

1 **Highland City Planning Commission**
2 **February 13, 2007**

3
4 **Present:**

5 Commissioner: Larry Mendenhall
6 Commissioner: Jennifer Tucker
7 Commissioner: Brian Braithwaite
8 Commissioner: Brent Wallace
9 Commissioner: Elizabeth Macfarlane
10 Commissioner: Roger Dixon

11
12 City Engineer: Matt Shipp
13 City Planner: Lonnie Crowell
14 Assistant City Planner: Carly LeDuc
15 Secretary: Dawn Corrigan

16
17 **Excused:**

18 Jerry Gorrell (Commissioner)
19 Barry Edwards (City Administrator)

20
21 Meeting convened at 7:03 pm
22 Prayer given by: Brent Wallace
23 Pledge given by: Jennifer Tucker

24
25 **Visitors:** JoD'Ann Bates, Anne S. Hansen, John Montgomery, Willard Spykes,
26 Jay Stokes, Robert Uzelac, George Wilson.

27
28
29 **Preliminary Comments**

30
31 Larry Mendenhall offered sympathy to the victims and their families of the
32 shooting in Salt Lake City that occurred on February 12, welcomed Carly LeDuc
33 to the meeting and to city service, thanked Jo'D Bates for her service to the
34 commission, and welcomed Dawn Corrigan.

35
36
37 **Item 1: Francisco & Stephanie Avila ~ Preliminary/ Final**
38 **Subdivision & Public Hearing**

39
40 Larry Mendenhall excused himself for a moment to discuss with Jennifer Tucker
41 his recusal from discussion and voting on Item 1. He recused himself because he
42 lives in the neighborhood under discussion and felt there was a potential conflict
43 of interest.

1 Larry Mendenhall then called the meeting back to order, summarized Item 1,
2 explained the reasons for his recusal, and turned proceedings over to Jennifer
3 Tucker.

4
5 Jennifer Tucker asked if the Avilas were present.

6
7 George Wilson indicated he is representing the Avilas, who are out of town.

8
9 Jennifer Tucker summarized the agenda item, which will allow the Avilas to
10 subdivide a lot into two parcels, thus providing an overall density of 2.008 acres
11 per lot.

12
13 Roger Dixon indicated he's driven past the lot, and that the proposal seems fairly
14 straightforward to him.

15
16 Brian Braithwaite asked Lonnie Crowell whether there were any ordinances that
17 would prevent this subdivision from occurring. Lonnie Crowell indicated the only
18 ordinance was the two-acre minimum.

19
20 Brian Braithwaite asked whether the subdivision would mean that the new lots
21 would be required to form their own association. Lonnie Crowell indicated it
22 would not.

23
24 Brent Wallace asked if the current home will be lived in. George Wilson affirmed
25 that it will be.

26
27 There was some discussion about the shape of the new lot and the acre feet of
28 water that will be required. It was determined that unusual lot designs are not
29 unusual in Bull River, and that the water requirements would be researched
30 during the recording process.

31
32 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

33
34 Anne S. Hanson, a Board member from Bull River, indicated that body has no
35 objections to the subdivision.

36
37 A brief discussion ensued about water required for the subdivision, landscaping
38 requirements, and the shape of the new lot. George Wilson indicated the division
39 was drawn following a split rail fence that is already in place on the property.
40 There was some discussion of whether the current driveway will have to be
41 moved. Lonnie Crowell indicated that will be up to the Planning Commission.

42
43 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

44
45 Larry Mendenhall asked that Section 10 of the Bull River CC & R (page 43),
46 concerning the subdivision of lots, be added to the meeting minutes. (See
47 attached.)

1
2 Brent Wallace asked whether the water requirement issue needed to be part of
3 the motion.

4
5 Lonnie Crowell indicated that it did not. The water question will be worked out
6 during the recording process.

7
8 **Motion by Brent Wallace, Planning Commission, to grant preliminary**
9 **approval and recommend final approval for the Avila Subdivision**
10 **subject to staff recommendations.**

11
12 **Seconded by Brian Braithwaite.**

13 **Unanimous vote, motion carried with one recusal.**

14
15
16 **Item 2: Alpine Credit Union ~ Conditional Use & Public Hearing**

17
18 Larry Mendenhall welcomed some Scouts who had joined the meeting during
19 discussion of Item 1.

