

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on June 3, 2014, 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 Dale Rackham Ralph Vaughan TJ Jensen Wayne Kinsey		
City Employees:	Sherrie Christensen, Director of Community & Economic Development Jenny Schow, Planner Jackie Manning, Admin Professional Clint Drake, City Attorney Terry Palmer, Mayor Brian Bloemen, City Engineer Jo Hamblin, Deputy Fire Chief		
Visitors:	Gary Pratt Mike Voorhies Arthur Miller Jack Frost Brad Frost Davin Higley Michael Reney Stephen Fackrell	Vick Herrick Robyn Voorhies Jeanie Brierley Lynn Miller Taylor Spendcove Mike Bastian Colby Bond Jana Smith	Scott Derrick Ruth Williams Mark Sanders John Miller Meghan Higley Dennis Higley Jared R. Thurgood

1. Meeting Called to Order: 6:08:03 PM

- a. **Invocation or Thought:** Commissioner Bodrero
- b. **Pledge of Allegiance:** Chairman McCuiston
- c. **Planning Commission Business:** Commissioner Jensen

Commissioner Jensen read aloud the planning commission city code, 3.10.090:

The Planning Commission shall submit its recommendation for approval or disapproval of any application or proposal in writing to the City Council after complying with all requirements regarding public hearings and notice to the necessary parties. Normally the Planning Commission should act within 30 days of a matter being submitted to it, but may extend this time by motion and vote of a majority of the Commission as necessary to obtain additional information or for other good reasons. [Ord. 11-07 § 1 (Exh. A); amended 1996; Code 1971 § 3.02.090.]

Commissioner Jensen stated there are 4 items that city council sent to the planning commissioners that are past 30 days. He stated there is an item that is almost over the 30 day limit mark, the discussion regarding district 2. He suggested making a motion to formally delay these items.

MOTION TO DELAY PRD SUBDIVISIONS IN A REGULAR MEETING WITHIN THE 30 DAY TIME FRAME, DUE TO LACK OF TIME TO REVIEW AND DISCUSS ITEM, AND ADD THE DISCUSSION TO THE NEXT AGENDA, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN.

Director Christensen had a clarification regarding the motion. She stated the item Commissioner Jensen wanted to delay was in this current meetings work session. Commissioner Jensen stated he didn't feel they would get a chance to address that item this work session.

COMMISSIONERS KINSEY, JENSEN, AND RACKHAM VOTED YAY, COMMISSIONERS VAUGHAN, BRODERO, AND MCCQUISTION VOTED NAY. MOTION FAILED.

MOTION TO MOVE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA AND BUSINESS TO ITEM 13 ON THE AGENDA, AND TO ADOPT THE SYRACUSE CITY AGENDA FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING FOR JUNE 3, 2014, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

2. **Public Comment:** This is an opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding your concerns or ideas. Please limit your comments to 3 minutes.

