

1 **Highland City Planning Commission**
2 **January 9, 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 Commissioner: Jerry Gorrell

12
13 City Administrator: Barry Edwards
14 City Engineer: Matt Shipp
15 City Planner: Lonnie Crowell
16 Secretary: JoD'Ann Bates

17
18 Meeting convened at 7:04 pm
19 Prayer given by: Brian Braithwaite
20 Pledge given by: Mark Stout

21
22 **Visitors:** Chris Dalley, Nabi Rizavi, Katie Schoepf, Julie Schoepf, John
23 Montgomery, Stefan Grant, Thornton Garcia, Will Jones, Doug Bennett, Lyman
24 Buhler, Tony Johns, Nicole Bean, Matthew Chesler, Mark Thompson.

25
26
27 **Item 1: Spruce Estates ~ Final Subdivision Approval**

28
29 Larry Mendenhall reviewed the background and staff recommendations of the
30 proposed subdivision.

31
32 Lonnie Crowell stated that the current information provided from UDOT will be
33 used for the measurement of the parkway detail along SR92. Lonnie stated that
34 and the applicant had addressed all the recommendations.

35
36 Will Jones stated the applicant had complied with all the recommendations
37 except the rollback taxes which will be satisfied prior to recording. Will inquired
38 if the tree fee per lot could be waived due to the amount of trees already on the
39 property. Barry Edwards indicated that they have not had great success in
40 transplanting pine trees throughout the city. Barry would rather have the money
41 go towards yearling trees that would benefit both the subdivision and the city.

42
43
44 Brian Braithwaite inquired if the previously discussed sewer issue of lots 3 & 4
45 had been resolved. Matt Shipp stated that the city wants to see the road continue

1 through to the northwest. He commented that there are a few answers to the
2 sewer problem and feels confident after looking closer at the property that it can
3 be resolved rather the road goes through or not. Will Jones stated that the
4 applicant is also comfortable with the options they have been given regarding the
5 sewer and feels it can be worked out.

6
7 **Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission recommend City**
8 **Council grant Final Approval for the Spruce Estates per the**
9 **conditions and recommendations of staff excluding the second half of**
10 **recommendation 1 stating that the applicant work with UDOT to**
11 **ensure that the parkway detail remain along SR92 following UDOT's**
12 **present long range plan for widening. Based on the finding of fact**
13 **that the preliminary subdivision meets the existing code, that the**
14 **through street would be more beneficial to the subdivision and that**
15 **property owners and the city provide services to the subdivision.**
16 **Recommendation to include the following conditions, 1) Applicant**
17 **place a note on lots 11 through 14 that UDOT may or may not widen SR**
18 **92, 2) the developer install a masonry wall be constructed on the**
19 **parkway detail easement line and 3) the setbacks for homes along the**
20 **highway are measured from the parkway detail easement line, not the**
21 **property line.**

22
23 **Second Brent Wallace.**
24 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

25
26
27 **Item 2: CR Zone Sign Ordinance ~ Code Amendment**

28
29 Larry Mendenhall reviewed the information and staff recommendations
30 regarding the proposed code amendment.

31
32 Jerry Gorell stated that he would prefer to go with a duplication of the C1 Zone as
33 it currently stands. The lower the signs the better, he wants to do as much as he
34 can to make that a pleasant view for the citizens of Highland.

35
36 Jennifer Tucker stated she has paid more attention to signs recently specifically
37 for this purpose. It seemed like the reason for the taller signs were to stand out
38 apart from the buildings and the traffic. She tried to imagine Highland built up
39 and she could not see the need for a taller sign. She is still leaning more towards
40 not needing taller signs in the Highland area.

41
42 Brain Braithwaite stated his opinion has not changed for him from last meeting.
43 He feels there is no value in the taller sign.

44
45 Brent Wallace stated he wants the sign to be informational but not overpowering.
46 He is not in favor of a 25' sign.

