

**WEST VALLEY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

April 14, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chairman Harold Woodruff at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Woodruff, Brent Fuller, Jack Matheson, Terri Mills, Barbara Thomas, and Imaan Bilic

ABSENT:

Phil Conder and Joe Garcia

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

Steve Pastorik, Jody Knapp, Ron Weibel, and Nichole Camac

WEST VALLEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

Claire Gillmor, Assistant City Attorney

AUDIENCE

Approximately one (1) person was in the audience

ZONE TEXT CHANGE APPLICATION

ZT-4-2010 West Valley City

This is a proposed amendment to Title 11 of the West Valley City Municipal Code.

A summary of the sections to be amended are as follows:

11-1-104 Definitions – definitions added for Landscaping and Park Identification Signs

11-4-111 Criteria for Bonus Sign Area – amendment to bonus criteria and the amount of bonus to be awarded.

11-4-116 – Addition of Sign Landscaping Section with standards for that landscaping.

11-5-103 – Amendment to Monument Sign Standards

Re-organization:

The following information has been relocated from other sections throughout the Ordinance to reduce the amount of redundant information and consolidate the Ordinance:

11-4-117 – Measurement of Setback – new section

11-5-106 – Pole Signs - Consolidated redundant information

11-5-108 – Wall Signs – New section to consolidate redundant information

11-6-102 – Residential Business- Re-organization

11-6-103 – Commerical “C-1” District - Re-organization and removal of redundant information

11-6-104 – Commerical “C-2” and “C-3” Districts - Re-organization and removal of redundant information

11-6-105 – Business/Research Park District - Re-organization and removal of redundant information

11-6-106 – Manufacturing “M” District - Re-organization and removal of redundant information

Staff Alternatives:

1. Approval, subject to the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing.
2. Continuance, to provide more time for staff to further refine the Ordinance or for the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing.
3. Denial, as the current ordinance is adequate

Applicant:
West Valley City

Against:
Alan Anderson
1241 W Village Main Dr.
WVC, UT 84119

Discussion: Jody Knapp presented the application. Barbara Thomas stated that a 100 foot frontage requirement for two separate signs on one property seemed like too small a separation. Jack Matheson stated that he doesn't see a problem with two signs if there are two frontages of 100 feet or more. Terri Mills stated that she feels a well placed sign is more appropriate than multiples signs. Commissioner Thomas asked if directional signs are considered as part of a company's sign limit. Jody replied no.

Alan Anderson, representing the Chamber of Commerce, discussed the frequency of sign ordinance changes in West Valley City. He stated that he feels the many ordinance changes proposed by the City is confusing and frustrating for business owners. Mr. Anderson indicated that the Chamber of Commerce does not approve of a 50% live plant material requirement and added that if this is an important change to the City he feels there should be an option for xeriscaping or decorative rock in the ordinance. Mr. Anderson stated that he also feels that requiring landscaping to be two times the size of the sign is too much. He added that he is concerned with one sign on the corner of two frontages because it is a safety hazard when drivers are looking back over their shoulder at it as they pass. Mr. Anderson stated that smaller signs are difficult to see depending on speed limits. He suggested that different zones sometimes need different requirements such as a residential business versus a commercial business. Mr. Anderson stated that Chamber West hopes that if this ordinance is passed the City will take a break for several years and allow businesses to see a solid ordinance in place.

Jack Matheson stated that Mr. Anderson's opinions carry weight and are important to the Planning Commission. He added that the Planning Commission has allowed larger signs for some businesses in the past and asked if Mr. Anderson feels this is a bad thing. Mr. Anderson replied that different businesses and properties sometimes require different allowances depending on various situations. He added that a single sign ordinance does not always fit every potential sign. Mr. Anderson stated that when the City changes their sign ordinance he gets many complaints regarding the City's E-Center sign and the lack of ordinances being met in that case. He indicated that the Chamber is working on an objective to ordinance modeling. He suggested basing an ordinance not off of square footage of an actual sign but off of building or frontage size and looking at specific businesses and their needs.

