



Planning Commission Work Session

MINUTES FEBRUARY 7, 2012 7:39 PM-9:01 PM LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| FACILITATOR | Chairman Gregory Day |
| NOTE TAKER | Judy Merrill |
| ATTENDEES | Kenneth Hellewell, Tyler Bodrero, Dale Rackham, Gary Pratt, T.J. Jensen, Braxton Schenk, Curt McCuistion, Michael Eggett, and Kent Andersen |

Gregory rearranged the agenda by starting with Item 2, then Item 3, and finally Item 1.

ITEM 1: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SIGN REGULATIONS

Jeff Gibson, owner of Wendy's in Syracuse, explained how his business was invisible. A lot of cars drove up and down Antelope Drive but did not notice his location. Gregory asked him for ideas. Jeff explained that he had been able to contact the approving authority for the property on the northeast corner of Antelope Drive and 2000 West and acquire permission to place a directional sign there. Because UDOT controlled Antelope Drive, which was not a major thoroughfare, they did not offer opportunities for signage. His monument sign was built exactly to the original Ordinance standards with no interior lighting, so it could not be seen from Antelope Drive. He suggested creating a minor conditional use permit for larger and more visible signs that would ensure proper maintenance. Braxton referred to other cities that allowed off-premise signs only along major thoroughfares with a certain amount of square footage for other businesses to lease. TJ preferred adding a demolition clause in the ordinance in cases when sign owners went out of business. Kent said it was already addressed in the proposed language.

ITEM 2: LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS PARK ZONE STANDARDS

Kent said the Business Park Zone standards were the same as presented previously. Staff simply hoped to move forward with the proposed language to facilitate a request from the Rentmeisters to allow them the ability to continue using their current commercial property after relocating the business to Antelope Drive. Staff proposed permitting storage units in different locations within more zones, such as a new Light Industrial zone. Michael referred to the listed permitted uses, such as the printing and publishing industries that tended to produce a lot of noise and traffic, and suggested making those conditional as well as weld-ing and machine shops, which could create some hazards to neighboring uses.

TJ suggested adding a chart to make it easier to see the permitted and conditional uses in various zones. Kent told him a lot of other cities did that and suggested adding the chart at the beginning of Title 10 as well as the beginning of each zone chapter. TJ asked if they saw any value in making industrial warehouses permitted uses or if they thought those should be conditional. Gregory said he could see it being conditional. Gary stated that industrial warehouses and storage facilities could vary greatly in size, and the Ordinance needed a clear definition that they were two different uses. TJ suggested making them conditional if the use involved hazmat issues. Michael agreed to move it to conditional and add definitions.

Gregory referred to the restrictions of odors and asked if the City had the equipment to measure it and ensure compliance. Kent said he needed more time to research it. Gregory asked him to quantify odors to which they could compare. Michael explained the problem with identification and how to treat them, such as determining what measures to take for objective analyses. The Ordinance needed an established standard. Tyler suggested using EPA code, and Ray Zaugg suggested using the North Davis Sewer District's requirements. Michael pointed out that, if the City adopted such language, they would need to purchase equipment to measure odors. Braxton preferred placing the burden on violators to disprove a nuisance. Michael explained the difficulty in verifying a nuisance, such as odors, because it often required multiple visits. A resident asked if there were distance requirements from these types of uses to residential, due to hazards and noises. Michael explained that conditional uses were very specific in order to mitigate such impacts. The Light Industrial zone would not be meant for the level of uses discussed and should have standards in place to prevent them. Another resident asked if the City would be able to enforce issues related to odors and, by allowing uses needing that type of enforcement, if it would be cost effective. Michael stated that the City already had a grandfathered area operating as light-industrial, similar to the proposed Light Industrial zone. Tyler explained that the City was not trying to create more industrial uses but did need to allow them, such as Rentmeisters' storage units, while protecting adjacent uses. However, the City also needed to be careful not to burden taxpayers with enforcement costs. Kenneth referred to issues that arose with Wal-Mart. The City restricted hours for deliveries and idling trucks and could do the same here. A resident asked Kenneth to call any resident adjacent to Wal-Mart, as he did, to determine if Wal-Mart was complying with the restrictions mentioned. He knew one homeowner who said the lights were very bright, the store was always open and noisy, and it had been very taxing on their family. Their home was forever changed because of it. After discussing Ordinance language regarding light pollution, Gregory directed staff to require a photometric plan as part of the site plan application.

Ray Zaugg suggested designating packaging operations as conditional uses since they could involve chemicals or benign substances, such as vitamins or vanilla, which, in concentrated amounts or large quantities, could be hazardous. Michael agreed to place manufacturing uses, such as hazardous chemicals or similar toxic substances, under conditional. He then pointed out that commissioners could compel, per existing special provisions, any necessary requirements to mitigate risks for noise, glare, or pollution regardless of whether it was conditional or permitted.

Gary referred to Subsection (E) of the proposed Business Park zone regarding lighting and distances, which did not exist in the proposed Light Industrial zone. Gregory asked if lighting standards should be different for these two zones. Kenneth believed they could, since different uses required different lighting needs. He also asked for a correction to the conditional use section 10-xx-30 formatting. Kent referred to some additional language they had been using for development plan and agreements that he could include in this section, if commissioners deemed it appropriate, which would just further expand on what they were looking for in a development agreement. Gregory asked if it was the language they included in the PRD zone. Tyler said it was and that it applied here as well.

Commissioners discussed whether to keep or eliminate the proposed overlay zone. Kenneth explained the need for a broad Business Park zone with necessary restrictions through an overlay zone. It provided greater flexibility while preventing certain components allowed in the overlay zone, such as density, from the Business Park zone. TJ agreed that the overlay zone was the best tool for regulating the Business Park zone in different areas of the City. Mike explained the purpose of overlay zones as combining differing, adjacent, and possibly incompatible zones in order to set a design style or pattern. He warned of the tendency to create overlay zones that were too onerous and became impediments to developments rather than general guidelines. Tyler did not see a need for having separate regulations in an overlay zone and suggested incorporating it all into the business park zone with maybe a table. He suggested more discussion and analysis on how to regulate height, density, and offsets, which were the only standards that would change in the various areas of the City. Kenneth pointed out that the purpose statements would be unique to each overlay zone, and TJ reminded them that the City could place multiple zones under that overlay.

ITEM 3: RESIDENTIAL TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR ZONES

Michael referred to the Wasatch Choice for 2040 document in their packets, which was from an organization with a vision for the entire northern region of Utah specific to growth and related transportations challenges. It provided smart principals to strategize the City's planning efforts. Implementing the vision would help in absorbing a 65% population growth over the next 30 years while enhancing the economy, protecting natural areas, providing more choices for living and traveling, saving money and energy, and improving the air quality and health. They estimated that Syracuse would grow another 83% by 2040. Kent explained that some of the major themes to consider were: 1) lot coverage to landscape ratio; 2) garages; 3) living space, by requiring a certain square footage of living space in order to regulate higher density units; and 4) exterior material aesthetics. Commissioners then discussed high-density housing versus open space and single-family homes.