
Syracuse City Planning Commission Meeting

January 3, 2012

1. Meeting called to Order and Adoption of Agenda

Planning Commission Chair Gregory Day called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m., indicating that City staff posted the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting and delivered copies to all Commission members. Tyler Bodrero offered the prayer, and T.J. Jensen led the pledge of allegiance.

Members Present: Chairman Gregory Day, Vice Chairman Gary Pratt, Kenneth Hellewell, Tyler Bodrero, T.J. Jensen, Dale Rackham, and Curt McCuiston as well as City Planner Kent Andersen, City Engineer Robert Whiteley, and Administrative Secretary Judy Merrill

Excused: Braxton Schenk

Visitors: Robert Favero Craig Johnson Wade Stoker Jerry Stoker

Commissioners reviewed the January 3, 2012, Planning Commission meeting agenda.

T.J. JENSEN MOVED TO ADOPT THE JANUARY 3, 2012, AGENDA AS OUTLINED, SECONDED BY TYLER BODRERO; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Approval of Minutes

Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the December 20, 2011, meeting.

TYLER BODRERO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 20, 2011, MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN, SECONDED BY GARY PRATT; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. Public Hearing: Proposed Amendment to Land Use Ordinance for PRD Building Height Regulations

Chairman Day referred to the proposed Stoker Gardens development, which motivated this new proposal. The PRD zone currently required all buildings to be "equal to the horizontal distance from the nearest zone boundary with a maximum height of 30 feet to the top of the roof ridge." The units Castle Creek Homes planned to build in that subdivision would be 26 feet 3½ inches tall, which would require the setbacks to be the same. However, the current setbacks were only 21 feet on the south and 15 feet on the north, with no options for compliance other than eliminating units, which would not allow the development to be financially viable. Staff realized that the PRD zone had much stricter height limits than any other zone in the Land Use Ordinance. At build out, commercial development on the northern side of this PRD could have buildings as tall as 35 feet and as close as 10 feet to the boundary line. Residential R-2 development on the other three sides could have two-story homes as tall as 35 feet and as close as 8 feet to the boundary lines. The current minimum lot standards imposed upon Stoker Gardens by the PRD regulations seemed overly cumbersome when compared to the surrounding zones' standards.

Planner Andersen referred commissioners to the third page of Chapter 15, regarding development plan and agreement requirements, and pointed out an oversight staff wanted to correct in order to reflect the correct maximum density of 12 units per net acre rather than 8.

Chairman Day opened the meeting to public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jensen asked for clarification of the proposed amendment and whether it would bring the minimum lot standards specific to building heights in line with the other zone requirements. Director Eggett told him he was correct, other than two exceptions 1) a maximum of 30 feet to the ridge roof line, and 2) required approval by City Council to clearly show any developer that a PRD would need approval for that height.

Chairman Day asked if they needed to change the wording from "and as approved by City Council" to "or as approved by City Council" and whether it meant the City would allow building heights up to 30 feet as an exception if approved by City Council. Director Eggett explained that the Commission could evaluate it that way, but the intent of the last sentence was to simply show that City Council would approve it as part of the overall PRD development. If the Commission preferred having the ability to allow flexibility between 30 and 35 feet, since 35 feet was the maximum height allowed by building code, they could modify the language in that section to reflect such a desire. Commissioner Jensen worried that "as approved by City Council" made it arbitrary, while Director Eggett believed that, rather than arbitrary, it gave discretion to Council in weighing in and understanding the process better regarding any need for a height up to 35 feet. Vice Chair Pratt added that it tied in with the setbacks and gave flexibility to the City to look at setback requirements on a site plan versus heights of buildings and make determinations. There would be no change to the setback requirements.

Director Eggett explained the concerns, whether founded or not, with having a group home environment of up to four attached units, which created a perception of being bigger and closer. Vice Chair Pratt stated that a lot of the height issues had to do with roof trussing and constructing buildings with style rather than just flat roofs. Style required height, so he supported such a change.

