

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF HOLLADAY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**Wednesday, September 5, 2012**

**6:30 p.m.**

**Holladay Municipal Center  
4580 South 2300 East**

**(It is noted that, due to intermittent recording system failures – portions of these minutes are missing or incomplete)**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Planning Commission Members:**

Les Chatelain, Chair  
Lori Khodadad, Vice Chair  
Spence Bowthrope  
Brad Wright  
John Garver

**City Staff:**

Paul Allred, Community Development Director  
Rick Whiting, City Planner  
Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner  
Pat Hansen, City Planner

**PRE-MEETING/WORK SESSION**

Chair Chatelain called the Work Session to order at 6:40 p.m. The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.

City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, addressed the draft Residential Building Corridor text amendment and stated that there have been no changes since the last meeting. He met with Councilman Lynn Pace to discuss the building corridor threshold and where it does and does not apply. Several ideas were alluded to in the staff report with respect to identifying a lot as either small or large and making the threshold a 1.5-acre lot or larger to which the building corridor would not apply. Councilman Pace recommended flexibility with respect to which properties on the street are to be averaged and the ability to determine which homes are comparable. Using that flexibility in addition to the lot definitions, an urban fabric may be easily ascertained. Staff recommended taking public comment and continuing the matter to allow an amended set of code amendments to be drafted. Continuing the issue would also allow further discussion and review. Notice was given of the City Council Public Hearing scheduled for September 20.

(6:44:38) Mr. Teerlink reported that several changes were made to the fire station proposal. The Public Works Department asked that the new building behind the station more user-friendly for the public. Landscaping on the site plan and the drawings as well as lighting were clarified. Fencing issues were discussed.

With respect to the Holladay Village Square, Mr. Teerlink said that the developer made all of the requested corrections. It appeared to Commissioner Khodadad that the extra enhancements were still being encouraged by the developer. Mr. Teerlink remarked that there is some flexibility. Significant changes will need be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

(18:50:50) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, stated that site lighting is still being configured. The Planning Commission agreed to allow the Technical Review Committee (TRC) to resolve the issue. Building materials and color specifics were discussed. Staff was provided with a site illumination plan. Mr. Allred reviewed the items in the staff report pertaining to additional lighting detail such as the location of parking lot lights, the design for building mounted lights, the promenade area between buildings, and light values for the parking deck. He explained that light values are needed for the parking deck, on the westerly parking lot, and in the promenade area. In the rear parking area, the lighting should be sufficiently bright, yet shielded from neighbors and turned off during certain hours.

Mr. Allred was pleased with the additional detail provided by the architects on the store front systems. He liked the flexibility by which the store front could be used by the tenants. One potential tenant asked for a roll-up store front, which would be at their discretion. The developer wants tenants to determine whether the awnings are automatic or crank. All awnings will be cloth and high quality.

Details were given on the types of lighting to be mounted on the building. Mr. Allred reported that the proposed closure matches the building. The proposed brick colors were discussed.

Chair Chatelain asked when the final engineering plans will be presented. Mr. Allred indicated that City Engineer, Clarence Kemp, was in the process of completing the civil engineering work. The most recent title report was nearly clean with two small exceptions from 2008 when the City owned the property. Mr. Allred, City Attorney Craig Hall, and Mr. Kemp planned to meet with the Salt Lake County City Recorder and get advice on amending the underlying plat. Mr. Allred hoped to have the plat recorded as soon as possible. The most significant concerns with the title report had been resolved and staff planned to ask for recommendations from the recorder. The plat submitted by the applicant's engineer would then be redlined with the final drawing to be presented to the Commission. A hearing may be required and possibly scheduled for the first meeting in October.

(19:00:25) Mr. Allred stated that since the last meeting the developer has worked with staff and reviewed the redlined issues. He believed all concerns had been addressed. What was presented was determined to comply with the ordinance. Mr. Allred asked that staff be given direction if there are changes to the exterior materials. The Planning Commission was open to the idea of adding brick or stone elsewhere on the buildings as long as it is brought back for review. Mr. Allred was of the understanding that if accent materials and minor changes are made, further review will not be necessary by the Planning Commission.

