Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes of Morgan City Planning Commission WORK and GENERAL meeting held in open public session electronically on April 21st, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.

MINUTES

APRIL 21ST, 2020
6:30 PM
MORGAN CITY COUNCIL ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY
Chair Nathan McClellan.

MEMBERS

EXCUSSED
George Hopkin, Dave Carter.

CITY STAFF
Mayor, Ray Little; Council Member, Tony London; City Council Member David Alexander; City Planner, Weston Appling; City Planning Attorney, Steve Garside; City Manager, Ty Bailey.

OTHERS PRESENT
John Patterson, Tom Harding.

Chair, Nathan McClellan welcomed all that joined from the electronic meeting room. Nathan advised the group that the meeting will be a video as well as audio recording. That the video and audio will be on the Morgan City website as well as YouTube account and will be a permanent record. During the meeting, Nathan asked to please mute the participants' location, raise hand and unmute to participate in a discussion. This will avoid talking over each other. Voting will be by the raise of a hand.

WORK SESSION

Minutes - The Commission discussed the minutes from March 17th, 2020 with no corrections.

Historic Overlay Guideline Review - Signage 157 Commercial Street. Nathan opened the discussion indicating the submitted documents are located on the Morgan City website for review and reference. John Patterson is the applicant and Nathan invited Mr. Patterson to address the Commission with a background as well as reasoning behind the particular sign design submittal.

John Patterson discussed the history of the building. In the mid 1900's the building was thriving as the First National Bank. The submittal is a replica of the sign during that time period. The difference is that "First National Bank" was above the clock. John chose to change that part of the sign to have the building address numbers. The wording on the building is in keeping with the historical use of the building.

Nathan referred to the staffing notes regarding lighting. The Historic Commercial Overlay Zone restricts signs from having interior illumination. The reason for this restriction is outlined in Section 10.14.090(K) (7) of the Morgan City Municipal Code which states, "Historically, signs used on Commercial Street were relatively simple. The earliest signs had no lighting. In later years, an indirect lighting source was typical. These historic sign characteristics should be continued".

Staffing notes also stated; The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay Zone. Section 10.14.090 (K) (8) of the Morgan City Municipal code state that, "Design guidelines for the rehabilitation of existing properties should be compatible with the style of the main building. Each case should be reviewed on an individual basis, taking into consideration the unique circumstances of each building".

Nathan stated the Commission has a say on the sign and would like the members of the Commission to start a discussion regarding; the staffing notes, application and options. Jim Brown stated he would be in favor of the lighting on the sign and asked the applicant which part of the sign would be lighted. Mr. Patterson stated the numbers above the clock as well as the clock would be lighted. Jim asked if there would be lighting on the building that would be directed on the flush mounted sign. John indicated there would not be any other lighting but the illuminated clock and numbers.
Lance questioned the accuracy of the building numbers. Clarification indicated the buildings official number addressing is that of 157 Commercial Street.

City Council member, David Alexander questioned the prominence, is putting the sign flush on the building promoting First National Bank when that is not what is in the building. John stated he had talked to the local bank and since they do not use "First National Bank" they didn't see a problem. The name is just the building name such as; the Wells Fargo building. David Alexander has retired with his career being in banking. David explained that there is protocol when it comes to banks and names. For example, to have "National" in a bank name, there is permission from a Federal agency with accompanying guidelines. The Treasury department could have a problem. John along with staff and Commission members discussed changing the flush sign to letters such as; FNB Building. John indicated he understands the dilemma and is good with changing the name.

Wes Woods commended John Patterson on the thoroughness of submittal. Wes stated the submittal had before and after pictures with detail of the project. Wes would like this to become the "standard" especially those requesting approval of the History Guideline overlay review.

Final Approval-Pheasant Run-The subject property is located at approximately 175 North 525 West. This project was before the Commission in February 2020 and received preliminary plan approval. Since that time, the applicant has worked with staff in preparing the plat for final approval. Nathan asked the members if they had any thoughts on the project submittal.