6:18:05 PM

Gary Pratt, Syracuse, Utah, stated he reviewed the last couple years of minutes regarding item 9 [Still Water Estates] and the progression from planning commission to the city council. His understanding is when something hasn't been approved by City Council there is no need for the Planning Commission to take any action. He stated the way it worked was, before the final approval the applicant went to the City Council because they had been meeting with the city manager and the mayor, and was told they did not have the vote at the City Council level. He stated this was prior to them [Planning Commissioners] voting on the final. He stated the final was not a unanimous vote for the Planning Commission and they kicked the can to the City Council. The City Council only approves the subdivisions, not the major conditional uses. Even though there were votes against and for, the votes came with the caveat that it didn't meet code. He suggested that when reviewing the minutes there are reasons for that. There are also reasons the city council did not accept the project either, because it didn't meet code. He stated he didn't feel tonight was a position where the Planning Commissioners should approve anything on the condition that the City Council hasn't approved. In the City Council's work session they actually have disapproved this application, so there is no need to push this forward. He stated he understands there has been a letter sent from the Ombudsman from the state, because the applicant appealed to the state, around the planning commission prior to the final vote, to get their opinion. He stated the opinion has not come back yet. Other than the letter that the planning commission received from the Ombudsman that refers to another city, which, when he read through it, it has a lot of things that aren't even similar to what the case is in Syracuse is. He stated that obviously falls into the legislative branch in this city and the attorneys involved. He stated it was mentioned in the minutes that several things had been addressed to the Planning Commission and to the City Council from objections from property owners adjacent to this property and also local citizens. He stated the first is sound. He stated nothing has ever been submitted, that he has seen, to this Planning Commission that it warrants the sound comparison that the applicant put forth. The applicant said the lawn mower has the same sound level as 300 horse power, power boat. He stated a lawn mower is 89DB, or 90 depending on the mower you pick and speed boats are 3 or 4 times that. The second issue is water clarity. He stated he owns a company that put ponds in, when a private property owner puts a pond in, they are required to circulate that water or to have flow through. If you go to any golf course you will see that. He stated they have ponds that they water their golf course with. He stated if those ponds don't have circulation pumps, then they are flow through. He stated that is not being done here. The applicant claims that he will treat the water, but no documentation or process has been submitted to this planning commission that warrants their approval or the fact that he will treat the water, or show how he will treat the water. The third issue is mosquitos. The applicants claim is that he has gone to the mosquito abatement to the county. He paraphrased what the applicant said in a previous meeting in regards to mosquitos stating there are no mosquitos in the ski lake because there is no vegetation around the perimeter, and motor boats run up and down the water to agitate the water which prevents mosquitos from breeding. He stated this is untrue. He said, "if you go to mosquito breeding on the google there is 700 pages of information about mosquito breeding. The uniformity is mosquitos can breed in any standing water, whether it is agitated or not. So that has never been given to the Planning Commission that mosquitos don't breed in his lakes. Also, in an article the EPA has not put forth that they now can regulate any body of water private or public."

3. **Public Hearing:** Subdivision Amendment Trailside Park Phase 7, Ovation Homes, property located at approximately 1900 W. 3000 S., R-1 Cluster Zone.

6:26:14 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained the Final Approval for Trailside Park Phase 7 occurred on September 10, 2013. At that time, the developer was in the process of purchasing additional land directly to the east of phase 7. The transaction has since been complete and the developer would like to amend phase 7 to include this parcel and an additional parcel to the south for an overall increase of 1.85 acres. The total acreage for the amendment is 4.826 acres which includes 22 single family lots and .43 acres of common area.

This subdivision is an R-1 Cluster Zone. The purpose of this zone is to encourage open space conservation by clustering dwelling units. Previous phases of the subdivision have been allowed to calculate previously developed open space and common areas toward the bonus density calculations. The overall percentage of open space exceeds the 25% requirement for a cluster subdivision. The open space breakdown is as follows:

Total area of the subdivision including Phase 7- 28.86 acres

Total open space – 10.57 acres

36% open space

Staff has been working with the developer to provide amenities to this phase of the development. They include an open space buffer on the east end and a new trail connection, providing trail access for residents of this phase and any future development. City staff is providing the following recommendations:

1. The new trail should be a minimum of 6 feet wide and paved. It may desirable to use cement to delineate between the

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

- master trail and the internal trail connection.
2. The open space adjacent to lot 80 should be widened to 16.92 feet to match the open space adjacent to lot 81.
 3. Replace the proposed chain link fence with one that meets the Buffer Table 10-6-080 requirements of a minimum 5 foot non-climbable.
 4. The landscape plans do not include details for the detention basin. It would be an added amenity to include a gazebo and landscaping into the design.

Planner Schow summarized the staff memo and added the applicant will add a temporary turn around on the amended stub road.