Chairman Day believed it would help applicants understand more easily that they could build up to 30 feet while needing special approval to go higher; however, he also understood the need for additional controls. Commissioner Bodrero then asked if a request to construct a building higher than 30 feet would come before the Commission for a recommendation to City Council for approval. Director Eggett confirmed his understanding of the process and then referred to a good point brought up by Planner Andersen. Once the City made a determination and approved such an exception, it created an arbitrary standard between developers by limiting one to 30 feet while allowing another up to 35 feet. Commissioner Bodrero then wondered if the proposed language correctly reflected the desired intent. Director Eggett suggested eliminating that line if the Commission had concerns. Commissioner Bodrero suggested it might simply be an issue with the second sentence and changing it from 'ridge' to 'line' or leaving 'ridge' and adding 'roof line,' along with another sentence that read, "Any height greater than 30 feet would need to be reviewed and approved by City Council." Commissioner Jensen wondered why a development would need to go above 35 feet when limited to 8 or 12 units per acre. He asked if the City wanted these types of

developments to be shorter or if they should just allow them to build up to 35 feet with no exceptions, since 35 feet was the standard. Director Eggett agreed that 35 was the standard but that 30 feet created a cap that made PRD developments feel less intensive on neighboring single-family, traditional-style uses. Commissioner Jensen was fine with 30 feet but felt it too arbitrary for City Council to allow one developer to exceed it and not everyone. Commissioner Bodrero asked Commissioner Jensen if he preferred striking that language. Commissioner Jensen said yes. It should just say, "...top of the roof ridge." Since City Council had to approve it anyway, he did not see a need for the Ordinance to call it out.

Vice Chair Pratt asked for someone to show him the language that led them to the fact that a developer could go up to 35 feet, when it specifically said the maximum height was 30 feet. Commissioner Jensen explained that they were simply debating whether to allow them to build up to 35 feet, which was the standard in other zones, but he believed 30 feet was fine. If not, it should just say 35 feet. Director Eggett suggested striking that portion of the sentence since it was clearly creating reasonable confusion. Commissioner Jensen agreed with staff's assessment that 30 feet might feel less obtrusive, and Vice Chair Pratt preferred leaving it at 30 feet.

Chairman Day referred to the current proposed rear-yard setbacks of 15 feet, which were closer to property lines than other zones. However, he considered it reasonable to allow two-story structures up to 30 feet. Vice Chair Pratt explained that the only reason he supported it was because of architecture, which would allow nicer roof configurations. The buildings would not be higher, and the footprints would not change, just the height of the roofs. He did not want any ambiguous language that could cause a problem.

Director Eggett recommended retaining the words 'roof ridge.' Changing it to 'roof line' made it too questionable, including 'roof line.' Vice Chair Pratt stated that a roof ridge was the top of the roof, architect-urally, but Chairman Day pointed out that some roof structures did not have a ridge. They were flat. Commissioner Bodrero suggested using 'roof ridge line.' Commissioner Jensen preferred "...30 feet to the top of the structure." Director Eggett agreed. Vice Chair Pratt preferred "...top of the roof structure."

T.J. JENSEN MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, THE LAND USE ORDINANCE, REGARDING PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING MINIMUM LOT STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO BUILDING HEIGHTS WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT SECTION 10-15-040(F) READ "WITH A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 30 FEET TO TOP OF THE ROOF STRUCTURE." GARY PRATT SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4. Stoker Gardens PRD Subdivision Final Plans

Planner Andersen explained that staff updated their packets with the most current staff reviews, which included a note that the developer changed the landscape language in the development agreement. City Engineer Robert Whiteley could not attend the Commission meeting that evening but expressed confidence in the project moving forward. His comments were outlined in an email, and the packet now included colored elevations as well.

Chairman Day invited Kyle Hamblin forward to present the request. Mr. Hamblin referred to their discussion last time regarding staff concerns for the building exteriors. The colored renderings did not come out exactly as they planned, so he displayed some sample boards. He told them he also emailed a web link that commissioners could use to view pictures of their other developments to show what they planned for these buildings. The rock, garage doors, and front doors would all remain the same on each building, but the shades of the HardieBoard and stucco would vary with two color schemes. In order to comply with the Ordinance for exterior building requirements, they increased the percentage on the front to 31%. The side elevations fronting public roads would still have the 4-foot wainscot.

Vice Chair Pratt asked about the development agreement. Mr. Hamblin explained that they had not completed the CC&Rs but believed the development agreement guaranteed those in the future, which the City would approve. They were taking their time in order to be thorough. Director Eggett suggested that commissioners make recommendations of what they would like in the CC&Rs and assured them that, if City Council did not approve the development agreement, the City could not approve the development.

Commissioner Jensen asked Mr. Hamblin if he looked over the staff reviews. Mr. Hamblin stated that he did receive the addresses from staff and would include them on their final plat set and had been working on all the rest of the identified items from staff. The only item not yet started was the bond.

