

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on December 11, 2012, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Brian Duncan
Craig A. Johnson
Karianne Lisonbee (arrived at 6:12 p.m.)
Douglas Peterson
Larry D. Shingleton

Mayor Jamie Nagle
City Manager Robert Rice
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

City Attorney Will Carlson
Community Development Director Michael Eggett
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Fire Chief Eric Froerer
Police Chief Brian Wallace
Finance Director Steve Marshall
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Planner Sherrie Christensen

Visitors Present:	Clint Sherman	Tim DeHaan	Justin Brown
	Bridger Cook	Ryan DeHaan	Hayden Cynch
	Alex Teeples	Adam Crosby	Nathan Niemann
	Mike Norton		

The purpose of the Work Session was for the Governing Body to review the agenda for the business meeting scheduled for 7:00 p.m.; receive a presentation regarding Chloe's Sunshine Park donation options; discuss City Cemetery burial fees; discuss the potential petition to disconnect cemetery property from Clearfield City; discuss culinary water meters/radio reads; review agenda items five, six, and seven on the business meeting agenda; and discuss Council Business.

Chloe's Sunshine Park donation options

[6:00:17 PM](#)

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson approached the Council and reviewed the PowerPoint presentation included in the Council Packet.

[6:01:42 PM](#)

Ms. Robinson reported the City will be selling bricks/pavers to be located at the park; individuals or businesses can buy a brick and have their name or business logo engraved on it. She reported the bricks will be sold for \$100 each. Mayor Nagle asked if the price will be the same for both sizes, to which Ms. Robinson answered yes. Councilmember Shingleton stated he thought that the price for the larger paver should be higher. Councilmember Peterson agreed and suggested charging \$150 for the larger bricks that will have room for a business logo and \$100 for the smaller bricks. Mayor Nagle agreed with that suggestion.

[6:02:47 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle asked if there will be information in the newsletter about how to purchase one of the pavers. Ms. Robinson reported that she will advertise on the newsletter as well as on the City's website. She also reported on the options citizens have for making monetary donations to the City.

[6:04:49 PM](#)

Councilmember Johnson inquired as to the name of the City's 501(C)(3) entity. Ms. Robinson stated it is the Charitable Foundation of Syracuse City and it can be used for future projects as well.

[6:05:00 PM](#)

Councilmember Shingleton asked how the City raised money on the utility bill for the construction for the Museum. Ms. Robinson stated the format of the utility bill was different when fundraising for the Museum was taking place. She stated that people could check a box and dictate how much money they wanted to donate for the project.

[6:06:39 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson stated that when the fundraising for the Museum was taking place the City conducted various contests to see which areas of the City could raise the most money. He asked staff to brainstorm and see if they could come up with those types of ideas for fundraising for this project. Ms. Robinson stated she would be happy to work on that and her staff had talked about approaching local schools to see if they wanted to compete with one another to raise money for the project.

Discuss City Cemetery fees

[6:07:23 PM](#)

A staff memo from Public Works Director Whiteley explained cemetery fees were last reviewed and adjusted by city council in July 2011. The rates were updated to ensure they cover actual operating and maintenance costs. These fees are reflected on the current Consolidated Fee Schedule. A request was made to the city to waive fees for infant burials. The current fee is \$100 for a resident infant internment. Cemetery fees are established in order to cover operating costs, such as record-keeping, mapping, online updating, agency and survivor coordination, internments, and ongoing maintenance of the land. Regardless of the size of the internment and who the individual is, there are still costs that the city is responsible for in order to properly and safely perform the necessary tasks. Fee comparisons were performed in July 2011. Our current fees remain one of the lowest cost cemeteries in the area. The currently established fees are suitable for continued operation and maintenance of the cemetery and city staff recommends that the fees remain unchanged.

[6:07:36 PM](#)

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo.