***(19:03:55) Commissioner Khodadad moved to close the Work Meeting and move to the Council Chambers for the Regular Meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

***The audio was missing from 7:04 to 7:37***

## **CONVENE REGULAR MEETING**

Chair Chatelain called the Meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Residential Building Corridor and Front Setback Code Amendment – Planner: Jonathan Teerlink.**
- 2. Holladay City Fire Station – 2210 East Murray-Holladay Road – Final Site Plan – P Zone – Planner: Paul Allred.**

(19:37:25) Mr. Allred introduced City Planner, Pat Hanson, who is returning to work for the City on a part-time basis. He also introduced Intern Jason Bond will be assisting staff.

Mr. Allred presented the Final Site Plan for the Holladay City Fire Station and recommended approval. He explained that City Administration has been working on the project for a long time, and had selected the architects and the design team. He commended those involved for a job well done.

Mr. Allred detailed items 1 through 4 from the preliminary approval with all having been resolved. The primary concern was the appearance of the back building, which initially did not meet the required setbacks. The landscaping was removed from the front of the Public Works Building and in its place additional parking was added. The entire site will be approximately 40% landscaping with both regular greenery and an abundance of water-wise landscaping.

Mr. Allred was pleased with the look of the building elevations. He explained that the parking areas are all concrete rather than a concrete-asphalt mixture. A colored material palette display was provided showing the architectural details of the building, such as colors and textures. The brick had not been finalized and the issue was still open for discussion with the administration.

Chris Jensen from Think/ASWN Architecture stated that the brick was custom made by Robinson for Coors Field in Colorado. It is a tumbled brick with a worn, aged look. A manmade sandstone material was to be placed the base of the tower and around the base of the building. Mr. Allred commented that the color palette gives a good idea of the appearance of the building. A committee of City Council was formed that will make the final determination. It was noted that the design and shape of the building resemble a classic fire station.

(19:44:32) Mr. Allred noted that the garbage dumpster is nicely designed. The enclosure will be of the same brick as the building and tie in nicely with the site.

Mr. Allred discussed items that still need to be resolved prior to the building permit approval being granted. The site will be graded, have utilities prepped, and work will begin on the footings and foundation. Once work commences, these items should have been resolved. He recommended the Planning Commission allow the TRC to resolve any outstanding design issues. Mr. Allred specifically recommended final site plan approval subject to the civil engineering details (such as the traffic signal relocation), utility issues, and relocation of the Casto home, fire sprinklers, and UPDS (which is the environmental requirement for the State). The listed items had been discussed, but there were details remaining to be finalized.

Mr. Jensen reported that the size of the water line was discussed and it was noted that fire sprinklers for the interior of the building would be installed as not previously noted on the site plan drawing.

With regard to item 2, the site lighting plan was revised and considered and improvement. Some light poles were removed and others reduced in height, thereby eliminating the 20-foot poles and leaving the 14 and 16 foot poles. The actual accent lighting on the building would be discussed at a future date.

In terms of light fixtures, Kenny Nichols, with Think/ASWN Architecture, commented that an LED light source may be most costly, but in terms of lighting control, they are able to come on half way or all the way and are great for energy conservation. Staff planned to work out the details of the lighting plan. Mr. Jensen indicated that they are close to having a full control system in place to review with staff as well as information on how the operation will work. Mr. Allred emphasized the importance of the lighting aspect of the project due to the surrounding high-density housing.

Fencing was next discussed. Mr. Allred suggested that open fencing be used and explained that the cost of fencing is a decision to be made by City Administration. Prior to the building being occupied, there should be a fence in place allowing security of the site. In response to a question raised, Mr. Nichols stated that he agrees with Mr. Allred and believed open fencing will enhance the overall neighborhood and keep the area open.

Mr. Jensen stated that there are multiple options they will continue to explore. The benefits of an open fence are durability and longevity with a long standing warranty. Mr. Allred stated that there are several reasons why an open fence is beneficial. It is not a target for graffiti, it will hold up in a wind event, and visibility through the fence may help deter crime. He also noted that there is an accountability factor. The site is visible and creates accountability with regard to maintenance and upkeep. A walled off site will be less inviting. Mr. Jensen had toured other fire stations with fencing on two sides. He explained that there are many public uses for fire stations beyond what they are designed for.

