

Minutes
City of Clayton Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, May 26, 2009

Call to Order

Chair Catalano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at Hoyer Hall, 6125 Clayton Road, Clayton.

Present: Chair Tuija Catalano, Commissioner Bob Armstrong, Commissioner Keith Haydon,
Commissioner Sandra Johnson

Absent: Vice Chair Ed Hartley

Staff: Community Development Director David Woltering
Assistant Planner Milan Sikela, Jr.

Administrative

1A. Review of agenda items.

1B. Chair Catalano to report at the June 2, 2009 City Council meeting.

Approval of Minutes

2. Approval of minutes from the joint special meeting of April 28, 2009.

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Haydon seconded a motion to approve the minutes from the joint special meeting of April 28, 2009, as submitted. The motion passed 4-0.

Public Hearings

3. **ZOA 01-09, Municipal Code Amendment, City of Clayton.** Study session regarding possible amendments to Section 15.08.030 of Clayton Municipal Code (Sign Provisions) to provide greater clarity of the Sign Permit review and approval process and allow administrative approval of specified minor signage.

Assistant Planner Sikela presented the staff report.

Planning Commission questions included:

- Under the proposed Planning Commission Review and Approval section of the Permit Procedures, a reference should be made to directory signs that exceed ten square feet in area and six feet in height.
- Remove the parenthetical reference that this provision does not apply to Corner Lots and Through Lots from the Planning Commission Review and Approval section of the Permit Procedures.
- Make sure the terms "Corner Lot" and "Through Lot" are defined in the Code and are capitalized when referenced in the Sign Provisions.
- As it is currently written, would a Corner Lot or Through Lot need Planning Commission review? Director Woltering indicated that, as currently written, proposed signage involving a Corner Lot or Through Lot would need Planning Commission review if signage was proposed for modification on more than one frontage.
- Would subdivision entry signs need Planning Commission review? Assistant Planner Sikela indicated that a new subdivision entry sign would need Planning Commission review, whereas a change of copy would not.

- Has staff received any support for this amendment from the City Manager or City Council? Director Woltering answered that staff had reviewed the matter with the City Manager of amending the sign provisions for clarification purposes and to delegate authority to staff to administratively review and approve minor sign permits. The City Manager supported bringing the matter forward for consideration.
- Would the sign permit fees or deposits be affected by these amendments? Assistant Planner Sikela responded no, the fee would remain a \$50 fee for administratively reviewed and approved sign permits and a \$1,000 deposit for Commission reviewed and approved sign permits.
- Do we have opportunities to perform these “clean up” amendments together in one ordinance? Director Woltering answered, yes, staff could bundle these “clean up” amendments together for efficiency purposes, similar to what was done with the “Omnibus” Ordinance.
- Would the appeal process be affected by these possible amendments? Assistant Planner Sikela responded no, the appeal process would remain the same. Sign permits approved by staff could be appealed to the Planning Commission, and sign permits approved by the Planning Commission could be appealed to the City Council.
- What about noticing administratively reviewed and approved sign permits? Assistant Planner Sikela indicated that administratively reviewed and approved entitlements such as home occupation permits and tree removal permits are noticed since these entitlements typically occur in residential areas. Conversely, almost all of the sign permits approved by the City are for properties located within commercial districts where signage is a typical component of businesses. Businesses come and go and signs come and go; requiring noticing of administratively reviewed and approved signs would seem to counter the purpose of allowing staff to administratively approve minor sign permits to streamline the process.
- How would these possible amendments have affected the review of the CVS Pharmacy signs? Assistant Planner Sikela responded that the CVS Pharmacy signage still would have come before the Planning Commission for review and approval, because the subject property is located on a Corner Lot and the signage changes were being proposed on multiple frontages.
- We should clarify the differentiation between a “minor sign change” and a “change of copy”. Director Woltering indicated that a sign project involving only a change of copy would not require a sign permit. A change of copy simply involves a change in text or image with no structural change. Conversely, a minor sign change could involve a change in copy as well as a change in the structure of the sign. As long as the number, size, and general location of the signage does not change, the signs could be reviewed and approved administratively as a minor sign. Define and codify the terms “minor sign” and “change in copy”.
- We need to codify wording to address these “gray area” signs that do not easily fall into any one category, such as the CVS Pharmacy signs.
- A provision should be included so that staff has the discretion to refer a “minor sign” application to the Planning Commission for consideration.
- The Commissioners indicated general agreement in being supportive of streamlining the sign permit process by allowing staff to administratively review and approve specified minor signs.
- The Commissioners generally concurred that a more expedient review and approval process for minor sign permits would be more business-friendly and that staff would be able to use the appropriate controls and safeguards that have been established by the City.

Old Business

4. None.

New Business

5. None.

Communications

6A. Staff.

1. Housing Element Update Project Status Report

Director Woltering indicated that the staff was targeting June 3, 2009 for the distribution of the Draft Housing Element to the Planning Commission for the upcoming June 9, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

2. Planning Commissioner Recruitment Process Staff Report

- ▶ Two Seats Open.
 - Vice Chair Hartley has decided not to seek reappointment.
 - Commissioner Keith Haydon has served to term limit.
- ▶ Applications are due June 5, 2009.

6B. Commission – None.

Adjournment

7. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.



Submitted by
David Woltering, AICP
Community Development Director



Approved by
Tuija Catalano
Chair

Plng Comm\2009\Minutes\0526