[6:08:36 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson stated that he appreciates the comparison of Syracuse's fees to the fees charged in other cities and he noted that Syracuse City's fee for infant burial is second to the lowest. Councilmember Johnson stated that he looked at the fee for Farmington City and their fee is \$125 for the purchase of the lot and \$100 for the burial. He stated that he is still of the opinion that the City should waive the fee.

[6:09:06 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan stated that he has considered this request and he feels the City needs to be careful; oftentimes people want government to take care of a lot of things, but he feels that charity starts with people in the community and it would be difficult for the City to be in the business of deciding who needs charity and who doesn't. He stated that should be more of a community function and if a family has a problem, people can pitch in as friends, families, and neighbors rather than asking the City to bear the cost.

[6:10:10 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle asked if there is a desire to bring this item forward for a vote. Councilmember Shingleton stated that the City's fees are in line with the fees charged in other cities and as long as that fee is only charged to cover the City's costs he is comfortable. He stated that he thought the Council should review the fees and determine if they are appropriate and research found that there are a handful of cities that charge the same fee as Syracuse.

[6:11:06 PM](#)

Fire Chief Froerer stated that something to consider may be that waiving this type of fee may set a precedent for other fees, such as ambulance transport fees. He stated it is very sad if he transports an infant and the infant does not survive and the family receives a bill for that service. He stated that there are costs associated with various services provided by the City.

[6:11:52 PM](#)

City Recorder Brown added there is a section of the City Code that allows individuals to apply for a fee waiver and those applications could be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Council.

[6:12:23 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle asked Councilmember Shingleton if he is comfortable with the current fee schedule, to which Councilmember Shingleton answered yes.

Discuss potential petition to disconnect Cemetery property from Clearfield City

[6:12:40 PM](#)

A memo from City Attorney Carlson explained Syracuse owns property immediately north of the city cemetery which is inside Clearfield's city boundaries. In the past, Syracuse has made efforts to make minor adjustments to its boundary

with Clearfield. Such adjustments are allowed to be negotiated by Utah Code §10-2-419. In a work session on June 19, 2012, the Clearfield City Council unanimously declined to participate in a boundary adjustment. Syracuse anticipates eventually converting the property north of the cemetery from farmland to expand the existing cemetery. Utah Code provides a separate procedure for a property owner to disconnect land from a city. This memorandum outlines the procedure for a disconnection as well as potential obstacles, including apparent restrictions on municipal use of the disconnection process. The boundary between Clearfield and Syracuse is jagged, with the line running along 500 West, 1000 West, 1480 West, and 1525 West at different locations. Along some sections of the border a road is entirely within one city while at other points the border runs down the middle of the road. The recently considered Ninigret development is almost entirely in Syracuse, but it also includes a small portion of land in Clearfield's city boundaries. Syracuse also owns farmland immediately north of the city cemetery which is in Clearfield. This complicates efforts to maintain infrastructure along the border as well as development opportunities. In an effort to increase clarity and streamline development for both cities, Syracuse staff spoke with Clearfield staff about implementing some boundary adjustments. On June 19, 2012 the Clearfield City Council was asked about this possibility during a work session. The Clearfield Council was not impressed with the suggestion. Clearfield expressed several concerns, including: disappointment with improvements of 500 South near Barlow Park, development of a subdivision in that area prior to completion of the street, the value of the cemetery property owned by Syracuse for residential development, buffering for Clearfield residents, Syracuse' reputation for not being cooperative in issues along the border, and not wanting to benefit the cemetery. Clearfield Council Minutes, June 19, 2012, pp. 5-6.

