

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, October 9, 2013

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:29:07 PM](#) . Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Emily Drown; Vice Chair Clark Ruttinger; Commissioners Lisa Adams, Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Michael Gallegos, Marie Taylor, Matthew Wirthlin and Mary Woodhead.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford, Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Nielson, City Land Use Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was not held prior to this meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 25, 2013 MEETINGS [5:29:11 PM](#)

MOTION [5:29:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife made a motion to approve the September 25, 2013, meeting minutes. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioners Woodhead and Gallegos abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:29:36 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Ruttinger stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:29:41 PM](#)

Mr. Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:29:47 PM](#)

[Bud Mahas Construction alley closure at approximately 1550 N 900 W](#) – Bud Mahas Construction is requesting the closure of a City-owned alley located between Duluth Avenue and 1500 North Street west of 900 West. The alley was created as part of a subdivision plat but has not functioned as a public alleyway. If the city decides to close the alley, it will be sold to adjacent property owners at fair market value. The property abutting the alley is zoned M-2 Heavy Industrial. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Everett Joyce at (801) 535-7930 or everett.joyce@slcgov.com. Case number PLNPCM2013-00196).

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the use of 1500 North.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:32:08 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak for or against the petition, Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:32:42 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding the Bud MaHas Construction Alley Vacation petition PLNPCM2013-00196, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report discussion and plans presented, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council relating to petition PLNPCM2013-00196 to vacate the alley located between Duluth Avenue and 1500 North Street west of 900 West Street subject to the conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Adams joined the meeting [5:33:51 PM](#)

[5:33:54 PM](#)

[Projecting Signs Text Amendment](#) - The Salt Lake City Council is requesting that projecting signs, or blade signs, be allowed in certain zoning districts including the Sugar House Business Districts (CSHBD1 and CSHBD2) and Commercial Corridor (CC). The proposed regulation changes will affect sections 21A.46 of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A – Zoning, may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at (801) 535-7660 or maryann.pickering@slcgov.com. Case number PLNPCM2013-00739.

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission table the petition to a future Planning Commission Meeting allowing time for Staff to make suggested changes as directed by the Planning Commission and to clarify some issues, ordinance changes which would be required by the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the type of signs being reviewed and where examples were located in the City. They discussed what tenants would be allowed to have projecting business storefront signs and where they needed to be located within the buildings. Staff explained that projecting business storefront signs would be for tenants on the ground floor with street frontage.

The Commission discussed whether the proposal should be allowed in just the Sugar House Business District zones in an effort to move the petition forward and revisit issues relating to the Commercial Corridor zoning district through a separate petition that the Planning Commission could initiate at a future date. The Commission and Staff discussed if staggering the signs on the face of the building was necessary, if businesses which shared a common entry could have a sign with all of the business names on it or if only those businesses with direct entry from the street could have a projecting business storefront sign. They discussed if the ten foot height minimum from the ground could be lessened, whether these signs could be distracting and look cluttered and whether the signs really promoted walkability of an area. The Commission and Staff discussed why the proposed signs did not help vehicle traffic as well as pedestrian traffic. Staff explained the projecting business storefront signs are lower and smaller than most signs. The Commission and Staff discussed how to address sign clutter, how other Cities address this type of sign, what the signs do to the overall look of the streets, the landscape requirements for the buildings and how do the signs interact with it, lit or animated signs and Property Management's opinion on the proposal where the sign encroaches in the public right of way

Councilmember Søren Simonsen, who sponsored the Legislative Intent with the City Council, reviewed the purpose of the proposal, the changes and zoning affected. He stated the City Council petition was for the Sugar House Business District zones one and two but he would not object to making it City wide. Mr. Simonsen reviewed the projecting building sign styles in Sugar House and the historic nature of some of those signs. He asked the Commission for direction on how to apply the proposal to the area.

The Commission and Mr. Simonsen discussed the larger signs in pedestrian orientated spaces and why they were necessary. They discussed the dimensions of a projecting building sign. Councilmember Simonsen noted that new businesses are starting up in

Sugar House and the visibilities of those businesses from the Streetcar stop are very hard to see. Projecting business storefront signs will help pedestrians see what businesses are on the street.

The Commission and Mr. Simonsen discussed tabling the proposal and the issues with upcoming businesses getting permits for signs. They discussed the time table for approving the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed what signs should be allowed in Sugar House and taking the time to correctly address the options making the right choice to start with. They discussed how the proposal could be put on the City Council's agenda in order to get approved in a timely manner.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:11:24 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Amy Berry, Sugar House Community Council, stated the Council was in favor of the petition but a blanket approach in the Sugar House Business District zone two was not the best idea due to the close proximity to residential areas. She stated current signs were hard for pedestrians to see and the proposal would promote businesses and walk ability complimenting the areas. Ms. Berry stated allowing one sign per building was not ideal as one could not identify a business if they were on the opposite side of the building where a sign was not located.

The Commission and Ms. Berry discussed the size of the signs and eliminating the larger signs. Ms. Berry stated the Community Council did not discuss the elimination of the larger signs and probably would not be in favor of eliminating them.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION [6:15:31 PM](#)

The Commission and Mr. Simonsen discussed the letter from Mr. Alan Johnson. They discussed the original intent to allow projecting business storefront signs and not prohibit the larger projecting building signs. The Commission and Mr. Simonsen discussed canopies and vintage signs. They discussed if the Commission could regulate sign movement, lighting and future sign proposals.

The Commission determined the Public Hearing would remain open for a future meeting.

The Commission would like Staff to address the following

- larger signs
- staggering signs
- sign location
- how to address multiple tenants in one building
- options for illumination
- clarification on the air space lease with Property Management
- design elements keeping with the character of the district
- graphics and examples of other areas with these signs
- how this proposal is different than what zoning allows in other areas of the City
- address comments made in the letter from Alan Johnson

MOTION [6:29:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated regarding petition PLNPCM2013-00739, she moved to table the petition and continue the Public Hearing until such date the Planning Staff was prepared to bring the petition back with responses to the concerns and questions raised by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Staff stated they would have the proposal ready for the November 13, 2013, meeting.

The Commission and Staff discussed dividing out the Commercial corridor and just looking at the Sugar House Business district zone and making sure there were no conflicts with the West Salt Lake Master Plan currently underway. They discussed why the commercial corridor was added to the petition and if Staff needed to ask the City Council for their approval in adding it to the petition.

Commissioner Woodhead amended the motion to suggest that the petition be divided in to two, the Sugar House Business District and the Commercial Corridor and the Planning Commission would like to review the Sugar House proposal as quickly as possible. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the amendment.

The Commission and Staff discussed who needed to initiate the petition for the Commercial Corridor. The Commission discussed if splitting the petition would benefit Redwood Road or not.

[6:36:51 PM](#)

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [6:37:23 PM](#)