

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Commissioner Maher called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

**Roll Call**

Tom Maher, John Linton, Matt Weir, Craig Larrabee, Preston Dean

**Others Present**

Scott Kirkland

**Staff Present**

Senior Planner: Steve Mumford

Planning Coordinator: Lianne Pengra

**1. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Maher led the Commission and Audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

None

**3. Status Report from City Council**

A. Bike Park

Mr. Mumford explained that there was plenty of representation on both sides of the issue and the meeting was good for the public. He explained that the site plan for the bike park was approved and another meeting is set for next week to approve the \$25,000 the city will give for the development of the park, and the MOU between the City and WAFTA.

B. Multi-Family & Commercial Design Standards

Mr. Mumford explained that the Design Standards were approved at the last City Council.

**4. Approval of Minutes**

A. N/A

**5. Development Items**

**A. Proposed Development Code Amendments - Public Hearing, Action Item**

1. Building Height

Mr. Mumford reminded the Commissioners that this amendment had been brought up before and they were now revisiting the issue. He said that the current code does not talk about measuring the height of a structure on a sloped lot. He explained that the proposed amendment measures the height from the average of the highest and lowest finished grade points. He explained that it also regulates ancillary structures and adds a schematic to the code. Mr. Mumford added that this will help the Building Department.

Commissioner Linton explained that the Ranches HOA measures structure height the same way.

Commissioner Maher noted that this issue had been before the Planning Commission in the past.

2. Commercial Signage

Mr. Mumford said that the current code requires a sign that has a slat for every building in a development, but isn't clear on whether additional monument signs are allowed. He explained that this amendment should clear any confusion on this issue.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Mr. Mumford explained that the amendment will allow the City to require the combined monument sign if needed, and that the City can allow one monument sign for each pad site. He explained that the signs would need to be 100 feet apart on the same roadway, four feet high and thirty-two square feet maximum.

Mr. Mumford said that the Mayor wants a standard for all monument signs for businesses in Eagle Mountain. He informed the Commissioners that the Mayor would like a sign design similar to the Chase Bank sign in American Fork with the exception of the rock used. He explained that she preferred the rock at the entrance to The Ranches and the individual subdivisions.

Mr. Mumford explained that the sign example was for the individual monument signs, not for the combined signs. He further explained that the standard for the combined monument sign had not been discussed in detail, but that the requirement could be that the same rock is used surrounding the combined monument sign.

Commissioner Maher said that he wants this to be very clear because the majority of the monument signs will be combined.

Mr. Mumford said that they want to push for the standard on individual monument signs to be like the Chase sign with The Ranches rock. He said that a schematic would need to be looked at to add to the code for the combined monument signs.

Mr. Mumford then said that the current code does not address changeable copy signs. He explained that they want to limit the copy face to 50%. He also said that scrolling or animated signs will still be prohibited and that this amendment just makes it clearer. He added that the amendment also requires that the signs are well maintained.

Mr. Mumford said that a developer wanted to use a scrolling or animated sign in place of a changeable copy sign, as the changeable copy signs tend to fade and turn yellow in a few years. He explained that other codes talk about the upkeep and maintenance of the changeable copy signs and that the Planning Department does not feel it is too much to ask for the sign owners to keep their signs white rather than letting them yellow. He mentioned that it is more cost-effective to replace the face of a changeable copy sign versus installing an animated sign.

Commissioner Maher asked what the requirements were for a changeable copy sign.

Mr. Mumford said that the signs are allowed for any business and that it would be added that the copy is not to exceed 50%.

Commissioner Maher asked if the business could have the sign forever.

Mr. Mumford confirmed that the signs are allowed permanently in commercial, airpark, industrial and mixed use areas. He explained that this is not new in that they are just now being allowed; this is to set guidelines for the currently allowed signs.

Commissioner Maher asked if this was the gist of Scot [Hazard]'s email.

Mr. Mumford explained that Mr. Hazard might have been talking about the slatted signs with the company name on the slat, rather than a changeable copy sign.

