

NORTH SALT LAKE CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JANUARY 13, 2015

**FINAL**

Chairman Robert Drinkall called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and welcomed those present.

PRESENT: Commission Chairman Robert Drinkall  
Commissioner Lisa Watts Baskin  
Commissioner Ted Knowlton  
Commissioner Stephen Garn  
Commissioner Kent Kirkham  
Commissioner Kim Jensen  
Council Member Ryan Mumford

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, Assistant City Manager and Community and Economic Development Director; Ali Avery, City Planner; Jim Spung, City Planner; Andrea Bradford, Minutes Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: none

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED MIXED COMMERCIAL ZONING PROVISIONS

Jim Spung reported on the changes made from the last meeting regarding the proposed Mixed Commercial Zoning provisions. He focused on the changes made to building and parking setbacks, parking orientation and location, landscaping requirements, signage and land uses in this zone.

Current setbacks in the General Commercial (C-G) zone are 20' front yard setbacks and 0' side and rear yard setbacks. The new zone is aiming to allow more diversity in the land uses and setbacks would be determined by which zoning districts are adjacent to a subject property. For example, the front yard setback would be 10'; the side yard setback would be 5' if the subject property is abutting the same zone or 10' abutting a dissimilar nonresidential zone. Side yards abutting a residential zoning district or open space would be 15'. Rear yard setbacks abutting a similar zoning district would be 10', 25' for dissimilar non-residential zoning or 50' abutting an

open space or residential zone. These setback areas could still be used for storage or parking.

Parking setbacks would be similar to the building setbacks with front yard parking at 15' from a public street and side yard 5' to 15' from the public street depending on whether it is a residential or similar zone.

The Planning Commission discussed prohibiting outdoor storage in the public zone and requiring some type of a buffer, either walls, trees, or other type of landscaping, when storage areas abutted a residential zone.

Ken Leetham commented that one of the struggles with this area was determining outdoor storage restrictions. He said that staff is trying to create a tool that would have a real change in the neighborhood without creating a situation that is out of touch with the market.

Commissioner Knowlton said that it was a balance as bringing buildings closer to the street hides the visual impact of parking and reduces the need to focus on landscaping and outdoor storage restrictions. Further, he proposed the idea of allowing developers to choose between two possible design options: 1) having some allowed parking between the street and building with enhanced landscaping and buffering; and, 2) having buildings closer to the street and without parking between buildings and the street and then with reduced landscaping and buffering. Commissioner Knowlton noted that if these options are acceptable to the City, they might meet the realities of the market a little better than just one option.

Ali Avery commented that there is an economic concern for situations such as a small building and a large storage yard. She suggested that there could be a maximum percentage of a lot that could be used for outdoor storage which would cause the developer to increase the size of their building rather than having a large storage yard.

Council Member Mumford commented that if parking is not allowed in the front of the building then the storage area would already be required to be in the back. Ken Leetham replied that it has been debated that one to two rows of parking be allowed in the front and on the side of a building

Jim Spung commented that one example could be one row of street facing parking with a 20' landscaping buffer to help to achieve better aesthetic appeal. Commissioner Knowlton stated that asphalt is not attractive and suggested allowing the option for the developer to choose between a row of parking in front of the building and offering a concession for those who were able to put parking elsewhere on their lot.

Commissioner Drinkall asked if storage trailers used for a business would be prohibited if they were stored on site. Ali Avery replied that the wording should be changed to allow storage trailers that are used for the business, to be stored on the property for one business day in between use.

Jim Spung then reported on the signage requirements including consistent and comprehensive sign packages for each project, materials and colors that are compatible with associated structures, one wall sign per tenant per building face, one monument sign per building frontage and limiting window signage to retail uses and tenant name only. He said that current sign ordinances are hard to enforce and that these proposed requirements are more usable. Other requirements would also include limiting wall signs to 30% of the available wall space or 150 square feet, monument signs would not exceed 150 square feet per face, window signage would be limited to 10% of the area of the window, monument signs would be limited to 25' in height, monument signs would be in a landscaped planter, roof signs, flashing or animated signs would not be allowed.

Commissioner Drinkall asked if UDOT would adjust the speed limit on Redwood Road based on the suggested General Plan changes that the City was proposing to make. He also commented that he would like to see shorter monument signs. Ali Avery replied that she was unaware if UDOT would be changing the speed limit but that the General Plan had not been submitted to UDOT at this time.

Jim Spung stated that he would review the on on-site parking requirements including possible shared parking requirements between lots, offering two options for parking for new developments, and multi-tenant signage requirements.

Jim Spung then reported on proposed changes to simplify the Land Use table and addressing land uses not found in the current code. Some prohibited businesses included breweries, distilleries, etc. which would not be allowed per State code due to the proximity to residential areas.

The Planning Commission determined that these types of businesses could possibly be a permitted use and would be regulated by State code depending on the distance from residential areas.

Conditional uses include kennels and pawn shops. Other prohibited uses include heavy manufacturing (including foundries), cemeteries, check cashing or payday lenders, incinerators and medical waste, sexually oriented businesses, RV parks, etc.

Commissioner Baskin asked why self-storage was not permitted in this area and said that with proper measures in place it could be appropriate in this area. Ken Leetham responded that there could potentially be negative aspects to that type of business but that staff would review that use.

Commissioner Kirkham asked why check cashing or payroll business were not allowed. Ali Avery replied that a lot of cities prohibit this type of business as they are predatory businesses and are often associated with crime.

Jim Spung asked for the Commission's opinion regarding mixed use/residential in this area. Commissioner Knowlton commented that consideration should be given to vertical mixed use units as a segment of the population favors residential proximity to restaurants and shopping.

Council Member Mumford expressed the minority view of his disapproval for mixed use units in an industrial zone as they would not be setup with parks, sound barriers or other items normally planned for residential use. He commented that areas over 5 acres already had a tool in place for determining residential or mixed use with a P District approval.

Commissioners Knowlton, Baskin, Jensen, Garn and Kirkham expressed that mixed use units could be an option as long as they were not built above manufacturing businesses. These types of units could create interest for those who would like to live above their business and also increase walk-ability in the area. Jim Spung commented that a large part of why this ordinance was revised was to phase out manufacturing uses and to promote redevelopment and growth in this area.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Commissioner Kirkham moved to approve the November 25, 2014 minutes as amended. Commissioner Garn seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Drinkall, Garn, Knowlton, Baskin, Kirkham, Jensen and Council Member Mumford.**

**Commissioner Garn moved that the minutes dated December 9, 2014 stand approved as amended. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Drinkall, Garn, Knowlton, Baskin, Kirkham, Jensen and Council Member Mumford.**

4. ADJOURN

Chairman Drinkall adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary