

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on May 1, 2012, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

1. Meeting called to Order and Adoption of Agenda

Planning Commission Chairman Day called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m., indicating that City staff posted the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting and delivered copies to all Commission members. Gary Pratt offered the prayer, and Gregory Day led the pledge of allegiance.

Members Present: Chairman Gregory Day, Vice Chair Gary Pratt, Kenneth Hellewell, Braxton Schenk, T.J. Jensen, Tyler Bodrero, and Curt McCuiston as well as Community Development Director Michael Eggett, City Planner Kent Andersen, City Attorney Will Carlson, City Engineer Brian Bloemen, and Commission Secretary Judy Merrill

Excused: Dale Rackham

Visitors: Elliot Wigder Terry Palmer Ray Zaugg Pat Zaugg

Commissioners reviewed the May 1, 2012, Planning Commission meeting agenda. As requested by Secretary Merrill, commissioners agreed to modify Agenda Item 2.

TYLER BODRERO MOVED TO MODIFY AGENDA ITEM 2 BY REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO THE APRIL 17, 2012, REGULAR MEETING AND WORK SESSION MINUTES AND TO ADOPT THE MAY 1, 2012, AGENDA AS AMENDED, SECONDED BY GARY PRATT; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Approval of March 20 and April 3, 2012, Regular Meeting and Work Session Minutes

GARY PRATT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20, 2012, PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AND WORK SESSION MINUTES AS WRITTEN. BRAXTON SCHENK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

GARY PRATT MOVED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 3, 2012, PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN, SECONDED BY BRAXTON SCHENK; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

T.J. pointed out that the March 20, 2012, regular meeting minutes reflected a meeting of only 7 minutes with numerous public hearing comments. Even though the Commission just approved those minutes, he suggested verification and correction of the meeting times.

T.J. JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20, 2012, PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES IN ORDER TO ADJUST THE TIME OF ADJOURNMENT. BRAXTON SCHENK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

T.J. JENSEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20, 2012, PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES WITH THE CORRECTED TIME OF ADJOURNMENT. GARY PRATT SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

TYLER BODRERO MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE APRIL 3, 2012, PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MINUTES, SECONDED BY GARY PRATT; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. Pheasant Crossing Business Park Subdivision Plat and Site Plan

Chairman Day asked staff to provide an overview of this request. Planner Andersen stated that City staff provided reviews for preliminary, final, and site plans of the Pheasant Crossing Business Park, located at approximately 724 South 2000 West. There were three major issues the developer needed to address: 1) communication efforts with Benchmark, 2) phasing, and 3) drainage.

City Engineer Brian Bloemen came forward, stating that the only real issue he found related to the need for a cross access agreement between this lot and the adjacent property on the south owned by Benchmark. This Subdivision would be using two of their approaches. In the event that something happened that closed that access, emergency personnel would only have the one ingress. He also wanted to know more about how the drainage would work on the site, since everything appeared to be just gravity flowing. He asked if they were going to be draining onto Benchmark's property in order to know whether they needed a drainage agreement with Benchmark as well.

Vice Chair Pratt referred to the only access road as being off of 2000 West. Engineer Bloemen pointed out that there was an access off 700 South. Vice Chair Pratt asked about the status of an access easement agreement.

Dan VanZeben, with VanZeben Architect, came forward to respond to their questions. He referred to the Commission's request that he write to Benchmark. He mailed a certified letter that explained the City's requirements with respect to the plat and separation of the two properties and received a return receipt. He submitted that proof to City staff to show a good faith effort. He made some additional phone calls and visited their office that morning to try and speak with Brent Nelson as well. Because Mr. Nelson was not in, he talked with the Benchmark staff. They said the company did not want these two parcels together, which was why they sold it. When he referred to the necessity of having a cross-access easement for the road on the west side of BND's parcel for emergency personnel from 700 South and to minimize traffic concerns with drivers trying to egress and turn onto 2000 West, they referred him to Mr. Nelson's personal assistant to make an appointment with Brent tomorrow. If the City Fire Department provided him a letter indicating the importance of that roadway access, it would help in his negotiations for that easement. Mr. VanZeben believed they met the requirement of initiating communication with Benchmark to find out if they would work with him, and he did not believe it would be possible. With respect to the phasing, they were trying to develop according to the market and would only be improving the southwest portion for one office building at first. It would include internal parking, landscaping, a trash enclosure, and fundamental requirements for a development. He then displayed the most recent plans brought with them that evening, which indicated the first office building as two units, with the second unit constructed later. The property on the north would be for future development as well, so they anticipated coming back at some unknown point in time, depending on the market, for approval of possibly some retail buildings that would fit with the GC zoning, such as a food facility, and the other site to the west as retail or office space. He said he attended the Architectural Review Committee meeting last Thursday and appreciated their comments.

Planner Andersen asked about parking along 2000 West. Mr. VanZeben asked if they needed to provide that with the first phase or when they developed phase 2. Planner Andersen recommended graying out all improvements planned for phase 2.

Mr. VanZeben then referred to the drainage, addressed in their feasibility report. The detention basin on the southwest corner would keep it within the confines of the lot boundaries and handle all storm drainage via sloping of all parking and with grading away from the buildings into catch basins with reinforced concrete piping. The site was relatively flat, and, because of the types of facilities planned there, they did not want people crossing icy sloped areas. He received all the review comments from the various City departments and planned to accommodate each one.

Commissioner Schenk referred to the City Engineer's review that referenced the Fire Chief's recommendation to widen the driving lane or install mountable curbs for the fire trucks to turn inside the development. Mr. VanZeben explained that they would provide 26 feet for the access way between the 90 degree parking, which was typically just 24 feet, or they would be fine with installing the modified curbs instead. He then asked for approval of this one lot development as presented with his assurance that they would return for further approvals to improve more of the parcel in compliance with all rules and regulations.

Commissioner McCuiston referred to the trash enclosure and asked whether cars could park close enough to block it off. Mr. VanZeben admitted that parking and trash enclosures were always a challenge. Their intent was to place it in the middle of the lot so that patrons would not see it once the property was built out. The contract for waste-management would need to be for early morning service prior to business hours of operation, so parking would not be an issue. Another option would be placing two bins designed to roll out. Commissioner Jensen suggested rotating them 90 degrees clockwise so that they were not facing the parking stalls. Mr. VanZeben agreed and said they would be fine rotating them just 45 degrees so they would come in off 700 South and turn around and go back the other way or onto 2000 West. Chairman Day recommended facing them to 700 South to inhibit visibility on 2000 West. Mr. VanZeben agreed.

Commissioner McCuiston pointed out that the drawings were unclear as to the type of access they were providing for 700 South and that it might require ADA ramps and truncated domes. Mr. VanZeben explained that they would continue the sidewalk, add a stop sign, and install a truncated pad with ADA ramps.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the applicant's intentions for pursuing a cross-access agreement with Benchmark. Mr. VanZeben advised him that he would continue his attempts to meet with Mr. Nelson and felt the City's letter would help. He would be meeting with UDOT's Region 1 the next day regarding their 300-foot distance from the corner. If they could not acquire approval to access 2000 West through the Benchmark property, UDOT might grant BND Development a curb cut. So, instead of waiting to find out if they could negotiate an agreement with Benchmark, he would be working towards both options.

When asked about their color scheme, Mr. VanZeben explained that the metal portion of the entry roofs would be a slate blue. The parking lot lights would be dark sky luminaires rather than LED.

GARY PRATT MOVED TO RECOMMEND PRELIMINARY, FINAL, AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL OF THE PHEASANT CROSSING BUSINESS PARK SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 724 SOUTH 2000 WEST, SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY'S MUNICIPAL CODES AND TO THE CONDITIONS THAT IT COMPLY WITH ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CITY ENGINEER'S AND CITY PLANNER'S REVIEWS, DATED APRIL 27, 2012, AND TO FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. BRAXTON SCHENK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4. Public Hearing: Amendments to Subdivision Ordinance Specific to Cul-de-sac Lengths

Chairman Day asked City staff to present the proposed changes. Planner Andersen referred to the City Engineer's findings of numerous subdivisions throughout Syracuse that did not comply with the current standard that limited cul-de-sac lengths to 400 feet. His recommendation was to increase that allowance up to 650 feet with exceptions granted for up to 900 feet if a developer complied with certain requirements. Planner Andersen forwarded the current proposed language to all public safety departments, and each expressed approval.

Chairman Day opened up the meeting to public hearing.

Ray Zaugg, 1598 West 700 South, voiced his concern with those extreme lengths, because drivers mistook those cul-de-sacs as through streets. He believed the exceptions were excessive.

No one else came forward, so Chairman Day closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the requirement for secondary emergency access for longer cul-de-sacs and asked what would constitute as a secondary access—whether it had to be a road or if it could be a vacant lot. The City Engineer indicated that any hard surface or grassy area could serve as an access. Vice Chair Pratt asked who would be responsible for that type of right-of-way. Engineer Bloemen advised him that it would most likely be privately owned and maintained. Planner Andersen suggested the Commission simply require each developer, requesting an exception, to identify the means they would employ to maintain each secondary access. Commissioner Jensen recommended adding the word unobstructed before the reference to secondary emergency accesses in order to prevent the planting of trees or parking of vehicles. Vice Chair Pratt referred to other cities where he observed such accesses blocked off with removable barriers and signage identifying the road or other type of access as only for emergency vehicles. Developers or HOAs would maintain them and provide notification to all property owners of their limited purpose. Chairman Day expressed confidence in their Fire Department to ensure all needful requirements were in place, such as language on the plat or conditions of approval.

Vice Chair Pratt agreed with Mr. Zaugg's concerns that the exceptions were too extreme. He lived in a long cul-de-sac that was even shorter than the proposed 900-foot maximum; however, many drivers still treated it like a through street. The signs identifying his road as a dead end were not visible to drivers until after turning onto the cul-de-sac. Because children had a tendency to play in cul-de-sacs, having drivers of large trucks find themselves on these dead-end streets and having to struggle to turn around was a safety hazard. He cautioned commissioners against the 900 feet, even with conditions. The fire code limited them to 750 feet, and he did not believe subdivisions needed cul-de-sacs longer than that.

Commissioner Hellewell referred to a discussion he had with UDOT regarding the current Antelope Drive interchange for the West-Davis Corridor, which routed Bluff Road through a subdivision. They based their rationale on the fact that they could not cul-de-sac the north end of Bluff Road due to the City's restrictions on lengths. That was an example of how this proposed change made sense and could benefit the City. Planner Andersen agreed, stating it would require about 750 feet to accommodate a cul-de-sac at that location.

Chairman Day conceded that the City's 400-foot limit was restrictive, and even more so than in other cities, and that it almost appeared as if Syracuse had been ignoring the standard by approving previous developments with cul-de-sacs longer than 400 feet. Planner Andersen pointed out that it was an issue for Castle Creek when they were trying to lay out the Stoker Gardens development. Vice Chair Pratt preferred limiting cul-de-sacs to 750 feet.

Commissioner Schenk asked the other commissioners, who were also developers, about the reasons for wanting longer cul-de-sacs. Chairman Day explained that it depended on the shape of the parcel. Cul-de-sacs also increased the value of lots because residents preferred living on them due to lower traffic volumes. However, those preferences conflicted with the needs of cities having to service cul-de-sacs. He, too, believed that 900 feet was excessive, but they existed. His preference would be to simply limit cul-de-sacs to 750 feet with no exceptions, based on fire code. Vice Chair Pratt agreed, stating that he considered 750 feet liberal enough and preferred eliminating any exceptions. Commissioner Bodrero liked the exceptions and did not expect every developer to request one. Approval would be at the discretion of commissioners, who would decide whether each request was appropriate and which of the requirements to apply in order to make it work, such as the Bluff Road example. Commissioner Schenk recommended changing the limit to 550 feet with exceptions up to 750 feet. He considered it important to draw a line, because he felt that anyone wanting an exception would ask for the maximum length. Vice Chair Pratt was willing to reduce the maximum exception to 800 feet.

Director Eggett pointed out that commissioners could choose to approve or deny an exception if the Ordinance allowed that option. However, if there was no option, commissioners could not consider an exception even for circumstances where they considered it appropriate. Commissioner Bodrero liked the idea of allowing exceptions but preferred to lower both benchmarks. Commissioner Jensen suggested limiting cul-de-sacs to 400 feet and allowing exceptions for lengths up to 650 feet by meeting most of the requirements, and then meeting all of them for lengths greater than 650 feet. Director Eggett recommended allowing up to 500 feet, based on the Public Works Director's recommendation. Chairman Day did not believe any of them would be able to tell the difference between a 400-foot and 600-foot cul-de-sac and did not see a greater benefit to limiting them at 400 feet. Vice Chair Pratt recommended a 400- or 500-foot minimum with an exception up to a maximum 750 or 800 feet rather than utilizing varying steps. He preferred leaving it to commissioners to decide which requirements would apply in each circumstance. Commissioner Jensen clarified his comments by stating that any exceptions for cul-de-sacs longer than 500 feet and up to 650 feet would need to comply with all the requirements except the looping of water lines. Any cul-de-sacs longer than 650 feet would need to comply with every requirement.