Utah Code anticipates two relevant methods of adjusting a border between cities: adjustments based on approval by both cities, and disconnections based on the request of property owners. UCA §§10-2-419 and 10-2-501 through 510. "The legislative bodies of two or more municipalities having common boundaries may adjust their common boundaries as provided in [Utah Code 10-2-419]." UCA §10-2-419. Unfortunately, the Clearfield Work Session of June 19, 2012 suggests Clearfield Council does not intend to pass any ordinance permitting a boundary adjustment. *See* Clearfield Council Minutes above. Even so, state law does provide a method for property owners to disconnect their land from a city. Since Syracuse owns some land in Clearfield city limits, the question was raised of whether the city could annex the land using the disconnection method. The disconnection process begins with property owners [petitioner] filing a request for disconnection. UCA 10-2-501(2)(a). That request must include four things:

1. The names, addresses, and signatures of the owners of more than 50% of the real property in the area proposed for disconnection;
2. The reasons for the proposed disconnection;
3. A map or plat of the territory proposed for disconnection; and
4. One to five persons with authority to act on the petitioners' behalf in the proceedings. *Id* at (2)(b).

After filing the request, the petitioner must publish the request in the paper once a week for three weeks and deliver the request to the Clearfield Council. *Id* at (3). The Clearfield Council must hold a public hearing and, within 45 days of the hearing, decide whether or not to grant the disconnection. UCA §10-2-502.5. If the Clearfield Council denies the request, the petitioner may file a petition to disconnect in District Court. *Id.* 1 If the Clearfield Council grants the request, only Davis County can challenge the decision. UCA 10-2-502.5(5)(a)(ii). Assuming that the Clearfield Council denies the disconnection and a petitioner files the petition, the Court is likely to hold a hearing on the matter. At that hearing, the petitioner must prove four things by the preponderance of the evidence:

1. The viability of the disconnection;
2. That justice and equity require that the territory be disconnected from the municipality;
3. That the proposed disconnection will not:
 - a. leave the municipality with an area within its boundaries for which the cost, requirements, or other burdens of providing municipal services would materially increase over previous years;
 - b. make it economically or practically unfeasible for the municipality to continue to function as a municipality; or
 - c. leave or create one or more islands or peninsulas of unincorporated territory; and
4. That the county in which the area proposed for disconnection is located is capable, in a cost-effective manner and without materially increasing the county's costs of providing municipal services, of providing to the area the services that the municipality will no longer provide to the area due to the disconnection. Utah Code §10-2-502.7(3). In making a decision, the court would have to consider all relevant factors, including how the disconnection will affect: the municipality or community as a whole, adjoining property owners, existing or projected streets or public ways, water mains and water services, sewer mains and sewer services, law enforcement, zoning, and other municipal services. *Id* at (4).

If the court orders the disconnection, it must also order the county to levy a tax on the property to compensate Clearfield for costs of disconnection and a proportionate share of obligations accrued while the property was in Clearfield. UCA §§10-2-506, 507. If Syracuse were to attempt to disconnect the property north of the cemetery from Clearfield, it would face several obstacles. First, Clearfield's lack of cooperation on the earlier boundary adjustment suggests that a disconnection request is likely to be denied and end up in District Court. Second, Utah Code may prohibit cities from engaging in disconnections as petitioners. Utah Code §10-2-510 states: "This part [about disconnections] may not be construed to abrogate, modify, or replace the boundary adjustment procedure provided in Section 10-2-419."

To the extent that Syracuse's attempt to disconnect is an attempt to avoid obtaining the cooperation of Clearfield, it is likely to be statutorily prohibited. In *Bluffdale Mountain Homes, LC v. Bluffdale City*, the Utah Supreme Court pointed out that: The plain language of section 10-2-419(1) limits the boundary adjustment remedy to neighboring municipalities. Section 10-2-419(1) states as follows: "The legislative bodies of two or more municipalities having common boundaries may adjust their common boundaries as provided in this section."⁶⁹ Only municipalities "having common boundaries" may adjust their boundaries under this section *Bluffdale Mountain Homes, LC v. Bluffdale City*, 2007 UT 57, 167 P.3d 1016, 1037. In this context, a court could easily determine that since 10-2-419 only applies to municipalities, 10-2-510 prevents municipalities from pursuing disconnection efforts. Syracuse would have to argue that it pursued an adjustment under section 419 only to be rebuffed by Clearfield and that accordingly the disconnection is not an abrogation, modification, or replacement of section 419. No appellate courts in Utah have addressed such an argument. Syracuse would also have to argue that it qualifies as a person under state code. Utah Code §10-2-501 defines petitioners as "persons who...own title to real property within the area proposed for disconnection." Case law has long recognized corporate personhood for the purpose of protecting property owned by the corporation. See *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts v. Town of Pawlet*, 29 U.S. 480 (1830).