Mr. Mumford then explained that currently temporary event signs need to be approved through the Planning Commission and City Council with public hearings. He explained the proposal allows the Planning Department can approve the signs. He said that the signs would be up to 6 square feet, the Planning Department would check the location of the signs to ensure they are not blocking sight triangles, and the signs would be limited to fourteen days before the event. He explained that this cuts out the public hearing process.

Commissioner Linton said that these sign amendments prohibit animated signs, but that the city uses animated signs at the entrance to The Ranches.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Mr. Mumford explained that those signs are for emergency purposes.

Commissioner Linton said that the uses he has seen were not emergencies.

Mr. Mumford said that he was not aware of other uses of the signs.

Commissioner Maher asked Mr. Mumford to make a note of this to see how to go forward with it with City Council.

Commissioner Weir asked what the aversion is to animated signs.

Mr. Mumford answered that the light is the largest problem. He explained that the signs are sometimes brighter than necessary and they shine into the adjacent properties and streets. Mr. Mumford also said that while he can't speak for the entire City Council or city, but that another reason may be to keep the rural atmosphere in Eagle Mountain.

Mr. Mumford explained that in the last city he worked in, an animated sign factory began operating and shortly thereafter, the city was receiving five applications a month for the animated signs. He explained that after many signs are up, some can perceive them as traffic hazards, although no studies have proven that.

### 3. Industrial Master Site Plans

Mr. Mumford explained that industrial sites larger than five acres or those which will be phased are difficult to plan out as far as lot sizes if the buyers are not already in line. He explained that in order to avoid having the development go through subdivisions and then maybe need to return to re-subdivide and change lot lines, the amendment will allow for a Master Plan up front that divides the development into sections for future subdivisions. He explained that each buyer would come in and do a final plat and that this removes the preliminary plat from the process.

Mr. Mumford explained that the utilities, roadways, connections, architecture and other major issues are taken care of with the Master Site Plan and the details will be taken care of when the person comes in to do the Site Plan and Final Plat.

Mr. Mumford said that the amendment allows the Planning Director to waive some information which may be difficult to come by in certain instances.

Commissioner Maher said that a "catch all" needs to be very clear that any changes are assigned to the developer and that the provisions never go away.

Mr. Mumford explained that he has only discussed this with one developer and that developer is well aware that if one size of lines are installed and a buyer requires a bigger line, the developer is responsible for replacing the lines or not selling to that buyer.

Commissioner Linton asked for clarification on the last line in the Staff Report.

Mr. Mumford explained that the Master Site Plan and the Preliminary Plat both have public hearings at the Planning Commission, so the public hearing is still a part of the process with the amendment.

Commissioner Linton asked for assurance that the wording be fixed if the commission recommends approval.

Mr. Mumford said that it would be.

Commissioner Dean asked if the monument signage amendment affects building signs.

Mr. Mumford said that it did not affect building signs; it just clarifies that each pad can have a monument sign with the previously talked about requirements.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Commissioner Maher opened the Public Hearing at 6:23pm.

Scott Kirkland with Sage Communities said that when an approval is done on an office building or a retail site, the amount of monument signs and how many tenants maximum on each sign should be pre-approved.

Mr. Kirkland said that if many businesses are on a small sign, a traffic problem could develop. He voiced his concern about a situation like this arising on Ranches Parkway.

Mr. Kirkland said that a maximum number of monuments and maximum number of tenants with required spacing. He said that if the building owner has 15 allotted spaces and 16 tenants, the sixteenth one is out of luck. Mr. Kirkland said that he doesn't like how State Street in Orem looks with all of the multiple tenants on the signs.

Commissioner Maher wanted clarification that it is one monument sign for the building if it is 100 feet from the next building. He said that there will not be a flood of monument signs.

Mr. Mumford explained that if there are two or three businesses in a pad site in one building, they could have three monument signs as long as they are 100 feet away from each other.

Commissioner Maher said that there is only one sign per building.

Commissioner Linton said that a pad usually indicated a single business.