Public Hearing Open

6:32:42 PM

Lynn Miller, Syracuse, Utah, lives in Trailside phase 2 and has lived there for 14 months. She stated she has spoken to Brad Frost and is working through various issues. She stated there is a significant elevation issue on phase 7 that will affect her lot. She stated has a disagreement with Mr. Frost regarding the elevation issue. She stated the land behind her property is approximately 4 feet lower than her lot, but she has been told by Mr. Frost it would be filled. Her new concern is the elevation for phase 7 will be higher than her lot. She thought her backyard would be flat, but the backyard is sloped down. She asked for a retaining wall, but Mr. Frost would not do it. She stated the home next to her is 2 feet taller than her lot. He put a partial retaining wall to the South, but the drainage is coming from the east. She stated phase 7 lots will be 3 to 5 foot higher than the elevation of her lot. She stated the retaining wall is not enough.

6:38:13PM

Gary Pratt, Syracuse, Utah, stated he was on the Planning Commission when Trailside began and the Planning Commission should look at the big picture. He stated when the project began it was 3 or 4 phases and now it is 7, 8, or 9. He stated staff will look at code and say as long as they [the developer] are meeting code they will shrug their shoulders and not address the issues that current land owners and property owners have; and future ones may have. He stated in his personal circumstance in his neighborhood there are a couple lots that ended up being exactly what the property owners described here. He stated it is because the foresight of the city didn't take into account that as these properties phase out the leveling and drainage are not dealt with, except in the initial sketch plan. He stated the city does not follow through as far as making the developer accountable for the drainage systems and leveling positions that those lots should be in. He stated they shouldn't have to have huge walls be put up around them. He stated from a perspective of planning if you look at this entire development from the beginning to the end it is morphed into something different than what it started out as. He stated the Planning Commission can still look at what was promised and in HOA's (Home Owner Association) and development agreements and CC&R's (Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions) and ask if there is some kind of continuity they are seeing, or if it's making a drastic change because the developer is different. He asked the Planning Commission to take a look at this and table it or suspend it, until there is accountability through staff to ensure all the t's are crossed and the property owners are being accommodated properly.

6:41:16PM

Ruth Williams, Syracuse, Utah, stated she lives in trailside two houses to the west of Lynn Miller. She stated she has a severe slope in her backyard. She stated she lost half of her backyard to this slope. She stated the new development with phase 7 will create a ditch. She agreed with Mr. Pratt that there needs to be more forward thinking as the phases merge together in regards to drainage.

Public Hearing Closed

6:42:31PM

Brad Frost, Utah, stated he appreciated the homeowners and clients that live in the developments. He stated some items should not be taking the time in this meeting. He wanted to address the suggestion of tabling (as mentioned by Gary Pratt). He stated they are amending a plat that was previously approved by the planning commission, so tonight they just need to review the road that goes to the south. He stated they are governed by where the sewer is located on 2000 West. He stated they have done everything they can to lower the elevation.

Mr. Frost referenced the development agreement (mentioned by Gary Pratt) and the previous developer (who he purchased the development from) did not live up to his development agreement and Mr. Frost paid for that. What they have proposed to the owners and clients, shouldn't affect the approval of the amendment. He stated his responsibility as a developer is to ensure the water in the phase 7 does not affect phase 2. He stated there is a drain on all the yards. He proposed to put in a retaining wall and give the owners an allowance to raise their yard and level and move the fence. They currently don't know the exact elevations as of yet.

Commissioner Vaughan stated he was not on the planning commission a year and a half ago when phase 2 was brought in. He asked if open space, number of units, elevation, etc. were discussed with all the phases, when it turned into a cluster subdivision. He asked if they had elevation charts to go with that. He wanted to ensure the developer had complied with what he initially presented before the Planning Commission. Director Christensen stated this property was not included in the original planning for the cluster subdivision; it was phase 1 and 2 only. She stated the phases began approximately 10 years prior, and the developer sold the development to Brad Frost, Ovation Homes. She stated Mr. Frost put in the open space amenities that were lacking and they finished infrastructure. She stated in phase 3, he approached the Planning Commission about consideration for the open

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

space and the density calculations to be based on phase 1, 2, and 3 combined, because there was excess to the 24 percent open space that had been dedicated in phase 1 and phase 2. The Planning Commission gave him permission to go forward with that and with the smaller lots, instead of the patio style homes. This has been a discussion with phase 8 to return to the open feeling or the bookend for the open space.