The City Attorney was asked whether Syracuse can adjust the boundaries between Syracuse and Clearfield so that the property owned by the city north of the cemetery would be inside Syracuse city limits. Based on a June work session in Clearfield, a collaborative boundary adjustment seems unlikely. As a property owner, Syracuse could seek to disconnect the property from Clearfield, but it is likely to face the same opposition. Moreover, state code on disconnections suggests that cities may be precluded as property owners from disconnecting their land from other cities.

[6:12:40 PM](#)

City Attorney Carlson reviewed his staff memo.

[6:14:43 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle stated that the collaborative process started when she approached Mayor Wood and told him that Syracuse has tried to annex the property into Syracuse and she explained to him that it is a burial ground and it will not generate revenue for the City, but it would be nice for the Syracuse Cemetery to be in Syracuse. She stated that Mayor Wood took the issue to his Council in 2011 and they were receptive, but over the past year there has been a change of sentiment and they no longer feel that they want to entertain the idea. She stated there have been some comments that have been made by some residents that have been hurtful to Clearfield and their current position is that the property will stay in the City.

[6:15:49 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson asked how Mayor Wood and the Clearfield City Manager feel about the issue. City Manager Rice stated that he has talked to the City Manager about the issue a number of times and he is not opposed to allowing the disconnect, but he does not have a vote. Mayor Nagle stated that she has a lot of respect for Mayor Wood; he is an amazing man that can do a lot of good things, but his comment to her was that the general consensus of the Council was that the property would be annexed "over their dead bodies". Councilmember Peterson asked if that is the feeling of their Governing Body as a whole. Mayor Nagle stated that there were meetings of the working group assembled relative to the State Road 193 project and there were some things said about Clearfield and her sense is that their Council is very disappointed and they felt hurt and that stopped the collaborative process. She stated that she does not want to go forward with the disconnect because it does not serve the City; she does not want to make any more adversarial relationships with neighboring cities than already exist. Councilmember Johnson agreed; if there is already tension this will add more tension.

[6:17:26 PM](#)

Councilmember Shingleton suggested going back to Mayor Wood to see what the current feeling is. Mayor Nagle stated that she called him last month and nothing has changed.

[6:17:33 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan stated that it would be best for the entire cemetery to be located in Syracuse, but there should be overtures of peace before proceeding with this process. Mayor Nagle stated that she wanted to be clear that Mayor Wood was not adversarial at all. Councilmember Duncan stated there is some bad blood and he thinks the City should wait

for things to blow over. Mr. Rice agreed and added that it will eventually work itself out, most likely that will happen when development of the property begins.

[6:18:39 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan asked if the City pays the water bill to Clearfield. Mr. Whiteley explained how the payment for water on the land works. He then explained that the entire Cemetery is not located in Clearfield; the existing 6.75 acres is located in Syracuse and the City purchased a 20-acre parcel in Clearfield to be used for future expansion. Councilmember Duncan stated that if the City approaches Clearfield in the future to apply for development of the property and Clearfield denies that request, that may enhance the City's argument for disconnect. Mr. Carlson agreed and reiterated that feelings about allowing the disconnect may change over the next few election cycles.

[6:20:01 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson stated he feels that the Councilmembers can help to mend the relationship between the two cities; if any member of the Council happens to run into a member of the Clearfield Council at a social or training function, they could make an effort to bridge the gap. Councilmembers Johnson and Lisonbee agreed.