20
21 Larry Mendenhall reviewed the background and recommendations regarding this
22 proposal. He recommends that the commission approve the conditional use
23 permit and invited Jay Stokes from the Alpine Credit Union to address the
24 commission.

25
26 Jay Stokes, President, Alpine Credit Union, provided background on Alpine
27 Credit Union, stressing the credit union's ties to the school district and educators.
28 He explained that the credit union currently has four locations, so a Highland
29 branch would be the fifth. He indicated that Alpine Credit Union has 5,000
30 members in the area, with one-fifth of their total membership in the Alpine area.

31
32 Larry Mendenhall invited comments from the commissioners.

33
34 Roger Dixon and Elizabeth Macfarlane had no comments at that time.

35
36 Brent Wallace asked how far it is to the nearest branch. Jay Stokes indicated it's
37 five miles away.

38
39 Discussion ensued about the nature of Alpine Credit Union versus other credit
40 unions and financial institutions, and the question of when market saturation
41 occurs.

42
43 Jay Stokes stressed that the Alpine Credit Union customer base is not
44 commercial. Brian Braithwaite asked how hard it would be for the credit union to
45 change its charter. Jay Stokes indicated it would be possible, but that it was not
46 the organization's philosophy or intention to do so.

1 Jennifer Tucker asked about landscaping and light pollution mitigation.

2
3 Lonnie Crowell indicated that the conditional use permit would be subject to the
4 staff recommendations regarding landscaping and lighting that were detailed in
5 the agenda (see page 7).

6
7 Jay Stokes indicated the credit union is willing to do whatever the city requests in
8 regard to these questions. He pointed out that while the Utah Community Credit
9 Union has projected lights, Alpine Credit Union uses recessed cans, which create
10 less light pollution. He added that their garbage dumpsters are professionally
11 maintained.

12
13 Brent Wallace asked Jay Stokes if he had reviewed the staff recommendations.
14 Jay Stokes indicated he had and reiterated that the credit union's business hours
15 are Monday – Friday 9 am until 5:30 pm and Saturday 9 am until noon, that they
16 are closed on Sunday, and that they do not have any services outside the banking
17 arena.

18
19 Larry Mendenhall directed the commission's attention to the proposed site plan,
20 where he pointed out that the landscape area is fairly generous and meets
21 minimum requirements. Lonnie Crowell confirmed this.

22
23 Jay Stokes said light pollution from the drive-thru lights should be kept to a
24 minimum across the Alpine Highway, but that the credit union would welcome
25 suggestions in terms of landscaping to block it from the road. He added that the
26 credit union has complied with all greenery requirements in Lehi and elsewhere
27 where they've built.

28
29 Brian Braithwaite asked if service at the credit union's ATM is 24-hour and Jay
30 Stokes indicated it is.

31
32 Larry Mendenhall said the commission appreciates the credit union's efforts to
33 comply with requirements for the Town Center and that the proposed building is
34 a nice building.

35
36 Larry Mendenhall opened the public hearing.

37
38 Robert Uzelac asked what kind of revenue Alpine Credit Union would bring to
39 Highland City.

40
41 Jay Stokes responded that the credit union does not pay income tax and would
42 not bring sales tax, but that it does pay property and commercial taxes and taxes
43 on all its assets.

44
45 Robert Uzelac observed that not much of that would go to the city.

1 Larry Mendenhall suggested that the city needs a cross-section of businesses in
2 the Town Center. He added that a mixture of service-oriented businesses plus tax
3 revenue would be ideal, and opined that a consumer-oriented credit union could
4 be beneficial to the citizens of Highland.

5
6 Robert Uzelac asked if the credit union does home loans.

7
8 Jay Stokes indicated the credit union doesn't do construction loans, but that it
9 does do original purchase loans. He added that the credit union never sells loans
10 that it issues.

