

Minutes of the Regular meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on August 9, 2016 at 6:16 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson
Corinne N. Bolduc
Mike Gailey
Karianne Lisonbee (participated via electronic means)
Dave Maughan

Mayor Terry Palmer
City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

City Attorney Paul Roberts
Finance Director Steve Marshall
Community Development Director Brigham Mellor
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Fire Chief Eric Froerer
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Police Chief Garret Atkin

[6:16:45 PM](#)

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Palmer called the meeting to order at p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. Councilmember Gailey provided an invocation. Councilmember Maughan led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[6:19:26 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:19:41 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY MOVED TO SET ASIDE THE AGENDA TO MOVE ITEM TWO TO A LATER TIME WHEN THE WENDY'S AWARD RECIPIENTS MAY BE IN ATTENDANCE. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:20:07 PM](#)

3. Recognition of former Planning Commissioner TJ Jensen for his years of service

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained The Mayor would like to present TJ Jensen a plaque in appreciation of 6 years of dedicated service to the Syracuse City Planning Commission. Mr. Jensen and his family are longtime residents of Syracuse and have been involved in many community issues and have served on different committees over the years.

TJ Jensen was appointed to the Planning Commission December 2010 and was reappointed for another 4-year term from July 2012 to June 2016 and during that time served as Vice Chair and Chairman. As a Planning Commissioner he served on numerous committees, including the Trails Master Plan Committee, The City Logo Design Committee, Transportation Master Plan Committee, on various Development Committees and recently participated as an advisor to the General Plan Committee. Mr. Jensen has been involved early on with the West Davis Corridor discussions and alignment planning. Alongside his Planning Commissioner obligations, he continued to invest his time and share his ideas for the betterment of Syracuse City residents.

Mr. Jensen said "He has been more than happy to serve the Community as a Planning Commissioner and hoped that his service has been worthwhile to the citizens of Syracuse City."

Mr. Jensen's years of service to the City and community have been greatly appreciated. On behalf of the Syracuse City Council and Planning Commission we would like to thank Mr. Jensen for all his hard work and dedication. We wish him the best with his future endeavors and know he will continue to be involved with community issues as a devoted Syracuse citizen.

[6:21:01 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer read the staff memo for the record.

[6:23:32 PM](#)

4. Presentation by Syracuse Chamber of Commerce recognizing Public Safety Professionals.

Representatives of the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce were in attendance to present Police Chief Atkin and Fire Chief Froerer with a thin blue line and thin red line flag to be flown at both the Police and Fire Stations, respectively. The flags symbolize the appreciation the Chamber has for the emergency responders in the community.

[6:27:25 PM](#)

5. Common consent: Proposed Resolution appointing Robert Williams to the Emergency Preparedness Committee.

An administrative staff memo explained Mayor Palmer has recommended the appointment of Robert Williams to the Disaster Preparedness Committee to fill a vacancy created by Lee Hammond's resignation. If appointed, Mr. Williams will complete Mr. Hammond's term, which expires June 30, 2018.

[6:27:35 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer reviewed the staff memo.

[6:28:44 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R16-41 APPOINTING ROBERT WILLIAMS TO THE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:29:11 PM](#)

6. Approval of Minutes:

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Work Session of June 28, 2016; Regular Meeting of July 12, 2016; and Special Meeting of July 15, 2016.

[6:29:37 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES LISTED ON THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:30:24 PM](#)

7. Public comments

[6:30:36 PM](#)

Heath Rogers stated he is a resident of Syracuse as well as an employee; he has worked for Syracuse for the past 18 years. He is proud to work for the City and loves that he has the opportunity to work in the City he lives in and serve the citizens that he calls his neighbors and friends. Today the City employees were presented with a compensation plan during an all-employee meeting. He stated the purpose of the plan is "to establish a planned approach to ensure that Syracuse City attract the best talent possible and motivates and retains that talent for the overall benefit of the citizens. It is essential that Syracuse City recruits and retains the best possible talent in order to ensure the most efficient use of City resources." He stated under the current plan, employment positions are benchmarked at the 60th percentile; everyone may not be pleased with that, but as they learn about the new proposal they feel the City is taking a step back. Valuable employees will now be benchmarked at the 50th percentile. He stated that is in direct conflict with the purpose of the plan; he has a hard time believing it will be possible to recruit and retain the best talent possible if the City is benchmarking at the 50th percentile. There are many other issues in the plan and employees are concerned; many of them do not dare to address the Council, but they are very frustrated after attending the all-employee meeting today. He urged the Council to delay a decision on the plan rather than adopting the plan that has been proposed for adoption tonight. He asked that they spend more time developing a plan that places more value on employees City-wide. He then discussed issues specific to the Police Department; an officer was lost to another agency recently and another is in the final stages of deciding whether to move to another agency. His decision will be based on financial issues. The employees of the City have never been asked to be the highest paid employees, but they must be competitive with other cities. The Police Department recently advertised two officer vacancies and only nine people applied; one failed the physical fitness test and five others had issues on their background reports. Only three people were interviewed for two positions. One decided to withdraw so the Department was left with two candidates. He noted that as a part time position he oversees physical fitness for the Police Academy at Weber State University (WSU) and a new class started today; there are only 14 people enrolled compared to over 40 people in the same class five years ago. He stated he considers this a crisis and the proposed plan will be a major setback for what the Police Department has built and continues to build as they grow to keep up with population growth.

He reiterated his recommendation to delay action on the proposed plan and take additional time to develop a plan that is fair for employees and not a burden on the citizens.

[6:35:32 PM](#)

TJ Jensen addressed the item on the agenda dealing with yard encroachments; one of his last acts as a Planning Commissioner was to submit a dissent letter about allowing year yard encroachments less than 25 feet in a R-3 zone. He stated he feels it is very important to maintain 20 feet of minimum clearance in a year yard for many reasons; reducing the encroachment to 10 feet will be very troublesome. He stated the main thing he wants to talk about is the Piper Glen Subdivision; the developer was originally going to rename the street in the subdivision "Piper Glen Court". He stated he has spoken with residents and gathered signatures to have the street name changed to Yumada Court; the Yumadas have been residents of Syracuse since World War Two and they have done many great things for the community. He noted he has spoken with Public Works Director Whiteley who informed him that the street name has been changed and he feels this is a great honor. He presented the Council with a list of 47 signatures of people that knew the Yumada family very well and remember them fondly.

