

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
January 12, 2016
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Curt Cochran, Chair
 Don Quigley
 Anna Barbieri
 Garl Fink
 Lynette Wendel
 Dale Kehl
 Israel Grossman

City Staff

Mark McGrath – Director of Community Development
 Jim Spung – Associate Planner
 Stephanie Nate – City Attorney Office
 Jean Gallegos/Admin Assistant/Recorder

PUBLIC: Geri Seamon, Karl Seamon, Kathy Zdunich, Virginia Syme, Adriana Cervazos, Jay Curtis, Terrie Jackson, Jeff Krantz, Terri Saxton

The work meeting to review the Agenda was held by **Mr. McGrath** from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

WELCOME: **Commissioner Cochran** assumed duties as Chair, welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. [6:58:28 PM](#)

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda/File #	Application	Applicants	Action
2.	Review/approval of Minutes for December 8, 2015.		Approved by motion as presented.

MOTION: **Commissioner Barbieri**– I move for approval of the consent agenda consisting of the Minutes for December 8, 2015.

SECOND: **Commissioner Fink**

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

MOTION: **Commissioner Quigley** – I would like to change the agenda to move Item #7 on the agenda to actually be Item #5, move Item #5 down to be #6, and #6 down to #7 to facilitate the flow of discussion.

SECOND: **Commissioner Fink**

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

CONDITIONAL USES

3.	46C15 – Abelardo and Adriana Cavazos - Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit for a Reception Center – 1767 West 4160 South. (Jim Spung/Associate Planner) 7:01:51 PM
----	--

- 3.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item. The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit to allow a reception center at approximately 1767 W 4160 S in Taylorsville. The definition of a "Reception Center" as found in 13.36.190 of the Land Development Code is: "A building, together with its accessory buildings and premises, which is a place of assembly with the predominant purpose of hosting single events either occurring alone or as part of another activity or business. The noise ordinance shall be enforced as provided in Section 26A-1-114 of the Utah Code Annotated. Typical uses include wedding receptions, birthday parties, bar mitzvahs, quinceañeras, conventions, and other similar events, etc. Consecutive or repeated similar events shall not be held by the same applicant." The property is located within the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district and is within 250 feet of a residential district; which requires administrative conditional use approval for "reception center" as per 13.08.020 of the Land Development Code. The Community Development Director has reviewed the application and determined it is in the best interest of the public and the City to hold a public hearing and present the application before the Planning Commission. The proposed business would provide a multi-purpose space for events, meetings, aerobic classes and birthday parties. The maximum occupancy will be 80-100 people with two (2) employees during a peak shift. Consumption and/or serving alcohol will not be allowed at the premises. The applicant(s) are proposing to locate their business within a multi-tenant strip commercial building with shared parking and access. The proposed hours of operation are: Sunday-Thursday – 9:00 am-9:00 pm; and Friday-Saturday – 9:00 am – 10:30 pm.

3.2 **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- 3.2.1 The applicant is requesting approval of a reception center at 1767 W 4160 S.
- 3.2.2 The subject property is located within the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district.
- 3.2.3 The subject property is within 250 feet of a residential district, which requires administrative conditional use approval in the CC zone.
- 3.2.4 The Community Development Director has chosen to hold a public hearing and defer action to the Planning Commission.
- 3.2.5 The hours of operation are Sunday-Thursday: 9:00 am – 9:00 pm and Friday-Saturday – 9:00 am – 10:30 pm with two (2) full-time employees.
- 3.2.6 The proposal is in compliance with the conditional use permit standards (13.33.040.A).
- 3.2.7 The proposed use is not contrary to the City's General Plan.
- 3.2.8 A public notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property advising them of a public hearing to be held January 12, 2016.

3.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of a conditional use permit for File #46C15 subject to the following conditions:

- 3.3.1 The use must be compliant with all requirements of applicable reviewing agencies
- 3.3.2 Hours of operation are limited to: 9:00 am to 9:00 pm, Monday – Thursday; and 9:00 am to 10:30 pm, Friday-Saturday. The business shall comply with all applicable noise ordinances.
- 3.3.3 No alcohol may be served or consumed on the premises.
- 3.3.4 Consecutive or repeated similar events shall not be held by the same applicant.
- 3.3.5 Conditional Use Permit is subject to review upon substantiated and unresolved complaints. Complaints which cannot be resolved may be grounds for permit revocation.