11
12 Larry Mendenhall indicated that lighting at the credit union would primarily be
13 downward lighting directed at the building, with subdued lighting in the parking
14 lot and security lighting at the ATM, and that there would be an allowance for
15 backlit signs.

16
17 Jay Stokes indicated that Alpine Credit Union has used marquee signs before but
18 in their more recent development in Lehi they went with something more
19 subdued. He added that the credit union doesn't use signage for marketing.

20
21 Larry Mendenhall asked if there were any further comments.

22
23 Jay Stokes said he knows there are commercial banks but that the credit union
24 isn't interested in competing directly with them.

25
26 Larry Mendenhall closed the public hearing.

27
28 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission, to approve the**
29 **conditional use permit for Alpine Credit Union.**

30
31 **Seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.**

32
33 **Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission, to amend the**
34 **original motion to be subject to the condition that Alpine Credit**
35 **Union work with staff on the layout and placement of additional**
36 **shrubs.**

37
38 **Motion to amend seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.**

39
40 **Roger Dixon commented on the amendment, asking what it adds.**

41
42 **Brian Braithwaite said the amendment gives the applicant further**
43 **direction.**

44
45 **Lonnie Crowell requested clarification on the amendment, asking**
46 **how much the commission wanted the lights to be shielded. For**
47 **instance, do they want a wall of shrubs?**

1
2 **Brian Braithwaite indicated the commission wants enough greenery**
3 **to break up the light pollution significantly.**

4
5 **Unanimous vote, amendment carried.**

6
7 **Unanimous vote, amended motion carried to approve the conditional**
8 **use permit for Alpine Credit Union subject to condition that the**
9 **applicant work with staff on the layout and placement of additional**
10 **shrubs.**

11
12
13 **Item 3: CR Zone Sign Ordinance ~ Code Amendment**

14
15 Larry Mendenhall thanked Lonnie Crowell and Carly LeDuc for background
16 information on this item.

17
18 Larry Mendenhall explained that the purpose of this item is to modify the sign
19 ordinance code, as recommended by staff. The modifications are designed to
20 allow some latitude to the Town Center in regards to signage. There has been
21 discussion in the past that the current signage code for the Town Center is
22 detrimental to businesses in the Center.

23
24 Larry Mendenhall stated that the purpose of the code modification is to establish
25 an ordinance that will be consistent with good practices, attract buyers, and have
26 an attractive appearance.

27
28 Larry Mendenhall and Lonnie Crowell directed the commission to page 24 of
29 their agenda packets, where the proposed changes were presented in a table.
30 Larry Mendenhall suggested that the commission's approach be to look at the
31 matrix and make the CR Zone compatible with signage that will be allowed in the
32 rest of the zones; however, he also suggested that this discussion should stick to
33 the CR Zone itself.

34
35 Roger Dixon asked Lonnie Crowell if the intent was to allow both commercial
36 freestanding signs and monument signs in the same area. Lonnie Crowell
37 confirmed that under the proposed code changes, this would be allowed.

38
39 Larry Mendenhall suggested that discussion start with freestanding signs, and he
40 read the description of CR Zone freestanding signs from the agenda.

41
42 Roger Dixon asked if, under the suggested changes, it would be possible that
43 there would be nine monument signs. Lonnie Crowell explained that the
44 freestanding signs would be for businesses by the highway, which would not be
45 allowed monument signs. Monument signs would be for the interior businesses
46 only.

1 There was a brief discussion using Robert Uzelac's Goodyear Tire store as an
2 example.

3
4 Larry Mendenhall observed that the conversation seemed to have diverted to
5 monument signs and brought it back to freestanding signs. He asked whether the
6 commissioners would have any issues if one freestanding sign were permitted on
7 Highway 74 and one on Highway 92. Roger Dixon indicated that he would have
8 an issue, because of the height.

9
10 Discussion ensued about whether these changes would mean two signs total on
11 the highways, or four, because of the need to allow Highland Marketplace the
12 same options as Town Center.

13
14 Jennifer Tucker indicated she agreed with Roger Dixon that the combination of
15 four freestanding signs plus the possibility of endless monument signs seemed
16 like too much.