[6:38:30 PM](#)

Shauna Greer stated she is the Human Resources Specialist for the City; she loves working for Syracuse City and the City has some great employees. She asked that as the Council is considering the compensation plan and making a decision tonight that they keep in mind the morale of the employees; she knows one of the top priorities of the Council is to provide quality service to citizens, but if the employees are not happy and morale is low, residents will not be properly taken care of. Additionally, high turnover could also impact residents and be very costly for the City.

[6:40:26 PM](#)

Austin Anderson stated he is a Detective Sargent in the Police Department and has been employed with the City for nine years. Syracuse City has invested a lot of money in training for him and other officers in the Department and many of them are being recruited by other agencies, but they choose to stay in Syracuse because of the leadership they work for. Today they were presented with a new compensation plan and he fears it will cause some officers to consider other offers from other agencies. Adoption of the new plan would be detrimental to the Police Department; as a sergeant he could leave the City and move to another city and be paid for to be a patrolman. Additionally, the new compensation plan indicates that someone receiving a promotion will only be eligible for a two percent pay increase; that is less than he could get by moving to another agency and accepting a position with less responsibility. He stated many officers want to be in Syracuse; they are choosing to be here because of who they work for. He feels that many of the things in the Plan are in conflict with the purpose of the plan and he asked that the Council use caution and understand the implications of their actions. He stated benchmarking at the 50th percentile is a step backwards. City Manager Bovero did a great job of putting a plan in place where one had not existed before; the employees felt the City was moving in the right direction, but the new plan halts that movement. He suggested the Council strive to keep the core employees of the City and work together to make the City a place where everyone wants to come to work rather than the agency that other agencies recruit from.

[6:43:36 PM](#)

Colin Handy stated he is a Syracuse resident and the K-9 handler for the Police Department. He stated it is rare that the Council hear from an employee at his level, but he would like to make it known that many people from other agencies wonder why Syracuse City employees are staying where they are. His response is that he likes the community, the size of the Department, the quantity of calls that he handles, and he just likes where he works in general. He has heard the statement that money is not the most important thing and that is true and that is how he feels, but only to a point because he has a family that he must take care of and meet certain needs and he and other employees simply want to be paid in a manner that is competitive with other cities. He saw the proposed plan for the first time today and it is his opinion it is not a good start. He urged the Council to use caution in considering the plan.

[6:46:28 PM](#)

Cassie Brown stated that as a Department Head she does not get the opportunity to address the Council in this manner very often, but she wanted to tell the Council a few things about some of the people that work for Syracuse City. She understands that the position of City Councilmember is not a full time job and the Councilmembers are not in the office every day to see what the employees are doing; many of them probably do not know many of the people that work for the City and what exactly they do for the City. She stated that the people that report to her are amazing women that do a great job for the City; they will not leave their position with the City – even if she were to tell them that the Council was decreasing pay – because they honestly love their jobs and they are loyal to the City. However, they do a great job for the City; they have been employed with the City for several years and they bring a wealth of knowledge and experience that allows them to operate the Justice Court smoothly and without complaint from residents. She stated as their supervisor she would love to be able to go to her employees and say that the City acknowledges what they are doing repay them for their service; she feels that is not the message they hear when

the listen to conversations held in City Council meetings. She stated she is in a difficult position because she attends all meetings of the City Council and she knows that the elected officials of the City are doing what they feel is best for the City; that is the job of the Council and she respects that and feels many employees do as well, but there may just be a disconnect and the employees would simply like to hear that the Council appreciates them. Many employees are not feeling appreciated right now. There are many employees that have been with the City for several years; she has been with the City for 10 years and when she started working here the City was doing great. In 2006 development was on the incline, but shortly after the economic downturn occurred. It is natural for elected officials to look for ways to reduce the budget and one of the first things that is considered is employee compensation because it is the largest part of the City's budget. Many employees stuck with the City through those years, though they lost a lot of great benefits that drew them to their employment with the City in the first place and they continue to buy in year after year with no real plan in sight. When Mr. Bovero was hired by the City he worked to develop an employee compensation plan and many employees appreciated that work, but now they feel "the rug is being ripped out from under them". She concluded that the City has great employees and it means a lot for them to feel the Council appreciates them.

[6:49:49 PM](#)

Chad Smout stated he is also an employee and citizen. He thanked the Council for their work and willingness to make difficult decision on behalf of the City. He stated he has worked for the City since he was 14 years old and he has seen it grow; now he has a young family and he wants to continue to see the City grow to its potential. The City needs to provide quality services and that is done largely by employees; he has worked with many employees and the City has some great employees that are very loyal. Over the past several years the economy has gone up and down and the City has done a lot more with less and the employees have accepted that; however, when an employee is really working hard and doing their best, they would love to be compensated for that. He stated he would like to see his hard work impact his family as they enjoy the services the City provides.

[6:51:47 PM](#)

Matt Jensen stated he has been with the City for two years as a part-time Facilities Maintenance Technician. He has had many hard jobs in the past where he has felt employees did not care about him; when he first got his job he was very excited because government is supposed to be very stable, but after one year his hours with the City were reduced. That was a big hit for him and very concerning. During the employee meeting today he saw the proposal for the new plan and it has him even more concerned as he questions the future well-being of the employees. He asked that the Council look into it further and reconsider.

[6:53:38 PM](#)

Eric Froerer stated he is the Fire Chief of the City. He was unable to attend the employee meeting this afternoon, but he heard about it from many of his employees. He stated he wished to echo the sentiments that have been spoken about the compensation plan; it really boils down to being respected, valued, and appreciated and the proposed plans do not offer much of that to the City employees. Additionally, the current plan includes many different components that can offer benefit to the employees and many of them are not considered in the plan proposed for adoption tonight. He stated he understands the Council's desire to vote upon a plan tonight, but there is a lot of disruption in the ranks of employees and it is difficult for them to focus on their jobs with so many unknown factors. He stated that the current plan was adopted upon just six months ago and now it is being reconsidered and that shakes the confidence the employees have in the City and they question their value. He stated he has a great Fire Department and there are great employees across the board and he believes the Council can do better in considering a plan that possibly includes some of the components of the current plan in the new plan.

[6:56:29 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated it was his understanding that Plan B was taken off the table and he asked if that plan was presented to employees today. City Manager Bovero answered no and indicated that the plan included in the Council packet for consideration tonight is the plan that was presented to employees.

[6:57:04 PM](#)

Robert Whiteley stated he is the Public Works Director as well as a resident; the reason he is a resident is that he absolutely loves Syracuse. He is thrilled that he gets to work in the City where he lives as he has a vested interest in taking care of it. He respects the Council for the position they are in and the fact that they must make very difficult decisions. He noted he is also concerned about the compensation plan; once he began working for the City he gained an understanding of the great amount of work the City employees do. They are loyal and dedicated and the employees in his Department are top notch and the City is very fortunate to have such knowledgeable employees. He asked that the Council be very careful in their decision making regarding employee compensation. The employees believe the proposed plan slows down the potential for any pay increases or growth and that can be harmful. He stated the Mayor has used the analogy of a three-legged stool in the past; employees are one of those essential legs that makes the City function.

[7:00:15 PM](#)

Matt Bolduc stated he would like to address the Council as well as the employees in attendance this evening. For the last 28 years in one capacity or another he has made his living through the Federal Government, whether as an enlisted employee of civilian employee of the United States Air Force. He stated he would like to respectfully point out to all employees that they have not had to deal with a one-percent pay increase per anum for the last eight years; they have not been subject to a three-month furlough without pay for the last eight years. These things are happening to Federal Employees who are just as good as the employees the City has. What the City employees are not remembering is that they need to be good stewards of the tax dollars just as the Federal Government employees must. He addressed the Police Department and stated he understands they have a hard job; he has taken fire as well and it is very difficult. It is difficult to do that job night in and night out under pressure, but he asked the Police Officers to take that a step further and go out with the question ‘when am I going to be shot at today’ rather than ‘will I be shot at today’. He compared the compensation of an E1, E2, or E3 position in the military to the compensation the Police Department receives; the Police in Syracuse are pretty safe. He stated his brother works for the Unified Police Department in Salt Lake; it is not an easy job and he deals with the worst of the worst day in and day out. He complains about his compensation, but he also understands there is a finite amount of tax dollars that can go into compensation packages. He suggested that simply because the compensation plan is changing, that does not mean the City employees are being disrespected or underappreciated; it simply means the government is trying to take care of the money they have, which is the Council’s responsibility as the collector of taxes.

[7:03:24 PM](#)

Erin Behm stated she has been employed with Syracuse for nine years; for the first five years she did not receive any pay increases, but she stayed with the City. She left a nursing career to become a Police Officer that that resulted in a large pay cut, but she was doing something she loved. There have been ups and downs, but after today’s meeting she saw more employees disappointed than ever before. The reason for that is that the employees feel the Council does not believe in them; they feel let down and that the Council believes they are expendable. It was hard for her to see that and it is much harder to stay and decline offers from other agencies that are very close by. She stated she is unsure what the City will do if five officers were lost in a week; the City paid for their training and it feels the Council is not valuing that investment.

[7:06:27 PM](#)

Jody Howell stated she is the Court Clerk Supervisor and has been employed with the City for 18 years; she loves her job, but she feels the City is going backwards. She would like for the Council to reconsider the plan with a focus on maintaining the current status rather than moving in the wrong direction.

[7:07:27 PM](#)

Casey Johnson stated he is also a citizen and employee; he agrees with the comments the City employees has made and they are going through some tough times right now. A couple of weeks ago he attended his daughter’s D.A.R.E. graduation and at the end of the event all the kids were asked to say what they want to be when they grow up; only one student in the entire sixth grade said they wanted to be a Police Officer. That was shocking to him; law enforcement has changed and people do not want to get involved in the profession. The State of Utah changed the retirement benefits for public safety employees and that has also had an impact on interest in the profession. Given all the hard things the law enforcement community is facing, a better compensation plan may help the City’s employees and he asked that the Council consider that going forward.

[7:09:37 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY MOVED TO CONSIDER ITEM TWO ON THE AGENDA AT THIS TIME. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[7:10:11 PM](#)

2. Presentation of the Syracuse City and Wendy’s “Award for Excellence” to Destyne Vanderstappen and Beau Miller for the month of August 2016.

The City wishes to recognize citizens who strive for excellence in athletics, academics, arts and/or community service. To that end, in an effort to recognize students and individuals residing in the City, the Community and Economic Development, in conjunction with Jeff Gibson, present the recipients for the “Syracuse City & Wendy’s Award for Excellence”. This monthly award recognizes the outstanding performance of a male and female who excel in athletics, academics, arts, and/or community service. The monthly award recipients will each receive a certificate and be recognized at a City Council meeting; have their photograph placed at City Hall and the Community Center; be written about in the City Newsletter, City’s Facebook and Twitter Feed, and City’s website; be featured on the Wendy’s product television; and receive a \$10 gift certificate to Wendy’s.

Mayor Palmer noted both teens receiving the award for August 2016 were nominated by the staff of Cook Elementary School.

Destyne Vanderstappen:

Destyne VanderStappen excels in academics and athletics. Destyne shared her talent of tumbling with the class and they were very impressed with her skills and dedication. Destyne reads above grade level and participated in Battle of the Books as a 2nd grade student. Destyne has very strong math and writing skills. She is a wonderful example to her peers. All students look up to Destyne because she is kind and includes everyone at recess. She looks for students that need a friend. Destyne is an outstanding student!!!

Beau Miller:

Beau Miller was nominated by his 4th grade teacher at Cook Elementary for the Syracuse City Award. She had the privilege of being Beau's teacher last school year. Beau is very good at sports, but never bragged about how good he was. Beau has a lot of friends, and would always talk to those who needed a friend, even if it was the unpopular thing to do. Beau had to have a surgery before the end of the school year that required him to stay home and do all of his school work on his own. Even though this was hard for Beau, he would stay caught up in all of his class work. If he had questions about assignments, he would ask or have his mom send an e-mail. We are very proud of the hard work Beau did this past school year and believe his sportsmanship and academics is worthy of this award.

[7:15:49 PM](#)

At this time, the Council recessed their meeting and convened in a special RDA meeting. The Council meeting reconvened at [7:46:00 PM](#) .

[7:46:11 PM](#)

8. Proposed Ordinance 16-24 adopting the Syracuse Antelope Drive Community Development Project Area (CDA) Plan.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the RDA board conducted a hearing and ultimately approved the Syracuse Antelope Drive CDA. The City Council must also approve the Plan and designate the plan as the “official community development plan of the project area,” in order to make the CDA effective. Once the CDA has been adopted by both the RDA and Council, it will become effective. Staff anticipates triggering increment in the CDA in 2018, and it will generate increment for use in the project area for 20 years. It is important to note for those unfamiliar with CDAs that the existence of a CDA does not raise taxes for the properties located within the area or the community in general. Increment is generated from taxable real and personal property located in the plan area after the base year (2016), and is transferred to the RDA in order for the RDA to incentivize development through participation and reimbursement agreements with developers.

[7:46:12 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo.

[7:46:25 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 16-24 ADOPTING THE SYRACUSE DRIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (CDA) PLAN. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION.

[7:46:51 PM](#)

9. Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Jackson Court, located at approximately 1958 S. 2000 W.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information about the application:

Location:	1958 South 2000 West
Current Zoning:	PRD
General Plan:	PRD
Total Subdivision Area:	5.22 acres

This item was tabled by the Planning Commission on July 19, 2016 for the following reasons:

- The development lacks a direct connection to an arterial.

- The private road within the development does not have curb, gutter, or sidewalk.
- The proposed development is intended to be a phase of the Craig Estates development
- The Planning Commission alleged that private roads are not permitted.
- The development needs to show additional amenities.
- The road layout within the development raised concerns about emergency service access.
- Specific snow removal agreements with the HOA had not been reached.

On August 2, 2016 the Planning Commission voted 6 to 1 to recommend that the City Council approve the revised plans presented during that meeting. Responses to the original reasons for which the item was tabled during the July 19, 2016 meeting are included in this report. These responses are in the format that was presented to the Planning Commission on August 2, 2016. The applicant provided an updated site plan that includes the covered pavilion with seating opposite the grill area in the central common space. There is also a buffer requirement on the northern property line where the project abuts the PO and GC zones. This buffer is not included in the plan but the applicant has indicated that it will be included in final phase iterations of the subdivision. The applicant has requested approval of a 20 lot preliminary subdivision plat known as Jackson Court in the PRD Zone. The dimensions of these lots are as follows:

Land Use	Area (sq. ft.)	Percentage of Total Project Area	Acreage	Comments
Privately Owned Units (20)	48,339 (2,400 each)	28.3	1.11	20' front and 15' rear yard setback compliant. All units separated by 16'.
Private driveways (20)	11,644	5.1	0.27	All are 20' by 20'.
Private road	31,722	14	0.73	Parking areas and turnaround hammerheads provided per IFC requirements.
Public street	15,902	7	0.37	Standard 60' ROW width and 120' cul-de-sac diameter compliant
Open space	71,781	31.6	1.65	Exceeds minimum 30% requirements.
Common space	47,841	21.1	1.09	Exceeds minimum 20% requirements and contains amenities.
Total	227,249	100	5.22	None.

As is shown, all proposed land areas meet the minimum requirements for the PRD Zone. The applicant has also provided a subdivision design document showing the types of housing intended for the development. The home designs are similar to those existing in the Craig Estates neighborhood. The landscape plan provided by the applicant shows various trees which line the public street and generally border the private road. The ordinance requires that landscaping requires that "The aesthetic and landscaping proposals shall provide for trees and shrubs that break up the look of having the same building style duplicated throughout the development and shall be in accordance with the Architectural Review Guide." Trees have been provided between each home along the private road and to the rear of the homes to meet this requirement. Entry landscaping is provided on proposed berms in the central common area to create an inviting space. Trees have also been provided in this space. Existing mature trees are planned to be maintained which will provide shade and aesthetic benefit to the community. A covered gathering area with a grill, counter, and outdoor seating is to be provided in the center of the common space. The applicant has included an example of what this may look like in the subdivision design document. Staff has also been involved in discussions with the applicant and their landscape architect about the types of amenities that will be provided. As landscaping is not considered an amenity, the only amenities are the covered grill area and two benches. During the Planning Commission meeting on July 19, 2016 the Planning Commission expressed concern about the lack of amenities in the subdivision and cited this as a reason for tabling the item. The applicant has since submitted an updated plan that shows the addition of an additional covered pavilion area in the central common area that will house some seating and tables.

The applicant has submitted revised plans, additional emergency vehicle access map, and a record of communications with the Craig Estates HOA to address concerns set forth by the Planning Commission in their motion to table the item in the July 19, 2016 meeting. These documents are included in this report. Staff has also researched the various reasons for continuing the item and presents the following responses (concerns listed in italics and responses below each statement):

- *The development lacks a direct connection to an arterial.*
SCC 10.75.040(A)(7) “Minimum lot standards” states that “The development design shall include a direct connection to a major arterial, minor arterial, or major collector roadway.”
The only road that abuts the property and falls within the bounds of the Code is 2000 West which is a major arterial. There is sufficient space to provide a direct connection to 2000 West. This connection may be a private or public road as permitted in the PRD Zone.
SCC 8.10.070 “Relation to adjoining street systems” states the following: “Street access for new subdivisions shall be established by using the AASHTO Traffic Design Manual calculation of seven and one-half seconds of travel time between street accesses onto existing roadways (which calculated would be 385 feet at 35 mph) unless otherwise recommended by the Planning Commission. The street arrangement must be such as to cause no unnecessary hardship to owners of adjoining property when they plat their land and seek to provide for convenient access to it. Where, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, it is desirable to provide for street access to adjoining property, proposed streets shall be extended by dedication to the boundary of such property. Half streets along the boundary of land proposed for subdivision will not be permitted.”
The speed limit on 2000 West where it abuts the proposed development is 35 miles per hour. Using the AASHTO standard, the City Code establishes a minimum separation of 385 feet for new intersections. When measuring south from 1900 South (shown in red below) and north from 2025 South (shown in blue below), there is no point where the proposed subdivision fronts 2000 West where an intersection may occur that would meet the AASHTO standard. As such, a public street access may not occur from the proposed development to 2000 West without a recommendation from the Planning Commission.
The speed limit on Craig Lane is 25 miles per hour which requires a minimum separation of 275 feet between intersections (shown in yellow below). The intersection created by 2060 South has a separation distance which approximately overlaps the frontage of the property. Again, a street access may be provided here with a recommendation by the Planning Commission.
The applicant has expressed that they would be willing to provide access to 2000 West if necessary. However, staff has also included text in the draft development agreement that would require a traffic study for Craig Lane between the proposed development access and 2000 West, requiring road widening or other mitigation requirements along Craig Lane if a significant traffic impact were predicted.
It is the prerogative of the Planning Commission to recommend that the development access 2000 West. It is also the prerogative of the City Council to approve the development accessing Craig Lane. Due to the AASHTO standard cited in the City Code showing the proximity of 1900 South and 2050 South, and the heavy use of 2000 West, Staff recommends that the property be accessed from Craig Lane.
SCC Section 8.15.010 “Design Standards” Subsection (N) reads: Private streets shall only be permitted in PRD and cluster subdivisions. Private streets shall meet the minimum construction standards established for publicly dedicated streets with the standard right-of-way requirement. Pavement widths less than 35 feet may be permitted, when the private street ties into a minor collector street or greater, and does not terminate in a cul-de-sac. Private streets shall be perpetually maintained by a professionally managed homeowners’ association as established within an approved development agreement. The purpose of a private street is not to provide a street which is substandard in construction to public streets, but one that allows for private gated access and maintenance for the exclusive use and benefit of the residents residing on said private street.
The section of this Code stating that “Private streets shall meet the minimum construction standards established for publicly dedicated streets with the standard right-of-way requirement.” and “Pavement widths less than 35 feet may be permitted, when the private street ties into a minor collector street or greater, and does not terminate in a cul-de-sac.” verify this statement. The private street may not be narrower than 35 feet as Craig Lane is not a minor collector street or greater and a standard cross-section must be utilized.
- *The proposed development is intended to be a phase of the Craig Estates development .*
Some mention was made in the meeting that a rezone of Craig Estates to PRD would be required to include the proposed development as a phase of Craig Estates. There is no current precedent for this or is there a City or State Code that requires it. An example of multi-zoned phasing that has been approved by the City recently is Keller Crossing of which phases 1 and 3 differ in zoning and phase 2 is split into 2 distinct zones. As the PRD Zone and R-2 Zone are both residential zones, just as the R-2 and R-3 Zones which underlie the Keller Crossing subdivision, requiring Craig Estates to be rezoned to include the proposed subdivision as a phase or add-on would be inconsistent.
- *The Planning Commission alleged that private roads are not permitted.*
As stated above in SCC 8.15.010, private roads are permitted in the PRD Zone.

- *The development needs to show additional amenities.*
The applicant has included an additional pavilion with 4 tables across the sidewalk that bisects the central open space of the development. All other amenities remain the same. As there are no explicit requirements for the type, size, or number of amenities within the City Code, the determination of whether what the applicant has provided on the updated plan remains to be determined by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- *The road layout within the development raised concerns about emergency service access.*
The applicant has provided a map showing the design track for a fire truck. The tracks are contained within the paved area of the private road.
- *Specific snow removal agreements with the HOA had not been reached.*
The applicant has provided documentation indicating the specifics of snow removal agreements with the HOA of Craig Estates. Fire hydrants have also been moved to accommodate for snow storage at the end of each projecting leg of the private drive.
The memo concluded all other requirements of the PRD Zone are met by this development.

[7:47:12 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[7:50:08 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he has serious concerns about this development; he attended the last Planning Commission meeting during which the project was discussed and three different Planning Commissioners indicated that the project does not comply with the City Code; however, they felt it was a good use of space and they voted to recommend approval and he is disappointed in that. He stated the Planning Commission is charged with upholding the City Code. He is very concerned about the requirement for arterial access and he does not feel the current plan provides arterial access as the developer is requesting that the trail be considered arterial access. He added when the developer came to the City Council to discuss the potential rezone of their property in order to facilitate this development and the Council asked the developer directly if they were willing to meet the City Code for PRD developments and the developer answered yes; however, they have moved in the opposite direction and all the concerns that were expressed about assigning PRD zoning to the property have been ignored. He stated he cannot support the project tonight and feels that it must go 'back to the drawing board'.

[7:53:09 PM](#)

The Council engaged in discussion about the concerns and responses to those concerns as listed in the staff report with a continued focus on arterial access to the property. Additionally, Councilmember Bolduc stated her greatest concern is allowing a private drive to serve 18-homes and the type of precedence that would set for future development in the City.

[8:00:10 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer stated he agrees with concerns expressed about the width of the road running through the development; he would like to understand if emergency response vehicles will be able to serve the project given the width of the road. Fire Chief Froerer indicated the width of the road meets the International Fire Code (IFC) minimum requirements and the drawing includes the turn-around radius for a fire truck. He noted the Fire Marshall would not recommend approval of a project that does not meet IFC requirements. Councilmember Maughan stated that he understands that the project meets IFC minimum requirements, but he is still concerned about safety and the ability of a fire truck to navigate the road if a vehicle or even a bicycle were parked on one side of the road.

[8:03:52 PM](#)

Discussion then briefly centered on storm drainage from the project, after which Councilmember Lisonbee expressed her concern about the lack of parking for the development; there are 12 total parking spaces for 20 homes and there will frequently be on-street parking, which could negatively impact a fire truck or ambulance's ability to access the home of someone who may be having an emergency event. She indicated she cannot support a project that would potentially result in placing a resident's life at risk.

[8:05:56 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts noted this is an administrative decision and it is important to allow the applicant to address the body and the concerns they have expressed; additionally, if the Council is going to deny the application, they must cite specific code provisions.

[8:06:51 PM](#)

The Council continued their discussion of the concerns raised in the staff memo, with a continued focus on arterial access to the development and the safety concerns associated with allowing an ingress/egress point from the development onto 2000 West.

[8:26:53 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer invited the applicant to address the concerns raised by the Council. Mike Waite and Troy Barber approached and expressed their desire to provide a safe, quality development on the subject property. Mr. Barber indicated that he feels the only

facet of the development that may not be 100 percent compliant with City Code is the access to the property from 2000 West; however, it is his opinion that creating an access point onto 2000 West would be very dangerous and he chose to provide access to the development from Craig Lane because it is safer and a better decision for the City. He concluded that if the Council refuses to grant approval of the plan because of the lack of an access onto 2000 West, he will alter the plan and provide an access onto 2000 West because it will ultimately allow for him to maximize his profit on the project. He added the Fire Department has indicated that the road throughout the development meets City Code and IFC relative to width. Councilmember Maughan stated he prefers the access to the project be from Craig Lane, but he is concerned about allowing a private drive to serve the number of homes in the development. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed and noted that she is hesitant to approve a development with a road so narrow that it would not be passable by a fire truck or ambulance if vehicles were parked on either side of the road. Mr. Barber stated if the road is dangerous he does not want to build it, but the Fire Department has indicated the road meets IFC minimum standards. Discussion then centered on the road width and options for addressing concerns expressed by the Council by widening the road to 35-feet in width. This led to discussion about ongoing maintenance of the road if it is a private road rather than a public road. Councilmember Maughan stated he does not want the City to eventually assume responsibility for a road that the City does not want or cannot maintain. Mayor Palmer stated that the City can refuse acceptance of ownership of the road. Mr. Barber stated that he is willing to build a 35-foot road, but leave it is a private road that will be maintained by the HOA rather than the City. Discussion centered on other developments in the City that are served by private drives or private roads, after which Mr. Barber indicated that if he is to be required to provide a 35-foot public road, it will be necessary to redesign the entire development.

[8:55:46 PM](#)

The Council thanked Mr. Waite and Mr. Barber for their comments and continued their discussion of concerns relative to access to the project and the width of the private drive. Councilmember Maughan stated he is willing to table the item and would like the Council to review the comments made by the Planning Commissioners who expressed their concerns that the project does not fully comply with City Code. Councilmember Anderson stated she is willing to do that. Mr. Mellor stated that the staff report provides a detailed summary of the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission and staff has provided a response to each of those concerns. The Council offered staff direction for items to investigate in order to continue review and discussion of the project during the next work session meeting.

[9:03:21 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDOC MOVED TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL FOR JACKSON COURT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1958 S. 2000 W. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

[9:03:42 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson stated she supported the motion to table because the City Attorney has indicated the Council must have legal grounds for denying an application and she would like additional time to research the projects compliance with the City Code. Councilmember Maughan stated that he is still concerned about the lack of an arterial access point.

[9:05:54 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts noted that if the applicant would like to submit a response to the concerns expressed this evening they are welcome to do so and such response will be made part of the record of the next meeting.

[9:07:17 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey noted he does not see any problems with the development as designed and he agrees that an access point onto 2000 West would cause safety issues.

[9:08:04 PM](#)

10. Final Subdivision Approval, Laurelwood Subdivision, located at approximately 870 S. 1600 W.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information about the application:

Location:	870 S. 1600 W.
Current Zoning:	R-2
General Plan:	R-2
Total Subdivision Area:	5.14 acres

The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the final plat known as Laurelwood Lane Phase 2 with the following condition:

1. All lots shall meet the minimum lot width requirement in the R-2 Zone.

The applicant has provided an updated plat which meets this condition. The applicant has requested approval of a 15 lot subdivision phase known as Laurelwood Lane Subdivision Phase 2 in the R-2 Zone. The dimensions of these lots are as follows:

Lot	Zone	Lot Size (R-2 10,000 Sq. Ft. Min.)	Lot Width (R-2 85 Ft. Min.)	Existing Structures to Remain
201	R-2	11,309	94.95	None
202	R-2	11,748	87	None
203	R-2	13,177	85	None
204	R-2	10,680	87	None
205	R-2	10,970	97	None
206	R-2	10,393	93	None
207	R-2	10,448	85.20	None
208	R-2	10,454	85.20	None
209	R-2	10,461	85.20	None
210	R-2	10,438	85	None
211	R-2	10,004	85	None
212	R-2	10,447	95	None
213	R-2	10,415	85	None
214	R-2	10,408	87	None
215	R-2	12,888	102	None

As is shown, all proposed lots meet the minimum lot dimension requirements in the R-2 Zone.

[9:08:21 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[9:08:40 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated the subject property is somewhat challenging and he applauds the developer for the manner in which they designed the project to ensure compliance with City Code.

[9:09:28 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY MOVED TO GRANT FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL FOR LAURELWOOD SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 870 S. 1600 W. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[9:09:54 PM](#)

11. Public Hearing: Proposed Resolution 16-40 updating and amending the Syracuse City Consolidated Fee Schedule by making adjustments throughout.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained staff periodically reviews and recommends changes to the consolidated fee schedule. City Administration is recommending the following changes outlined in red in Exhibit A to the resolution. These changes include:

- Split the sewer fee into two components:
 - NDSO Sewer Disposal Fee - \$18.50 (increase \$3.00 in July 2016)
 - Syracuse Sewer Maintenance Fee - \$5.30
- Updated other fees as follows:
 - Public safety impact fee - residential = \$192.00
 - Public safety impact fee - commercial = \$0.14 per square ft. of building
 - Excess Sewer Fee for commercial businesses = \$1.85 per 1,000 gallons of water use over 5,500 gallons.

[9:10:51 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo.

[9:11:00 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer opened the public hearing. There were no persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

[9:11:20 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 16-40 UPDATING AND AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE BY MAKING ADJUSTMENTS THROUGHOUT. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDOC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[9:12:07 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee asked if the public safety impact fees were adjusted based on an analysis of the fees charged by other cities. Mr. Marshall answered no and stated the fee recommendations came directly from the City's Public Safety Impact Fee Analysis document.

[9:12:39 PM](#)

12. Proposed Ordinance 16-21 amending Section 10.40.030 of the Syracuse City Municipal Code pertaining to onsite parking.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the memo is accompanied by two versions of the proposed ordinance: the one staff and the Council analyzed at their July 26, 2016 Work Meeting, and a version which has been modified in light of the comments received at that meeting. The second is a version which incorporates comments received during the July 26, 2016 City Council meeting. It is the only one which is accompanied by Ordinance language. The memo reviewed the differences between the two versions:

- Subsection (2) is now split into two categories:
 - o Areas zoned other than Residential or Agricultural are required to improve any areas used for parking
 - o Undeveloped parcels within the Residential or Agricultural zones may have vehicles parked thereon, so long as the owner keeps vegetation down to 6"
- Subsection (3) – Struck the words “by the Planning Commission”
- Subsection (4) – Added sentence which expressly notes that this section will not prohibit the use of semi-circle, pull-through or hammerhead driveways, which are required in certain circumstances by other provisions of City code (if a residential property is developed along collectors or arterials).
- Subsection (5) – Removes requirement that vehicles parked in side yards be at least 20' from the right-of-way
- Subsection (6) – Changed “tractors” to “vehicles or equipment”
- Subsection (6) – Added R-1 zones as a zone in which farm equipment kept for agricultural use may be parked on any yard area, including front yards
- Subsection (7) – Added subsection number to orphan paragraph
- Subsection (7) – Added language which permits one restoration permit at a time for each licensed driver who resides at the residence

[9:12:49 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo.

[9:13:36 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 16-21 AMENDING SECTION 10.40.030 OF THE SYRACUSE CITY MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO ONSITE PARKING. COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[9:14:01 PM](#)

13. Proposed Ordinance 16-23 amending Section 10.30.050(c) of the Syracuse City Code related to yard encroachments.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained recent review of home plans has raised concern about restrictions in our ordinance relating to cantilevered floors, roofs, and other yard encroachments.

The first section of Code that has presented issues is:

10.30.050.C.1 Chimneys, bay windows, sills, lintels, cantilevers, or other ornamental features may project not more than 24 inches into required front, rear, and side yard spaces, provided they are not more than eight feet in width. This title prohibits side yard encroachments within cluster subdivisions with side yard setbacks less than seven feet, and in no instance shall the side yard distance between two structures be less than 10 feet.

This has been an issue for developers as many times cantilevered floors are wider than 8 feet. It's likely that this code was only meant to apply to bay windows and other similar features and as such, would be sufficient, however it continues to be an issue as homes built to setback lines become more and more common.

The next section of code that has caused concern is:

10.30.050.2 Unsupported cornices, eaves, gutters, and terraces may project 10 feet into any required front, rear, or side yard. Uncovered porches and decks may project 10 feet into any required front or rear yard.

The final section of Code is:

10.30.050.C.3 Attached covered decks and patios may encroach into rear yards provided the total covered patio width does not exceed 33 percent of the total length of the principal structure to which it will attach and it does not extend closer than 20 feet to the required rear yard line.

Since the rear setback in the R-3 Zone is 20 feet, this code does not allow covered deck/patio encroachments into the rear setback of the zone. This may have been intentional and is not a significant concern to staff, but has been of concern to developers trying to include covered decks/patios in the R-3 Zone.

Developers have expressed that the cantilever Codes are too restrictive and should be loosened. It is also possible that the concerns expressed by developers are a symptom of homes being built to setback lines in many cases. This issue arises from home builders acquiring a few home floor plans and attempting to apply them to lots of various sizes and shapes rather than designing a home to fit a specific property. However, as this is generally a more affordable option, it is likely that this type of ones-size-fits-all home development will continue to be proposed. The Code sections in question have been discussed in detail with the Planning Commission during two work sessions held on June 7, 2016 and June 21, 2016. As result of these sessions, staff has been directed to address minimum side yard distances, covered decks and patios, and building cantilever widths. The proposed code is included as an attachment to this report. The proposed ordinance was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on July 5, 2016.

[9:14:05 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[9:15:39 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 16-23 AMENDING SECTION 10.30.050(C) OF THE SYRACUSE CITY MUNICIPAL CODE RELATED TO YARD ENCROACHMENTS. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[9:16:05 PM](#)

14. Proposed Resolution 16-39 adopting the Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that pursuant to previous discussions with the Council, attached is the latest draft policy on the agenda for adoption. On July 28, the draft was sent to the Council via email for comment or suggested edits. No suggested edits were submitted. The attached draft shows the changes made to 'Plan A', as discussed at the July 26 work session. One minor detail that remains is the dollar amount to be budgeted for the Public Safety and Public Works Certificate Advancement Program.

[9:16:24 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[9:17:50 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he would like the record to reflect that he does not support the plan that has been included in the packet for adoption this evening.

[9:18:20 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated that she met with Mr. Bovero to discuss some changes that needed to be made to the Plan and those changes may be the reason for some of the confusion about the implications of the plan. She responded to the comments made by City employees that the plan seems to be a step backwards and argued that it in some ways that may be true, but in some ways it is false from policy considerations.

[9:19:15 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MOVED TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION R16-39 ADOPTING THE EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION POLICY AND FISCAL YEAR 2017 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION PLAN. COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

[9:19:54 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated that the Council indicated previously that a plan would be put in place by tonight. Councilmember Anderson stated that is correct, but that was a Council imposed deadline. In conversations she has had with employees, they have indicated they would prefer the Council lift that deadline in order to spend additional time to develop a quality plan. Councilmember Maughan agrees with that sentiment, but he wondered if it is necessary to put another plan in place in the meantime. Mr. Bovero stated the City does have a current policy, but funding for some components of that policy

has been frozen and those monies will remain frozen until further action by the Council. Councilmember Maughan asked the Council if they are willing to consider leaving the current plan in place for the current fiscal year with a plan to spend a significant amount of time over the course of the year to develop a new plan. Councilmember Gailey asked if that would entail un-freezing money set aside for certain components of the plan. Councilmember Maughan answered yes. Councilmember Bolduc stated she is not in favor of that. Councilmember Lisonbee added that during the last meeting where the proposed plan was reviewed, a majority of Councilmembers supported it and she would prefer to continue working with the proposed plan to make improvements rather than discarding it at this point. She feels that the Council can spend a couple of weeks responding to the comments made by the employees this evening. Mayor Palmer stated that he can support that direction forward.

