

Minutes of the Special Joint Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission with City Council held on August 14, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

**Present:** Commission Members: Curt McCuiston, Chairman  
Tyler Bodrero, Vice-Chairman  
TJ Jensen  
Dale Rackham  
Wayne Kinsey  
Anne Greeson  
Ralph Vaughan  
Sean Dixon

City Employees: Mayor Jaime Nagle  
Sherrie Christensen, Community and Economic Development Director  
Jenny Schow, Planner  
Kelly A. Janis, Planning Administrator  
Steve Marshall, Interim City Manager  
Steven Garside – City Attorney

Excused: None

City Council: Doug Peterson  
Karianne Lisonbee  
Brian Duncan  
Craig Johnson  
Larry Shingleton

Visitors: Ray & Pat Zaugg Tom Freeman Eric Rice  
Gary McEntee Graham Larson Brent Moss  
Ed Gertge Mike Ostermiller

**1. Meeting Called to Order**

[6:01:41 PM](#)

**a. Adoption of Meeting Agenda -**

**MAYOR NAGLE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE SYRACUSE CITY AGENDA, AS WRITTEN FOR AUGUST 14, 2013, WITH THE AMENDED CHANGE. COMMISSIONER KINSEY SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, THE MOTION PASSED.**

[6:02:35 PM](#)

**2. Planning Commission & City Council Training – Steve Garside**

[6:02:42 PM](#)

**Mayor Nagle** – At the end of the last meeting, Steve Garside suggested that it would be a great opportunity for the Planning Commission and City Council to receive some training in reference to the way the bodies function and the roles and responsibilities of each member. We were very willing to take advantage of his offer.

**Attorney Garside** – Our motivation is for our government to run well and our objective is to keep out of the newspaper. We look at the liabilities and the complaints from the citizens. The first point I would like to bring up is conflict of interest – many individuals are scared of conflicts of interest. We cannot avoid conflicts and certain types of conflicts are inherent and understood. The primary objective of the state law, Municipal Officers and Employees Ethics Act, is not to prohibit conflict of interest, but to require disclosure; that is the key. For the most part, most conflicts can basically be resolved by disclosure. There are some specific processes, depending on how great the conflict of interest is, but if the conflict is financial, that is where it becomes more strict. Disclosure, with regard to these two bodies, the conflicts are inherent and it is one that you will need to evaluate yourself. Can I make a detached decision? My recommendation is that you need to decide that on your own. Disclosure needs to be upfront, disclosure is paramount, decisions need to be unbiased, detached decision, recusal is important. I would recommend that when an individual recuses his or herself to leave the room completely. As an abundance of caution, we recommend that the recused party leave the room. Those are my recommendations in reference to handling conflicts of interest. As far as the staff goes, I recommend that the HR department has conflict of interest forms, and any employee that has any outside interests outside employment, whether or not related, still need to be filled out as a precaution.

**Councilman Duncan** – I live close to the high school. Is this going to be a conflict?

**Attorney Garside** – You are elected to represent the citizens and from your view, do you feel you adequately represent the citizens above your own interests? Though you live close to the high school, it is best to be careful.

**Director Christensen** – The appearance of the impropriety can be detrimental, even if you know there is not conflict, it is best to avoid it.

**Attorney Garside** – Just disclose the information. If you know your participation can be more of a distraction than a benefit, this could pose a problem.

[6:12:49 PM](#)

#### **Roles**

**Attorney Garside** – The first thing I want to do is to keep you out of paper and our role is to keep city out of trouble. If you follow the advice of council you will be avoiding personal liability. Staff may not advocate a position, our role is to present from our professional background and just provide information as disinterested employees. Our role is to be diplomatic. With regard to development agreements, your best interest is pre-annexation. No one has any right at all to be annexed into the City even if they are in your annexation declaration policy. They have no right to ask to come into City. The next position is that you have a strong position on is the General Plan Amendment; there is no property interest in a general plan amendment. The next best situation is for a rezone, and again, no property interest in a proposed zone. If the proposed rezone is consistent with the General Plan, then it gets a little more complicated. But you still have the upper hand in negotiating prior to the rezone; once the rezone is done, you have no upper hand and they are vested in that zone.

