

**Kanab City Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**  
**February 19, 2019**  
**Kanab City Council Chambers**  
**26 North 100 East**  
**6:30 PM**

**Present:** Chair Pro Tem Scott Colson, Commission Members Breck Judd, Donna Huntsman, Joan Thacher and Ben Clarkson; Arlon Chamberlain City Council Liaison; Land Use Coordinator Mike Reynolds; Attorney Jeff Stott; and Administrative Assistant Janae Chatterley.

**Not in Attendance:** Chair Chris Heaton; City Planner Bob Nicholson

**Approval of Minutes:** Correction needed on line 83 & 230 (spelling error). A motion was made by Donna Huntsman and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Breck Judd to approve the minutes from February 5, 2019 with the amendments. Unanimous vote, motion passed.

**Public Comment:** Colette Cox thanked the Commission for looking at the sign ordinance and for inviting the Chamber of Commerce to be involved.

Francis Batista commented that he hopes the business stakeholders will be able to provide input with the sign ordinance.

Jeff Jensen commented about the request from the Commission to review the ordinances for Vacation Rentals. He explained that his vacation rental has allowed his family to stay in Kanab. He also wanted to point out that it provides good paying employment for local residents.

Donna Huntsman responded that she was the commissioner who requested to have Vacation Rentals be put on the agenda but the discussion has been tabled for now.

**Public Meeting for a review and discussion, approve or deny an Amended Lot Line Adjustment to parcel 65-304 [1498 S Lee Dr ] and parcel 65-305 [1075 W Lee Cir] in compliance with Utah State Code [10-9a-608 paragraph 2] upon approval of the land use authority. [Applicant; Kimber W. Heaton and Devon & Kris Griffiths]** Mike Reynolds explained that this is a type 1 lot line adjustment. The adjustment is being requested so that the driveway will clear the property lines. One of the properties is less than one acre and is currently non-conforming for the RR-1 zone and will still be non-conforming with the lot line adjustment. The property owners agree to the lot line adjustment.

Joan Thacher asked about the history and how the driveway was misplaced.

Mike Reynolds does not know the history but his guess is that the survey and equipment back then was not as accurate as they are now.

Scott Colson asked will the house meet the setbacks requirements with the lot line adjustment.

Mike Reynolds responded that the house will meet the setback requirements and clarified that there are not setbacks for a driveway.

Ben makes a motion to approve the amended lot line adjustment to parcel 65-304 and parcel 65-305, Breck Judd seconds, unanimous vote.

**Public Meeting for a review and discussion, approve or deny final site plan and a conditional use permit to install a freestanding sign with architectural design panels with area coverage between 230 square feet and 340 square feet at the Kane County Hospital on parcel K-C-4-1 located at 355 N Main St in the R-1-18 residential zone. [Applicant; Kane County Hospital ].**

Mike explained that the hospital sign is in a R-1-8 zone and would require a conditional use. There is some debate on the type of sign this is whether it is freestanding, monument or architectural design.

Jeff Stott explained free standing signs are not allowed in residential zones. The only two type of signs that I can see this fitting into is a civic sign or a monument sign. A civic sign only allows 16 sq.ft., a monument sign allows 80 sq.ft. and up to 12 feet high. The question is whether this sign is

80 sq.ft.. The wording alone would be within the 80 sq.ft. but if you include the brown behind it, the sign would be well over 80 sq.ft.. The questions are, if the sign is only the wording or does it include the area behind it. He provided the definition of the sign area, the area in square feet of the smallest rectangle enclosing the total exterior surface of the sign. His suggestion is to be consistent to whatever has been decided in the past and what will be decided in the future.

Celeste Meyeres asked about the regulations on decorative fencing or a decorative wall.

Jeff Stott explained that it would have to be part of a building wall

Mike Reynolds explained that the sign is approximately 15 inches to 2 feet from the building. Mike displayed the location of the sign and that it is in front of the building but is not designed to walk between the building and sign. He hasn't heard from the hospital board of directors as to whether or not they have approved the sign. The application was submitted by the sign company.

Donna asked for clarification on if the concern with the sign is that it is not flush with the ground. Jeff Stott explained that is one of the concerns the other is if the background of the sign needs to be included in the measurements with the words of the sign.

Donna believes that it would be part of the sign.

Jeff Stott commented then it would be too big for a monument sign.

Ben Clarkson feels that this is not a sign, he feels a sign is out along the roadway, this is internal to their property. He feels it is an architectural structure as it is internal to the property and made to make a statement. If this was set out by the street it would change the use and could block visibility.

Joan Thacher commented that they currently have one small sign and this is in a residential area. She does not find any utilitarian use and does not feel it displays Kane County Hospital very well. If this is only being looked at as architectural design, she doesn't like making exceptions and that it sets a precedence for other businesses. She considers the entire structure should be included in the measurements.

Arlon Chamberlain believes that where this is located it is more of a mural or architectural feature.

