



**City of Jordan
City Planning Commission
Meeting March 11, 2008**

Members present: Jeanne Marnoff (Council rep.), Chair Terry Jeffery, Jan Gilmer, Rob Mishica, and John Watkins,

Official representatives: None.

Staff present: City Engineer Doug Carter from Bolton and Menk, Planning Consultant Joanne Foust from MDG, City Attorney Annett Margaret, Senior Planner Joe Janish, and Planner Casey MacCallum, Steve Kochlin Fire Chief.

Others present: Tim Nightingale Jordan Mini Storage, Tom Nightingale Jordan Mini Storage, Derek Schmidt Jordan Mini Storage, Missy Nightingale Jordan Mini Storage,

1.0 Call to Order. Chair Terry Jeffery called the Planning Commission to order at 8:01 p.m.

2.0 Adopt Agenda. Moved by John Watkins, seconded by Jan Gilmer, to adopt the agenda but moved 7A to immediately after adopting the agenda.

7.0 Jordan Mini Storage. As presented by Joe Janish: The 2006 Site Plan Review Ordinance requires that all commercial and industrial development be reviewed by the Planning Commission and receive approval by the City Council. Under this review Missy Nightingale applied for developing a mini storage in the Timberline Industrial Park.

The Jordan mini storage facility is located within Timberline Business Park south of the Jordan Water Tower and north of Vivant Custom Woodcraft. The project would be phased overtime as the buildings fill up. The full build out, shown on an attachment, would consist of six buildings and a total area ranging from either 23,120 to 24,100 square feet of storage space. The first building to be constructed is 6,400 square feet in size. Since this project would be phased out over several expansions staff asked the Jordan Planning Commission and City Council to consider entering into an agreement to require phased in curb and gutter along with the completed landscaping plan in the future.

The doors would have a new locking device that would not allow for people to cut the locks to gain entry into the building. The locks would be flush mounted to the door, and according to the applicant an individual would need to remove the overhead door in order to gain access. No office space is provided onsite. Lighting would be provided on the buildings in order to provide illumination during the night.

The site would consist of six buildings. The applicant was proposing a metal siding with bricks on the lower portion of the building facing Corporate Drive. The building is currently proposed to be beige with green trim.

At the last Planning Commission meeting the applicant was directed to make a few changes in regards to the architectural features of the building facing Corporate Drive, and to work with the Fire Chief to provide proper emergency vehicle access. Since the last meeting the applicant has submitted two drawings (Option 1 and 2 as enclosed). Option 1 is an attempt to meet the minimum requirement within the Architecture Controls Ordinance. The second option is an attempt to show what the Planning Commission had recommended at the last review. These two options would consist of brick and steel. The colors have remained the same with beige steel and green trim.

Staff developed 3 additional alternatives (Option 3, 4, 5). With the additional options staff was attempting to illustrate the Planning Commission's direction was from the previous meeting. Option 3 is all brick on the side of the building that would face Corporate Drive (including the gable for the roof). Option 4 included two pages one attempts to show what the building would like with the signage (a sign permit will be required) while the second page attempts to show what the other ends of the buildings facing Corporate Drive would look like. The beige in the pictures could then either be steel or stucco. Option 5 again contains two pages attempting to show the building with the sign (a sign permit will be required) while the second page attempts to show the other buildings. This option is similar to 4, however it creates a

“window” type concept. The triangle representing the roof would be brick and the “window” could then be either steel or stucco.

Please keep in mind that options 1 and 2 could also involve stucco or some other material in order to attempt to provide compatibility with surrounding industrial buildings.

Mr. Janish further explained the applicant revised the plan to include additional asphalt as shown in the site plan drawing. According to the City Attorney the City of Jordan does have the ability to require access around both buildings as requested by the Fire Chief.

Senior Planner Janish further informed the Planning Commissioner’s a letter was received from Mr. Schuette, Elite Waste Disposal. The letter described concerns with the construction of a steel building and if allowed would “set a precedence for future buildings.” Mr. Schuette again expressed his concern with not requiring the curb and gutter for up to three years.

Planning Commission Discussion. The applicant Missy Nightingale, the applicant’s business partner Tom Nightingale, the applicant’s engineer Derik Schmidt, City Staff including Senior Planner Joe Janish, Planner Casey MacCallum and Attorney Annette Margaret spoke during the Planning Commission Discussion.

