

**PAYSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**July 26, 2013**

**REGULAR SESSION – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Acting Chairman Blair Warner, Ted Fitzgerald, Todd Cannon & George Van Nosedol; City Councilmembers Kim Hancock and Mike Hardy; Planner Jill Spencer, Administrative Secretary Amanda Baker. Chairman John Cowan, Commissioners Harold Nichols & Rob Baird excused

**INVOCATION:** Commissioner Van Nosedol

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Approval of minutes for the regular meeting of April 24, 2013  
Approval of minutes for the regular meeting of May 22, 2013

No discussion on the consent agenda

***MOTION** by Commissioner Fitzgerald to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Cannon . Motion carries.*

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No Comments

**REVIEW ITEMS**

**PUBLIC HEARING – REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PAYSON PLAZA. SUBDIVISION LOCATED NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF 800 SOUTH AND TURF FARM ROAD (1270 West). THE SUBDIVISION CONSISTS OF TWO (2) LOTS IN THE S-1, SPECIAL HIGHWAY SERVICE ZONE.**

***Motion** by Commissioner Fitzgerald to open the public hearing. Seconded by Commissioner Van Nosedol.*

Planner Spencer presented information from the following staff report.

**INSERT STAFF REPORT**

Commissioner Fitzgerald questioned if the Planning Commission is the body that approves this subdivision request.

Planner Spencer stated the Planning Commission is the land use authority.

Questions about the preliminary and final plat included

- Parking
- Location of garbage dumpster
- Improvements of the frontage of the entire parcel

Project Architect Curtis Miner stated that the applicant would be improving the entire lot with the first phase of the building.

Planner Spencer stated she received a phone call from a concerned citizen who questioned if there was enough parking for the uses in these buildings.

1  
2 Mr. Miner stated that they calculated parking for the worst case scenario, they feel that there is adequate parking.

3  
4 Planner Spencer reiterated that the Planning Commission is the final authority on this.

5  
6 Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if lot one was considered in the

7  
8 Planner Spencer stated that staff looked at the lot conceptually. Planner Spencer explained how the final plat and site plan  
9 process works.

10  
11 Mr. Curtis Miner architect for the project stated that he doesn't have any issues with the project but asked if there were any  
12 questions.

13  
14 Commissioner Cannon asked if there was a location for a restaurant.

15  
16 *Motion by Commissioner Fitzgerald to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Commissioner Cannon.*

17  
18 *Motion by Commissioner Fitzgerald granting the prelim and final plat approval, contingent upon the satisfaction of staff*  
19 *requirements. Applicant shall work with staff to complete these requirements. Finding that we are excited to see*  
20 *development of that area and the sooner we get phase two going we will be able to get all lots improved and filled.*  
21 *Seconded by Commissioner Van Nosedol. Motion carries.*

22  
23 **PUBLIC HEARING (continued) – REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PROPOSED**  
24 **AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 19, ZONING ORDINANCE AND TITLE 20, SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.**

25  
26 Planner Spencer gave an update on the proposed amendments to Title 19.

27  
28 Commissioner Fitzgerald questioned the need for hard surfaced roads in regards to the mining and landfill ordinance.

29  
30 Planner Spencer stated that the off street parking should be hard surfaced but others could be all weather passable roads.

31  
32 Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if this could raise any concern for the current operations.

33  
34 Planner Spencer stated that any current uses would be able to continue as they are.

35  
36 Commissioner Cannon asked if it could be defined between permanent and temporary. He stated that all permanent roads  
37 should be hard surfaced

38  
39 Commissioner Van Nosedol questioned if the existing ones could be allowed under a grandfather clause.

40  
41 Planner Spencer stated that they could. They would be considered a non-conforming use.

42  
43 Commissioner Fitzgerald questioned recreational uses in the proposed zone.

44  
45 Planner Spencer stated it should probably say recreational uses owned and operated by a government agency.

46  
47 Planner Spencer stated there are two additional amendments to the ordinance. She stated Auto Body Repair was  
48 inadvertently left out of the GC-1 zone as an approved use. She stated that Auto Body Repair is an appropriate use in that  
49 zone. She also stated there has been an application to put a freestanding sign in a condominium project. The current  
50 ordinance didn't have regulations that clearly define how signs would be contemplated in a condominium scenario. She  
51 stated the sign committee has discussed this in detail and have proposed language which they felt was fair not only for this  
52 particular property but for multiple parcels of land in the city that may have a similar situation.

53  
54 Secretary Amanda Baker presented the changes being proposed to Title 19.15. In discussing section 19.15.3.3.4, she stated  
55 that most of the language was has been in the ordinance. She stated that the Sign Committee felt that having two  
56 freestanding signs on any given parcel would not be appropriate however in the right circumstance a monument sign may

1 be more appropriate. She stated that the Committee also felt that more than one reader board on a parcel was also not  
2 appropriate.

3  
4 Commissioner Warner asked why we don't want to allow multiple reader boards.

5  
6 Mrs. Baker stated that when talking about multi-tenant or condominium projects, we are talking about multiple businesses  
7 in a small space. She stated that the sign committee felt that more than one reader board was not appropriate. She provided  
8 a few scenarios to consider. She stated that the committee felt that it was too busy and not appropriate for that project.

9  
10 Councilman Mike Hardy asked if multiple businesses could advertise on one reader board.

11  
12 Mrs. Baker stated that they could as long as it is part of an overall project sign.

13  
14 Commissioner Warner stated he sees that in Provo and feels that it is appropriate but he wondered if it would be self-  
15 regulated.

16  
17 Commissioner Cannon stated that points of entry are of big concern here. He stated in order for a business to be successful  
18 they need to be seen. He questioned if these regulations would be appropriate for large commercial developments with  
19 several points of entrance. He stated that based on the scale of the project it could be a problem.

20  
21 Mrs. Baker stated currently with the scale of the development that we have or the potential for development it would be  
22 appropriate at the time.

23  
24 Commissioner Cannon stated that we need to look at what will be appropriate for the future.

25  
26 Planner Spencer stated that staff has discussed it with the Woodbury Corporation. In order for them to develop his 35 acres  
27 the way that they want to, they will have to change multiple ordinances, not just the sign ordinance. She stated they have  
28 already looked at our ordinances and they feel that a new zone will need to be created. She stated that at that scale there  
29 would need to be modifications to our ordinance.

30  
31 Commissioner Cannon questioned if there was a better way to write the ordinance.

32  
33 Planner Spencer stated that the concern is that there is an application in now that is not at that scale that needs some  
34 regulations so they can move forward.

35  
36 Commissioner Fitzgerald requested clarification on some of the verbiage.

37  
38 Commissioner Cannon asked if this also referred to directional signage.

39  
40 Mrs. Baker stated that this does not address directional signage. She stated that directional signage would be allowed in  
41 addition to the signs being discussed.

42  
43 Mrs. Baker stated changes being proposed to 19.15.3.3.6 (4) would not allow reader boards as wall signs in multi-tenant  
44 buildings because the sign committee felt that having so many in such a small space was not appropriate.

45  
46 Commissioner Warner stated he's not sure it is the best idea to limit businesses. He stated that it may be appropriate for  
47 some businesses.

48  
49 Mrs. Baker stated we should think about the businesses that we have in the city and if that is what we want in the city.

50  
51 Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if that included window signs.

52  
53 Mrs. Baker stated the sign committee felt strongly that a multi-tenant or condominium project signs that each business be  
54 allowed stationary space for advertising. They felt that each business needed to have more than just reader board space so  
55 that the public could easily identify the business.  
56

1 Councilman Hardy questioned if a reader board could be located on the same sign as the permanent advertisement spots. He  
2 also questioned if they would be able to have their own wall sign.

3 Mrs. Baker stated they could. She stated the ordinance limits the reader board to 50% of the allowable sign face area but  
4 that they can co-exist on the same sign. She also stated that each tenant would be allowed a wall sign.

5  
6 Commissioner Warner stated he understands what the sign committee is trying to accomplish, but wasn't sure if he was  
7 comfortable with where the language was at. He stated he can see exceptions to general rules but isn't sure how to put into  
8 language those exceptions. He suggested a scale.

9  
10 Mrs. Baker stated that we could put in a scale similar to the regulations of project signs.

11  
12 Commissioner Cannon stated that he can see developers getting very creative with their phasing in order to get multiple  
13 signs. He stated that we need to control that better.

14  
15 Councilman Hancock stated the first issue is that there are situations where two monuments are needed. He stated that the  
16 language seems quite clear. He stated the language states that there are appropriate locations for a second sign and if the  
17 applicant seeks it there this language allowing that to happen.

18  
19 Commissioner Cannon suggested referencing sections 19.15.3.3.4 and 19.15.6 (Freestanding & Monument) to each other.

20  
21 Mrs. Patricia Gunnerson stated that her business is located across from Park View elementary and kitty corner from  
22 Memorial park. She stated that her business is a three-sided lot and are looking to put up a freestanding sign on the west  
23 side of the property. She stated that they currently have a privacy wall that faces memorial park that has an existing sign on  
24 it that needs to be replaced. She said that their intent is to have two reader boards that display the same thing at the same  
25 time. She also stated they would like to display community information as well. She stated if there is only one sign on the  
26 property there wouldn't be any additional signs telling patrons what businesses are in the complex. She stated she would  
27 like to have the ability to allow additional signs on a case by case basis.

28  
29 Commissioner Fitzgerald questioned if Staff had a concern with the signage that was being proposed by Dr. Gunnerson.

30  
31 Mrs. Baker stated this is a condominium parcel; Dr. Gunnerson's office is on the far east pad, and putting a sign on the far  
32 west portion of the common area would result in an off premise sign because it is a separate parcel, which is why we are  
33 looking to add language for condominium and multi-tenant projects.

34  
35 Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if the applicant's proposed sign would be allowed with the changes that are being made to  
36 the ordinance.

37  
38 Mrs. Baker stated that the applicant would need to modify their plans but the language would allow them to erect a  
39 freestanding sign while (if approved by the Development Services Director) keep their existing sign.

40  
41 Commissioner Warner suggested language be added that in this situation reader boards be accessible to all tenants.

42  
43 Commissioner Cannon stated many owners use that as a selling point and can see that as a conflict. He stated that he sees a  
44 lot of wisdom in what staff has proposed by allowing only one reader board. He understands the reason for the business  
45 wanting two signs. He stated that they are in very close in proximity and can be very busy. He stated that he sees the best  
46 option would be to use the pole sign as the dominant sign and put the reader board on the monument sign. He stated having  
47 two reader boards seems like a lot of activity in a small amount of space. He stated it goes back to the scale of the project.

48  
49 **Motion** by Commissioner Fitzgerald to close the public hearing. Seconded by Commissioner Cannon  
50 Commissioner Cannon recommending approval of the ordinance amendments with the provision that staff add a cross  
51 reference between sign placement and the monument and freestanding sections.  
52 Motion seconded by Commissioner Van Nosedol. Motion Carries.

53  
54 **Motion** by Commissioner Fitzgerald recommending the City Council approve the ordinance as presented, with the  
55 modification that the ordinance say "government recreational facilities". Also, recommend approval of the proposed  
56 changes to Appendix A. Seconded by Commissioner Cannon. Motion carried.

**COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS**

Planner Spencer gave the Commissioners an update on current projects and the lifecycle of the landfill

Commissioner Van Nosedol asked Planner Spencer if she has followed up on the recycling.

Planner Spencer stated she had not.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion** by Commissioner Van Nosedol to adjourn.*

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

DRAFT