 4, 3, and 2. Before commissioners were able to begin, Kevin Porter, with Visual Advertising, requested to speak regarding agenda item 2 so that he could leave early. Everyone consented. He then distributed photographs of his company’s bench in front of the Jiffy Lube business. He explained that UDOT required him to remove his bench during the widening of Antelope Drive. After its completion, he returned the bench but accidentally placed it at the wrong bus stop. Instead of relocating it, he added a second bench to the correct bus stop and planned to acquire approval for the Jiffy Lube location. Due to his oversight, he neglected to pursue the permit until after Jiffy Lube submitted application for a monument sign. Judy contacted him to explain that the Ordinance considered these benches as on-premise detached signs and that lots could not have more than one detached sign per frontage. Because he could not keep his bench sign on Jiffy Lube’s property, he began working with UTA to relocate their bus stop farther west in order to retain that second bench on Antelope Drive. During one of his site visits, he realized that moving the bench westward would make it too close to the Shadow Point entryway sign, since it could not be closer than 100 feet from any other sign. UTA supported these signs at their bus stops for the convenience they provided their patrons, so Mr. Porter requested consideration of a waiver from the Ordinance requirements for these types of benches.

TJ asked if Mr. Porter talked with both Jiffy Lube and Shadow Point land owners about this bench sign. Mr. Porter told him he did, and they were all amenable to the bench staying at its current location. Braxton did not feel bench signs should have the same regulations as other signage.

**ITEM 1: TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE PRESENTATION ON TRAILS**

TJ explained that commissioners organized the Transportation Committee about a year ago to look at various aspects of transportation in the City. With the West-Davis Corridor coming through, the City Administration asked them to wait. The Committee continued their mandate by focusing on trails. In 2001/2003, the City had a committee working on trails but never adopted their plan. The current Committee picked up where the previous one left off. He referred to the first part, which was the text document, and the second part, which were maps. The first map identified existing trails, which encompassed 7 miles throughout the City. The second map showed the Committee’s proposed trails. They wanted designated bike trails at least every half mile throughout the City. Major corridors should have shared-use trails and subdivisions should have shared lanes. He hoped the State would continue its bike lane along Antelope Drive westward to the County’s guard shack and continue its bike lane on 2000 West as well. With a potential interchange, the Committee hoped UDOT would add sections of bike lanes for access and create a major bike corridor going north and south as well as east and west. The map included unclassified trails. The Committee wanted to designate all of them as Class 1 shared-use trails. That way, if a road developed there later, they could downgrade the trail to make it a Class 3 shared lane.

- Class 1 would be for shared use. The Emigrant trail was a good example.
- Class 2 would be dedicated bike lanes.
- Class 3 would be shared lanes that involved the installation of signage along existing roads identifying them as bike routes. The signage would increase safety and allow the City to direct traffic into the proper roads.
- Class 4 would be dedicated equestrian trails, or the Great Salt Lake Shoreline Trail, which would tie into some of the other planned trails by Davis County. This route would allow riders to get from the bird refuge to the County’s guard shack.

Curt reviewed the Committee’s goals and definitions, and he then recommended that everyone go over the text and email him their comments. TJ hoped to give developers incentives for helping the City add trails. Dale asked them to add the classifications into the definitions.

Gregory asked if everyone wanted a public hearing on February 7, 2012, regarding this matter, and everyone agreed. Once City Council adopted their recommendations, they would speak to the Committee and perhaps suspend it.

**ITEM 4: DISCUSSION OF RESIDENTIAL ZONING REGULATIONS**

Mike referred to The Ninigret Group’s tour in Salt Lake earlier that month, which included a discussion of residential zoning plans. Afterwards, the Mayor and City Manager directed staff to study high residential uses next to major corridors. He asked commissioners to consider and evaluate what they thought might be appropriate residential uses for these corridors. He and Kent would try and identify other transportation

corridors and bring commissioners examples.