Jody indicated that there is an option for xeriscaping and decorative rock at the discretion of the Planning Commission written into the ordinance. She added that West Valley City typically is more concerned with the actual size of the sign since many businesses throughout the City have very little frontage. Jody stated that freeway signs are dealt with under a separate section of the sign ordinance as well as different requirements for residential business zones. She added that large sites are allowed pole signs.

Brent Fuller stated that he would request Mr. Anderson to provide Jody with a written list of concerns for the Planning Commission to review and discuss. Commissioner Thomas stated that she has a difficult time being sympathetic to businesses that have signs like Golden Corral. She stated that their sign is large, raised, and unattractive. Jody stated that the sign at the Golden Corral does not currently meet the ordinance.

Mr. Anderson stated that unique circumstances, such as the widening of 3500 South, call for different signs. He added that businesses must have something to appropriately advertise their business and specials on to draw customers in. Jody indicated that Golden Corral is a unique situation but they could have placed their sign in the landscaping instead of the parking lot if they had gone with a shorter, smaller sign.

Terri Mills stated that twice the area of the sign for landscaping is not too much. She indicated that there are many water efficient flowers that provide options for beauty and simple maintenance. Jack Matheson stated that he feels the Planning Commission should still have the ability to look at signs and modify requirements to help businesses with difficult or irregular properties.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Matheson moved for continuance to allow further discussion of proposed changes to the ordinance.

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Bilic	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – ZT-4-2010 – Continued

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS

C-6-2010

The applicant has requested continuance to allow further time to reach a parking agreement with the neighboring property.

Applicant:

Milagros Orozco

Discussion: Harold Woodruff indicated that the applicant has requested continuation for this application.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Fuller moved for continuance.

Commissioner Mills seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Bilic	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous –C-6-2010 – Continued

C-7-2010

T-Mobile

7185 West 3500 South

C-2 Zone .9 acres

T-Mobile is requesting conditional use approval to construct a 60' high monopole on the property at 7185 W. 3500 S. This property is zoned general commercial (C-2) and has a retail building on the 3500 South frontage and self-storage units behind the retail building. This project was previously approved by the Planning Commission in July, 2008. However, the applicant put the project on hold and the approval expired after one year. The West Valley City General Plan anticipates general commercial uses in this area.

The proposal from T-Mobile is to construct a standard (non-stealth) 60' high monopole with flush mounted antennas. The monopole and associated equipment would be behind the retail building and between the manager's residence and a building containing self-storage units. The Wireless Communications Facilities ordinance allows a non-stealth monopole in this zone as long as there is not another non-stealth monopole within a one-half mile radius. The closest approved monopole is approximately 1.4 miles to the north of this location.

The monopole and associated equipment is inside the gated area of the self-storage units and not accessible to the general public. However, it is next to the interior travel lane for the storage units and will be secured by an eight foot high chain link fence. The area between the two buildings where the facility will be located is approximately 20' by 36' and the lease area for the facility will be 11' by 21'. The area is currently surfaced with gravel and there are no plans by the applicant to change that other than a 10' by 10' concrete pad for the equipment and the necessary foundation for the monopole.

Staff Alternatives:

- Approval, subject to the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing and the following conditions:
 1. All requirements of any affected departments and agencies must be met.

2. All applicable requirements of the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities ordinance (Chapter 7-23) must be met.
 3. The lease area must be kept free of weeds and debris.
- Continuance, to allow for the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing.

Applicant:

T-Mobile
Not Present

Discussion: Jack Matheson stated that the proposed location of this monopole is much better than its original proposal behind the school. The Planning Commission had no further concern.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Thomas moved for approval subject to the three conditions listed by staff.

Commissioner Bilic seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Bilic	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous –C-7-2010 – Approved

PLANNING COMISSION BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from March 10, 2010 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**

Approval of minutes from April 7, 2010 (Study Session) **Approved**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nichole Camac, Administrative Assistant