(19:53:16) In response to a question raised regarding the Public Works Building, Mr. Nichols stated that it will not be completed in total at the same time as the Fire Station. They plan to construct the footings and foundation concurrent with the fire station and backfill the Public Works site with gravel. Commissioner Garver questioned the continuity of the two buildings. Mr. Nichols responded that material wise, the Public Works Building will tie in with the fire station with both having the same shingles, brick, and hardy board. Budget wise, it will contain pre-fabricated trusses and standard wood frame construction. The Public Works Building was upgraded from a simple metal shed as in the original design, to be more complimentary to the fire station building.

Mr. Jensen stated that the fire station has a dominant roof and the Public Works Building will only reach 20 feet at the highest point. The elevation has been raised to ease the impact so that visually the rear height will not affect the neighboring condos.

Mr. Allred explained that the Public Works Building is not bound by the same height limits as accessory buildings in residential areas. It is its own main building with a separate use. In

residential zones, there is a maximum height limit on accessory buildings of 20 feet. Even so, this building will have approximately the same height as a residential accessory building.

(19:57:18) A question was raised regarding the neighboring residential apartments owned by Mr. Bird. The property borders the west property line. Mr. Bird expressed concerns about buffering. Although Commissioner Bowthorpe concurred with what was said, he was curious about Mr. Bird's perspective with regard to the fencing and whether he would prefer a solid barrier or an open fence. Mr. Bird's concerns were addressed with landscaping and the site was expected to be even more heavily landscaped where it meets his property. Mr. Jensen commented that with regard to Mr. Bird's property, there is a height disparity between the two structures. With regard to grading, there has been a small wall constructed to prevent drainage encroachment onto his property. It was noted that the existing fence owned by Mr. Bird is in need of attention. The new fence will replace the current fence and improve Mr. Bird's property.

Commissioner Bowthorpe wanted to make sure that Mr. Bird's comments and concerns had been addressed. Mr. Bird was one of only a few residents who commented and Commissioner Bowthorpe wanted to ensure that the Commission has been responsive. Mr. Jensen stated that the fence will be constructed prior to completion of the building, which is possibly one year away. He suggested reaching out to Mr. Bird to discuss the details and allow him to review the plan.

Mr. Jensen stated that due to the natural grade, the building needs to be placed at an elevation so the slope from the garage door is not so steep. This has created a fairly steep west property side yard, which has a 20-foot setback. A retaining wall will be placed approximately 10 feet inside the property in order to make a transition in grade creating a swale that will eliminate any water from spilling over into Mr. Bird's yard.

In response to Commissioner Bowthorpe's question pertaining to the space between the fence and the wall, Mr. Jensen stated that it would contain landscaping and a swale. Mr. Allred commented that the design includes an abundance of dense trees and landscaping to screen the area. There are approximately 50 to 60 feet between the apartments and the fire station property line in addition to another 20 feet of setback from the fire station to the property line.

(20:02:23) Commissioner Wright suggested there be a curb wall to separate the two properties and help with maintenance issues. Mr. Jensen stated that on the east side, there is a brick wall that is in poor condition. A plan is in place to do landscaping with lawn and xeriscaping to include two types of gravel that will blend into the adjacent properties.

Commissioner Garver raised the issue of LEED standards. Mr. Jensen replied that everything being done is high efficiency as far as mechanical, plumbing, the use of LED lights, and compact fluorescents lighting. He noted that they had been as energy efficient as possible. The lighting controls will shut lights down when not in use and rooms will have occupancy sensors, however, they will not pursue an active LEED certification. A comment was made that because of the residential nature of the building, it will be akin to an energy star rating.

***(20:06:25) Commissioner Khodadad moved to approve the Final Site Plan for the City of Holladay Fire Station and Public Works facility based on the following:***

**Findings:**

1. *The site plan meets the requirements of site plan approval as required by City Ordinances.*
2. *The site plan complies with the standards and rules for development in the P-Zone.*

**Requirements:**

1. *The civil engineering details will be resolved.*
2. *The Site Lighting Plan will be improved upon and presented to the TRC.*
3. *Fencing will be put in place prior to occupancy of the buildings.*
4. *Defer approval of those items to the Technical Review Committee.*

*Commissioner Bowthorpe seconded the motion. Vote: John Garver-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Brad Wright-Aye, Chair Chatelain-Aye. Motion passed unanimously*

3. **Holladay Village Square – 4664 South 2300 East – Final Site Plan – HV Zone – Planners: Paul Allred, Jonathan Teerlink, and Rick Whiting.**

(20:08:30) Mr. Allred presented the staff report and recommended final approval. He explained that all outstanding issues have been resolved, clarified, or corrected. He reported that the trash enclosure design ties in with the building. Additional lighting detail was provided, particularly for the parking lot and parking deck. Light values in the promenade area, the area between the buildings, and the parking deck were also provided. Architectural details of the building were addressed.