Wes Woods asked regarding the required documents stated in the staffing notes, when are they reviewed and are they to be recorded. Weston stated yes, they are to be recorded. Ty indicated Pheasant Run if recommended for approval, will be on next Tuesday's City Council meeting. Staff has been preparing the documents with City Council being the approving legislative body for the required documents. Those documents will be approved in conjunction with final approval of the subdivision.

Lance asked about access to the fire lane for residential use questioning if it is emergency access and gated, is it not for public use. Steve Garside asked for clarification on the easement being that of 20ft when the City was requiring a 60ft width for the future public roadway. Weston stated the parcel has had lot line adjustments to accommodate the future road width of 60ft. The 20ft access easement will be for this project and maintained using a maintenance agreement with the current parcel owner. Steve stated since this is a Morgan City service access, Morgan City uses are public.

Historic Overlay Guideline Review-Façade for 145 N. Commercial Street-Work Session only had a few minutes left. Hence, no discussion occurred.

---

**GENERAL SESSION**

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

**MARCH 17TH, 2020**

**DISCUSSION**

Nathan opened for discussion regarding the minutes from March 17th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. No discussion on the minutes.

**MOTION**

Lance Prescott moved to approve the minutes of March 17th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting as presented.
Second: Wes Woods
Unanimous
ITEM #1  HISTORIC OVERLAY GUIDELINE REVIEW-SIGNAGE
157 COMMERCIAL STREET

The applicant, John Patterson, is requesting a historic design review for an attached projecting sign as well as a flush mount sign. This property is located at 157 North Commercial Street and is a historic property that fronts Commercial Street. Signs within this zone require a historic design review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Chair, Nathan McClellan invited applicant, John Patterson to address the Commission. John Patterson stated he has purchased the old bank building which he is remodeling and refurbishing. In the mid 1900's the building was thriving as the First National Bank. The submittal is a replica of the sign during that time period. John indicated issues came up in the work session regarding the flush mount sign of First National Bank and that a suggestion was made to possibly change the wording to read FNB building. Mr. Patterson stated he understands the reasoning and is good with the change.

Nathan stated the code does not favor internal illumination of signs. The Code is as follows; The Historic Commercial Overlay Zone restricts signs from having internal illumination. The reason for this restriction is outlined in Section 10.14.090(K)(7) of the Morgan City Municipal Code which states, "Historically, signs used on Commercial Street were relatively simple. The earliest signs had no lighting. In later years, an indirect lighting source was typical. These historic sign characteristics should be continued".

The code also mentions; The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay zone. Section 10.14.090(K)(8) of the Morgan City Municipal code state that, "Design guidelines for the rehabilitation of existing properties should be compatible with the style of the main building. Each case should be reviewed on an individual basis, taking into consideration the unique circumstances of each building".

Lance Prescott stated the design is that of the era when Commercial Street was thriving. The applicant has produced a replica of the sign used at that time. The quality of the signage is good, and Mr. Prescott believes the submitted sign will fit well in bringing back an historic theme. The illumination of the clock and numbers should be considered. Commission member, Wes Woods stated the type of submitted sign really upgrades the look of the business inside as well as being classy. The applicant has put in some time to do research and presented the Commission with a complete application. The submittal has before and proposed after pictures with renderings from a sign company able to produce the replica. The internal illumination of the sign is appropriate.

Jim Brown questioning the paint schedule, it is to be determined or is the red the finished product. Mr. Brown also asked the applicant if red is his final coloring, what was the reasoning. John Patterson indicated the paint schedule presented will be the finished product. The reasoning behind the red color is to compliment the historic signage that of Buzzy's and the Country Café. John understanding the color will not be an exact match and yet Mr. Patterson is with the understanding the current owner of those buildings is hoping to refurbish the original signs.