Derik Schmidt, the applicant’s engineer, discussed the amount of asphalt, grading for storm water runoff, and landscaping after the final phase for easier construction.

The Applicant passed out the City Ordinance and pictures of the site. She then discussed how she met the requirements and described the ordinance as containing ambiguous wording.

Tim Nightingale explained to the Commission that brick around the buildings can cause challenges if someone were to damage the brick work and repairs were needed.

City Attorney Annette Margaret discussed the City’s rights under the police power: the right to regulate land and impose reasonable architectural requirements. She stated that in her opinion what City Staff was requiring is reasonable, but it may be determined unreasonable if the City were to require 100% all block on all sides like what was constructed next door. Mrs. Margaret also explained that Item #5, which Missy Nightingale described as ambiguous, is typical for cities.

Tim Nightingale discussed that in 2004 they looked at the code and priced out buildings as to what they understood. They believe they meet the architectural controls. They purchased and improved the previous mini storage in town and this project will add tax base to the community. The Timberline lot is abnormally shaped because of the Jordan Water Tower, and they are investing \$1 to \$1.5 million into the City.

Missy Nightingale discussed how the architectural controls would not work and that option 1 meets the ordinance. The buildings have a low profile, low pitched roof, and are easy to screen.

Fire Chief Steve Kochlin discussed fire protection for the property and the tactical need to be able to drive emergency vehicles around both the 6400 square foot and 7920 square foot buildings.

Planning Commissioners discussed the different options and preferred options #3 or #5. They also discussed including a sunset clause on the landscaping and curb and gutter; and requiring landscaping for the first phase to help screen the property. Commissioners went on to discuss requiring a minimum architectural standard to improve the character and values of the Industrial properties but allow the applicant the freedom to design and build what they need and want to express.

Motion Mishica, second John Watkins, to recommend to the City Council that (1) the ends of the buildings facing Corporate Drive shall be 100% brick, stucco or some material close in nature so to resemble options number 3 or 5, at least 30% of the ends of the building facing Corporate Drive extending vertically from grade be brick or similar material, and that steel is prohibited on the ends of the buildings facing Corporate Drive; (2) landscaping along Corporate Drive and the neighboring property should be increased while maintaining clear sightlines for motorists; (3) the agreement should include a sunset

clause for the minimum number of years before the landscaping must be put in regardless of building construction; (4) the agreement should also include a sunset clause for the maximum number of years before the entire curb and gutter is put in regardless of building construction; (5) fire access including (i) the pavement should be extended for the full fire truck movement on the north end of both interior buildings, (ii) pavement on the west side of the building in phase 1 shall provide coverage of turning movement, and (iii) the distance between the 6400 square foot buildings for a height of 20 feet is not less than 14 feet; and (6) the engineers requests as attached are met.

3.0 Minutes.

Motion Rob Mishica, second by John Watkins, to accept the February 12, 2008 Planning Commission Minutes as amended. Unanimous approval. Jan Gilmer abstained.

4.0 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update: There were no items for Comprehensive Plan discussion.

5.0 Public Hearing. There were no items for public hearing.

6.0 New Business. There was 1 items of new business.

- A. Commissioner Appointments.** As Senior Planner Janish presented: The Park and Recreation Commission has been established with seven (7) members and one (1) of those seven (7) members are a City Council member. Staff believes it would be beneficial to have a consist number of individuals within the advisory commissions and also to have an odd number of members in order to prevent ties in votes.

Staff informed the Planning Commission of the change within the Park and Recreation Commission and recommended the Planning Commission to move the City Council representative into the currently vacant 7th position.

Motion Jan Gilmer, second John Watkins, to eliminate the vacant seat and replace it with the City Council representative. Unanimous approval.

7.0 Old Business. There were no items of old business.

8.0 Planners Report. There were no items on the Planner Report.

9.0 Commissioners report. Commissioner Terry Jeffery suggested the Planning Commission during the next year look into (1) architectural controls and (2) impervious service requirements.

10.0 Adjournment. *Moved by John Watkins, seconded by Jan Gilmer, to adjourn at 10:34p.m. Motion unanimously approved.*

Respectfully Submitted,

Casey MacCallum
Jordan City Planner