Mr. Allred next detailed changes made. In terms of the architectural detail, the store front systems were discussed. He remarked that items such as colors, entrance placement, window treatments, and metal panels or textures are variable. Three different designs were presented.

Mr. Allred reported that clock faces will be illuminated from behind and measure seven feet in diameter. Changes to the brick color were described. The brick size remained unchanged. The paver design was also added and is a required element on the corner. The Commission agreed to scored concrete in the promenade area. City Planner, Rick Whiting, clarified that the discussion allowed for the crosswalk and the approach on the corner to include the use of pavers. The scored concrete was to be used beneath the tower and potentially for restaurant use. Mr. Allred explained that the pavers will extend from the corner to the base of the tower and wrap around the base but not extend into the pass through. The red pavers are not required in the promenade area between the buildings because there may be restaurant furniture or seating.

(20:14:01) With regard to landscaping on the mid-block road parking lot area, the developer showed the two-foot buffer and narrowed the drive aisle. The utility service letters had all been received.

Mr. Henroid agreed with Mr. Allred's suggestion that there be a landscaping strip on the far west side of the parking lot to buffer it against the mid-block road. He also expressed concern with accessibility of the drive aisle and preferred the buffer, standard parking stall depth, the lane, and removal of two feet of the middle landscaped island. It was stated that the Civil Engineering Department was in agreement. Details were further discussed. Mr. Allred commented that small

delivery trucks will access the upper parking deck and the larger ones will serve businesses on the east side of the west parking lot.

Mr. Allred stated that the final lighting plan and the tree grate on the south end still need to be resolved.

The Commission Members commended Mr. Henroid on his visual presentation and were pleased with the rendering.

(20:21:41) A color palette was next presented. Additional details of the site plan including site lighting, parking deck issues, amended plat, changes to the brick, color, revised renderings, civil engineering, landscaping, street furniture, enhancements of the elevated walkways, etc, were discussed.

***Commissioner Khodadad moved to approve the Final Site Plan for the Holladay Village Square subject to the following:***

***Requirement:***

The applicant must address and resolve any remaining “redline” corrections on the Preliminary Site Plan per the TRC.

***Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote: John Garver-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Brad Wright-Aye; Chair Chatelain- abstained from voting. The motion passed 4 to 0 with one abstention.***

The audio skipped to 8:41:46

**4. Approve Minutes of the July 26, and August 7, 2012 Meetings.**

(22:46:40) The minutes were reviewed and modified.

***Commissioner Khodadad moved that approval of the minutes of July 26 and August 7, 2012, meetings be continued to the next meeting. Commissioner Bowthorpe seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**5. Residential Office Zone – RO Zone (continued) – Planners: Rick Whiting and Intern Jason Bond.**

(22:02:33) Mr. Whiting presented the staff report and identified the key issues as parking and architectural controls. The current assumption was that new construction is not allowed in this zone. He explained that the new zone was really being proposed to allow remodeling and reconfiguring existing homes, and converting them into businesses to allow a natural transition from residential use to commercial use that looks and somewhat acts as residential. The new zone should be limited to major streets and presumably focused on Highland Drive. The item in question had to do with parking in the front of homes, and if allowed, to what extent. Mr. Allred’s position was that the ordinance states that parking should be in the back. An unintended

consequence could be an overabundance of pavement where grass and greenery once existed and introduction of noise and exhaust fumes closer to the residences to the rear and sides of existing homes.

Chair Chatelain pointed out that the dental lab (Oganov) on Holladay Boulevard removed the entire front yard and replaced it with parking, which was not allowed. The Commission discussed a rental on south Highland Drive (Burt Carson) where there was a request to convert it into an office building. Chair Chatelain commented that the home was a good example of parking in the front or back and he did not consider it to be aesthetically appealing.

Commissioner Bowthorpe said it had more to do with how the space is landscaped and buffered and having strict requirements. Somehow it must be structured to protect and buffer the surrounding neighborhood from sound, light, and exhaust. Mr. Whiting pointed out that it has to do with the scale and scope of the business.

