

1 **Highland City Planning Commission**
2 **February 27, 2007**

3
4 **Present:**

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

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

15
16 **Excused:**

17 Brian Braithwaite (Commissioner)
18 Barry Edwards (City Administrator)
19 Lonnie Crowell (City Planner)
20

21 Meeting convened at 7:09 pm
22 Prayer given by: Larry Mendenhall
23 Pledge given by: Dawn Corrigan
24

25 **Visitors:** JoD'Ann Bates, John Montgomery, Jeannie Spykes.
26
27

28 **Item 1: CR Zone Sign Ordinance ~ Code Amendment**
29

30 Larry Mendenhall briefly reviewed discussion from the last meeting regarding
31 this item. He indicated that the current issues before the commission were the
32 minimum setback between different types of signs, the size of signs, and the
33 number of signs that would be permitted along SR-92 and SR-74.
34

35 Larry Mendenhall added that the night's assignment for the commission was to
36 craft an ordinance that will ensure the CR and C-1 Zones are compatible and
37 allow vendors to attract business while preventing sign pollution.
38

39 Larry Mendenhall directed the commission to the matrix on page 25 of the
40 agenda and suggested discussion start with monument signs. He asked the
41 commission if there were any issues with the size of monument signs, which is
42 specified at 6'x7'x3' in the proposed ordinance changes.
43

44 Roger Dixon asked if the monument signs need to be so deep. Carly LeDuc
45 indicated that the three feet specified on page 25 of the agenda isn't right, and

1 that in fact the actual proposed depth is two feet. It was determined that the
2 maximum size of 6'x7'x2' specified on page 27 of the agenda is the actual
3 proposed size.

4
5 Roger Dixon indicated he was okay with that as the size for monument signs.

6
7 Larry Mendenhall welcomed Jennifer Tucker, who had just arrived, and also
8 excused Brian Braithwaite, who is in New Zealand. He apprised Jennifer Tucker
9 of the discussion thus far.

10
11 Larry Mendenhall asked the commission to review the portion of the monument
12 sign proposal stating that monument signs are only permitted if the business is
13 within 50 feet of SR-92 or 74.

14
15 Jennifer Tucker asked if that distance is measured from the back of the curb and
16 Carly LeDuc indicated that it is.

17
18 Brent Wallace asked why this language is in the ordinance and Larry Mendenhall
19 answered that it's to identify the sign with the building.

20
21 Larry Mendenhall asked John Montgomery of Thomas Fox Properties what his
22 thinking was about positioning of the monument signs. John Montgomery
23 indicated the applicant is petitioning for 130 feet.

24
25 Larry Mendenhall asked John Montgomery how many monument signs the
26 applicant is proposing along SR-74 and SR-92. John Montgomery answered
27 three or four along SR-74 and five or six along SR-92. Roger Dixon pointed out
28 there would possibly be three or four on the other side of the street as well.

29
30 Larry Mendenhall asked whether Wendy's has a monument sign and Carly LeDuc
31 confirmed that it does. Discussion ensued about the monument sign for the
32 Wendy's on SR-92. Further investigation determined that there is not a
33 monument sign for Wendy's.

34
35 Jerry Gorrell observed that between freestanding, monument, and wall signs,
36 Highland City could go from no signs to 25 or more in a site where the
37 commission has been careful to maintain landscaping and resist visual pollution.
38 He fears that the commercial center will start to feel like The Meadows in
39 American Fork, which isn't what the citizens of Highland want.

40
41 Larry Mendenhall indicated that development elsewhere, such as at Point of the
42 Mountain and American Fork, doesn't impact Highland. However, Jerry Gorrell
43 disagreed, indicating that such development does impact Highland, because the
44 relaxed, rural family environment is being encroached upon.

45
46 Discussion ensued about the results of the citizen survey and what they meant in
47 terms of the citizens' desires about commercial development in Highland.