3.4 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** [7:05:01 PM](#) **Commissioner Quigley** asked Ms. Cavazos how many participants she anticipated for these events and her response was between 80 and 100. **Commissioner Grossman** wanted to know if there would be live music and she replied there would be. **Commissioner Fink** asked her if she had read and understood Staff's Recommendations, to which she indicated that she did. **Commissioner Cochran** wondered who she would be targeting for this market and she responded that it would probably be mostly small weddings, birthday parties, etc. **Commissioner Quigley** added that the size of the facility at 1600 square feet would not equate to accommodating that many people. **Commissioner Barbieri** wanted to make sure that the guests would leave by at least 10:30 p.m. and **Ms Cavazos** advised that is what will happen.

3.5 **SPEAKING:** [7:10:34 PM](#)

- 3.6.1. **Virginia Syme.** She said that her home is in very close proximity, directly behind this building. She was concerned because there is already a reception center in the same group of buildings, which has turned out to be a big problem. They stay there until 1:00 in the morning and make a lot of noise. Her concern was that this would also happen with this one.
- 3.6.2. **Kathy Zdunich** She was opposed to the late hour they propose to stay open until. Also about proper food preparation and clean up.
- 3.6.3. **Jeri and Karl Seamon.** The Seamons live right behind the Flamingo Reception Center, which is presently operational in the same general area as this new one is proposed to be. It has turned out to be a huge headache, especially with the noise. **Mrs. Seamon** expressed concern about 1600 square feet not being enough to accommodate that many people. **Commissioner Quigley** asked her if the noise problem was from people coming back out of the alley or just sound permeating from there in general. **Mrs. Seamon** advised it was coming from inside the building, with band music so loud it vibrates her home. She continued on to say that when the application was heard regarding the Flamingo, it was portrayed to be a reception center but has since evolved into more than that. **Mr. Seamon** advised that the noise was mostly from the bass of a boom box and that his wife has called the police several times. **Mrs. Seamon** expressed appreciation to City Councilman Burgess for his intervention in the matter, which has resulted in the noise being softened down a bit. **Mr. and Mrs. Seamon** advised that all they are concerned with is having their neighborhood remain peaceful and quiet.

3.6 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Cochran** asked Ms. Cavazos to explain her target market for this application and she said it would mostly be for birthday parties for older kids during the evening and smaller children during the day, small family parties, weddings, etc.. There would be no loud music allowed after 10:30 on Friday and Saturday nights. **Commissioner Wendel** commented that people differentiate between the types of noise. The bass levels need to be controlled. It is the vibration from that which creates the concern for neighbors. **Commissioner Kehl** asked if the noise concern should not be taken care of under the business license process. **Mr. McGrath** asked if he meant in terms of what is permitted, to which **Commissioner Kehl** replied in the affirmative. **Mr. McGrath** then said that it is based on the Salt Lake County Noise Ordinance, implemented by the County Health Department. There are standards in terms of what is a permissible noise level from 10 pm to 6 am and what is permitted outside those hours. **Commissioner Kehl** asked if there is a complaint filed about the noise vibration would a County agency then come out and put up a sound meter to check that. **Mr. McGrath** said that was correct. If the business is found to be in violation of the ordinance that is grounds for some type of action by the City. He could not answer the question of the difference between regular noise and that created by loud bass music. [7:20:52 PM](#) **Commissioner Barbieri** added that it sounds like the neighbors are already having problems with the noise level and advised the applicant to be sure she adjusts the music to comply and to keep the doors shut to contain as much as possible. **Commissioner Quigley** reiterated the importance of being especially cognizant of the concerns of the neighbors.

- 3.8 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Barbieri](#) - I move for approval of this application for a reception center at 1767 W 4160 South, with Staff Conditions 1 through 5.
SECOND: [Commissioner Quigley](#)
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

4. 48C15 – Young Electric Sign Company - Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit for a Freeway Oriented Pylon Sign. (Jim Spung/Associate Planner) [7:31:40 PM](#)