Commissioner Vaughan asked what the nexus was for the cluster development, other than this shared a north, south property line. Director Christensen stated in phase 7, which Commissioner Vaughan present for, they required Mr. Frost to put in the trail at the end of the street. Mr. Frost was also required to put in street trees, and added improvements in the detention area. They made it possible for all the residents to have access to Trailside Park and the open space that is available there. Planner Schow stated she has met with the neighbors on multiple occasions regarding their concerns. Planner Schow, City Engineer Bloemen, Building Inspector, and Director Christensen made a site visit to inspect and review the potential problems with the development, but it was difficult to get an idea because the yards were fenced, and the improvements weren't in, so it made it difficult to get a good feel for the issues. She believes the land sloped in phase 2 because the developer had to meet grade, but now in order to get a road in and tie into the higher level, the other area has to be raised up. She stated these are items to discuss with phase 8, because phase 7 has already been approved. Her personal recommendation is the stub road improves and makes the piece of land accessible and gets away from the long straight road to provide more access.

Director Christensen stated when phases 3, 4, and 5 were approved to go to the individual lots, rather than the patio homes, Mr. Frost convinced the planning commission that his buyers didn't want to pay as high HOA dues, because they were income sensitive. Mr. Frost stated his buyers wanted smaller lots they owned themselves. She stated as they have progressed through phase 6 and 7 they are down to 34 percent open space, but the planning commission instructed Mr. Frost a few months ago to provide 15 percent open space in phase 8 to allow growth and connectivity for the overall project. There was discussion regarding the definition/requirements of cluster subdivision between Commissioner Vaughan and Director Christensen with an emphasis on whether phase 7 and phase 8 meet those requirements. City Attorney Drake stated phase 7 did not need to stand alone if it is taken into account with the entire subdivision. The purpose is so developers can develop subdivisions in an efficient manner. Planner Schow stated Phase 7 alone is not 10 acres, so they would not have accepted the application had it not been viewed and approved by the Planning Commission as a cluster subdivision.

Commissioner Jensen asked the fire department if they would be willing to send a letter stating they are good not having another temporary turn around on the other street. Deputy Chief Hamblin stated in code Appendix C on ISU 2012 there is a little bit of difference with the ordinance that is in Title 8. He stated the ordinance states either 150 feet or 2 lots in depth. He stated the streets are 150 feet deep. He stated when they look at the 2 lots in depth, that is when it is required to have a temporary turn around. He stated lot 81 is just one lot, but across the street there is 2 lots. He stated in looking at it from his standpoint, it is 150 feet. He stated if it were over 150 feet then it would definitely require a temporary turn around. He stated per ordinance lot 83 and lot 82, that would be 2 lots in depth which is why it would require the temporary turn around. He stated they may want to address taking out the 2 lot depth and just make it 150 feet. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated he would be OK with sending a letter.

Commissioner Jensen and City Engineer Bloemen discussed various solutions regarding the elevations between phase 2 and phase 7. City Engineer Bloemen stated the water drains to the Northwest into a catch basin. He stated there is a private catch basin installed as well. Commissioner Jensen asked about the pads for the houses on the south side. City Engineer Bloemen stated they complied with code. Commissioner Jensen and City Engineer Bloemen discussed potential water drainage issues. Commissioner Vaughan inquired about a French drain. City Engineer Bloemen believed there was one installed between phases 3, 4, and 5, and phase 1. Mr. Frost confirmed that there was a drain in phase 1 and currently they are installing a drain on phase 4. He stated he is working with his engineer on Phase 7 to retain water from phase 2. Commissioner Jensen and City Engineer Bloemen discussed the directions of the sewer flow for each of the phases.