[6:20:27 PM](#)

Councilmember Shingleton inquired as to when expansion of the Cemetery will be necessary. Mr. Whiteley explained the Cemetery is currently 1/3 occupied and other plots are already sold; 28 percent of the burial plots in the existing Cemetery are still available. He stated that it may be 10 years before expansion is necessary.

[6:21:13 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle stated she feels that the consensus among the Council is to let this issue rest and not pursue a disconnect at this time. The Council agreed.

[6:21:25 PM](#)

Discuss culinary water meters/radio reads

A staff memo from Finance Director Marshall explained City Staff has previously discussed with the Council the idea of placing meters on secondary water to implement a bill for use system to help conserve irrigation water. This idea was removed from consideration. This discussion will focus on our culinary water system and the possibility of placing a radio read device on all culinary meters. This device would be capable of sending up-to-the minute real time information and data to our utilities department and would allow the city to read meters instantaneously at any time during the year. This information could also be available to each resident so they would have access to water usage at any time from a computer in their home. We wanted to have an open conversation and get the Council's thoughts about implementing this type of upgrade to the system. We want to discuss the Pro's and Con's about this type of project and have a candid discussion about whether this would be the right decision for Syracuse City. Some of the Pro's and Con's for this project are as follows, this is not an all inclusive list:

Pro's

- Year-Round Metering of water usage for all residents and businesses.
- Real time data accessible by citizens.
- Help with leak detection and water conservation.
- Citizens would not be billed all at once for high usage during winter months.
- Already have meters for culinary water and they are already installed.
- No seasonal employees to read meters during summer months.

Con's

- High start up costs for 6500 homes currently built in Syracuse.
- Ongoing maintenance costs of new system.
- Likely a 2-3 year phase in for project.

Estimated costs of a project can vary depending on the vendor we use, type of radio read system we install, and installation costs of the new system. A radio read device can vary in price from \$75 per unit to \$120 per unit. The software and system to support the radio read equipment could cost between \$70,000 and \$120,000. For our city of approximately 6,500 homes, the estimated cost to fully implement a system city wide would be anywhere from \$550,000 to \$900,000. This is a wide range because it is a rough estimate of costs. There are several entities that have already converted to a radio read system here in Utah. Some of these entities include Spanish Fork, Sandy, Nephi, Lehi, Highland, Bountiful, Murray, South Jordan, Payson, St. George, and Weber Basin Water. We have not contacted any of these cities to get their input on their

radio read systems. The City Staff would like open discussion and direction from the City Council as to whether a project like this would be beneficial to the City.

[6:21:31 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo with input from Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Rice.

[6:30:52 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated that even if the City purchased the radio read system the City would still need to have an employee that would be responsible to monitor the information and alert citizens that they may be incurring a water usage overage. Mr. Rice stated that the system offers tools to provide customers automatic alerts of any issue with their account. Councilmember Lisonbee stated her concern is that this seems very expensive and she is not sure this is the right time to consider it.

[6:31:44 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan stated there is a real advantage to installing the system before development starts up again.

[6:32:04 PM](#)

Mr. Whiteley stated the staff has not explored the idea in depth and staff is seeking direction from the City Council regarding whether to proceed with getting more firm data relative to the costs of the system and program. Councilmember Johnson stated that he does not want to explore the program because it is not a necessity at this time. Councilmember Duncan stated that the net savings of implementing the program is only \$10,000 a year, with equates to a 55 to 90 year payback for the system. He stated that he would like to add an article to the newsletter to get feedback from citizens regarding the system; the only way the City will be able to pay for the system is to raise the water bill until it is paid for. Councilmember Peterson stated the City has a lot of money in the culinary water fund. Councilmember Duncan agreed, but stated that money can be spent elsewhere. Councilmember Johnson agreed and stated he would rather see the money spent on other infrastructure needs in the City.

[6:33:06 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall stated the biggest cost associated with the culinary water system is the supply of water and it is hard to quantify how much water will be conserved by the implementation of this system, but there is a projection that 10 percent of the water supply is lost to leaks in the system.

[6:33:33 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson agreed that his initial response that this is a system that would be nice to have, but is not a true necessity, but as a Council that should be looking into the future, this is something they should consider. He stated that if this system can save the City and residents water and money he thinks the citizens will support it. He stated that he talked to a man that lives in Syracuse, but works for Farmington and they have a similar system in their City; it is not a fixed base system and they still use a meter reader to obtain meter data. He stated the man loves the system and reported that they have had no issues with it and the maintenance is very low; it also saves residents money. He asked the man if he would support the system as resident of Syracuse and the man answered yes. He stated that the only con that he reported about the system was the upfront cost, but he would still be willing to support it.

[6:34:45 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle asked if it would be easy for staff to come up with firm costs without an inordinate amount of research. Mr. Marshall stated he could try to nail down some numbers further. Councilmember Duncan stated that he struggles with the payback time frame for the system and he asked what will be happening in the City in 55 years. He stated that he wondered if the system will even last that long and be relevant 55 years into the future. Mr. Rice stated that if the City saves 10 percent of the current water supply that could equate to another \$40,000 in savings. Mr. Marshall added that an additional \$1.00 fee on each resident's utility bill per month would raise the City \$78,000.

[6:36:00 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle asked if the City can conduct a request for proposal (RFP) process and then choose not to act on it if the Council determines it does not make financial sense for the City at this time. Mr. Marshall stated that is an option. Councilmember Duncan reiterated he would also like to include a survey in the newsletter about the system. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that if that is done the survey needs to include factual numbers for the citizens to consider. She then stated she has heard from residents that have said they would not like to see the program implemented; she has a neighbor that has a pretty significant leak somewhere, but the City came in and said she does not have a leak inside of her house but for two years she has been paying over \$200 per month for water and she has no idea where the leak is and she is frustrated by paying that much money. She stated there is nothing she can do because she has been told there is not a leak and obviously that would not be fixed by the installation of a radio read. Mr. Marshall stated that the City will not look inside a resident's

house to try to locate a leak; rather, an employee will inspect the City's portion of the line up to the meter to determine if there is a leak. Mr. Whiteley agreed and noted that anything beyond the meter is the homeowner's responsibility.

[6:38:44 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan stated that he would like the survey to ask citizens if they are interested in the program and how they want to pay for it.

[6:39:15 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle suggested that the staff consider conducting an RFP process. Mr. Marshall stated he would work on that. Mr. Whiteley stated the costs in the Council packet came from an RFP that the City did last year and bidders do not like to provide firm data unless they feel like the requestor is serious about the project. Councilmember Shingleton suggested approaching other cities to determine how much they paid for a similar system. Mayor Nagle stated she would like to see a cost per household to implement the program.

[6:40:26 PM](#)

Review agenda item #5 – disposal of a parcel of real property

A staff memo from City Engineer Bloeman explained Syracuse Town acquired a "flag" lot in 1919 which the City shop and rodeo arena currently occupy today. A 16.5' wide strip extends from 2700 South Street south to the rodeo arena. In 1948 Syracuse Town acquired a second wider parcel to the west of their previous parcel from 2700 South Street south to the rodeo arena. The current shop road lies within the parcel acquired in 1948. In doing so a gap of ±13 feet was left between the two parcels, which to this day still remains unclaimed by the County. Adjacent property owners have a right to claim the unclaimed property. In addition, a portion of the "flag" lot (0.13 acres) was quitclaimed by the City in 2006. Furthermore, the distance between the parcel previously quitclaimed in 2006 and Lot 1 of Syracuse Meadows Subdivision Plat A is 60 feet. Staff is recommending to project the westerly line of the parcel previously quitclaimed in 2006 south to the southerly line of the Fox Haven development. The City will retain everything to the west of this line and Clinton Sherman would be granted everything to the east. This will result in the following land being exchanged:

1. The City will grant ±0.26 acres of property it owns in fee to Clinton Sherman
2. The City will not contest Clinton Sherman claiming ±0.08 acres of unclaimed property
3. The City will claim ±0.14 acres of unclaimed property

In exchange for granting the land, Clinton Sherman has agreed to help the City improve 2400 West Street. The following is what has been agreed to:

1. Syracuse City will relinquish all rights to the property east of the projected easterly right-of-way line of 2400 West street through the Fox Haven Subdivision.
2. Clinton Sherman will not contest Syracuse City claiming the property west of the projected easterly right-of-way line of 2400 West street.
3. Clinton Sherman will agree to pay up to \$1.20 per square foot to replace the asphalt on the west side of 2400 West in front of the development (As a result of utility installation and City Standards the east half of the road will be required to be replaced with the development).
4. Syracuse City will pay for the road base under the asphalt (Clinton Sherman will pay for road base under the portions of the road impacted by the Fox Haven Development).
5. Syracuse City will agree to install curb, gutter and repave from the north line of the Fox Haven to 2700 South street.

Staff does not see this strip of land being utilized at any point by the City and is recommending it be disposed of as excess property. This will bring the existing right-of-way along 2400 West to 45 feet. The additional right-of-way will be acquired when the property to the west develops.

[6:40:44 PM](#)

Mr. Whitely reviewed the staff memo.

[6:44:03 PM](#)

Mayor Nagle stated it was a big priority to locate all the pocket pieces of land in the City and determine how to deal with them; everyone on staff that has worked on that project has done a great job.

[6:44:17 PM](#)

Review agenda item #6, Hammon Acres Subdivision final approval

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained the Planning Commission held a public meeting on November 20, 2012 for Final Plan approval of Hammon Acres Subdivision. All items noted in staff report have

been addressed by the Planning Commission. Lots 101-103 are zoned R-2, while lot 104 is zoned A-1, which accounts for the varied lot sizes in the subdivision. On December 20, 2012, the Syracuse City Planning Commission recommended that the Syracuse City Council approve the Hammon Acres Subdivision, subject to the City staff reviews dated November 14, 2012. The Syracuse City Planning Commission and CED Staff hereby recommend that the City Council approve the final plans for the Hammon Acres Subdivision, located at approximately 1290 South 3700 West, subject to meeting all requirements of the City's Municipal Codes and City staff reviews dated November 14, 2012.

[6:44:29 PM](#)

Community Development Director Eggett reviewed the staff memo.

[6:46:00 PM](#)

Review agenda item #7, Fox Haven Subdivision final approval

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained the Planning Commission held a public meeting on November 20, 2012 for Final Plan approval of Fox Haven Subdivision. All items noted in staff report have been addressed by the Planning Commission. The only outstanding item is the land exchange necessary to properly dedicate the full width of the road right-of-way (previous agenda item disposing of City owned property adjacent to 2400 West). Pursuant to City Council approval of said exchange in correcting the surveying error gap, all requirements of sketch, preliminary and final have been met. On December 20, 2012, the Syracuse City Planning Commission recommended that the Syracuse City Council approve the Fox Haven Subdivision, subject to the City staff reviews dated November 11 & 16, 2012. The Syracuse City Planning Commission and CED Staff hereby recommend that the City Council approve the final plans for the Fox Haven Subdivision, located at approximately 2900 South 2400 West, subject to meeting all requirements of the City's Municipal Codes and City staff reviews dated November 11 & 16, 2012.

[6:46:01 PM](#)

Mr. Eggett reviewed the staff memo.

[6:47:54 PM](#)

Council business

There was no Council business.

The meeting adjourned at [6:48:00 PM](#)

Jamie Nagle
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: January 22, 2013