Mr. Kirkland said that the Ranches office building is one pad with five or six tenants. He asked that if their signs could be separated by 100 feet, could they have multiple signs.

Mr. Mumford said they could.

Mr. Kirkland asked if it was one tenant per monument.

Mr. Mumford said no; they could be combined.

Mr. Kirkland said that the signs should have a maximum number of tenants on each sign and that the lettering should have a size minimum. He said that if the wording is too small, people would be slowing down on Ranches Parkway to read the signs.

Mr. Mumford clarified that Mr. Kirkland is asking for a size minimum of the lettering of each individual tenant listed on the combined signs with more than one tenant.

Commissioner Maher said that was a good point.

Mr. Kirkland also explained that in California, signage was a Conditional Use Permit. He explained that there was a two-year renewal time period to make sure the signs were kept up and not yellowing.

Commissioner Linton said that is a good point and it was also a standard in a city where he served on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mumford asked if it applied to just the reader board type.

Commissioner Linton said it was any monument signage.

Mr. Kirkland said any signs on the face of buildings or any free standing sign should be on Conditional Use Permits.

Commissioner Weir stated that to review the signs is a great idea.

Commissioner Maher said that the sign renewal should come before the Planning staff.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Commissioner Weir said the primary point is to have someone look at the sign.

Commissioner Linton said that a Conditional Use Permit has to go before the Planning Commission. He recommended an alternate mechanism due to the busyness of the city. He also stated that the amendment needs to be reviewed.

Commissioner Maher said that the review is a great idea, but he wonders if that is the best use of the peoples' time.

Commissioner Weir said he expected generally quick reviews except in the cases where problems arose.

Commissioner Linton suggested having the Planning staff review and give sixty days to make corrections necessary and if the corrections are not made, the staff could bring the sign application before Planning Commission to cancel the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Mumford said that he would like something like that rather than bringing each sign before the Planning Commission. He explained that the Code Enforcement Officer would do inspections to determine which signs were in disrepair or starting to fade. He explained the Code Enforcer would send a letter or talk to the owner to have the needed repairs done.

Commissioner Linton clarified that they would then have sixty days to complete the repairs and if the repairs were not made in the allotted time, the Planning Commission would cancel the Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Dean wanted clarification about the proposal that states sign copy should not exceed 32 square feet. He asked if that was total for all tenants.

Mr. Mumford said that combined monument signs have a maximum copy of 100 square feet. He explained the 32 square feet refers to the individual monument signs.

Mr. Mumford said that a pad site had more than one tenant and they wanted to combine their signage, they would be limited to 32 square feet for that one pad.

Commissioner Dean said that would help eliminate the nine tenants on one sign.

Commissioner Maher said that it would only work if there was a text size minimum.

Mr. Kirkland said that the problem with the amendment is that it is defined by a pad and some pads are big, like a Wal-Mart pad. He recommended some definition of what a pad is.

Mr. Mumford said that this is specifically for developments with more than one pad.

Commissioner Linton said that the word "pad" and the word "tenant" are throughout and one pad could hold 32 tenants. He recommended revisiting the wording.

Mr. Mumford explained that the original text allowed one monument for each freestanding building. He said that it might need to have more specifics about more than one tenant.

Mr. Mumford explained that the purpose of this amendment is for situations like a strip center with the businesses connected with only one sign. He acknowledged that there should be a minimum size to the text.

Commissioner Linton said that with strip centers, there is the benefit of the façade signs which are generally large enough and clear enough to get the message across. He said that business condos can have high numbers of tenants in small building sizes.

Commissioner Dean said that with a five-story building, there will be a lot of tenants to put on the sign.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Commissioner Weir stated that in Orem there are signs with fifteen or twenty businesses on the monument sign.

Mr. Mumford stated that most tenants that go into those types of buildings understand that they won't have a monument sign.

Commissioner Maher asked about having a monument sign with each individual building.

Commissioner Dean explained that it is what it says now.

