

**Minutes of the October 12, 2010 Jordan Planning Commission/CGO Meeting
6:30 p.m. Jordan City Hall**

Present: Rolf Hafslund, Guy Beck, John Levar, Jeanne Marnoff and John Watkins. Also present: Ray Sandey, Barb Lee, Barbara Johnson and Planning Consultant Joanne Foust of MDG, Inc.

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Chair Hafslund..

Agenda: Foust referenced a letter from Haugland Company withdrawing their request for a text amendment to the C-3 Highway Commercial District, which had been scheduled as a public hearing. She also noted two additional design review requests for improvements in the downtown.

Moved by Marnoff, seconded by Beck to approve the agenda, as amended removing the public hearing, adding New Business Design Review items b and c, and moving Community Growth Options Industrial Zoning discussion after New Business. Motion Carried 5-0.

Minutes: Moved by Beck, seconded by Levar to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2010 meeting as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

Design Review for 214 Water Street: Foust introduced the agenda item, noting that Barb Lee has applied for design review as it relates to the Downtown Design Standards for the replacement of 15 windows in the two-story building located at 214 Water Street. The applicant is proposing colonial grids with dark brown trim. Illustrations of the existing and proposed windows were reviewed. The applicant has applied to the EDA for a matching grant to complete the project. The EDA will review the request at their October 19, 2010 meeting, with Council action on the recommendations of the Planning Commission and ED at their November 1, 2010 meeting.

The proposed *SunDefense* glazing was discussed. Commissioners noted the Design Standards allow tinting or reflective glass on upper floor windows, and require 70% visible light transmittal on the first floor. Lee noted they are not planning a reflective glass and wish to retain the historic look. The existing window sills will be retained.

Moved by Levar, seconded by Beck to recommend the City Council approve the design review for the replacement of 15 windows at 214 Water Street. Motion carried 5-0.

Design Review for 200 Broadway: Foust introduced the item, noting Barbara Johnson has applied for design review as it relates to the Downtown Design Standards for gutter, downspout and a proposed masonry coat on the building at 200 Broadway. The applicant is seeking matching grant funds to assist with the project.

Johnson addressed the Commission and noted she is experiencing drainage problems at the site. The commercial grade gutters and downspouts are proposed to assist with roof drainage to eliminate ice build up on walls and move water away from the building's foundation. She noted she would like to cut 10 inches of sidewalk and drop in a custom fabrication grate to allow the water to run through the sidewalk into the storm sewer drain. Roof repairs including caulking and recoating along with a masonry coat on the exterior of the south wall are also proposed to prevent water from seeping into the basement. Johnson noted a brown coloring would be added to the masonry to match the brick. Johnson explained the need for financing to assist with retaining the structural integrity of the building.

Commissioners discussed the request as it relates to the building materials and colors sections of the Design Standards. They noted their role is to review design related items. The EDA will discuss and determine if the project fits within their Matching Grant Program. Commissioners discussed alternatives to the stucco masonry including tuck pointing the brick and EFIS. The Commission requested more information on the proposed color, texture and location of the proposed masonry coat. Johnson noted she would like to explore the other alternatives and will submit a letter withdrawing the request for the masonry coat on the building at this time. She would like to proceed with the gutters and downspouts and will patch the cement between bricks at this time. Commissioners indicated the storm water

improvements were not addressed within the Design Standards. The need for review and approval by the City Engineer was acknowledged.

Moved by Beck, seconded by Levar to recommend approval of the design review request for 200 Broadway, contingent upon City Planner review and approval of the proposed color of the gutters and downspouts as it relates to the historic color palette adopted by the City and the colors complimenting the existing brick on the building; with the understanding that the applicant will submit a letter withdrawing the request for the installation of a masonry coat on the south side of the building. Motion carried 5-0.

Design Review for 115 East First Street: Foust introduced the item, noting Barbara Johnson is requesting design review as it relates to the sanding, priming and painting of 28 windows and the installation of interlocking deck components on the building at 115 East First Street. The applicant is seeking matching grant funds to assist with the project.

Johnson addressed the Commission noting this is her second request for approval on this building. She noted she would also like to cement the front door entrance. Photographs of the building, its windows and existing deck were reviewed. Johnson noted she is planning a deep burgundy and cinnamon brown color scheme.

Moved by Watkins, seconded by Beck to recommend approval of the design review for the sanding, priming and painting of the 28 windows on the building at 115 East First Street, contingent upon City Planner review and approval of the proposed color of the window frames as it relates to the historic color palette adopted by the City and the colors complimenting the existing brick on the building; noting the deck was previously constructed and is not a part of the design review or approval. Motion carried 5-0.

