



Planning Commission Work Session

MINUTES

MARCH 6, 2012

6:14 PM-8:35 PM

LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM

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

**ITEM 1: SIGN REGULATIONS**

Braxton referred to the proposed change for off-premise signs to allow up to 32 square feet if the business had allowable square footage remaining for signage, owned the sign, and maintained it.

After some discussion, commissioners decided to move the section on sign clearance, under general limitations, to the projecting signs section under structural types and to change the allowable 18 inches of projection to just 12 inches.

Under multi-tenant signs, everyone agreed to delete the sentence “No other single tenant detached signs shall be permitted on the same commercial lot.”

Under electronic message signs, commissioners discussed changing “these signs may be attached or detached or located on monument or multi tenant pole or pylon signs” to just “these signs may be attached or detached.”

Everyone agreed to an increase in the allowable measured area of electronic message signs to 70% of the total area.

T.J. noticed that off-premise signs in agricultural zones allowed more square footage for off-premise than on-premise signs, so everyone agreed to make them both 32 square feet. However, residential zones needed to remain the same with no more than two on-premise signs no bigger than 4 square feet each. Home occupations could have one off-premise sign 4 square feet in size as well.

Under Town Center Zone Restrictions, commissioners removed “Single-tenant pylon or pole signs” and “Exposed raceways.”

Gregory directed staff to place this on the first meeting agenda in April for a public hearing.

**ITEM 2: C-2 ZONE REGULATIONS**

Gregory referred to the Commission’s discussion in their last meeting regarding moratoriums and asked how they wanted to address this Chapter, whether through a subcommittee or work session discussions. Kent and T.J. preferred work sessions.

Kenneth considered C-2 as redundant, because the City incorporated most of it into the GC zone after crafting the C-2 zone, since most was applicable to both.

Gregory directed staff to put C-2 on the next work session agenda, allocating 45 minutes, to decide what direction they wanted to take.

Michael said staff would try and identify duplications and differences in the C-2 and GC language and provide an analysis.

**ITEM 3: RESIDENTIAL ZONE REGULATIONS**

Michael referred to the letter in their packets from The Ninigret Group that staff received earlier that day. He read the letter, stating that they wished to defer discussions concerning a higher-density residential zoning designation with respect to single- and multi-family housing. They did, however, wish to continue their pursuit of the Flex Development zone for Parcel 2 of their proposed development. They supported the City’s efforts to discuss zoning types that allowed a variety of housing options. As part of the current General Plan update, they wanted to see the PRD zone established on the most westerly parcel of their property, because they intended to pursue its higher-density housing option in the future.

Kenneth asked if The Ninigret Group understood the PRD zone or if they intended to approach the City in the future for an amendment to its density limitations. Michael could not answer that. T.J. preferred locating the housing component on the south side of their development, along 700 South, rather than on the west side.

Kent displayed a table he created that listed the different cities and their residential standards. Kenneth pointed

out that 12 units per acre in the PRD zone was a conditional use rather than a permitted use. Kent explained that the PRD matched most of the other cities, except that their rear yard setbacks were even more liberal.

Gary suggested making PRD a required buffer to encourage The Ninigret Group to relocate the housing on the southern part of the property.

Commissioners discussed the acreage requirement for PRD and the reasons behind the minimum 5-acre requirement. They eventually agreed that allowing PRDs as a conditional use for small, orphaned parcels had some value. They discussed the possibility of allowing triplexes on less than 5 acres, as an alternative, as long as it was a transitional zone and met other requirements. Gregory preferred making it a conditional use rather than its own zone.

Kent and Michael asked Gregory to write a letter to City Council and Mayor that the Commission had no interest in exploring higher-density residential uses. Gregory agreed, stating that he was not willing to recommend anything denser until after Stoker Gardens was built out, so they could see how well it worked in the City. Commissioners discussed the need for a more formal process for addressing the General Plan. Gregory suggested linking it to rezone requests. He then took a vote as to who was in favor of him writing a letter advocating the Commission's desire to keep the PRD as written rather than considering higher density. Everyone voted yes.

#### ITEM 4: SCHEDULING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

Michael explained that staff scheduled three public hearings for the March 20, 2012, meeting to consider the proposed business park, light industrial, and flex development zones.

As for Districts 1 and 2 of the General Plan, commissioners agreed to hold one more public hearing to allow input once Council adopted the new zones, if any, and commissioners were ready to recommend them throughout the City.

#### ITEM 5: DEPARTMENT BUSINESS

Michael advised commissioners that staff would be posting their email addresses on the internet by the next day. Commissioners were then advised of the following:

- ULC&T training on March 22, 2012, from 6-8 p.m.
- DUED meeting in West Point
- Wasatch Choice 2040 consortium meeting on March 27, 2012
- SBOSS meeting on March 13, 2012, at 1 p.m. at City Hall to craft a position statement pertaining to The Ninigret Group's development

#### ITEM 6: NEXT AGENDA

The work session would include another discussion on sign regulations and the C-2 Zone. The regular meeting would have the three public hearings as mentioned earlier.

Gregory asked for another item on the work session agenda to discuss the Town Center Overlay Zone.

Kenneth suggested posting a map of the voting precincts on the City's website again. Staff agreed to look into that.