17
18 The discussion turned to the proposed height of the freestanding signs. Roger
19 Dixon said he thought it was too high. Larry Mendenhall provided the analogy of
20 a Stop sign being 8 feet to give a sense of how high the proposed signs would be.
21 He indicated he is comfortable with the proposed height of 18 feet, which is 15
22 feet plus the 3 foot base. He thinks this is necessary for the businesses in the
23 back, which will be 400 feet off the road.

24
25 Roger Dixon and Brian Braithwaite indicated they found the verbiage of the
26 proposed changes to the code disingenuous, because they describe a freestanding
27 sign of "15 ft. max.," but the actual intent was to describe an 18 foot sign.

28
29 Larry Mendenhall stated that he is against visual pollution but that the signs
30 must be considered from the angle of the viewer, who will be 400 feet away. He
31 said that if the sign were less than 18 feet, the viewer wouldn't see the sign clearly
32 from 400 feet away, because of the angle.

33
34 Roger Dixon indicated that height was one of his concerns, and that he had two
35 others. The first concern is the total number of signs that will be allowed, and the
36 second is commonality and unity of theme.

37
38 Lonnie Crowell pointed out that the code changes as written specify materials
39 that will be allowed in sign construction, to ensure consistency and unity.

40
41 Larry Mendenhall suggested that all signs shouldn't look the same. He observed
42 that signs aren't simply the written word, they also establish identity. Therefore,
43 he thinks the city needs to allow a diversity of signs.

44
45 Roger Dixon stated that there should be uniformity between freestanding and
46 monument signs. He reiterated that allowing all the external businesses to have a
47 monument sign would mean nine for Highland Marketplace.

1
2 Brent Wallace pointed out that the code requires there to be at least 150 feet
3 between monument signs.

4
5 Roger Dixon asked how many monument signs there will be. Lonnie Crowell
6 indicated that one per building is what the proposed code says right now. He
7 added that the applicant had prepared a presentation, which John Montgomery
8 of Thomas Fox Properties would deliver, and asked the Chairman if Mr.
9 Montgomery could proceed with his presentation. Larry Mendenhall gave his
10 assent.

11
12 John Montgomery made a slide presentation. He asked the commission to
13 consider three sign options. The first was wall signs. He said the proposed wall
14 sign ordinance makes sense to the applicant. Every tenant can have wall signs on
15 up to two faces of the building. The retail businesses inside the center would only
16 have one wall sign. These are pan channel signs with very little light pollution,
17 sized as delineated in the proposal.

18
19 John Montgomery then moved on to a discussion of monument signs. He
20 explained that these would be located in the area between the sidewalk and the
21 building, and that they would be no closer than 150 feet from each other and 100
22 feet from the intersection.

23
24 Roger Dixon asked for clarification on whether the 150 feet stipulation only
25 applies to distances between monument signs, or does it also apply to distances
26 between mixed sign types. Lonnie Crowell and John Montgomery agreed that
27 currently it only applies to distances between monument signs. The other
28 consideration, of distances between mixed signs, has not been delineated yet.

29
30 Continuing his presentation on monument signs, John Montgomery explained
31 that each building could have its own monument sign. He also suggested that the
32 project name should be on the freestanding signs.

33
34 John Montgomery added that the proposed design for the monument signs
35 conforms with landscaping requirements. Lonnie Crowell confirmed this is the
36 case. John Montgomery pointed out that according to the code, every sign must
37 be approved by the commission.

38
39 Directing attention to his slide, John Montgomery indicated sight triangles,
40 which represent places where sight lines must be maintained. He said that
41 between the sight triangles and the 150 foot restriction, three tenants in building
42 G wouldn't have a monument sign.

43
44 Larry Mendenhall suggested that those tenants might rely on wall signs on the
45 street side. John Montgomery agreed that was one possibility but said the
46 applicant is proposing wall signs plus a spot on a monument sign.

47

1 Larry Mendenhall asked which buildings were designated for offices and John
2 Montgomery identified buildings A and B. Larry Mendenhall pointed out that
3 office signs generally speak in a “whisper” rather than a scream and suggested
4 that perhaps the office signs could be limited. John Montgomery agreed and
5 indicated that the applicant understands the appeal of Highland and wants to
6 preserve that as much as possible.