**Attorney Garside** – The role of the Planning Commission is that you remember that you represent the General Plan and the ordinance. You do not represent the citizens. Your allegiance is to the General Plan and the Ordinance. The term that is used with regard to planning commissioners is apolitical; you are not to be lobbied by developers, by neighbors, or by the city council or staff – you are not to be lobbied. If someone approaches you, you must disclose what has occurred. As far as your being a recommending body to the city council, that is why you are apolitical. The City Council, if you are receiving recommendations from the Planning Commissioners that are bewildering to you, then there could be one of two issues: 1) either the ordinance isn't specific enough or, 2) the Planning Commission is not following the ordinance of the General Plan. As far as the perspective or philosophy of the Planning Commissioners, they need to follow the code. You want someone who has the best interest at heart of the City so that as we come across conflicts in the ordinance or we want to make changes, they have some great input. It should be someone who has allegiance to City Code. Public input is important. Your role as a Commission is to follow the code of the General Plan and staff is to guide with you professional opinions and to give you good planning principles. Just as City Council has a liaison for the Planning Commission, If the Planning Commission or a commissioner wants to go to City Council, that is fine, but do not address or make a presentation to the City Council on a planning item. A liaison is sufficient and they can have that independent recommendation from the Planning Commission without any outside interference.

**Mayor Nagle** – What about the Mayor or Council members giving recommendations in the Planning Commission meeting?

**Director Christensen** – That issue does come up often; there will be a Council member there and the Commission will ask the opinion of the City Council member. The Planning Commission should advise the Council not vice-versa.

**Attorney Garside** – Be careful how to answer questions in meetings. If it is informational, then I am ok with that, but if it is advocating a position, then I would recommend against it.

**Commissioner Jensen** – What if it is an issue arises and you want to make a comment that does not deal with planning questions or concerns, such as another part of the city code?

**Attorney Garside** – Only on a planning commission item, I recommend that the commissioners do not address the City Council.

**Councilman Duncan** – Please help me understand this because the way we have done this is the Planning Commission goes through and reviews the General Plan and they make recommendations for changes. I believe they are following the General Plan and the language guides how those changes are made. They can make changes or recommendations of changes in other places.

**Attorney Garside** – With the General Plan, if they see issues arising, and they are concerned that the General Plan is not addressing an item sufficiently; the General Plan, even though the city ordinance and state law may differ, for the General Plan to be a strong defense for the City as development occurs, I would recommend that the only time it gets amended is under two situations: 1) if there has been an error, or 2) if there has been a significant change in circumstances since it was adopted.

**Director Christensen** – The General Plan is a circular process first to identify problems, then receive public input, research and analysis, write the plan, and then you implement it, then it starts over and again on your specific timeframe. Then you reanalyze, and ask how are we doing on the problems and are they still problems.

**Councilman Duncan** – So when we review the General Plan on a periodic basis, we go through the City. Also and appropriate time would be possibly five years and circumstances have changed, the economy has changed, and those kinds of items, population issues, etc...

**Attorney Garside** – When you look at the General Plan, it is where you want to see the City at build out. You try to anticipate all of those items and issues. But this is not in concrete and it is one of those things such as when UDOT will decide to come through and obviously it will change the transportation element of the General Plan. Then it will have a ripple effect on the other elements.

**Director Christensen** – This is a constant refining process, not every five years we change the whole plan.

**Attorney Garside** – Correct, but every five years wouldn't hurt to take a look and review any changes.

**Mayor Nagle** – None of our codes have been updated since the 1970s and we are going to go through those individually.

**Attorney Garside** – The Planning Commission is a recommending body; it is okay if the Commission suggests that the City Council look at the General Plan and to see if an amendment would be appropriate.

**Councilman Duncan** – A good example would be the SR-193 would be a good example of significant changes in circumstances.