Commissioner Bowthorpe commented that it is about conversions where a driveway and parking in front already exists. He felt that utilizing configurations makes sense. If there is a detached garage in the back, his opinion was that placement of parking in the rear makes sense.

(22:08:40) Mr. Allred remarked that another argument would be that for an existing home with an existing driveway, parking in the back dramatically increases the cost to the property owner. If parking is kept in front, that business is self-limited by the fact that they cannot have parking in the rear. If it is forced to stay in the front, the impact and capacity are limited.

(22:10:39) Chair Chatelain asked if the goal of Residential Office is for it to look like a residence. He stated that residential homes don't have parking in the front, and if parking is allowed, it tends to look like a grocery store. Mr. Bond commented that residences don't have parking in the back yard either. He suggested there be a balance between the two.

Commissioner Khodadad pointed out that parking should be allowed for whatever situation works for that particular property. Backyard parking should require a buffer similar to the NC Zone. Mr. Allred replied that there are prohibitions in the RM Zone where parking isn't allowed in the front yard due to the setback.

Aesthetics was one of the essential problems identified by Mr. Allred. Another was the matter of policy. He asked if the inclusion of small offices in the mid-block is allowed. Commissioner Khodadad commented that the NC Zone requires the business be right up to the street with parking behind. The comment was made that the NC Zone idea is to move the building up and to provide adequate buffering between the business and the neighbors.

Chair Chatelain remarked that allowing parking perpendicular to the road will create an issue of multiple entrances and multiple crossing points as opposed to one with a driveway. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the issue is controlled by the frontage standards and states that commercial lots are allowed only one entrance.

Commissioner Bowthorpe suggested that green space around the building and parking be required and allow the view from the road and back to be buffered. It would not matter if it is in front or back but rather how well it is done. Previously converted properties were discussed.

Mr. Bond remarked that because it is Residential Office compared to Neighborhood Commercial, there will be less intensity of use. Sufficient buffering for parking was determined to be more important than parking placement.

(22:21:53) Chair Chatelain suggested the Commission consider how landscaping and lighting were defined in the Village Center as a starting point.

City Planner, Pat Hansen, asked about a potential beauty salon on one of the streets being Residential Office. Chair Chatelain replied that it would be allowed as a home occupation and is permitted under the definition of Residential Office. She suggested that provision of services be put in writing. She was under the impression by the way it was written that a new structure could never be built in the zone. Commissioner Khodadad was of the understanding that it maintained the feel of residential and there could still be new construction.

(22:24:35) Mr. Allred invited the Commissioners to share their views on remodeling a home as opposed to complete demolition and replacement with a home office. He explained that the purpose of the zone is to pursue remodels rather than new construction. It was questioned whether a new zone was even needed. He brought up the issue of a residential office conversion being allowed as a conditional use in any existing zone. Ms. Hansen commented that for years that was how the County functioned. Every building and home that is now an office building was changed under the conditional use process, regardless of the zone. There was language targeted from residential to commercial conversions and it was allowed wherever the Planning Commission saw fit. Ms. Hanson also explained that there is an existing provision that allows that a home need only be 50 years old to be declared "historic". At that point the historic preservation ordinance allows for conversion without any hearings.

Mr. Allred shared an example of a school for autistic children that was constructed across the street from his home in Midvale. His issue was not that he necessarily was opposed to the use, but that he did not have any input or notification about it coming into the neighborhood. He was informed by the County that the school was a protected use and the State only had to grant a license and did so without notifying the surrounding neighbors. He pointed out that an open process would have been more beneficial than utilizing historic preservation and upsetting the neighborhood.

(22:30:41) As a side note, Mr. Allred reported that the moratorium will expire in 10 days. He spoke to Councilman Pace who was not overly concerned and stated that the City still has control over zoning regardless of the expiration. The Petitioner, whom Mr. Whiting had been working with, voluntarily withdrew his petition while the issue was being addressed. The applicant can later request that the Council reinstate his petition.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Khodadad stated that matter is up for discussion tonight and will come back to the Commission for further discussion. A rewrite will also be completed as well as a public hearing. The matter will then move on to the

City Council. Due to the importance of the issue Mr. Allred suggested the Planning Commissioners review and make recommendations to the City Council as soon as possible.