Commissioner Jensen asked Mr. Frost if he was putting a fire hydrant between lot 82 and lot 83. Mr. Frost stated if that is what the city staff requests he will comply. Commissioner Rackham asked if the temporary turn around will be paved, or road based. City Engineer Bloemen stated he assumed it would be gravel or road based. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated the temporary turn around will need to support the 75,000 pound weight of the apparatus, so if they put enough road base in to make the compaction then it can be road based.

Commissioner Rackham asked what the "user group" was for this subdivision. Mr. Frost stated it is "Active, Adult Community 55 and Over". Commissioner Rackham asked if the yard was considered part of the open space or common space. Director Christensen stated everything outside of the pads was considered open space; everything beyond. Commissioner Rackham stated the developer is responsible for maintaining such "common space", so he stated if the residents are having water problems, that would fall under the developer's issue. Mr. Frost stated the water issues do not fall into the common space. Planner Schow stated a few of the lots own back to the fence line, with a different configuration. She showed where the common space is, as well as the fence areas. She stated the backyards of those homes are private. Director Christensen showed the boundaries on the recorded plat. Director Christensen provided a history of the project with an emphasis on open space within the phases. Commissioner Rackham and Director Christensen discussed the definitions of common space versus open space. Commissioner Rackham and Commissioner Vaughan agreed that this item should be tabled until after phase 8 has been discussed, because phase 8 could potentially affect their decision with the amended phase 7.

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

Mr. Frost stated he wanted to postpone or table phase 8 and not discuss it today, because he felt there were changes that would make it better based on the planning commissioner's comments. In regards to the open space, Mr. Frost reminded the planning commission about the park within this project. He stated this project had 47 percent open space, which is higher than the 25 percent requirement. Commissioner Jensen stated he is good with the design of phase 7, as it has already been approved. He stated the change to the design is an improvement. He stated the drainage issues are a new revelation, that should have been caught, but was not.

Commissioner Brodrero stated the amended phase 7 is before them to allow optimal development with road connectivity and traffic flow. He stated if there is a drainage concern it should be specified as a condition, and the developer should address the water from that property. Commissioner Rackham stated by allowing the amended phase 7 they are tying their hands as far as phase 8 for making any changes. He suggested seeing the layout for phase 8 prior to approving the change to phase 7. Commissioner Vaughan stated that phase 7 and phase 8 are tied together with 1765 West, so he suggested tabling to allow for proper review between phase 7 and phase 8. Mr. Frost stated if they are not going to vote on phase 7, then he would like to take the time to review and go through phase 8 to ensure they are on the same table

MOTION TO TABLE THE DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT TRAILSIDE PHASE 7, OVATION HOMES, BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN, UNTIL A DATE SET BY STAFF, OR A DATE REQUESTED BY APPLICANT TO ALLOW TIME FOR PRESENTATION.

Commissioner Rackham asked if Commissioner Vaughan would include something in the motion regarding the drainage issue. Commissioner Vaughan stated he hoped that the engineering and planning staff would review the requirements that they are seeing, and address the issues. He stated they did not receive all the drawings, so he felt if they received a more complete packet, the planning commissioners could make a better decision. Director Christensen asked what Commissioner Vaughan what he felt he didn't receive. She asked if he wanted to see elevations with the lots and how they align with other phases; she indicated that was not something normally something that is reviewed by the planning commission, as it is something reviewed by the city engineer.

Commissioner Vaughan stated in this particular case due to public complaints he felt it would fall in the nexus of the planning commission because it is an adjacent property line to at least review them and see if the issues have been addressed somehow. Planner Schow stated the elevations for the back lots would be in the engineering set from the final approval for phase 7. She stated nothing changes along the back line from the initial approval, which is why it was not included in the amendment application for phase 7. Commissioner Vaughan indicated he would still like to see the drawings with the amendment as well.

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM, KINSEY, AND VAUGHAN VOTED YAY. COMMISSIONER BRODRERO, MCCQUISTION, AND JENSEN VOTED NAY. MOTION FAILED.