**City Council**

**Attorney Garside** – City Council – their role with regard to the Planning Commission is they receive apolitical input from the Planning Commission and then to take citizen representation part of that and apply it to their recommendation. They are elected to be able to withstand and deal with issues. Those issues should be openly discussed ~ not necessarily in a meeting. You have to realize that some may want to divide and conquer, particularly when they see a Councilman who is not always unified. This is where it is time to check the egos and to keep what is best for the City. What do the citizens want to see in this situation? This does not mean that you will always make the right decision. Decisions may not always be the best due to certain variables. Sometimes the council will have to vote against what a citizen would want simply to avoid significant liability. There will be some tough situations that can come up and that you will need to be ready for. It is best to be careful. You have the role to represent the citizenry, but on the other hand, you have to be careful. What happens to one city can affect other cities. Each city should maintain its individuality; we just want to make sure that we are all on the same page.

**Director Christensen** – When you get a recommendation from the Planning Commission, that recommendation is coming from a planning perspective, so it is the council's role to take that recommendation and bring in their knowledge. The Planning Commission looks at the planning perspective; the CC takes that and brings in other aspects that the PC cannot take into consideration , like provision of services, budgets, taxes, etc. We need to have sustainability in reference to jobs.

**Attorney Garside** – The General Plan will go through the citizens, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. It is the role of the City Council to review and find out if it will work in the City. We have to have sustainability in regard to jobs and commercial/industrial development. That is the balancing act that the Council takes on when reviewing those recommendations.

**Mayor Nagle** – There should be some training and I would like to get your direction on that. How should that process function?

**Attorney Garside** – Everyone does that a little bit different, but generally the Mayor is elected to be the Mayor, and that is how most of the ordinances state “with the advice and consent of the Mayor.” It is generally the Mayor that presents that and the presumption there is that the appointment should go through. Changes to the General Plan as opposed to changes to zoning, in terms of liability issues, property rights issues, etc...But as far as the liability goes, remember that with regard to zoning, as long as they are not deprived of the use of the property; it doesn't say what use it is.

**Attorney Garside** – The liability to zoning, as long as they are not deprived of the use of the property, just because you change it to something they do not like, is the change consistent to the General Plan? You need to have a good rational reason for the basis for making that decision.

**Councilman Duncan** – What about a legislative decision?

**Attorney Garside** – To give an example, our Supreme Court, with regard to citizen referendum, has put local governments at a risk. You could have a citizens referendum come in and catalog group homes; that could pass. And now that becomes your ordinance; now what you do with that ordinance, you could get sued. And you cannot repeal that ordinance because it is by referendum. That is just the shortsightedness in our Supreme Court because they have not been in the trenches. Those are just some of the issues that, as a local government, that we face and we have to be careful with.

**Mayor Nagle** – When we are looking at zoning, how do we make a determination if we pick and choose that way depending on who owns what, are we creating any liability or is there no property rights?

**Attorney Garside** – Is this zoning or General Plan? With the planning principles, does it make good planning sense as opposed to the whims of the property owners? The safe harbor is the General Plan and good planning principles. Are your decisions going to affect the outcome of where you eventually want to be? It is consistency and good planning principles. Difficult decisions will arise and you are going to make unpopular decisions. You just have to be careful because the people will come in and yell and scream with their property rights.

**Mayor Nagle** – The hardest think that you will have to do as an elected person is that you have to have ability to see what is best for ALL citizens, not just the few who show up to meetings.

**Attorney Garside** – The ones who are interested and the ones, who are there, may be a minority, where do we want this city to be and do we want it to be successful?

[6:49:31 PM](#)

**Director Christensen** – The first item is the General Plan, Northeast District 1. The recommendations from Planning Commission were to change the General Plan on the Ninigret parcel to Business Park and then the parcel around IHC to Professional Office, General Commercial, and PRD. I would like you to start with a dialogue on what the Planning Commission's feelings are on the C-2 zone and why they have recommended that it be rescinded.