Nathan still questioned why the Ordinance discourages internal illuminated signs. Steve Gersside stated when viewing historic photos, signage was not life. As time went by, goose neck type lighting had been added. The Ordinance reflects the historic time of Morgan City. We can say with this building, the City would like to reflect the vibrant era which has internal illuminated signs. The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay zone. Section 10.14.090 (K)(8) of the Morgan City Municipal code.

Lance Prescott moved to approval the submitted proposed signage for 157 Commercial Street as presented with the exception of wording change to the flush mounted sign which changes the wording from bank to building with appropriate verbiage change suggesting FNBA building or something to that effect. That the verbiage change will be reviewed by staff for approval.

Second: Jim Brown
Discussion on the motion: A recommendation to include approval of the coloring.
Lance Prescott accepted the recommendation to include approval of submitted coloring.
Second: Jim Brown second the recommendation.
Vote: Unanimous
ITEM #2  FINAL APPROVAL-PHEASANT RUN SUBDIVISION

The subject property is located at approximately 175 North 525 West. This project was before the Commission in February 2020 and received preliminary plan approval. Since that time, the applicant has worked with staff in preparing the plat for final approval.

Nathan stated the items was open for discussion with the Commission. Lance Prescott indicated it’s been a long road to get to final approval on this project and stated his surprise that someone with the project is not at the meeting. It is possible that the developer is watching and not contributed to the electronic meeting invitation.

The Commission along with staff reiterated some of the challenges discussed in previous meetings regarding this project i.e.; second access, change in planners, applicant submitting storm drain system not to city standards, frontages, cul de sac, transitioning, General Plan, etc. The project does meet current Code and City Standards. The City received a grant to amend the General Plan. Nathan stated as the Commission revisits the General Plan, this will be a great opportunity for the Commission to review and have input on the future Land use Plan for Morgan City.

Nathan stated Pheasant Run Engineering notes indicate the project has completed the requirements with the exception of documents to be approved by the Legislative Body. That from the Planning staffing notes, the project meets City Code. Nathan stated City Council Members request that the project be complete with not pending items. Even though the developer is not present, the Commission can make a motion. The motion would be that of a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for consideration and not an approval or denial of the Commissioning body.

Nathan stated he still had concerns regarding the layout of the subdivision and did not like the design. Ty Bailey discussed that the developer had challenges which required roads to be in specific areas, widths, etc. That a request was made by the Commission regarding cul de sac to increase frontages. That request would have increased density as well as create challenges for City staff with maintaining the roads not to mention more hard surface requiring a larger retention basin for storm water.

DISCUSSION

Jay Ackott moved to recommend Final approval of Pheasant Run Subdivision to the City Council for consideration.
Second: Lance Prescott
No discussion on the motion.
Vote: Unanimous

MOTION

ITEM #3  Historic overlay guideline review-Façade-145 N. Commerical St.

The applicant, Doug Wickliffe was advised any changes or modifications to the façade of a building in the Historic Overlay Zone is required to be approved by the Planning Commission prior to the changes or modifications. Staff asked the applicant to provide renderings such as: current pictures, modification design, product to be use, brochures, etc. that the City Planner could review and submit staffing notes to Commission. The renderings were not received for the City Planner to review. The applicant received an invite to the electronic Planning Commission meeting. At that time, Mr. Wickliffe provided an email with a current picture of the façade of the building with an additional picture of the type of windows to be installed and a written description of the changes. Mr. Wickliffe was again asked to present product and or brochures for review. This time, at the scheduled meeting.

Nathan read the email from Mr. Wickliffe. Doug Wickliffe is not present on the electronic meeting.

The applicant has been in front of the Commission at a prior meeting. Wes Woods stated again, it seems like the project is happening “off the cuff”. There is not enough information for a proper review. Mr. Woods indicated there has to be a standard for an application. At this meeting, the Commission has two reviews with one review providing a complete application with a design that the Commission does not have to interpret the intent. Wes stated this application is of the current façade and a written description of what the applicant is thinking of doing. Wes impression is that the applicant wants a blank approval, to just trust him that it will look good.