47

1 Elizabeth Macfarlane stated she would have to agree with what had already been
2 said and feels they will need to go 15' or smaller.

3
4 Roger Dixon would like to see a sign that was similar to the architectural design
5 of the building. He feels that if there is the name of the store on the side of the
6 building there is no need for both.

7
8 Larry Mendenhall stated he concurred with the comments made by the
9 commissioners. He feels that businesses should be able to establish an identity,
10 and feels that the identity can be established tastefully on a store front. Larry
11 continued that he does not think large free standing signs lend themselves to the
12 kind of development that they looking for. Larry referred to signs shown in the
13 staff information and feels there is no need to have a free standing sign.

14
15 Barry Edwards stated that the businesses along the peripheral area will have the
16 visibility that they need. The stores that will be behind that peripheral area will
17 not have that visibility. Barry feels if you what to have successful business you
18 need to have identification along the street.

19
20 Discussion ensued regarding height.

21
22 Larry Mendenhall stated that a conclusion would not have to be made tonight.
23 One of the directions that he would like to see the Planning Commission take this
24 year is at the conclusion of their deliberation, they put together a product that is
25 usable, workable and acceptable. As they send it to the City Council they have
26 something they can work with, and from the planning prospective they are
27 finished.

28
29 Tom Hulbert stated that he is only asking for two free standing signs not
30 monuments signs all along the entire perimeter. They would rather have the two
31 free standing signs versus the 10-12 monument signs that could be allowed by
32 ordinance. They would like to propose at a minimum of 15' and a maximum of
33 25' in height.

34
35 Jon Montgomery reviewed the packet recently passed out by Tom Hulbert and
36 stated that he would address some of the issues brought up by staff and the
37 commission. Review and discussion ensued. (See attached)

38
39 Brent Wallace feels that after the number of hours having been spent between the
40 applicant, staff and the commission he would hate to think that they are going to
41 approve this and have it end up being a stumbling block for the success of the
42 tenants. He feels that there is a compromise that could be made.

43 Larry Mendenhall appreciated Brent's comments and feels that this forum is a
44 place where the commission can discuss and become enlightened in how they
45 need to view the direction that needs to be taken. He feels that they need to
46 possibly broaden their view to more than just the CR zone.

47

1 Discussion ensued.

2
3 Larry Mendenhall feels that the direction the commission should take should
4 enhance the success of the community as well as the developer and feels there
5 needs to be some type of compromise on both sides. Larry continued that he
6 feels that it will take more than the discussion that has been held tonight. He
7 would like to have the commissioners look at signs as they drive down the road.
8 They also need to consider the factor of impulse buying. The commission will
9 consider what has been proposed and continue this item for further discussion.

10
11 **Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission moves to**
12 **continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting.**

13
14 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**
15 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

16
17
18 **Item 3: Temporary Signs / Sign Ordinance – Discussion**

19
20 David Church, City Attorney reviewed the law as it applies to temporary signs in
21 regards to the first amendment and freedom of speech and the regulations
22 allowed.

23
24 Discussion ensued for further understanding of the law in relation to current and
25 future ordinances.

26
27 Larry Mendenhall inquired if Dave Church would be willing to supply the
28 commission with some ordinances for them to review within the next couple of
29 weeks. Dave stated he would get those examples to the commission as soon as
30 possible.

31
32 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission moves to continue this**
33 **item to the next Planning Commission meeting, with City Attorney**
34 **Church providing the Commission with sample ordinances.**

35
36 **Seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.**
37 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

38
39
40
41 **Item 4: Approval of Meeting Minutes for November 14,**
42 **2006**
43 **Approval of Meeting Minutes for November 28,**
44 **2006**

45
46 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission approved the Meeting**
47 **Minutes for November 14, 2006 as amended.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

**Seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

**Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission approved the
Meeting Minutes for November 28, 2006 as amended.**

**Seconded by Jennifer Tucker.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm