

Minutes of the Syracuse City Planning Commission Work Session held on April 16, 2013, 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
 Gary Pratt
 Tyler Bodrero
 Curt McCuiston
 Wayne Kinsey
 Brandon Haddick
 - City Employees: Sherrie Christensen, Community & Economic Development Director
 Will Carlson, City Attorney
 Jenny Schow, Planner
 - City Council: Craig Johnson
 - Excused: Dale Rackham
 - Visitors:

1. Department Business

- Update on the status of the CED staff
- Davis County Trails update

2. Proposed Title X amendment adopting Architectural Review Committee and repeal conflicting sections

Review and recommendations were given by representatives from the Ninigret North I Subdivision LLC regarding the proposed Industrial Zone ARC requirements. Considerations include the following; pedestrian friendly design, roof levels consider parapets, building materials to allow metal, allow employee parking in the front of a building to reduce traffic conflicts, allow truck access between buildings. Photo examples were submitted for review.

Commissioner Hellewell described the purpose of the Architectural Review Committee and explained that it is a recommending body.

The Planning Commission discussed some language changes to clarify subsections in the ARC.

Attorney Carlson explained that while the ARC is vital to the future development of Syracuse City, the Ninigret Subdivision East of the power lines has a binding contract to the ordinance written at the time of the signed development agreement.

3. Discussion of proposed Mixed Use Zone

Attorney Carlson discussed the importance of setting the parameters for the MU zone. The Planning Commission discussed the purpose of the MU overlay and how to apply it to the General Plan. The planning Commission did not come to a consensus for the application.

Commissioner Hellewell ran through his recommended changes. The Planning Commissioners discussed single storey versus two story residential units and architectural features to provide variety and aesthetic value.

The Commissioners returned to the discussion regarding the application of the MU Zone, the consensus was to edit section 20 to say this use is not intended for use in Residential and Agricultural Zones and section 30 to strike 2 and 3.

4. Discussion on Minor Subdivisions

No discussion

5. Next Agenda

ARC for public hearing