GARY PRATT MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO CUL-DE-SAC LENGTHS AS DISCUSSED BUT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: INCREASE THE MINIMUM STANDARD TO 500 FEET AND ALLOW EXCEPTIONS OF UP TO 650 FEET, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ALL THE PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS BUT THE WATER LOOPING, AS WELL AS UP TO 800 FEET, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ALL THE PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS. T.J. JENSEN SECONDED THE MOTION;

Commissioner Bodrero did not agree with the exclusion of looping the water lines but did like the increase to 500 feet. He preferred applying all the requirements for anything above the minimum and even suggested striking "up to 900 feet." The exception could then read, "Exceptions to the maximum length of a cul-de-sac may be granted by City Council after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission." Vice Chair Pratt conceded that he was fine either way and that he was just trying to accommodate Commissioner Jensen's point. The cost of looping water lines, based on Director Whiteley's information, might be an unnecessary expense to a developer. So, commissioners either needed to establish a tier system or just require anything over 500 feet and up to 800 feet as needing to meet those requirements.

TYLER BODRERO MOVED TO AMEND THE CURRENT MOTION AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO CUL-DE-SAC LENGTHS AS DISCUSSED BUT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: LIMIT CUL-DE-SAC LENGTHS TO NO MORE THAN 500 FEET FROM CENTER LINE TO ADJOINING STREET CENTER AND THAT EXCEPTIONS TO THAT MAXIMUM STANDARD LENGTH FOR CUL-DE-SACS MAY BE GRANTED BY CITY COUNCIL AFTER RECEIVING RECOMMENDATION FROM PLANNING COMMISSION.

Vice Chair Pratt asked Commissioner Bodrero to clarify his reference to a maximum cul-de-sac length. Commissioner Bodrero explained that his motion was to strike the words "up to" so that City Council could grant any maximum amount after receiving a recommendation from Planning Commission.

BRAXTON SCHENK SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

Vice Chair Pratt asked for a roll-call vote.

VOTING AYE WERE BRAXTON SCHENK, TYLER BODRERO, AND KENNETH HELLEWELL. VOTING NO WERE T.J. JENSEN, GREGORY DAY, AND GARY PRATT.

Because of the tie, Chairman Day asked the alternate Planning Commissioner to vote.

CURT McCUISTION VOTED AYE, SO THE MOTION CARRIED.

T.J. JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING TO 9:30PM., SECONDED BY KENNETH HELLEWELL. GREGORY DAY, TYLER BODRERO, KENNETH HELLEWELL, T.J. JENSEN, AND CURT McCUISTION VOTED IN FAVOR, AND GARY PRATT AND BRAXTON SCHENK VOTED AGAINST; THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. Amendments to Land Use Ordinance Specific to Neighborhood Services/Commercial Zone

Chairman Day referred to their discussion in the work session, which gave him the impression that there were more changes they wanted to review and discuss prior to making a recommendation.

GARY PRATT MOVED TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES/COMMERCIAL ZONE FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. T.J. JENSEN SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

6. Amendments to General Plan District 1

KENNETH HELLEWELL MADE A MOTION TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO DISTRICT 1 OF THE GENERAL PLAN UNTIL SUCH TIME AS CITY COUNCIL ACTED UPON THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE BUSINESS PARK AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONES. GARY PRATT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Schenk recommended that Commissioner Hellewell amend his motion to table it just for further discussion rather than until City Council acted upon those zones.

Vice Chair Pratt asked if City Council had to address their recommendation within a certain amount of time. Attorney Carlson explained that the deadline was within 30 days unless extended but advised commissioners against tabling an item with an unspecified timeframe.

KENNETH HELLEWELL AMENDED HIS MOTION TO TABLE IT FOR FURTHER REVIEW, SECONDED BY T.J. JENSEN; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

7. Adjournment

GARY PRATT MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 9:09 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Gary Pratt
Planning Commission Chair Pro Tempore