Chairman McCuiston stated the city engineer would take care to make sure the drainage issue is well taken care of. Commissioner Vaughan stated he did not like to table projects and invited discussion regarding the drainage. Commissioner Brodrero stated the planning commission has an application for an amendment for an approved plat. He stated they have professional departments that have reviewed and commented for the planning commissioner's review and supplication. He stated the amendment for phase 7 should be approved with the condition and clarification that this phase is coordinated with staff, specifically engineering, to ensure that proper drainage is maintained. Chairman McCuiston stated, "Most of us are not qualified to look at drainage from an engineering perspective, and we should leave that to our professional." Commissioner Jensen stated they needed to review the application entirely, but he felt the amendment is simple and it's a project that has already been approved. He suggested that the drainage issue be reviewed for any potential back-up issues to ensure they are addressed. Commissioner Rackham stated the real issue is the developer wants to add access for a road that is not currently there for access for a subdivision that hasn't been approved yet. He suggested postponing the vote until reviewing phase 8. Commissioner Brodrero stated regardless of whether there is a phase 8 or not, it is good planning and for sight if there is potential for future development to provide a stub road to that. Commissioner Vaughan stated there is plenty of history of staff recommending through road connections.

MOTION TO MOVE TO ITEM 4 AND CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF PHASE 7 AFTER PHASE 8 AS BEEN DISCUSSED, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN, BRODRERO, AND MCCUISTION VOTED NAY. COMMISSIONER JENSEN, KINSEY, AND RACKHAM VOTED YAY. MOTION FAILED.

MOTION TO APPROVE SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT NUMBER 2, FOR OVATION HOMES, TRAILSIDE PARK PHASE 7, BY COMMISSIONER BRODRERO, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1820 W. 3000 S. R-1 CLUSTER RESIDENTIAL ZONE. SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY MUNICIPAL CODES, STAFF REVIEWS, AND THE CONDITION DEVELOPER WILL MEET WITH THE CITY ENGINEER AND PUBLIC WORKS REGARDING DRAINAGE ALONG THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN PHASE 7 AND PHASE 2,

UNDERSTANDING THAT THOSE REQUIREMENTS TO BE WORKED OUT WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT MAY OR MAY NOT PERTAIN TO ANY WORK WITH NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES, SPECIFICALLY THAT ANY DRAINAGE PROBLEM WOULD BE ELIMINATED. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. COMMISSIONER BRODRERO, JENSEN, MCCUISTION, VAUGHAN, AND KINSEY VOTED YAY. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM VOTED NAY. MOTION PASSED.

4. **Public Hearing: Sketch Plan, Trailside Phase 8, Ovation Homes, property located at approximately 1900 W. 3100 S., R-1 Cluster Zone.**
7:48:43 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained that Ovation Homes has purchased 7.32 acres to the south of Trailside Park Phase 7 and would like to develop this land as Phase 8 of this subdivision. The applicant has proposed 29 units with 2.03 acres of developed open space. The density and open space requirements are calculated as follows:

Proposed Phase 8	
Area	7.37 acres
20% infrastructure allowance	1.41 acres
Net developable area	5.90 acres
Minimum open space requirement 25%	1.48 acres
Proposed open space	2.03 acres
Density allowance	28 units
Total Trailside Park Development	
Area	36.96 acres
20% infrastructure allowance	7.39 acres
Net developable area	29.57 acres
Minimum open space requirement	7.39 acres
Density allowance	140 units
Density	
Total units phase 1-7	91
Proposed units in phase 8	29
Total Units of all phases	120 units

Planner Schow summarized the staff memo. She stated there has not been a full staff review for Trailside phase 8 as of yet. They do recommend an easement for the road and a potential lot, so they have the ability for the road if needed. Commissioner Jensen asked for the total density for the project. Director Christensen stated 4.058 is the total density for the proposed project.

Brad Frost, Syracuse, Utah, stated they would be fine with the planning commission tabling the project so they can get the project to where everyone can agree. Commissioner Rackham asked about the private driveway area. Mr. Frost stated the private drive would be handled similar to a private street. He stated it would be worked out with his attorney in the CC&R's (Covenants Conditions and Restrictions) to ensure it flows well. He stated they pay an extra \$5.00 per month to the HOA (Home Owner's Association) and that takes care of their driveways.