**Commissioner Jensen** – I will say that this was a split decision by the Planning Commission. They felt that the C-2 zone was redundant and it was very similar to the General Commercial zone. The only difference between the two was that the C-2 zone had a residential component. I thought that if we just put simple language that you can only use the acreage for which is allocated to residential for that density. There are some minor changes between General Commercial and C-2 as far as conditional permit uses, but the main difference was the residential component. Tyler and I thought that essentially there would be developers who would be interested if residential was allowed.

**Commissioner Rackham** - The PRD would take care of the residential.

**Commissioner Jensen** – Professional Office is the only zone that would cover medical. PRD was a good balance for that.

**Ed Gertge** – When we widened road and they wanted to rezone that to C-2, our intent was to try something similar to the R-4 zone that we could put parking and allow for more open space. The PRD would allow for an average.

**Director Christensen** – It is 35% open space and some of that will have a zero density on it.

**Ed Gertge** – We are still looking at a net average and we understand that we cannot exceed the average. How do we get 8 or 10 lots on a certain acre and have more open space? Then there is an ordinance now that you cannot have more than 4 attached units whether or condos or townhomes, we are still looking at 4 per attached building. So that limits what we can do. The developer that has been trying to work with us on that are asking if we want to settle for PRD or ask for R-4.

**Director Christensen** – We do not have R-4 so one of your choices would be to keep the C-2.

**Ed Gertge** – We have a lot of conflicting information. The developers have come to me and stated that Syracuse needs to get their eyes open. Is there any other city that does not have an apartment complex or a 16-plex? The state law says that you have to allow for apartments based on per capita. Many would like to see single family dwellings. We cannot think of a better spot for multi-family apartment complex. The family I represent would like to see in whichever zone would allow us to put the most homes or residences per acre. We are not sure what we want because you do not have the R-4 zone.

**Mayor Nagle** – Sherrie, you made a comment the other night about an idea that you wanted to bring forward in reference to reducing down the number of districts, and when a district opens, you have representatives from every district on the committee. Are we too far in this process?

**Director Christensen** – I do not think we are too far in the process. Where we have General Plan process broken down into 10 districts and we are reviewing 2 or 3 each year, you are not getting a comprehensive feeling of the City as a whole. Some districts do not have any industrial or commercial and some have all residential. It would be better if we were looking at this comprehensively and opening the General Plan just once every 5 years and bringing members from each one of the districts onto a subcommittee and ask those members : Where in the City should we have Commercial or Industrial zones? Parks? Where should we reserve areas for schools? This is more of a community building enterprise. I think that we get lost in that because every year we are supposed to be working on a different part of the General Plan and it does get a bit complicated that way.

**Mayor Nagle** – Steve thought we have too many districts.

**Director Christensen** – I would break it down into 4 districts or 4 quadrants with the division line being 2000 and Antelope or around that area because eventually both of those areas are going to fill up.

**Commissioner Jensen** – The last time that we had a major opening of the General Plan was in 2006, but that is not how it was done in the past.

**Mayor Nagle** – Do we have immediate stuff right now that we cannot go back and start this process?

**Director Christensen** – I do not think we have anything immediate that has been requested by anyone at this point. Now that we have dealt with Ninigret and Ivory Homes section and they withdrew their request for Industrial, we do not have anything pressing from outside sources. It would actually be a really good time to start and do an entire comprehensive one and have a thorough conversation with the both the Commission and Council. That is where we start for step one in the General Plan process. You scope out what are problems in city? Do we not have enough parks or enough money to fix the parks, does our secondary water system have problems, have we addressed affordable housing; those are the issues that we want scope out. And then we go to citizen input and we would do a series of public meetings, or to form subcommittees where we might form a subcommittee on parks, or one on land use, or another one for moderate income housing and bring those committees to meet, and then take public comments and give the citizens an opportunity to tell us what they think the problems are. What do they think we are deficient on, what would they want us to work on, where do they want the City to go, what do they think of the General Plan, is it going in the right direction? Then once we go through the public input and then it is the staff's turn to research and analyze that information. For example, if the citizens want a Costco, then staff is going to analyze if a Costco is feasible and figure if we have a market draw for a Costco in that area or anywhere in the City? Will we have the draw in 5, 10, or 15 years? It may be appropriate to say yes, this would be a good area for a Costco, but it may not be the right time. The right time will come in future days. Then you bring that back to step 4 which is the synthesis and conclusions and you combine the data with the ideas and have another series of public hearings. This is where the decisions are made as to what will or will not work, and then you update the General Plan, then putting it into concept, and step 6 you are initiating public policies and implementing it. That is when you make code changes to implement the goals that you established that the City wants to reach per the General Plan. The General Plan becomes our constitution, but it is a holistic document that affects the entire city and then in 5 years, we take another look and to see what are the problems today; are they the same problems we had 5 years ago, what worked and what didn't work? If we make the adjustments along the way, we will keep going in the right direction. It is a consistent process.

**Councilman Peterson** – We have to make a change because we have been called here to do this, but maybe there will be nothing to change.

**Director Christensen** – It is just a matter of educating the public on the General Plan and its process. The more times we go through the process, the better the General Plan should get and become more refined and giving more direction.

**Councilman Johnson** – These areas that have the C-2 and the potential of rescinding that, is there any immediate need for applicants saying I want to do this or that?

**Director Christensen** – On C-2, I have not had any interest.

**Councilman Johnson** – In particular areas of C-2, are there any plans coming forth?

**Director Christensen** – I have not been approached by a single developer to develop anything in C-2.

**Councilman Johnson** – Not just in that zone, but in those areas if it was zoned something else?

**Director Christensen** – No.

**Ed Gertge** – We have a developer who wants to do that in our particular area.

**Commissioner Jensen** – Is there something going in by the theatre?

**Director Christensen** – I was contacted by HN Development and they wanted to set up a meeting to come in and discuss some residential by the theatre. They inquired about being at this meeting; we sent them a letter to see if they were interested in the C-2 zone or not and what their feelings were. They did not show up at the meeting.

**Planner Schow** – When I talked with them, they did not realize that our highest unit would be a 4plex and I am not sure if they got the impression that it would be a waste of their time since our ordinance doesn't allow it anyway or if they felt it would be better to come in and set up a personal meeting.

**Mayor Nagle** – Should we be talking about Districts 1, 2, & 9 or is it more efficient conversation to say: Should we be looking at condensing down to 4 areas and looking at a plan to develop this?

**Director Christensen** - That is certainly on the table and I think that would be my suggestion because I would rather see us go through a General Plan process that was more comprehensive for the entire city, instead of looking at those individual districts.

**Councilman Shingleton** - I think it would flow better if we do that.

**Director Christensen** – If we are worried that the C- zone could be applied in the meantime, we could amend the C-2 zone to clarify that the 9.1 dwelling unit density is applied to only 20% and that takes care of the density concern in reference to the 46 units per acre. I do not think that anyone wants that.

**Mayor Nagle** – If no one is opposed to that, I think we should move that one rather quickly to make that correction. I would like to start the process and go through a very methodical approach.

**Councilman Duncan** – I would like to get these districts closed. As we take a look and decide we want to make changes, then as we make those changes, we could get a clean start.

**Councilman Shingleton** – I think that if we do something to this now, you are defeating the purpose. Let's just leave it be because no one is asking for any changes in it right now. We should leave it alone.

**Mayor Nagle** – Attorney Garside, The General Plan should not be messed with, unless a developer or land owner can make a case that there has been significant change in the personality, the structure, or the demographics of the City, which no one can argue that SR 193 hasn't done that to the City. It has opened up an entire green area that was landlocked prior. Now I think his counsel was well placed and how is the best way to avoid any type of litigation. I think this is a way to quiet things down for a while; there's no immediate need anywhere, so maybe this is the best way forward and the best way for the future.

**Councilman Peterson** – Legally and liability wise, what does it really mean?

**Director Christensen** – As a policy discussion, the Planning Commission or the City Council can direct me. When a developer comes in and he wants to amend the General Plan, you can direct me to strongly discourage them from even applying because the Planning Commission is in the middle of this planning process to comprehensively look at the General Plan. I will inform them that they have every opportunity, just like any other property owner or citizen to come in and participate in that process and it could be considered with that. But other than that, we are not going to entertain those General Plan changes. Staff will inform them that they will likely be told no. They can pay the fee and come ask, but they are probably going to be told no because we are in the middle of this process. And then the Council and Planning Commission have to hold firm to that.

**Gary McEntee** – From Ninigret's standpoint, the biggest concern we have here is the Business Park. We are sitting here looking at property that we think is no market or demand for; and to change that to a Business Park is taking the value out of our land. In addition to that, the process that we are talking is encouraging. We went through a process on Phase 1 where we sat down and had a development agreement; we agreed to certain things, certain investments, and agreed that we would develop industrial property and now we have a process to go through the Planning Commission to go to City Council to be approved to take the agreement we had in place and circumvent it. So from our perspective, we do not understand your rationale and the process. From our perspective in economic development and the use of the property, and the best interest of Syracuse, we believe that there are better uses on that property. We are proposing Light Industrial or Warehousing, yet we have a Business Park proposal and there has not been one real estate professional that has come in or even suggested that this is something that could be successful. The process, in our mind, we have tried to work very hard with all of you, we got a good developer, Ivory homes, we sat with the Planning Commission and looked at 1000 West, we made road wider, if a problem arises, we fix. The process for us is what is most disconcerting and it feels as if, in our particular case, our project was singled out because there is no other Business Park anywhere else, there is not rationale from what we can tell, and basically we have viewed this as someone looking to stop us from developing our property. We are concerned because we already have an agreement in place.

**Director Christensen** – Another issue I would like to bring up with the idea of this process; I think it would go a long way to do some healing in community because we have a lot of decisiveness over West Davis Corridor. With SR-193 & WDC we now know where the alignment is going to be so we can properly plan.

**Commissioner Jensen** – From the Planning Commission perspective, we had a 5 year plan and then West Davis Corridor came in. We did not feel like we could look at those other districts until we knew definitively where the road was going to go. Many of these districts would be closed already if we hadn't been delayed.

**Mayor Nagle** – So it doesn't matter if it's open or closed?

**Director Christensen** – It is a matter of whether we are going to tow the line and say we are not addressing any requests for a General Plan change until the update is done.

**Councilman Shingleton** – I think that is what we need to do is change language.

**Councilman Duncan** – The Planning Commission is working on that because we have the same issue with clustering.

**Commissioner Jensen** – Actually we were going to wait to see if we rescind C-2 first or not. Our last recommendation was to rescind it.

**Commissioner Bodrero** – We got halfway through C-2 before it was a majority decision that we are not going to pursue. Changes to C-2 are creating a mixed use; there have been several individuals that have interest in mixed use. The flip side of that coin is we could use General Commercial and PRD combined; that would cause a rezone to General Commercial if the PRD is approved. I think it does make sense having that application withdrawn seeing there are no others. I think we should step back and take another look.

**Gary McEntee** – I can appreciate this discussion, this was proposed and approved by the Planning Commission a year ago and we have already entered into an agreement. The process is very encouraging; I think that it is a very good idea to get a multitude of perspectives on what is best for Syracuse.

**Commissioner Jensen** – The rationale that we put forward was you have your Industrial, you have your agreement, and that is not going to change but, this was give you an additional option.

**Gary McEntee** – If that was the rationale, Industrial and Business Park is more restrictive and Business Park does not allow for warehousing. That would be undercutting our ability to develop the property.

**Mayor Nagle** – I hear your frustration and the Planning Commission; however we got here, we're here, so maybe this is a way forward. The likelihood of a change in 60 – 90 days is great, you can certainly apply now or you could wait for 90 days. Everyone waited 90 days, but we also say tremendous good will brought back into the City because the good faith we were operating with the developers and home builders. It is preventing a law suit and we came out with a win/win and we were able to come up with a solution that worked well for everyone.

**Commissioner Vaughan** – It is a nice idea to try to balance things out, but the City is not in the business of guaranteeing a return on investment for any developers; that is not our job.

**Mayor Nagle** – Our job is to plan and have a process that people understand.

**Commissioner Vaughan** – But we are not supposed to be sensitive to the market. We should not be basing our decisions upon whether that property value is going up or down.

**Mayor Nagle** – I do not think they are proposing that.

**Commissioner Vaughan** – When the developer starts talking about not being able to get the return that he wanted for his property, then he is asking us to make a decision based upon that so he can get his profit. That is asking us to make a decision based upon what he wants returned.

**Gary McEntee** – What I said was, if you put Business Park on that property, I am not asking you to guarantee my return, what I am saying is that, we do not believe that it will work, because what it is going to do is if no one wants to come out there for a Business Park. What was proposed was not feasible, all I was asking for was if you are going to move forward with that, then I would hope that as part of the discussion and part of the process, you would get input from other real estate professionals, planning, and then make your decision. Our point is we think that was poor planning.

**Councilman Shingleton** – I think we are just talking around in circles right now. I think what we need to decide is to leave it like it is, make the suggested changes to what we have.

**Ed Gertge** – Your proposed change makes me concerned about how that might affect our property.

[7:32:38 PM](#)

**Director Christensen** - As we go through planning process, Mr. Gertge would be invited to participate and give his comments as to whether or not that was the zone it should be. Maybe that property shouldn't be C-2, but the property on SR-193 should stay C-2? Maybe part of the property in the town center should be C-2?

**Councilman Duncan** – One of the concerns that we all have had, we've had the discussion about moving the Industrial west of the Corridor hasn't gone anywhere. The concept of the Business Park is that we had two problems in our City that were being discussed and why I really like the concept of Business Park was two reasons: 1) there's a real concern in the commercial area of our city that we would separate, and 2) we have empty commercial now and we have C-2 on nearly half a square mile. Business Park may not work for you, but it is much more likely to work for you rather than Commercial or Industrial.

**Mike Austermeller** – Our preference was to see what happens, which is why we withdrew the application.

**Councilman Peterson** – I propose that we give you direction to start here. We have 10 districts, why do we have districts? Why isn't it just one big district or two?

**Director Christensen** – It depends on how big your city is, so that when we have community meetings, they are manageable.

**Councilman Duncan** – It is finding the right balance between property and planning.

**Councilman Lisonbee** – I would urge that every single household be notified that we are looking at the General Plan and if the citizens would like to be a part of that, tell them when we are meeting, so that every single person has an opportunity.

**Director Christensen** – We could put it in the water bill, or I will need money in by budget to do that because that will cost quite a bit.

**Mayor Nagle** – We are legally responsible for including residents from all districts.

**Director Christensen** – There are lots of ways to do the data gathering. We could do a survey and advertise that survey.

**Councilman Duncan** – One concern I have about informing everyone would be that I think it would have a benefit because it helps with a global perspective, but we also have to remember that to a certain degree that planning should not be a democratic process. We need to be careful because this is not a vote

**Director Christensen** – Their input is valuable, but it is their opinion that we want, not for them to vote on anything.

**Mayor Nagle** – I agree with you that it is not a democratic process and there is a delicate balance.

**Commissioner Jensen** – This is a very comprehensive process. The General P...engaging residents...

**Councilman Duncan** – We want to be careful when we do this, because when we open up these districts, that we have a meeting before we open up a district and we pinpoint those substantial changes and circumstances that we think are there.

**Councilman Johnson** – We've had these committees in past so we do not want to ignore those past efforts.

**Mayor Nagle** – It does not make sense to form a committee and then say to them, it doesn't matter what you bring forward, we are not going to listen. That is the last thing we want to do.

**Motion to Adjourn – All in favor.**

[7:48:28 PM](#)

---

Curt McCuiston, Chairman

---

Kelly A. Janis, Planning Administrator

Date Approved: **September 17, 2013**