1
2 Jerry Gorrell indicated concern that developers “have won” in Highland, with
3 their desires being put ahead of those of the citizens.

4
5 Larry Mendenhall disagreed. He stressed that developers have not been the ones
6 who’ve decided about changes in Highland. He said the Planning Commission
7 was the body that decided to allow development of the corner of SR-74 and 92.
8 He reminded the commission that there was only one developer who was willing
9 to develop the whole parcel, so development would be synergistic.

10
11 Elizabeth Macfarlane said she’s been observing signs, in Park City and elsewhere,
12 and that she doesn’t feel she can agree to 18-foot signs, which are too tall.
13 Specifically, she’s concerned about freestanding signs. She explained that she’s
14 willing to concede on monument signs to a certain extent. She also echoed the
15 concern about how ordinance changes will affect the other side of the street.

16
17 Jerry Gorrell reiterated that his concerns are not about one type of sign in
18 particular, but about the cumulative effect of all of them.

19
20 Roger Dixon stated that since the commission has approved commercial zoning,
21 it has a responsibility to help the businesses be successful. The critical questions
22 are how many and what size signs to allow. He added that he too has driven
23 around observing signs, and that his conclusions are that Highland needs
24 something quiet, classy, harmonious, uniform, and as few signs as possible.

25
26 Roger Dixon continued that in his observation, places such as The Meadows
27 create a visual cacophony that actually offers too much information. He
28 concluded that he would be willing to eliminate the commercial freestanding
29 signs at the bottom of the matrix altogether.

30
31 Larry Mendenhall said he would be calling for a motion in approximately 15
32 minutes and that perhaps the motion should call for an either/or option for
33 developers concerning signs.

34
35 Jerry Gorrell said he liked the possibility of allowing two out of three of the sign
36 choices. For instance, businesses could be told, “If you put up wall signs, you
37 can’t have monuments.”

38
39 Jennifer Tucker said she’s observed that in other shopping centers, the largest
40 part of the sign often goes to the most prominent resident. She concluded that
41 real estate on freestanding signs often doesn’t go to the ones who need it most,
42 namely the smaller businesses in a complex, but to the ones who can spend the
43 most money.

44
45 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked whether it would be the developer who would
46 determine what went on the freestanding signs. Jennifer Tucker assented and

1 said for that reason she thought maybe the commission shouldn't allow
2 freestanding signs.

3
4 Jerry Gorrell pointed out that the proposed distance restrictions for monument
5 signs would mean some businesses couldn't have a monument sign.

6
7 Roger Dixon said what would make most sense to him would be for the stores
8 close to the road to have wall signs, and the stores in back to have monument
9 signs. He stated that all three types of signs weren't needed. Elizabeth Macfarlane
10 agreed with this.

11
12 Roger Dixon added that he wasn't sure why it would be necessary to have a
13 monument and a wall sign for the same business at Highland Marketplace,
14 though he acknowledged that it might be an issue for some of the businesses at
15 the center of Town Center.

16
17 Jennifer Tucker observed that at some of the retail centers in South Jordan, there
18 are two sets of signs—one at the entrance and a second sign inside the center.
19 Roger Dixon said he thought that could work.

20
21 Elizabeth Macfarlane reiterated concern that there would be a monument sign for
22 every store and asked if that could be restricted. Larry Mendenhall said it could if
23 that was the commission's desire. He asked if it would require a public hearing to
24 change the ordinance for the other zones. Matt Shipp replied that he wasn't
25 certain.

26
27 Brent Wallace said he disagreed that Highland was in danger of becoming like
28 American Fork, because of the "bull's-eye" nature of Highland's commercial zone.
29 He pointed out that signs can be attractive, not a blight, and that the signs at The
30 Meadows are big and plastic, but that the commission has the option of
31 specifying other materials and lighting. He said the commission needs to provide
32 at least one of the sign choices, but agreed that all three are not needed.