Lance Prescott stated there is no information of the color palate for the doors and trim nor a sample of the product to be used for the façade. Colors vary from product to product. For example, one company’s hard board color can be different than same color in their competitor’s product. The quality of the product can vary from distributor to distributor.
Nathan stated a good working relationship is communication. With no product samples and no applicant present, is an opportunity for miscommunication. Lance checked the email with the invite to the electronic meeting and Doug Widdiffe was on the email. Nathan indicated the Commission needs more clarity on the intent. Jim Brown stated for an example; the pictures shows a double door but the written explanation is referring to a single door. Jim stated there is a lot of assumption in the submittal with not applicant to discuss.

Ty Bailey asked Mr. Garside if the Commission could approve the application with conditions subject to staff approval. Mr. Bailey stated he is not asking specifically for this application. Steve stated it was possible with clear clarity of the conditions set forth by the Commission.

Jay Ackett stated the prior applicant brought a detailed sign rendering and during the hotel review of the façade, that applicant brought in specific product to be use. It is not unreasonable to request the same from this applicant. Nathan agreed stating Jay has a good standpoint. The applicant does have a trusted track record but too many unknowns.

Wes Woods stated how many of us have home improvement projects. On our own projects, we go to Home Depot or Lowe's and gather paint samples, brochures, product samples, etc. Wes indicated his point is that those items are available and should be presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION/DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wes Woods moved to table Historical review of façade at 145 North Commercial Street until the applicant can provide a more complete application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second: Jim Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanimous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADJOURNMENT:**

This meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm

Teresa Shope, Secretary

These minutes were approved at the meeting.
MORGAN CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF MEMO

DATE: May 19, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting


It has been identified that the Municipal code does not include standards which require a full secondary access for residential developments. The most recent example of this is the Pheasant Run subdivision where the secondary access was a twenty-foot (20') access road. In previous Planning Commission meetings, it was discussed that the development standards listed under Municipal Code 10.22.050 is what triggered the secondary access requirement. Which states that a secondary access point is required for developments over twenty (20) lots. The access is for emergency and firefighting equipment. However, this section of code is specific only to sensitive lands and was not the reason for the secondary access. The Pheasant Run subdivision came during a transition of Planning Staff and the project was reviewed by multiple planners which created some confusion.

The actual requirement for the secondary access road came from the International Fire Code (IFC) Section D107 which states, "Developments of one- or two-family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds thirty (30) shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads." The twenty-foot (20') emergency access road met the standards for a fire apparatus access road, and so a full right-of-way was not required. However, as you are aware, the access road will be temporary and eventually turn into a full right-of-way as development continues in that area.

The City can modify the Municipal Code through a text amendment to require developments have a secondary access that is a full right-of-way access. For example, the City can establish a threshold for the number of units that will require a second access. Syracuse City uses this option, their code requires that all subdivisions with more than thirty-five (35) homes have a minimum of two (2) ingress/egress roads, unless an acceptable alternative for emergency access can be made and approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Their code also limits the block lengths to one-thousand, three-hundred and twenty feet (1,320') or a quarter (1/4) mile and cul-de-sacs are limited to five-hundred feet (500').

Another option is to require all subdivision projects to have a secondary access regardless of subdivision size. South Weber uses this option. The ordinance requires two (2) ingress and egress routes for each subdivision or condominium project, unless it is determined by the Planning Commission that it is not feasible due to topography or other constraints. Additional development requirements may be imposed in order to mitigate circumstances of a single
access. Blocks are not permitted to exceed one-thousand, two-hundred feet (1,200') in length and cul-de-sacs can't exceed four-hundred feet (400') from the beginning of the turnaround. Both options provide a way to require and allow for exceptions to the secondary access requirement. Along with requiring a second access, limiting the length of blocks and cul-de-sacs can help increase street connectivity.