TJ expressed concerns for the way the C-2 ordinance was written regarding the calculation of density for its residential component. He asked for a review of the 9.1 density as soon as possible so that the City Council could vote on it in three weeks. Then, commissioners could get the next residential zoning density discussed and recommended. Kenneth preferred striking the C-2 zone completely, since there was no benefit to the City from C-2 that the GC zone did not now have. Gary agreed. Gregory did not think it wise to create orphan zones, such as R-4 and now possibly C-2. He reminded commissioners that they had to bring back the cluster option in the R-1 zone and preferred examining the C-2 zone very carefully before removing it. Kenneth preferred listening to the residents and not allowing rentals in Syracuse. Gary agreed. Gregory believed that no one came out in favor of apartments but did not believe that meant they were against them and was the overwhelming point of view. Kent asked if a 12-unit density, similar to Stoker Gardens, would be acceptable, since a major transportation corridor would be an area much harder for a land owner to sell as a single-family residential lot. Tyler believed there was an ability to do it right, just like Stoker Gardens, and they just needed to come up with the right controls. TJ expressed an openness to change. Mike offered to look at other cities with major transportation corridors and bring back ideas of how they planned around them. Gary and Kenneth did not want to allow any densities higher than the PRD zone. Dale recalled his experience in trying to find an apartment local when he built his home in Syracuse. He believed that apartments served a purpose and were a benefit to the City and expressed an inclination to consider higher density. Curt agreed, stating that high density should have a place somewhere in the City. Once Syracuse had major intersections develop, the City should consider high density around them. Braxton favored mostly PRD zones to higher-density zones but believed projects could be done correctly and was willing to consider higher density. TJ expressed a need for language quickly, although he did not want to rush it. He thought PRD was a good limit and preferred to remove C-2. He called for a moratorium on rezones to C-2 until they could find something better. The 200 South area needed buffering for existing residents, such as a park or PRD, and did not want to allow densities higher than 12-units per net acre. Tyler admonished commissioners to wait until they knew their options and considered them.

Gregory stated that residents' concerns were valid, and the Commission needed to maintain 100% transparency 100% of the time on this matter. Everyone was in favor of Gregory recommending a moratorium to City Council regarding the C-2 zone, and staff agreed to place an item on the February 7 agenda to consider removing the C-2 zone.

### ITEM 3: DISCUSSIONS OF PROPOSED LAND USE ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

#### Conditional Uses:

Mike pointed out that the Ordinance, Section 10-6-100, had no real definition or explanation of the purpose for conditional uses or how they should be applied in any zone application. This concerned him as commissioners discussed the business park and light industrial zones, since there were no standards for trying conditional uses in those zones either. This was a very large legal gap he believed they needed to fill, so he recommended adopting language provided in 2007 by the ULC&T, which they claimed every city needed to have in their land use ordinances to be legally protected. Mike suggested relocating conditional uses to its own chapter. Gregory directed staff to place this proposed language on the next Commission agenda for public hearing.

#### Light Industrial and Business Park Zone Regulations:

Kenneth suggested taking Ninigret's recommendations for permitted uses in the Business Park zone and placing them in a Light Industrial zone instead, because the uses were more applicable to such a zone. TJ suggested creating a Flex Park zone. Braxton liked that idea and then voiced concern for the Overlay zone proposed with the Business Park zone. Kenneth explained that the 200 South Committee did not want that entire area put into one zone, which was why they created the Overlay zone. Mike suggested changing the proposed Light Industrial zone to the proposed Flex zone. TJ pointed out that a Flex zone would allow them to restrict a tire store next to residential uses whereas a Light Industrial zone could not do that.

Kenneth left at 8:07 p.m.

Gregory directed staff to work on a new Flex Park zone as well as the Business Park and Light Industrial zones. Dale voiced his worries for too much overlapping among the three zones. Braxton preferred doing away with an Overlay zone. Dale asked if there was anything defining the overlay zone and expressed concern that it could be arbitrary and capricious.

Gregory convened a recess at 8:12 p.m.

Gregory reconvened the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

### ITEM 2. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS FOR SIGN REGULATIONS

Kent referred to the applicable ordinances from four different cities regarding off-premise signs. Braxton pointed out that most cities considered only billboards as off-premise signs. After a lengthy discussion, commissioners decided to move on to temporary commercial identification signs. Braxton said that most other cities would not issue Certificates of Occupancy to businesses without applications submitted for their signage. TJ believed there was a benefit for allowing these types of signs in this economy. Dale agreed but

preferred to limit them to 3 months. Everyone agreed to compromise and changed it to 4 months for businesses to install their signage.

For bench signs, everyone decided they only needed 40 feet from any other detached signs. For monument signs, everyone agreed to reduce the setback to 15 feet from adjacent shared private property lines.