7
8 Brent Wallace asked if the stipulation that monument signs be at least 150 feet
9 apart was intended to be exact or an average, and wondered how the stipulation
10 would place the signs in relation to the buildings. Lonnie Crowell said that taking
11 the number down to 130 feet would allow the signs to coincide with the buildings.
12 Brent Wallace explained he was suggesting that some flexibility might be helpful.

13
14 John Montgomery suggested that walking 150 feet would satisfy the commission
15 that the monument signs will be far enough apart. Brent Wallace told John
16 Montgomery that the commission would be willing to accommodate the applicant
17 on distance as long as the applicant accommodates the commission in terms of
18 the total number of signs.

19
20 Roger Dixon suggested that a combination of freestanding signs plus wall signs
21 could remove the need for monument signs.

22
23 Larry Mendenhall indicated he didn't feel a clear cut direction from the
24 commission yet and asked the commissioners to consider the impact of a flat sign
25 versus a freestanding sign on drivers who are passing by. He suggested that a
26 freestanding sign is a long distance sign and a monument sign is a short distance
27 sign.

28
29 John Montgomery asked the commission to consider an example like Wendy's.
30 He said in such cases there is always one sign perpendicular to the street, and
31 another parallel. Passersby need to see the sign but also associate it with specific
32 space. Therefore, the right combination is a wall sign plus a monument sign.

33
34 Larry Mendenhall said he thought that was the direction the city needed to go,
35 and stated that it was helpful to talk about the functions of the different signs.

36
37 Larry Mendenhall and Brian Braithwaite asked John Montgomery to address the
38 question of overpowering signs and whether there can be too many signs. John
39 Montgomery said he thinks there can be too many signs, and that it would be
40 possible to “junk up” the Town Center if there were too many. He gave some
41 examples of marketplaces with overpowering, tacky signage, and stressed that the
42 applicant is not after that kind of effect in the Town Center.

43
44 John Montgomery explained that the applicant is after an effect more like those
45 found in Deer Valley, some sections of Orange County, or Addison, Texas. He also
46 stressed that a six foot monument and an 18 foot freestanding sign will look very
47 small to most people. He pointed out that the rooflines for the retail section of the

1 Town Center are between 19 and 23 feet tall, and that for the office buildings they
2 may go as high as 40 feet. He observed that the signs are modest compared to the
3 roof heights.

4
5 Jennifer Turner explained to the applicant that the commission is concerned not
6 just about the Town Center, but the overall effect that these changes will mean to
7 the city and to an accumulation of signs on Highways 74 and 92. Larry
8 Mendenhall pointed out that the south side commercial district has a different
9 layout, but Brian Braithwaite suggested that with the approval of the credit
10 union, the businesses on that side will ask for the same signage.

11
12 Brent Wallace asked Robert Uzelac what his experience has been having a
13 business in the Town Center. Mr. Uzelac indicated that thus far their car count
14 has been about 65% of what they expected. He also pointed out that the street
15 doesn't have a street sign yet, so even when they tell people the business address,
16 they sometimes can't find it.

17
18 Brent Wallace said that while he agreed that sign pollution is a concern, having
19 vacant buildings with For Lease signs would be worse. He expressed concern that
20 the city invites businesses but then doesn't provide them a chance to be
21 successful.

22
23 Larry Mendenhall thanked Commissioner Wallace for his comments. He added
24 that the commission needed to decide on some basic parameters, and that for
25 him, if he were a Town Center tenant, the minimum would be a 20-foot
26 freestanding sign.

27
28 Robert Uzelac said his business had done some research, and that signage needs
29 to be big enough. He said a small monument sign doesn't serve much purpose.

30
31 Anne S. Hansen said the best model she's seen is in Vermont, where there are no
32 billboards, and all signage is the same color, with nothing larger than 25 feet. She
33 suggested that when the community establishes itself, the tire store will do better.
34 She doesn't want the signs to be advertising, and finds too many individual signs
35 an eyesore.