- 4.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item. The applicant is seeking approval of a freeway oriented pylon sign and electronic message center (EMC) sign at approximately 5800 S Redwood road in Taylorsville. He showed the site line study depiction provided by the applicant and advised that the applicant needs to demonstrate compliance with specific standards for EMC signage. Conditional uses may not have a detrimental impact or effect on the following: (1) The health, safety, and welfare of the city and its present and future inhabitants and businesses; (2) The prosperity of the city and its present and future inhabitants and businesses; (3) The morals, peace and good order, comfort, convenience, and aesthetics of the city and its present and future inhabitants and businesses; (4) The tax base; (5) Economy in governmental expenditures; (6) The state's agricultural and other industries; (7) The urban and non-urban development; (8) Access to sunlight for solar energy devices; and (9) Property values. The Planning Commission may approve one (1) freeway oriented pylon sign for parcels that have a minimum of 500 linear feet of frontage adjacent to and/or fronting I-215 (13.26.090.A.11). City Staff has conducted a review of the proposed signage to verify compliance with all applicable codes and ordinances. The proposal exceeds the maximum allowable square footage for a freeway oriented pylon sign. Currently the maximum sign area is calculated based on the amount of freeway frontage up to a maximum of 200 square feet. A text amendment to the City's Land Development Code (File 15Z15 is being processed which would increase the maximum allowable square footage for freeway oriented pylon signs). Staff recommends a building permit not be issued for the sign proposed in this application until the applicant can demonstrate compliance with the maximum allowable sign copy area for freeway oriented pylon signs. The applicant will also need to demonstrate compliance with Sections 13.26.050.F and 13.26.050.G which address specific standards for EMC signage.
- 4.2 **FINDINGS OF FACT:** Staff finds the following findings of fact regarding File 48C15:
- 4.2.1 The applicant is requesting approval of a freeway oriented pylon sign at approximately 5800 South Redwood Road.
 - 4.2.2 The subject property is located within the Regional Commercial (RC) zoning district and is part of the master sign plan approved for the Crossroads of Taylorsville shopping center.
 - 4.2.3 The proposed sign is 65 feet tall, or 35 feet above freeway grade.
 - 4.2.4 The proposed sign copy area is 949.6 square feet.
 - 4.2.5 The EMC portion of the sign is 28.9 percent of the total copy area.
 - 4.2.6 The EMC portion of the sign is not higher than 55 feet above freeway grade (55 feet).
 - 4.2.7 The proposed use is not contrary to the City's General Plan.
 - 4.2.8 A public notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property advising them of a public hearing to be held January 12, 2016.
- 4.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve File 48C15 subject to the following conditions:
- 4.3.1 The use must be compliant with all requirements of applicable reviewing agencies.
 - 4.3.2 Demonstrate compliance with the maximum allowable sign copy area for freeway oriented pylon signs prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - 4.3.3 The sign must be equipped with a meter to dim the brightness of the sign to not exceed one candle foot as measured at the property line six feet above the grade of the curb.
 - 4.3.4 Imagery and text shall not change more frequently than once every eight (8) seconds. Video, animated, or moving images are prohibited.
 - 4.3.5 Conditional Use Permit is subject to review upon substantiated and unresolved complaints. Complaints which cannot be resolved may be grounds for permit revocation.
- 4.4 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Mr. Jeff Krantz**, represented Young Electric Sign Company in this matter before the Planning Commission. He advised that Staff had covered the proposal very well in their presentation this evening and he had nothing further to add unless there were questions. [7:36:04 PM](#) There being none, **Commissioner Cochran** opened the meeting for public input.
- 4.5 **SPEAKING:** **Jay Curtis – 5919 Farm Ridge Road**, [7:36:54 PM](#) **Mr. Curtis** said he was neither in opposition nor favor but wondered if his second floor bedroom would be impacted by the electronic portion of this sign. **Mr. Spung** answered that based on the aforementioned line of sight study submitted by the applicant, it is difficult to determine the line of sight impact on this specific property. **Commissioner Cochran** added that based on the dotted line shown, it looks like the illuminated part of the sign would be just under the line of sight from the tops of the houses. However, there is no definitive answer to that question. **Commissioner Fink** asked Mr. Curtis if he can presently look over the Interstate wall from that second floor window. **Mr. Curtis** said that he could see just the very tops of some of the buildings along the south end of the center. **Commissioner Cochran** asked if anyone could say just how tall those buildings were. No one could say for certain but offered guesses ranging from 30 to 40 feet high.
- 4.6 **Mr. Krantz** came back up to answer questions and offered that they want to minimize the effects of the EMC as much as is possible and to do that would adjust the brightness up during the day and dim it back down during the night time hours, per

Taylorville City Ordinance. He felt that the eight second rule on changing images minimizes the impact and commented that Taylorville's ordinance with that regard is much more restrictive than other municipalities. [7:41:05 PM](#) **Mr. Spung** interjected that any EMC cannot be higher than 55' tall per City Ordinance. **Commissioner Cochran** wanted to know if the sign being at an angle would diminish the brightness affecting the neighbors and **Mr. Krantz** said it probably would not.