Vice Chair Pratt asked to know who had been keeping track of all the recommendations made throughout this process. Director Eggett assured him that staff was checking to make sure the development agreement reflected all the applicable items. Planner Andersen added that they had also been keeping track of desired items for the CC&Rs, such as no yard signage, maintaining space for at least one car in each unit, etc., and had been forwarding them onto Castle Creek Homes. Vice Chair Pratt asked that it include replacement of all dying landscaping as well. He then recommending that the Commission have the ability to look through the documents before it went to City Council for approval, rather than having it just go through staff review. Director Eggett assured him that staff had been and would continue to be diligent in verifying that Castle Creek Homes incorporated all desired language into the documents. Vice Chair Pratt reminded staff that they also needed to verify the appropriate language in the declarations and covenants. Mr. Hamblin complimented City staff for helping them make sure they had the correct verbiage for these documents. Most of their drafts pertained to landscaping, CC&Rs, and HOAs. They only had one issue, which related to the easement for the cell tower, but were able to resolve it with the help of City staff.

Vice Chair Pratt reminded Mr. Hamblin of a discussion they had during their last meeting regarding the relocation of landscaping from along the southern property line. Mr. Hamblin advised him that, after discussing it with Mike Schultz, they were willing to comply with that recommendation. Vice Chair Pratt asked at what level the City would make sure they executed this variation. Planner Andersen explained to him that anything like that should be included in the landscape plan. The Commission could leave it to staff's discretion or require new plans. Vice Chair Pratt asked that Castle Creek Homes identify

the landscaping on their plans purchased with the funds designated for the landscaping eliminated over the storm-drain easement. He did not want them comingled with the rest of the landscaping so that people reviewing the plans in the future could not tell the development included the full amount of landscaping. Commissioner Bodrero suggested adding a table that showed the exact amount of landscaping that would have been planted on the south and where or how they relocated it within the development, whether it was upsizing of trees or additional trees.

Commissioner McCuiston referred to the grading plan he discussed with Mr. Hamblin during the last meeting. Since there would still be drainage over the sidewalk and the issue with asphalt percentages for the driveways, he asked if the City Engineer had been able to review the plans relating to his concerns. Planner Andersen advised him that the City Engineer did review the revised grading plans and believed the applicant complied with the Ordinance. Commissioner McCuiston pointed out the 2% or 3% around the corner, over at the entranceway, into the development up north and asked if the City Engineer looked at how much water would be running down 1000 West and entering that one box. He then referred to their development agreement, on page 3 part 6 referring to garage sizes, which identified a typical two-car garage width as 25 feet and one-car as 21 feet, which he believed was a typo. Director Eggett turned to the document and determined that both widths were wrong. Commissioner McCuiston referred next to the easement running along the north side of Lot 35 to the cell tower and asked if the foundation wall's grade difference would require a handrail. Mr. Hamblin was not sure and agreed to check into that. Chairman Day acquired staff's assurance that all of Commissioner McCuiston's concerns would be forwarded to the City Engineer.

Upon Director Eggett's suggestion, Mr. Hamblin discussed the Commission's request for designated handicap parking and additional lighting. They had not designated such parking in any of their other developments, and the law did not require it. They preferred to include language in the CC&Rs to add handicap stalls if requested by potential or existing residents. By waiting, they would not be using up needed parking that may not even be used. As for lighting, they were open to discussion and recommendations. The plans did not include additional lighting for those additional parking stalls—just street and porch lights. Vice Chair Pratt discussed using LED lighting.

Commissioner McCuiston asked who would be responsible for the upkeep of the driveways and asphalts, based on his concerns with the half percent on asphalt. Director Eggett stated that the HOA would be financially liable.

GARY PRATT MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND FINAL PLAN APPROVAL OF THE STOKER GARDENS PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2040 SOUTH 1000 WEST, SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY'S MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES, THE CITY ENGINEER'S AND CITY STAFF'S REVIEWS DATED JANUARY 3, 2012, AND TO FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. T.J. JENSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

TYLER BODRERO MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO REQUIRE THE ADDITION OF A LANDSCAPE RELOCATION TABLE ON SHEET 12, A VERIFICATION OF THE CLOSEST STORM-DRAIN BOX ON SHEET 4 FOR STORM WATER ON 1000 WEST ENTERING THE SUBDIVISION FROM THE NORTH, AND CORRECTION OF THE GARAGE WIDTHS ON THE THIRD PAGE OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. GARY PRATT ADDED TO THE AMENDMENT FOR A VERIFICATION OF THE NEED FOR FOOTINGS OR HAND RAIL IN REGARDS TO THE RETAIN-ING WALL IF PART OF A FOUNDATION OR SIDE STRUCTURE. T.J. JENSEN SECONDED THE AMENDMENTS TO THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5. Adjournment

T.J. JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:07 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Gregory Day
Planning Commission Chair