33
34 Elizabeth Macfarlane also agreed that businesses should have a choice, but added
35 that if the commission allows the freestanding signs, everyone will choose that.
36 She suggested setting a limit such as four stores per sign.

37
38 Brent Wallace pointed out that the distance restrictions for monument signs
39 would prevent there from being an unlimited number of them.

40
41 Larry Mendenhall suggested that the commission work through the matrix,
42 pointing out places where the members want it to be an either/or choice. He
43 asked the commission about the restriction of 150 feet between monument signs.

44
45 Jerry Gorrell pointed out that the distance in the code used to be 300 feet and
46 asked if this had been discussed in the prior meeting. Roger Dixon said it had not.
47 Brent Wallace explained that in the previous meeting the commission had

1 discussed allowing some flexibility in spacing the monument signs, but that there
2 had been no discussion about going from 300 feet to 150.

3
4 Discussed ensued about the appropriate maximum distance between monument
5 signs.

6
7 Elizabeth Macfarlane suggested that a lot of heartache could be saved if the
8 decision was to go with an entrance sign, rather than a lot of individual
9 monument signs. Jennifer Tucker asked if the suggestion was to get rid of
10 monument and freestanding signs, and Elizabeth Macfarlane explained her
11 thought was that the monument sign would be the entrance sign.

12
13 Larry Mendenhall asked if the suggestion was to use an enhanced monument
14 sign as the entrance sign and Elizabeth Macfarlane confirmed that was her
15 suggestion. Larry Mendenhall then asked about the distances for monument
16 signs, wondering if the commission's consensus was that 300 feet was right as the
17 average distance, rather than 150, with nothing closer than 150 feet.

18
19 Roger Dixon said he would rather see the monument signs restricted to the two
20 entrances. Larry Mendenhall asked if the suggestion was to eliminate the
21 commercial freestanding signs. Roger Dixon said yes but also added he would be
22 comfortable with allowing a slightly larger monument sign in that case.

23
24 Roger Dixon asked John Montgomery whether, in light of the Wal-Mart being
25 approved in Cedar Hills and the Smith's Marketplace being advertised at Micron,
26 the developer's ardor for the Highland Marketplace project has cooled at all. John
27 Montgomery said no it has not. He added that the developer is about to invest
28 upward of 30 million in the Highland community, that they believe the project
29 will succeed, and that they believe what they do on the Northwest corner of 92
30 and 74 will also help the Northeast corner and Town Center as well.

31
32 Discussion ensued about the difference between a lifestyle center, or outdoor
33 mall, and a retail center.

34
35 John Montgomery observed that the Highland Subway has wall signs on three
36 sides of the building, and the Wendy's has two wall signs plus a monument.
37 (Further investigation determined that there is not a monument sign for
38 Wendy's.) He pointed out that for Highland Marketplace they are only asking for
39 two signs per business, and that they are restricting color and materials. He said
40 signs above the store fronts will be channeled letter signs, which involve lighting
41 each letter, rather than being a big lit box.

42
43 John Montgomery further stated that in regard to the monument signs, they are
44 asking for one per 130 feet, and one per building. He added that the sight
45 triangles were the only place where 150 feet wouldn't work. Brent Wallace asked
46 if 100 feet would work, and John Montgomery answered that it would but that it
47 wasn't necessary for the developer's purposes. He also reminded the commission

1 that at Highland Marketplace there will be businesses 400 feet off the road, and
2 that this isn't true at Kohler's, where it's more like 150 feet. Because of this, he
3 added, the most tasteful option for these tenants is a freestanding sign.

4
5 Larry Mendenhall asked how many feet from the start of the development to the
6 corner and John Montgomery answered that it's about 1000 feet. Larry
7 Mendenhall noted the slide indicated a total of six monument signs on the south
8 side and John Montgomery answered the intent was to have the six, plus possibly
9 one more from a tenant in Building D.