- 4.7 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Barbieri** advised that the neighbors will probably see the top of the marquee, however, that the sign was moved further east than originally was proposed by direction of the Planning Commission, in an effort to accommodate the impacted neighbors as much as possible. [7:48:29 PM](#) **Commissioner Quigley** added that the original sign was proposed to be 75' tall and was lowered in height after a lot of discussion and effort to minimize the impact on the neighbors. He asked Mr. Curtis how many two-story homes are in that particular area and **Mr. Curtis** said that probably one third of them are.
- 4.8 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Quigley - I will move for approval with conditions as listed in the Staff Report.](#)
SECOND: [Commissioner Fink](#)
VOTE: [All Commissioners present voted in favor. 7:51:56 PM](#)

SUBDIVISION

5. 14S15 – **Jim Wilkinson** - Consideration of a Plat Amendment for the Apple Hollow, Phase 2 Subdivision – 4721 S 3600 W. (Jim Spung/Associate Planner) [7:53:11 PM](#)

- 5.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item. **Mr. Jim Wilkinson** has filed a subdivision amendment application with the City of Taylorville to amend Lot 1 of the Apple Hollow Phase 2 Subdivision at approximately 4721 S 3600 W. The subject property is 29,052 square feet (0.667 acres) within the Limited Commercial (LC) zoning district. There is an existing abandoned single family dwelling on the property. The proposed amendment will divide Lot 1 into three (3) separate single family lots. This subdivision amendment request also requires the applicant to re-zone the property from Limited Commercial (LC) to a single family residential zone (R-1-6). The applicant has filed a re-zone application which is currently under review by City Staff (File #14Z15). This subdivision amendment will be contingent on the applicant receiving approval from the City Council to re-zone the property from Limited Commercial (LC) to single family residential (R-1-6). The lot closest to 3600 West will have its own private drive access from the public street. The two (2) interior lots will have shared access via a private lane off of 3600 West. The proposal complies with the standards for a private lane as determined by the City's Land Development Code. The proposal also complies with the lot standards for the R-1-6 zoning district. The City Engineer has reviewed the preliminary subdivision plans and is working with the applicant to bring the proposed subdivision into compliance with all City Codes and Ordinances related to grading, utilities and drainage. A representative from Unified Fire Authority (UFA) has reviewed the plans and has approved the access and turnaround as proposed. A Knox box will need to be provided on the gate for emergency access to the business to the north. In addition, no parking signs will need to be installed for the private lane and the turnaround. [7:55:23 PM](#)
- 5.2 **FINDINGS OF FACT:** Staff finds the following findings of fact regarding File 14S15:
- 5.2.1 The applicant is requesting to amend Lot 1 of the Apple Hollow Phase 2 Subdivision.
 - 5.2.2 The amended subdivision would subdivide Lot 1 into 3 separate lots.
 - 5.2.3 The proposed subdivision amendment contains 29,052 square feet (0.667 acres).
 - 5.2.4 The property is currently zoned Limited Commercial (LC).
 - 5.2.5 Prior to recording the subdivision amendment, the property will need to be rezoned to allow single family dwellings.
 - 5.2.6 The subject property is within the "Medium Density Residential" designation on the General Plan Map.
 - 5.2.7 The subdivision request complies with the City's General Plan.
- 5.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision plat amendment for File #14S15 subject to the following conditions:
- 5.3.1 Developer is required to demonstrate compliance with all applicable City Codes and Ordinances prior to recording the plat amendment with Salt Lake County.
 - 5.3.2 Comply with the requirements of all reviewing agencies.
 - 5.3.3 Complete the technical review with Staff.
 - 5.3.4 Staff is authorized to complete the Final Subdivision Amendment Review.
 - 5.3.5 The applicant re-zone the property from Limited Commercial (LC) to single family residential (R-1-6) prior to recording the final plat.
- 5.4 **DISCUSSION** **Commissioner Cochran** asked for clarification on where the driveway would be located. **Mr. Spung** said it was located along the south edge of the new homes and is indicated on the plat as such. [7:56:47 PM](#) **Commissioner Cochran's** main concern was where the visitors to these new homes would be parking. **Mr. Spung** said the ordinance requires a two car garage, with space for an additional two cars for each home. Anything in addition to that would need to be along the public street.
- 5.5 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Jim Wilkinson**. [7:57:46 PM](#) **Mr. Wilkinson** said that they now have updated plans but his engineer just barely got them done today, so he will be sending those to the City. Those plans have the water retention indicated for each lot, etc. He added that during the meeting with the City Staff held before the plans were drawn up, it was