Mr. Kirkland said that the number of tenants shouldn't be limited, just that there should be a minimum text size and a maximum square footage for all text.

Mr. Mumford said that they would look at adding some minimum and maximum signage for each tenant on the monument signs.

Mr. Kirkland asked if the maximum was already defined as 50% of the sign face.

Mr. Mumford clarified that the 50% was actually about the changeable copy signs but that the individual monument signs have a limit of 32 square feet.

Commissioner Maher stated that the minimum and maximum requirements need to be added for the individuals on the combined signs.

Mr. Kirkland stated that in regards to animated signs, he doesn't picture them in nice, classy cities he's been in.

Mr. Kirkland also stated that the 32 square foot maximum is the same restriction as one on a 100-acre development. He said that he doesn't feel that 32 square feet is enough for that large of a development. He thinks that the code regarding that needs to be looked at.

Mr. Mumford responded that in residential areas, the maximum square footage for monument signs is 64 square feet.

Mr. Kirkland asked what the code is for a temporary announcement-type sign in such an area.

Mr. Mumford said that kind of sign has a 32 square foot limit.

Commissioner Linton said that he feels a specific sign design with size, shape and color needs to be included since the city is themed, too. He stated this will keep the city cohesive.

Commissioner Maher asked what the Mayor meant when the Chase sign was discussed.

Mr. Mumford said that the Mayor wanted the Chase Bank sign with the rock from the Ranches signs to be the standard for the individual signs but that the combined signs were not discussed.

Commissioner Linton said that the combined signs should be the same type and that an artist rendering should be included.

Mr. Mumford said that they have contacted American Fork to get a schematic from them but have not heard anything yet.

Mr. Mumford said that the three different code amendments could be split up to be approved in sections.

Commissioner Linton asked if the Commission could trust the Planning Department in regards to the signage.

Mr. Mumford said they could.

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2008 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mtn, UT 84005

Commissioner Maher closed the Public Hearing at 6:39pm.

**MOTION:**        *Commissioner Linton moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the Proposed Development Code Amendments subject to the following conditions:*

1. A schematic drawing to be added for the monument signs showing specific materials, size, shape and height;
2. The grammatical errors to be corrected in the last sentence above the approval process in the Industrial Master Site Plans;
3. Maximum number of businesses that can be advertized on any one monument sign to be specified, keeping in mind the letter sizing needs to be legible from a distance;
4. Development Officer to review signs every two years to ensure the signs are in conformity. If not, the signs will be sent back to the Planning Commission to determine the status of the CUP.

*Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed*

**B. Sage Communities Presentation – Discussion Item**

Mr. Scott Kirkland from Sage Communities offered a presentation on new projects they are working on.

Mr. Kirkland explained that he wants to have the four communities he will discuss during this meeting to be ready to go before the Planning Commission by the end of June. He further explained his purpose is to shorten the upcoming meeting by giving the Commissioners background information now.

Mr. Kirkland said that he wants to create a concept of community living to raise the bar for The Ranches and for Eagle Mountain City.

Mr. Kirkland explained that product diversification is very important to Sage Communities. He said that architecture, home products and product material all need to be diversified. He explained that this creates greater curb appeal and makes a community which he is proud of.

The four communities Mr. Kirkland discussed were Mt. Airey Village, Scenic Mountain, The Village at Simpson Springs and Oquirrh Mountain Ranch. He explained which home styles will be in each community and what amenities they plan on building.

Mr. Kirkland also explained that they are putting in more amenities than are required in their communities. He also said that he wanted to show the Commissioners pictures of what they want to build so that the Commissioners will remember them and expect the amenities when Sage Communities brings them before the Commission again.

Mr. Kirkland said that they plan on creating a sub-association under The Ranches HOA for the four communities discussed. He explained that their covenants will be stronger, the maintenance will be better and the enforcement will be stronger. He explained that this could only benefit The Ranches and Eagle Mountain City.

**6. Other Business**

None

**7. Adjournment**

Commissioner Maher closed the meeting at 7:25 p.m.