The table below provides a break down of how many homes would be permitted if residential blocks and cul-de-sacs had a maximum limit. The number of homes is based off the minimum lot width for each zone. The highlighted areas shows the largest number of homes that would be permitted without a secondary access being required by the IFC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Street Size in Feet.</th>
<th>Number of Homes per Block per Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A, R-R Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,320'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000'</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800'</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600' (Cul-de-sac)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500' (Cul-de-sac)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400' (Cul-de-sac)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the discussion with and direction from the Planning Commission, Staff will draft a text amendment that encompasses the desired approach for requiring a secondary access and potentially limiting the length of blocks and cul-de-sacs.
The Morgan City Municipal Code currently does not regulate the height for primary structures in residential zones. The code also does not address setbacks from primary structures located on the same property in multi-family zones. The proposed draft amendment provides the Commission with options to discuss how to best address these items.

**Residential Structure Height**
A height requirement is a standard zoning practice that can help regulate the character of a neighborhood. Many municipalities allow both single-family residential and multi-family residential to be up to thirty-five feet (35') in height, with a few cities limiting single-family homes to two and one-half (2.5) stories or thirty-five feet (35'). Morgan City measures the height of a building from the averaged finished grade to the highest point of a flat roof, or decking of a mansard roof, or to the mid-point of a gable, hip or gambrel roof. The table below is a comparison of how surrounding municipalities regulate height.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Single Family Height Requirements</th>
<th>Multi Family Height Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr West</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Heights</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>2.5 stories or 35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain City</td>
<td>2.5 stories or 35'</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Weber</td>
<td>2.5 stories or 35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the maximum height permitted within a multi-family zone it is importation to consider how a multi-family project transitions from a high or moderate density to a lower density single family development. For example, a two-story townhome can serve as an effective transition while three-story townhomes would have more difficulty transitioning into a single family development.

The draft amendment as outlined below would require a thirty-five foot (35') maximum height requirement for both single and multi-family zones. Additionally, multi-family units within forty-feet (40') of a property zoned or used for agriculture or single family would be required to have a maximum height of twenty-eight feet (28') which would facilitate a better transition from a lower density to moderate density.

**Multi-Family Zone Setbacks**

As stated previously, the RM-7 and RM-15 zones lacks setback requirements for primary structures on the same lot. Under the current City Code a multi-family project would be required to place buildings that face each other fifty-feet (50') apart, however, there are no setbacks for buildings that are side to side, side to front, side to rear, or rear to rear from each other. The draft amendment would require a minimum of twenty-feet (20') for each of these missing setbacks.

Listed below is a proposed draft amendment. Based on the discussion with and direction from the Planning Commission, Staff will draft a text amendment that encompasses the desired approach for regulating the height in residential zones and setbacks within the RM-7 and RM-15 zoning districts.
### 10.14.070 RESIDENTIAL ZONES; TABLES 3-1

**TABES 3-1**

**PRINCIPAL RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R-R</th>
<th>R-1-20</th>
<th>R-1-12</th>
<th>R-1-10</th>
<th>R-1-8</th>
<th>RM-7</th>
<th>RM-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum front yard setback</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On arterial street⁴</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback between facing structures on same lot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side to front, side to rear, side to side, rear to rear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard (interior) one side/total⁴</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard between RM zones, adjacent to A, R-R and R-1 zones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard (corner lot) Street side arterial street</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum rear yard</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height⁵</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The RM-7 and RM-15 zones require 8,000 square feet for the first 2 dwelling units.
2. Corner lots shall meet the minimum lot width requirements on both street frontages.
3. Measured along the chord length for lots on curves.
4. Residential building lots should not face onto arterial streets. In those limited circumstances where the only available frontage is on an arterial street, it is important to achieve the greatest
setback possible to protect residents from the noise and safety hazards associated with potentially high volumes of traffic and high speeds. Side yard setbacks should also include greater setbacks for those same reasons. Arterial streets are defined in MCC 10.04.010.

5. In the RM-7 and RM-15 zones the maximum height of a structure shall be two stories and 28 feet for residential units that are located within 40 feet of a property used or zoned for agriculture or a single family residential use.