determined that the proposal being shown this evening was the best plan to meet the needs of his business which is next door and do something with the property itself, which has been vacant for a long time now. **Commissioner Cochran** asked if the private lane will be big enough for the oxygen truck to access okay and was informed by **Mr. Wilkinson** it was. The truck is a semi with a 52' single trailer and the engineer who provided the site plan designed the site to accommodate that. In order to deliver oxygen to the tank, the truck must be able to back in to within 10 to 12 feet of it due to the volatile nature of oxygen. There is now a locked gate with a Knox box in place for the Fire Department access, which will remain. **Commissioner Fink** commented that he has noticed there are several easements involved with this site and wanted to know what they were for. **Mr. Wilkinson** said he was not sure what they all were and the only one he knew for certain is the one that is at the bottom of the site plan is for Questar Gas. (The engineer commented off microphone and was not audible). **Commissioner Fink** advised Mr. Wilkinson to check on the status of the easements to see if they are all still active. **Commissioner Quigley** asked about the development time line for the project and **Mr. Wilkinson** said that they plan to renovate the existing structure first and sell it to finance the remainder of the site. **Commissioner Quigley** wanted to know if the people buying those new lots will be informed there will be a semi-truck coming in and out of there periodically for these deliveries. **Mr. Wilkinson** said he had no intention of hiding anything from any prospective buyers and would so notify them. He said that the semi-truck makes deliveries to his business every three weeks. If the business grows to the point where it needs weekly deliveries he plans to move the business to another area. **Commissioner Kehl** suggested Mr. Wilkinson, for his own protection, to record that on the plat as a note about the anticipated deliveries. **Commissioner Quigley** said that he had a question about doing that in that if it is recorded on the plat, then it would become memorialized and when he finally outgrows this site then they would have that same right of access for trucks. **Commissioner Kehl** added that the process is not so much to record utility easements on properties now but rather to place them on the streets, unless it is a drainage easement. **Mr. Spung** said that with regard to this question, the City will require that the lane has an access easement in favor of the business lot recorded on the plat. It wouldn't necessarily say semi-truck access but rather that the lot has a right of access to the northern lot. However, he did feel it was a good idea to let the new property owners know up front that it would be accessed by semi-trucks presently. [8:05:47 PM](#)

- 5.6 **SPEAKING: Terrie Jackson** (Her mother owns property to the south). **Ms. Jackson** said she is neither opposed nor in favor but just wanted to see what is going on. [8:07:17 PM](#) She asked the applicant if he were planning on remodeling the present home or tearing it down. **Mr. Wilkinson** replied he was going to remodel it because that was less expensive than tearing the whole thing down and starting over. (There was a discussion off microphone between Ms. Jackson and Mr. Wilkinson about what he plans to do with the site, especially the existing home, – which was inaudible for the recording). At the end of which, **Ms. Jackson** added that whatever happens will be an improvement. **Commissioner Cochran** suggested Ms. Jackson and Mr. Wilkinson meet after this meeting to discuss specifics privately. **Commissioner Fink** said that it seemed like Ms. Jackson had access off of that road into her property and wanted to know if that was correct. She replied that they had put cars back there in the past for temporary storage through that access. **Mr. Wilkinson** said that he had no problem with her keeping that access available. [8:10:29 PM](#)
- 5.7 **Commissioner Cochran** closed the public hearing portion of this meeting and opened it for discussion or a motion.
- 5.8 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Fink – I move for approval of File #14S15 with Staff Recommendations 1-5.](#)
SECOND: [Commissioner Barbieri](#)
VOTE: [All Commissioners present voted in favor.](#)

ZONE CHANGE

6.	14Z15 – Jim Wilkinson – Recommendation of a Zone Change from LC to R-1-6 at approximately 4721 S 3600 W. (Jim Spung/Associate Planner) 8:12:29 PM
----	---