10
11 Larry Mendenhall suggested that instead of using the term commercial
12 freestanding sign, the commission could use the term modified monument sign.
13 He added that if the commission agreed to a modified monument sign at each
14 entrance, the only remaining concerns to discuss were the height and width of the
15 signs and the fear of too many signs.

16
17 Larry Mendenhall asked if the signs will be lit. John Montgomery answered yes,
18 but "not in the way you're accustomed in Utah." These signs will not be Plexiglas
19 with light, but rather will have pan channel lighting on the letters.

20
21 John Montgomery compared the signs to the rooflines. Larry Mendenhall shared
22 some information from the United States Sign Council about their legibility
23 index. He added that he liked the pan channel illumination and thought the
24 monument signs could be classy. He wondered, though, whether the channel
25 letters should be required. John Montgomery indicated that most businesses
26 would prefer not to use them, but that the developer is willing to make it a
27 requirement for this development.

28
29 Larry Mendenhall directed discussion to the dimensions of a modified monument
30 sign. John Montgomery said that with 11 tenants in back, the 18-foot sign will be
31 required to be legible.

32
33 Jerry Gorrell asked if there were any issues with wall signs; the other
34 commissioners indicated no. Then he asked John Montgomery if it would work to
35 go with a modified monument sign at each of the four entrances. John
36 Montgomery indicated he thought that would work fine.

37
38 Larry Mendenhall said he considered this suggestion a breakthrough.

39
40 Jerry Gorrell said he was envisioning modified monument signs that would be 10
41 or 12 feet tall and asked John Montgomery about making them wider to regain
42 the necessary square footage. John Montgomery replied that a wider sign would
43 look like a wall, would have to be parallel to the street rather than perpendicular,
44 and that he doubted the commissioners would like the effect.

45
46 Brent Wallace asked whether 13 feet with a three foot base would work. John
47 Montgomery indicated he would need to ask the sign designers. Brent Wallace

1 asked how many signs the developer was requesting under the code change and
2 John Montgomery indicated two freestanding signs.

3
4 Jerry Gorrell reiterated that the old code required 300 feet between monument
5 signs, so that the changes would increase the possible maximum from 5 to 11, but
6 John Montgomery replied that the developer had not asked staff for this change.

7
8 Larry Mendenhall asked if what the commission was recommending was one
9 modified monument at each set of sight triangles, to be placed on one side of the
10 sight triangle.

11
12 Elizabeth Macfarlane assented and asked the commission if they were
13 recommending that there would be just these four modified monument signs plus
14 wall signs. Jerry Gorrell agreed that's what the commission was asking for.

15
16 Larry Mendenhall asked how many regular monument signs would be allowed, in
17 addition to the modified monuments. Elizabeth Macfarlane and Jennifer Tucker
18 indicated zero.

19
20 Elizabeth Macfarlane added that the modified monuments would be taller than
21 the monument signs defined in the code, and she was comfortable with that, but
22 that she didn't want to be bombarded with other signs.

23
24 Brent Wallace said that according to this discussion, freestanding (or what the
25 commissioners were now calling a modified monument sign) signs and wall signs
26 were the only choices, and asked John Montgomery what he thought of that.
27 John Montgomery asked if the south side would be limited to two signs as well.

28
29 Brent Wallace suggested that maybe the standard would be two per thousand
30 feet, but John Montgomery pointed out that he doesn't have a thousand feet on
31 the east side.

32
33 Jerry Gorrell asked whether the commission's feeling would be the same if the
34 center had four entrances on a side, rather than two, and asked Matt Shipp if
35 there was a restriction about how many entrances a center could have. He replied
36 that they were required to have 150 feet between them. Jerry Gorrell asked if the
37 developer could really have put in that many and Matt Shipp replied that UDOT
38 would have objected.

39
40 Roger Dixon asked if the businesses could be split up between two signs, so that
41 half would be on one modified monument and the other half on the other. John
42 Montgomery indicated it would be the developer's preference not to split them.