The Commission discussed a situation where a developer wants to convert a home to a small office. Mr. Allred stated that the applicant could ask for a home-based business license with customers, which is conditional use. He noted that the applicant must reside on the premises. If it is an office use, not residential, the applicant would have to rezone the property to RO or NC or create a new zone. Mr. Allred used Wayne Jansen of Jansen Insurance on Murray Holladay Road as an example of someone who lives in the back of the home with an office in front.

(22:37:00) A Commission Member stated that the RO zone is designed for someone who wants to do a residential to office conversion. It is easier and has specific guidelines that are meant to protect the neighbors. It also limits what an owner can do with the office use. Mr. Allred remarked that the purpose of the zone is to preserve neighborhoods with businesses being brought in to preserve homes rather than tear them down. Preservation encourages investment in the community.

Mr. Bond commented that two things he kept going back to were residential aesthetics and the intensity of uses. He asked if the two can be maintained with a conditional use permit, or if a new zone is needed for the office conversion. With a new zone, he felt there would be more details pertaining to how the home is converted. With a conditional use permit, there wouldn't be as much control. Commissioner Wright commented that over time, homes become businesses and the area eventually transitions to a business zone.

(22:40:44) Ms. Hansen stated that Highland Drive at one time was a small residential street and has become a five-lane street lined with businesses. She discussed homes that are not worth saving and should not be turned into office buildings. She thought the door should remain open to allow those types of structures to be demolished and a new business built in their place.

Mr. Allred related the issue to Tom Nelson and the neighbors who are upset with the City Council, staff, and the Planning Commission for the adoption of Highland Drive Corridor Master Plan. There have been two meetings conducted in the last two weeks. Tom Nielsen emailed him and asked specifically to address the Commission for 15 to 30 minutes detailing where they stand. The neighbors are seeing vestiges of the way they used to live disappearing and view the Highland Corridor Plan and the RO Zone as threats. He emphasized that the issue is a policy question regarding the purpose of a potential new zone.

Mr. Allred agreed with Ms. Hansen's statement and questioned what would happen if someone wanted to invest money in the property and convert it to an office. He asked the Commission for feedback and whether it should be allowed to deteriorate as a residence or torn down and redeveloped.

(22:42:50) Mr. Allred indicated that the question is what is to be done with the deteriorating and dilapidated single-family housing on Highland Drive. The issue seemed to be already resolved when the City Council adopted the Highland Drive Corridor Plan that said single-family should be deemphasized on Highland Drive. Mr. Whiting suggested north Highland Drive be evaluated with regard to how it has evolved. Mr. Allred discussed the area north of Murray Holladay Road

and zoning on the east side being Commercial or RN and stated that there really is no future for single family residential.

**6. Sign Ordinance Amendment – ORD Zone – (continued) – Planner: Paul Allred.**

The broken audio picked up here at 8:21

(20:41:46) According to Mr. Allred, Steve Peterson desire 15% of the façade of the highest floor. If the five floors are taken into consideration, the maximum sized signage would be less than 5% of the total building. Kevin Christensen, from Young Electric Sign, suggested the crown signs accentuate the building and feature reverse pan channel lettering or brushed aluminum. The proposed percentage was in line with staff's recommendation of three to five percent for a crown sign.

Mr. Allred asked the Commission for feedback on the number of signs to be placed on a building and their location. It was confirmed that placement of signage should on the top floor regardless of a tenant's location and may be placed on all four sides of the building.

Mr. Teerlink described the reverse pan channel lighting as a halo-look. They are illuminated from behind and reflected on the wall lighting with the silhouette of the letters. Brushed metal letters were another option. Mr. Allred suggested viewing the Meiers Chicken sign. A panchannel letter, which is a metal letter with a translucent face, colored plastic, and a light behind, was listed as another option. Commissioner Khodadad asked if the building's signage should be the same. She noted that her preference would be the brushed aluminum letters. She felt the addition of colors would not complement the building. Mr. Allred clarified that with reverse pan channel lettering, the color is a glow that comes from behind the sign. The letter face is opaque, but illuminates the edge and gives off a soft glow. Staff agreed to prepare and present visual examples.

Commissioner Khodadad stated that the Millrock buildings have a classy appearance. The addition of logos and colors will detract from the buildings.