- 6.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item. Mr. Jim Wilkinson has filed a request to amend the zoning map from Limited Commercial (LC) to Single Family Residential (R-1-6) on property at 4721 S 3600 W. The property is 29,052 square feet (0.667 acres) and is located in the Apple Hollow Phase 2 Subdivision. There is an existing abandoned single family dwelling on the property which the applicant intends on renovating if the re-zone is approved. In April of 2015, a rezone application for the same property was presented to the Planning Commission requesting to rezone from LC to RM-8. Due to insufficient information and the need for trucks to access the property regularly, the Planning Commission forwarded a negative recommendation to the City Council (4-2 vote).
- 6.2 **FINDINGS OF FACT:** Staff finds the following findings of fact regarding File 14Z15:
 - 6.2.1 The applicant is requesting to rezone property at 4721 S. 300 W. from Limited Commercial (LC) to Single Family Residential (R-1-6).
 - 6.2.2 The subject property contains 29,052 square feet (0.667 acres).
 - 6.2.3 There is an existing abandoned home on the property.
 - 6.2.4 A subdivision amendment application (File #14S15) for the subject property is currently under review by City Staff.
 - 6.2.5 The subject property has approximately 95 feet of frontage on 3600 West.
 - 6.2.6 The subject property is approximately 297 feet deep.
 - 6.2.7 The subject property is within the "Medium Density Residential" designation on the General Plan Map.
 - 6.2.8 The zoning request complies with the City's General Plan.
- 6.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #14Z15 with no conditions.

- 6.4 **DISCUSSION:** Items 5 and 6 were discussed together, with no further input or discussion made on this portion of the proposal. The public hearing was held in conjunction with Item #5.
- 6.5 **MOTION Commissioner Grossman – I will make a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #14Z15 with no conditions as recommended by Staff.**
SECOND: Commissioner Fink
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

TEXT AMENDMENT

7. 15Z15 – Recommendation for a Text Amendment Concerning Signage and Outdoor Advertising - (Jim Spung/Associate Planner) [7:28:01 PM](#)

- 7.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item. In November of 2015, the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council to complete a comprehensive update of Section 13.26.090 Standards for Permanent Signs that Require a Permit (File #10Z15). On November 18, 2015, the City Council approved the proposed amendments as Ordinance 15-13. The recent amendment unintentionally left an unrealistic maximum sign copy area for freeway oriented pylon signs (200 square feet). It became clear this maximum area was overlooked because the maximum sign copy area for a non-freeway oriented pylon sign is currently 350 square feet. A larger sign area for a freeway oriented sign would increase the visibility and effectiveness of the sign. The proposed amendment would increase the maximum allowed square footage to three hundred and fifty (350) square feet, plus one-half (0.5) square feet for each linear foot of freeway frontage over three hundred and fifty feet (350') to a maximum size of nine hundred and fifty (950) square feet. The proposed amendments would also limit any reader board, changeable copy area, and electronic message centers to 40 percent of the allowed sign copy area or 350 square feet, whichever is less. The current code limits these sign types to 65% of the sign copy area. In an effort to prevent a "billboard looking" sign, the overall width of the sign structure would be limited to 30 feet.
- 7.2 **FINDINGS OF FACT:** Staff finds the following findings of fact regarding File 15Z15:
 - 7.2.1 The maximum sign copy area for a freeway oriented pylon sign is currently 200 square feet.
 - 7.2.2 The maximum sign copy area for a non-freeway oriented pylon sign is currently 350 square feet.
 - 7.2.3 The maximum height for a freeway oriented pylon sign is currently 35 feet above the nearest traveled freeway lane or frontage road, whichever is greater.
 - 7.2.4 The proposed maximum sign copy area for a freeway oriented pylon sign is 350 square feet plus on-half (0.5) square feet for each linear foot of freeway frontage over three hundred and fifty feet (350') to a maximum size of nine hundred and fifty (950) square feet.
 - 7.2.5 Staff recommends adopting the new language found in amendment submitted by Staff.
- 7.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission sends a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval of File #15Z15 as stated in Exhibit A of the Staff Report. (Copy attached to the Minutes)
- 7.4 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** City of Taylorsville
- 7.6 **SPEAKING:** As no one came forward to speak either in favor or opposition, **Commissioner Cochran** closed the public hearing and opened the meeting up for discussion or a motion. [7:30:04 PM](#)
- 7.8 **MOTION Commissioner Quigley - I will make a motion to send a positive recommendation to the City Council adopting the ordinance change.**
SECOND: Commissioner Grossman
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

BUSINESS ITEM: Election was held for Planning Commission Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2016 with the following results: Commissioner Grossman was elected Chair and Commissioner Quigley as Vice Chair.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Fink** was not able to attend the last City Council meeting, so no report was given. Per **Commissioner Cochran's** request, **Commissioner Wendel** read the assigned names for the next few City Council meetings.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Barbieri** the meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m. [8:16:37 PM](#)

Respectfully submitted by:



 Jean Gallegos, Admin Asst/Recorder for the
 Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on February 9, 2016.