Donna Huntsman commented that the responsibility of the commission is to comply with the ordinance. She asked if the Commission has the authority to determine if the structure is a sign or an architectural design.

Jeff Stott responded that this is a sign and the Commission needs to determine the size of the sign surface. He also clarified that what Ben said is technically correct but whether a sign is located at the street or next to the building we would follow the same requirements in the ordinance and this may be something the Commission would like to explore during the revision of the sign ordinance that we will be discussing in the future.

Discussion between staff and Commission regarding a conditional use and if it is required or does this request just fall under the sign ordinance.

Jeff Stott clarified that this is a sign request and would fall under the sign ordinance and he does not feel that a conditional use permit is needed.

Breck Judd commented that a definition and the purpose of a sign is to inform the public this is who we are and what we do. Looking at the this sign the only portion of the sign that is doing that is less than 80 sq.ft. the rest of it is just aesthetics.

Donna Huntsman asked if this is approved in the future what is the basis for us to make an exception.

Breck felt that the exception would need to meet within the use and purpose of the building.

Scott Colson wants to ensure that whatever is decided tonight the same decision is applied for future applicants and that any decisions are consistence.

Breck makes a motion to table the discussion and asked that the representatives attend the next meeting to answer questions and discuss the sign. Ben Clarkson seconds, unanimous vote.

**A review and discussion on a proposed ordinance amendment or complete replacement of Kanab Land Use Ordinance Chapter 7 dealing with signs within the city limits. This is a discussion item only to introduce a preliminary sign ordinance for consideration and**

**modification prior to presenting a preliminary proposal to the business community for additional review and comments.**

Mike Reynolds discussed that we would like to simplify our sign ordinance. Staff took an ordinance from another city and applied some of our current sign ordinance within the draft version. Mike is working with Colette Cox from the Chamber of Commerce to get business input and suggestions on the draft version. Those suggestions will come back to the Commission to finalize the draft and then recommend approval from City Council.

Jeff Stott explained that there are three things we can do while reviewing and updating Chapter 7: 1. Keep the same ordinance but clean it up; 2. Draft a simpler ordinance that does not define signs, but instead just require an amount, size, lighting, whether it is permanent or temporary. This would allow flexibility, or; 3. Allow just a few types of signs which would be more restrictive and easier to enforce.

Scott Colson asked how other businesses could be involved.

Colette Cox responded that the Chambers of Commerce is looking at putting together a steering committee and will hold some forums or provide surveys for local businesses to get involved.

Breck Judd commented that he would like to get feedback from the businesses before the commission proceeds.

Jeff Stott commented that he assumes they would like a draft to work off of and providing a draft would be more productive.

Francis Batista commented that a draft would be appreciated but trying to make a one size fits all approach is the wrong choice, there should be some flexibility and latitude. The ordinance would also need to be more consistent. He would like to see setbacks taken into consideration.

Ben Aiken agrees that the businesses would like to have the commission provide them with some guidelines to start with.

Cyrus Meija owner of Raven's Heart Gallery, he would like to see consistency on the sign requirements throughout all commercial zones.

Ben Clarkson asked if the draft in the packet is just a cleaned-up version of the current ordinance. He prefers to see the ordinance evolve instead of throwing everything out and starting new. Signs are a big deal now in order to be successful, a large portion of the budget is going into the signage. We should encourage signage that looks good and ties in with our theme and not restrict it.

Francis Batista commented that with the new Convention Center there will be more foot traffic and ordinance need to tie in with both the increased foot traffic as well as cars driving by.

Mike Reynolds commented that the draft ordinance is only a draft ordinance, it is more organized, concise and all in one area or paragraph than our current ordinance.

Donna likes the organization in the draft, she would like to see illustrations in the ordinance but towards the back of the ordinance as references. She would also like to make sure that the lighting ordinance is included. She would like to make sure that there is some engagement and collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce during the process.

Joan Thacher agrees with the Commissioners and would like the ordinance to be simple, easy, and enforceable.

Scott Colson commented that the business and residents need to be involved. He likes to see creativity with signs and feels that it should be encouraged. He wants clarity because it is fair and consistent but would like some flexibility.

Discussion regarding which draft ordinance that the Chambers of Commerce should use, Commission and staff decided that the draft ordinance in the packet should be used with reference or review of the current ordinances.

**Staff Report:** Mike Reynolds announce that the next Planning Commission meeting on March 5<sup>th</sup> 2019 will be held at the Kanab City Library. This is for the new zone change request from Karen Alvey and Best Friends

**Commission Member Report:** Donna Huntsman let the commissioners know about the Utah League of City and Towns website and the training they provide for Land Use.

**Council Member Liaison Report:** Arlon Chamberlain reported on the City Council meeting and that an approval was provided to the Kane County School District to use City Property for the High School sign as long as it meets the Sign Ordinance.

Ben Clarkson motions to adjourn the meeting.

---

Chairperson

---

Date