(20:52:52) With regard to wall signage, a comment was made that there is a distinction and new area of crown signage being created, which is in front of the office building. On a retail building, wall signage is for retail and other commercial businesses. Typically, it is a percentage of the wall space. Mr. Allred proposed that the office, retail, and restaurant uses be addressed. The possibility of Millrock putting small eateries on the mail floor of those buildings was discussed. He considered the situation to be an unintended consequence of changing uses in the zone.

Chair Chatelain clarified that if it is retail, the applicant is allowed 15% for the retail or another figure that is agreed upon. If an office is also included, the office percentage is offered. Mr. Allred explained that when a building contains both retail and commercial uses, the signs should be stated on the main floor. Where there is retail or restaurant that is non-office, the same allowance should be given in another location. It is the responsibility of the landlord to determine how to allocate the percentage. The main concern was that the percentage does not exceed the limit of the ground floor level.

(20:57:34) It was noted that with regard to standards in other cities, signage is based on a percentage of the face of the building. It was acknowledged that retailers are concerned about signs. There is a different standard given and typically throughout the Valley it is 15% of the wall frontage. At 15% of the full face of a retail or hospitality unit, Holladay is more restrictive than Sandy City. Holladay only allows 10%. That is different than a mixed-use or an office crown sign, which is calculated using different standards. Retail involves the full face of the building. Mr. Allred stated that with regard to the side of the wall that faces 6200 South, the ski shop and other tenants are allowed to occupy 15%.

(21:00:05) Mr. Allred remarked that for one hotel, it is one use and would be allowed 15% of the entire wall. Small signs may be added. Commissioner Bowthorpe pointed out that if a building has retail on the main level; the same standard is applied, but just to the lowest level. Regardless of whether a space is retail or office and above ground level the tenant must negotiate signage. With regard to retail space on the bottom level, Commissioner Khodadad asked why the frontage of each space doesn't allow for 15%. Mr. Allred reiterated that it will be defined by the landlord.

Chair Chatelain asked for clarification regarding the mixed-use allowance. He pointed out that if a building has three stories, 15% of one story is not a sufficient amount of sign space. Ms. Hansen stated that throughout the Valley, there is a 10% allowance for any type of commercial. Mr. Allred detailed how the allowance is calculated and explained that most crown signs viewed by staff in Cottonwood Heights, are less than 2%-3% of the entire building face.

(21:05:55) Commissioner Khodadad questioned whether sign placement should be specified. With regard to crown signs, Commissioner Garver clarified that they are limited to one sign in one location with percentage restrictions. Crown signs cannot utilize the 15% in multiple locations across the face of the building. On the contrary, the retail level has the ability to have the area split between tenants and have multiple signs.

(21:07:20) It was stated that Cottonwood Heights City allows three tenants to split crown signage. At 15%, it results in each utilizing 5%. In some ways this puts Holladay tenants at a competitive disadvantage. Commissioner Khodadad pointed out that the Commission does not object to signage on all sides of the building and ultimately allowing a tenant to have signage around the top of the building. Mr. Allred remarked that there is a possibility of four different tenants, one on each building face, but they will still be limited to 15% crown sign of that top floor.

Signage placement issues were next discussed. Commissioner Garver stated that there should be some flexibility with respect to where signage is placed. There may be architectural features that preclude signs from being placed in certain locations. Mr. Allred commented that Millrock will have difficulty fitting crown signs on their building due to the shape of the floors and the location of windows. Mr. Allred recommended one attractive sign be placed anywhere on the face as they see fit. Retail and restaurant rules will apply on the first floor and above.

With regard to the main floor of a multi-tenant building, Mr. Allred asked if the business on the main floor has to be retail or restaurant in order to get a sign. He also asked if the landlord can decline signage to an office space on the main floor. Mr. Allred suggested that on the lower level of a multi-tenant building the Commission may want to allow 15% if there is any kind of retail or restaurant use located within.

(21:14:03) Signage regulations were discussed. Mr. Allred clarified that a business need not be restaurant or retail on the main level to qualify for signage; however, those above the first floor are allowed crown signage only.

Commissioner Khodadad pointed out that this situation will affect Millrock because they now have a bagel shop. Mr. Allred added that a restaurant could come into the ground floor of Millrock where workers can have lunch. Commissioner Khodadad replied that the same would apply as they would become a mixed-use building and allowed 15% of the lower level. Mr. Allred's opinion was that a tenant on the main floor cannot be prohibited from having a sign. He suggested rules be created to address the main floor and upper floors. Chair Chatelain asked about the signage location for a small snack bar on the second level of a building. Mr. Allred replied that it could not have a sign on the second floor. It could, however, have a monument sign and a sign adjacent to the elevator. A crown sign would be allowed only at the discretion of the landlord.

