

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on October 16, 2012, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

**Present:**

Commission Members: Kenneth Hellewell, Chairman  
TJ Jensen, Vice-Chair  
Curt McCuiston  
Gary Pratt  
Tyler Bodrero  
Braxton Schenk

City Council Members: Craig Johnson

City Employees: Will Carlson, City Attorney  
Michael Eggett, Community & Economic Development Director  
Sherrie Christensen, Planner

Excused: Dale Rackham  
Gregory Day  
Jenny Schow, Administrative Professional

### Item 1: Department Business

- Mr. Eggett informed the Planning Commission on the status of the following:
- Ground breaking today on Dr. Coleman's building. Explained the emergency egress with the pavers, but Dr. Coleman will still have to get the cross easement access.
- Ninigret is beginning construction on the subdivision construction.
- Have not heard from the Family Fun Center or the Assisted Living Facility
- Stoker Gardens has now been submitted to the county to record.
- GSL Adventures is moving into the building next to Gold's Gym. Outdoor recreation equipment moving from Clearfield.
- Cherry Berry Yogurt is moving next to Café Limon.
- Wasatch Villas is almost ready to record.
- Stillwater is still deciding how to make it work.

### Item 2: Discussion of proposed C-2 Amendments

Gary started the discussion regarding the proposed changes. He does not believe that you can fit 12 units per acre, he only thinks C-2 developments can achieve up to 8 per acre, with the 20% of the 80%. He wanted to know how the commission felt about the 6 unit building. The PC discussed that the 6 plex allows for more creative design.

The Commission discussed lot size and conflict between 2 story residential building and taller commercial buildings. Setbacks were discussed as to having setbacks for uses broke out for single family, multi-family and commercial. It was discussed that the setbacks between the commercial and the multifamily the separation distances are not nearly as important as single family. C-2 zone setbacks from residential zones, should be 10 feet, plus one foot for every additional foot of wall height over 10 feet. It was discussed that there would be a development edge setback minimum 20 feet with one additional foot for each additional foot of height over 20 feet.

The Planning Commission discussed the buffer table and how the buffer table works, allowing the property owners to choose the depth of the buffer, and then based upon that the amount of landscaping is determined (ie. the deeper the buffer, the fewer trees and shrubs required). It was discussed that there is no minimum buffer depth only minimum setback for buildings. The chairman asked that this be put on the work schedule as something to be addressed in the coming months.

The discussion on density and whether a criteria should be added to the C-2 as to how the density is granted. It was discussed that if you meet the criteria the developer can have up to the maximum 12 du/ac.

The language regarding the Architectural Review Committee needs to be recommendations to Planning Commission, not approved by the ARC. Make the language consistent through the document. A general city theme book could be developed and then used by the ARC to advise the developers and the Planning Commission. It is the responsibility to have the Planning Commission train the ARC to understand good architectural design. It was discussed that the Planning Commission and the ARC should meet once a year to keep current visions on track.

Parking was discussed with the request that parking terraces be removed from the residential areas, but that underground parking for multi-family could be used. Alleys, streets and courtyards were discussed. The commission did not want to see double frontage on single family dwellings, so developments could only have alleys if the houses faced a courtyard.

Building heights was discussed regarding to minimum and maximum height, making the maximum 2 story for residential uses. Sherrie will work with Kenneth on the tables for presentation at the next work session.

---

**Item 3: Discussion of review/propose Title VIII Amendments**

Will presented some language on the dead end street language. He explained the proposed changes that give a better set of criteria to extend dead-end roads longer than 500 feet. The proposed change takes the maximum out. If the 3 standards are met, the length should not matter. All six required items to meet the 3 standards.

The Commission had a discussion regarding the size of the turn-around for longer cul-de-sacs. There was a discussion regarding 100 foot right of way diameter with the 80 feet of asphalt or whether there was a need for 100 feet of asphalt. It was discussed that additional 20 feet of pavement takes up more land for the lots on the cul-de-sacs, increase of maintenance, increase of heat sink, and that the increase that the 80 feet is adequate to turn around a fire truck in regardless. Mike will talk to Jo Hamblin and verify that there is no issue with the current standard. The City Attorney will make the discussed changes for the next work session.

The Commission discussed the location of street lights on cul-de-sacs. It was discussed the street light location at the intersection, at the end of the cul-de-sac and at the mid-point. The distance between lights and an interval language was discussed. It was suggested that the developer could be required to submit a lighting analysis. Various intervals were suggested, at 200, 300 and 400 feet. The cost of operating and maintaining the greater number of street lights was discussed. It was suggested that Brian and Robert should be involved in the discussion. The engineering staff does have standards as to where the lights should go. Public works will be consulted for next work session.

Private street standards were discussed regarding the width of pavement. It was discussed that the reduced pavement width is within the 60 foot right of way. That would mean that the park strip and sidewalk would be wider.

**Item 4: Next Agenda**

Planning Commission directed staff to schedule a public hearing on the Title 8 changes for November 20, 2012 meeting.

The November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting was discussed as to keeping the meeting at 6 p.m. and closing the meeting and work session by 7:30 p.m. regardless of progress of the work session. The cul-de-sac lighting will be discussed in work session and the C-2 zone. Potential items for regular agenda are Prelim Fox Haven and Final Hammon Acres.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.