43
44 Roger Dixon pointed out that there will actually be more square footage on the
45 four modified monument signs than there would have been on the two
46 freestanding and indicated that he is in favor of the four entrance signs.

1 Larry Mendenhall asked whether in this schema monument signs would be
2 eliminated. Roger Dixon said he thought freestanding signs should be eliminated
3 and monument signs would be modified. Larry Mendenhall asked whether +--+
4 `existing signs would be grandfathered in and Roger Dixon agreed they would
5 have to be.

6
7 Brent Wallace asked whether this idea would be acceptable for stores far from the
8 road, which will be a long way from their monument sign. Larry Mendenhall
9 pointed out that the Town Center has other kinds of businesses than retail stores.

10
11 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked to hear from Jennifer Tucker, who said she liked the
12 idea of the modified monuments, and she liked the idea of offering developers an
13 either/or choice. She added that she is comfortable with an 18-foot sign as long as
14 she knows there won't be nine more signs in addition.

15
16 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked if a motion would need to specify how many feet
17 from the entrance the modified monument signs should be. Larry Mendenhall
18 said that information would not need to be in the motion and Jerry Gorrell added
19 the commission could specify that those distances must be part of the
20 architectural review.

21
22 Roger Dixon asked how tall the modified signs will be. Larry Mendenhall said 12
23 feet is too short and that they would need to be 15 or 18 feet tall. He asked John
24 Montgomery how tall the signs would need to be, from the developer's point of
25 view. John replied that they should be no less than 18 feet, and that anything less
26 would be illegible and unattractive. He added that these would be halo signs,
27 possibly using bronzed lettering, such as those used as Traverse Mountain.

28
29 Roger Dixon asked if that would be 18 feet from the top of the curb. John
30 Montgomery said it would be and reviewed the roof lines in the Marketplace.

31
32 Elizabeth Macfarlane suggested that in relation to the rooflines, 18 feet might not
33 be tall enough for the signs. John Montgomery asked if they could get 20 feet and
34 Brent Wallace said he thought that would work.

35
36 Discussion ensued about the dimensions of the modified monument signs.

37
38 **Motion by Jerry Gorrell, Planning Commission to recommend that**
39 **City Council approve the code amendments to the CR Zone Sign**
40 **Ordinance as recommended by staff and amended by the Planning**
41 **Commission to include the following changes to staff**
42 **recommendations:**

43
44 **That section 3-708: Wall Signs, on page 26 of the Highland City code**
45 **(which appeared on page 7 of this meeting's agenda) be accepted as**
46 **modified by staff;**
47

1 **That section 3-709: Monument Signs, be accepted as recommended by**
2 **staff with the exception that in section (1) Location the minimum**
3 **distance between monument signs be returned to 300 feet;**

4
5 **That section 3-710: Commercial Center Freestanding Signs be**
6 **accepted as recommended with the following amendments:**

7
8 **In the CR and C-1 zones, one freestanding sign can be placed at each**
9 **entrance of a commercial development. These signs will be reviewed**
10 **and approved during architectural review. Dimensions of these signs**
11 **are not to exceed 20 feet in height, 13 and a half feet in width, and**
12 **three feet in depth. The 20 feet in height will be measured from the**
13 **curb to the top of the sign;**

14
15 **And that each commercial development in the CR and C-1 zones may**
16 **choose commercial freestanding or monument signs as contained in**
17 **the ordinance, but not both.**

18
19 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**
20 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

21
22
23 **Item 2: Approval of Meeting Minutes for February 13, 2007**

24
25 **Motion by Elizabeth Macfarlane, Planning Commission to approve the**
26 **Meeting Minutes for February 13, 2007 as amended.**

27
28 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**
29 **Unanimous vote, motion carried, with Jerry Gorrell abstaining as he**
30 **was not present at the February 13, 2007 meeting.**

31
32 **Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.**