Chair Chatelain clarified that signage is only allowed if the store is retail and on the first floor. He asked about a situation where the back side of a building enters on a floor higher. Mr. Allred stated that if the tenant is not on the first floor, the landlord can give the crown signage to whoever he chooses. Chair Chatelain stated that if the term "ground floor" is used, he would be more agreeable. Mr. Allred clarified that crown signage is allowed on all four sides of the building. He also stated that it is highly unlikely that there will be any tenants with non-office uses on the upper levels.

(21:24:05) The Commission discussed the Canyon Slope issue of project identification signs, which are not currently allowed in the City. Canyon Slope would like to have a sign in front of the project on both 6200 South and 3000 East. There is, however, no such allowance in the ordinance and they are proposing substantial signage. Commissioner Khodadad questioned whether another is necessary since they are already getting 15% signage on all sides and a monument sign. Mr. Allred stated that as proposed each pad on the site will have its own monument sign.

A representative from the Canyon Slope project stated that all of the building and monument signs will be business identifiers. A project sign is an architectural element of the project that then carries and defines the theme. They are proposing to integrate the slanted edge of Hyatt Place, which is also being replicated in other architectural building designs. It would be placed on a project sign identifying Canyon Slope Square. As a secondary element, there will be a list of other major tenants, which is common in retail developments throughout the Valley. In this case, the developer has two issues that are not common elsewhere in the City. The first is the 50 foot distance from the curb to the property line, preventing sign placement where most signs are 10 feet within the right-of-way. The second issue was that as traffic comes off the hill and out of the canyons, it travels at approximately 50 miles per hour. A decision to turn left into the project comes quickly, which he believes creates a traffic safety issue. He proposed that they be given a project sign on the thoroughfare allowing notification of the project and its tenants. There were requirements unique to this site in the ORD Zone that should allow for that. He proposed that the Commission provide specific language at the public hearing that keeps the acreage and size

consistent with the ordinance. He considered it very important to the project and encouraged staff to include the specific language in the ordinance.

(21:29:55) A rendering was presented showing signage in comparison to the building on the west elevation. The proposed sign measures 20 feet, which is less than the Hyatt House sign for one building.

The audio skipped from 9:31:51 to 9:46:52

(21:47:04) It was stated that there is a significant difference between an office project sign, the needs of an office project sign and the needs of a retail and hospitality project sign. It was specified as non-office. As a result, there was no conflict and they would fall under the existing five-acre or larger conditional use. The Planning Commission agreed to allow project identification signs and one sign per major public street.

Pole signs were discussed. The developer's concern with pole signs was possible interference with utilities and a service sidewalk. The base was discussed, which would have at least 50% of the width. The height of the pole would range in size from 20 to 25 feet.

Square footage allowances and lighting were discussed. Mr. Whiting commented that an interior illuminated cabinet sign would be needed for impact, but the aesthetics for the area would be to have light shine on it. The developer asked that the matter be deferred to their Sign Specialist.

*A motion was made and seconded to hold a Public Hearing on this matter at the September 18, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion passed unanimously*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **7. Updates or Follow-Up on Items Currently in the Development Review Process.**

(22:00:46) The Commission discussed the success of the recent Holladay Village event. Mr. Allred commented that there was an incredible turnout and he was enthusiastic about future events.

(22:49:00) Mr. Allred reported that there is an upcoming appeal before the City Council. He assumed the matter would be headed to court. The City Council decision would be focused on the actual appeal. The public will not be invited to comment as it is just for the attorneys for the neighbors and the applicant. The appeal was of the denial of the Orchard Hollow conceptual subdivision and states that the Commission should have approved it based on the information at hand. Extenuating circumstances were that there were only four Commissioners in attendance.

Mr. Whiting remarked that if the City Council reversed the decision, the appeal would then go to District Court.

### **8. Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.**

### **9. Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.**

*(22:52:00) Commissioner Khodadad moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

**ADJOURN**

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:52 p.m.

*I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting held Tuesday, September 5, 2012.*

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Teri Forbes". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Teri Forbes, Minutes Secretary  
T Forbes Group

Minutes approved:    October 16, 2012