Community Growth Options (CGO) – Industrial Zoning Districts: Foust addressed the Planning Commission noting that information obtained at the September 14, 2010 Visioning Session and through the on-line survey has been summarized and will be reviewed. Draft versions of the proposed I-1, Light Industrial and I-2, General Industrial Ordinances have also been prepared for Commissioner review and input. She suggested the Commission review the proposed I-1 Ordinance considering input received.

It was noted that five of the 22 survey respondents suggested a mixed commercial/industrial district continue, while the remaining 77% suggested industrial uses or the creation of two industrial districts. Somewhat contrary to this result, a number of retail and service uses were suggested to be allowed in the industrial district. Commissioners discussed the need for definitions of light industrial and general industrial and reviewed sample definitions. A purpose statement for the I-1 district was also agreed upon.

Proposed “permitted uses” were reviewed. Sandey recommended the Commission look at current businesses in the industrial park as they develop categories of I-1 and I-2 to ensure they fit. Commissioners discussed the need to include general categories rather than list each specific type of use. Commissioners requested the addition of Professional construction trades, such as electricians, plumbers, mechanical, heating, venting and air conditioning, excluding contractor yards, be added to the permitted uses, along with mini-storage, parcel delivery, and public parks and open space. They requested the following uses be included in I-2: meat locker, armory and heliport. Commissioners suggested the following be conditional uses in the I-1: scientific research laboratories, investigation and testing conducted entirely inside a building and armories. They requested additional conditions be included with communication transmission towers and power lines. Commissioners discussed the inclusion of adult uses as a conditional use in the I-1 and/or I-2 districts and noted this should be determined after defining the geographic boundaries of the two districts. Commissioners concurred that mining and land reclamation should be moved to an interim use and that a separate ordinance is needed for this use.

Minimum lot sizes and setbacks were discussed. Commissioners requested concept plans illustrating the current lot size of 10,000 square feet with required setbacks, parking and surface coverage requirements

and illustrations with ½ acre and one acre lots. Survey respondents suggested a minimum ½ acre lot. Commissioners noted ½ acre may be sufficient for I-1, but larger lots may be needed for I-2. The Commission discussed including language to require lots platted after the date of the adoption of the revised ordinance to be the larger lot size. Current setback regulations appear to be appropriate and consistent with other communities.

Commissioners requested additional time and review of other performance standards in the ordinance including but not limited to air pollution, nuisances, noise, etc. These will be discussed at the November Planning Commission meeting.

Required building façade material requirements were discussed. Foust noted she had received a call with concerns that the current requirements are too restrictive as concrete block and exposed aggregate panels are not allowed. City Administrator Shukle has also received a call from an owner of an industry requesting tin buildings not be allowed, as they wanted to protect the value of their existing building. Commissioners discussed tying building material requirements to a size of building or to buildings constructed after the ordinance is adopted. Other requirements such as maximum length of a wall were discussed. Commissioners requested removing wood as an allowable accent material. Building façade requirements will be discussed again in November.

The maximum height of buildings in the I-1 district was discussed. A majority of the survey respondents suggested a maximum three stories or 35 feet, unless a taller structure is approved as a part of a conditional use permit. After much discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to recommend a maximum three stories or 45 feet, unless a taller structure is approved as a part of a conditional use permit.

Outdoor storage regulations were reviewed. Within the I-1 district, Commissioners requested outdoor storage not exceed 10% of the building footprint and be allowed through the conditional use permit process, requiring screening as one of the conditions. Commissioners also discussed the use of trailers for storage and noted a need to further research the current regulations.

Landscaping requirements were assessed. Commissioners requested an example of extensive landscape requirements from another community, to compare to Jordan's comparatively limited requirements. They also requested a concept plan illustrating the current perimeter landscaping versus five and ten percent of lot landscaping options.

Off-street parking regulations were examined. The Commission asked for City Engineer and/or Public Works Department input on the need or desirability of perimeter curb in front yard parking lots. Discussion regarding solid bumpers versus curbs in side or rear lot parking areas occurred.

Commissioners tabled discussion on the draft I-2, General Industrial Zoning Ordinance until the November 9, 2010 meeting. This meeting will be used to finalize I-1, Light Industrial as well. The Commission discussed tentatively planning an open house and public hearing at the December 14, 2010 meeting.

Old Business. There was no old business.

Planners Report. Foust reported the City Planner Joe Janish was absent from the meeting as he and his wife, Jill, had their first child earlier in the day. The Commission passed on their congratulations.

Commissioner Reports. Commissioners briefly discussed the suitability of allowing assisted living as a use in the highway commercial district. Some concerns with the compatibility of the use were discussed.

Commissioners asked Foust to verify the need for the proposed special meeting on Tuesday, November 2, 2010 at 8:05 p.m.

Adjournment. Moved by Levar, seconded by Watkins to adjourn the meeting at 10:53 p.m. Motion carried 5-0.