36
37 Brian Braithwaite stated that he can accept more signage than what he likes,
38 provided there is consistency of materials so that it doesn't feel like the pollution
39 of, say, State Street. However, he wants the signage to provide information, not to
40 serve as advertising. He added that for the freestanding signs, he felt 25 feet is too
41 much, but that 15 would be okay, and he could even go with 18. He asked how
42 things will be handled for buildings that don't face the road.

43
44 Larry Mendenhall returned the discussion to the matrix provided in the agenda.
45 This time he suggested the discussion start with wall signs. He read the size
46 requirements for wall signs, which are 5% of the façade or 100 square feet
47 maximum. He indicated he likes the idea of something that limits the wall sign

1 and the monument sign space, and also liked Brent Wallace's suggestion about
2 flexibility on spacing of the monument signs.

3
4 Larry Mendenhall asked the commission if there were any concerns about wall
5 signs.

6
7 Roger Dixon expressed concern about colors. Larry Mendenhall replied that
8 trying to legislate neutrality is difficult. Lonnie Crowell pointed out that Federal
9 law won't allow the city to legislate color or text, and Larry Mendenhall added
10 that the city can't change logos. John Montgomery pointed out the ordinance
11 specifies that the logo can only be 20% of the sign, confirming that the signs will
12 mostly be informational. He further added that some communities will have the
13 logo and/or brand color on the wall sign and use something different on the
14 monument sign. Larry Mendenhall suggested that in such a way the city could
15 subdue the monument signs.

16
17 Larry Mendenhall reiterated that he wanted to work through the matrix on the
18 agenda and returned the discussion to wall signs. A brief discussion ensued about
19 what the "2 max" stipulation referred to. Some were under the impression that it
20 meant two signs maximum for the building. In fact, it means signage on two walls
21 maximum for each business in the building. Roger Dixon asked if the 5%
22 stipulation is per tenant or for the building. Lonnie Crowell explained that it's 5%
23 of frontage per tenant.

24
25 Larry Mendenhall continued to lead the discussion through the matrix. There
26 were no comments on window signs or awnings. When discussion came to arcade
27 signs, Larry Mendenhall asked Lonnie Crowell to describe them. Lonnie Crowell
28 explained that arcade signs are the type that can be seen in Park City, and which
29 hang over the sidewalk under an arcade. He added that the 3 square feet defined
30 in the code is actually large for an arcade sign.

31
32 Moving through the matrix, Larry Mendenhall observed that marquee signs are
33 not permitted. Discussion returned to freestanding signs. Elizabeth Macfarlane
34 indicated that 18 feet was the maximum height she would be comfortable with,
35 and that she had some concerns about colors. Brent Wallace pointed out that the
36 code specifies materials, and John Montgomery reiterated that the commission
37 will have final approval on all signs.

38
39 Larry Mendenhall asked about the width for freestanding signs. Lonnie Crowell
40 said the dimensions would be 13 feet by 15 feet by two and a half.

41
42 Discussion ensued about Lone Peak Village.

43
44 Larry Mendenhall asked John Montgomery if he'd brought some examples of
45 freestanding sign designs. John Montgomery said he had, and showed the slide,
46 explaining that these examples were placeholders, and that the applicant will
47 bring better examples for review later.

1
2 Larry Mendenhall requested a motion to continue next time. He asked that the
3 commission consider some specifics in terms of what was discussed and come
4 back to the next meeting with definitive parameters for monument signs and
5 freestanding signs.

6
7 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to continue discussion**
8 **of the CR Zone Sign Ordinance at the next meeting, focusing on the**
9 **areas specified by the Chair.**

10
11 **Seconded by Brian Braithwaite.**
12 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

13
14
15 **Item 4: Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 23, 2007**

16
17 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to approve the Meeting**
18 **Minutes for January 23, 2007 as amended.**

19
20 **Seconded by Brian Braithwaite.**
21 **Unanimous vote, motion carried, with Jennifer Tucker abstaining as**
22 **she was not present at the January 23, 2007 meeting.**

23
24 Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.