[9:25:05 PM](#)

The Council and staff engaged in brief discussion regarding the implications of continuing forward with no plan in place. Mr. Bovero noted that discussions regarding things like career advancement increases and other benefits can continue in order for definitive information to be provided to the employees. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would like for those issues to be fleshed out during a work session meeting.

[9:27:37 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc noted that both plans considered by the Council, Plan A presented by Councilmembers Bolduc and Lisonbee and Plan B presented by Councilmember Maughan, called for benchmarking at the 50th percentile so that is one component of a plan that had the full support of the Council. Councilmember Maughan contended his plan indicated that employees could not be benchmarked at less than the 50th percentile; that number was in no way the maximum benchmarking level.

[9:29:07 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer asked that Councilmember Bolduc provide the entire Council with the research she has conducted relative to benchmarking practices in other communities so that the body can come to the meeting fully prepared to discuss the basis for the plan.

[9:31:27 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer stated there has been a motion and second to table the resolution and he called for a vote; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[9:31:37 PM](#)

15. Public comments

[9:31:51 PM](#)

TJ Jensen addressed the discussion that the Council had regarding the Jackson Court PRD; he noted the Planning Commission has recommended amendments to the City's PRD ordinance and he is concerned that the Jackson Court project is being considered while those ordinance changes are pending. He believes it would benefit all parties to gain a clear understanding of the proposed ordinance amendments before the project is considered any further.

[9:33:02 PM](#)

Ralph Vaughan stated he attended the Planning Commission meeting where the Jackson Court PRD was discussed and the Chairman voted in opposition to the plan because of a single, fatal flaw in the project design. He referenced an overhead color photo of the subject property that illustrates stopping distances for various types of roads based upon speed and critical speed (the 85 percentile of the actual speed people drive through a 35 mile per hour zone). One line on the photo indicates that there is not sufficient stopping distance at Craig Lane per ASHTO standards.

[9:35:30 PM](#)

Pat Zaugg stated she sent the Council an email regarding concerns she has about a development that is being considered in Syracuse. She has been told by several reliable people that a new zone is being considered for the development and she has great concerns about the lot sizes contemplated in that zone. She has been told that lot sizes would range from 3,500 square feet to 10,000 square feet. She noted she was a member of the General Plan Committee, which recommended that the smallest lot size in the City be 8,000 square feet unless the property is an R-1 Cluster development. She stated that if the 3,500 square foot minimum is approved it would be possible to build two homes on a lot the size of the City's minimum lot size. She has two sons that live in Woodside Homes and one of them lives in the development that has been referenced as an example of the type of development that will be built in Syracuse. The larger homes in that development are not located on the smaller lots and the smaller homes were not displayed. She acknowledged smaller lot sizes on the Ski Lakes development, but the Council previously acknowledged they did not want something like that project to occur again in the City as the developer took advantage of loopholes in the R-1 Cluster zone. She encouraged the Council to prevent that from happening again and she pleaded with the Council to reconsider the lot sizes. The subject property is very close to a freeway site and she asked if the

City really wants people driving through Syracuse and seeing a development of that caliber. She then noted one thing her husband wanted to mention is possibly removing the bike lane on 700 South; it is going to be problematic with construction of the homes in Monterey Estates.

[9:39:04 PM](#)

Fire Chief Froerer thanked the Council for their willingness to take another look at the compensation plan. He stated he also wished to respond to Mr. Bolduc's earlier comments. He stated that Mr. Bolduc indicated the Federal Government only offered one percent pay increases for a number of years and his response to that is 'shame on the Federal Government' for not keeping pace with competition. He stated the employees are not asking the Council to do anything fiscally irresponsible; somehow there must be a common ground between fiscal responsibility, competition, and fairness. All the employees are asking is to be paid competitively with their peers in neighboring cities like Clearfield, Clinton, Layton, Kaysville, and Farmington. He stated City employees are not Federal Government employees; the Federal Government has a different compensation plan with different benefits and they should not be compared to City employees.

[9:40:29 PM](#)

Matt Bolduc stated "with all due respect, Chief, you don't know what you are talking about". He suggested the Chief wants to compare Syracuse to Clearfield, Layton, and Kaysville, but each of those cities has a larger population than Syracuse and, therefore, a larger tax base. He stated it would be necessary to increase taxes to increase the tax base in Syracuse in order to pay employees what their counterparts in those other cities are made. He noted government is a zero sum game, whether it is at the local level or the Federal Government; the government cannot make a profit and the money to fund the City must come from somewhere. The citizens have charged the Council to make those decisions for them. Everyone has the freedom of choice to choose where they work; one officer indicated she chose to give up a career in nursing at a higher salary to be a Police Officer in Syracuse. She knew what she was doing and that she did it because she had the opportunity to do something she loved. There is give and take and he understands the Council's desire to save money and keep people because they are the best and brightest, but if someone decides to become a government employee they need to understand they will not always be the top compensated person and competitive. If the City employees want to be paid at the same level as Salt Lake City, that is not possible because that city has more citizens. He stated it is necessary to compare apples to apples.

[9:43:08 PM](#)

16. Councilmember reports.

At each meeting the Councilmembers provide reports regarding the meetings and events they have participated in since the last City Council meeting. Councilmember Maughan's report began at [9:43:34 PM](#). He was followed by Councilmembers Maughan, Gailey, Anderson, and Bolduc. Councilmember Lisonbee indicated she had nothing to report.

[9:55:37 PM](#)

17. Mayor's Report.

Mayor Palmer's report began at [9:55:42 PM](#).

[9:56:22 PM](#)

18. City Manager report

City Manager Bovero's report began at [9:56:26 PM](#).

[10:05:46 PM](#)

19. Consideration of adjourning into Closed Executive Session pursuant to the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Open and Public Meetings Law for the purpose of discussing the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; or the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property (roll call vote).

[10:05:48 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO CONVENE IN A CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 52-4-205 OF THE OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OR REAL PROPERTY AND PENDING OR

City Council Regular Meeting
August 9, 2016

REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The closed session began at 10:05 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:55 p.m.

At 10:55 p.m. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: September 13, 2016