Public hearing open.

8:00:36 PM

Gary Pratt, Syracuse, Utah, stated the quality of construction for private driveways and access for emergency vehicles has always been an issue for previous planning commissions. He stated if somebody parks on the street it would narrow the ability to get equipment in the area. He stated people will abuse parking things in private driveways because it is only used by 2 or 3 houses, so the residents think it is theirs. He stated the last hour and a half talks about what he was previously talking about in regards to looking at the big picture and subdivisions. He stated when developments come across in pieces it becomes a big deal when it comes to clustering. He stated Clustering is a major conditional use. He stated it is not like a regular subdivision that they are used to looking at. He stated an R-1 subdivision is an abridgment to A-1; it allows you to build houses on Agricultural land at the rate of 2.9 units per acre. He stated when you consider conditional use, there is a huge difference between open space and common area. He stated it is defined in our code differently and when they discuss agricultural amendments or definitions it is because the wording is exact same wording that is in R-1. He stated, "the reason the wording is the same is because they are saying if you have open space in your R-1 cluster it is because you are trying to preserve property for agricultural or farm raising ability; and so that is where the excess property goes. As far as common area, that is man-made. Man-made means trails, parks, common areas that as definition by our own code is in and around the dwelling units. That is the specific language that is there." He stated, "If you look at these last few phases, as mentioned by staff and by you, they do not meet cluster code. They only meet cluster code because you are allowing phase 1 and the previous phases to come in and allow the density to work that way." He stated there are economic reasons, like in phase 1, why you would not want open space around every single house. He stated

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

that is one approach to cluster and open space, but asked if it was economically sound. He stated the rules were not met by our current or previous code.

8:04:38PM

Robin Horhees, will be a Syracuse Resident in the mentioned area, Utah, she owns lot 68 in phase 6 and she was not aware that phase 8 was being developed. She stated there are no common areas in phase 7. She did not see any common areas in phase 8 other than by the trail. She stated it made things difficult if you wanted to throw a party, because all the picnic tables are in phase 1, 2, and 3.

8:05:32PM

Jeanie Brierley, Syracuse, Utah, stated the far southwest open space that will be there is currently her property. She voiced her approval for everything she has seen Brad Frost do. She stated the homes were similar and felt the open space should be included through the phases. She stated the section of land that Brad Frost will be purchasing from her will be land locked when UDOT comes and takes out her house for the West Davis Corridor. She stated this will allow for her to have a third acre or less.

Public Hearing Closed.

8:06:35PM

Commissioner Jensen stated on May 15, 2014 UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) signed a memorandum of understanding with the Utahns for Better Transportation stating they would meet with them on June 18, 2014 to discuss the shared solution on whether it is a viable alternative to building the freeway. He stated the stub road would tie into that, but there is no guarantee that UDOT will put in the West Davis Corridor just because they own the property.

Commissioner Rackham invited Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin to speak regarding the driveway. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated it is difficult access for fire apparatus to have access to the private driveways. He stated getting the fire trucks turned around is also a concern. Commissioner Vaughan asked Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin where he would like to see a fire hydrant. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin suggested putting the fire hydrant close to the inside of the curve near lot 120.

Commissioner Jensen stated the private driveways do not require city maintenance, so it would lower costs to deliver services. He stated he did not recall the sketch being so boxy when it was first proposed. He recalls suggesting clustering the houses closer together to allow creation of open space that could be accessed between every 4 houses. He stated the plan is lacking open space and suggested pushing lots 108 through 111 to the south and 97 through 100 to the side to allow for a park.

Commissioner Vaughan discussed the overall project in conjunction with UDOT and the West Davis Corridor and how it could potentially affect the design of the project. He referred to the staff report regarding the number of units within the phases. He stated in the first 7 units it is 3 times as large as phase 8, so there is over 25% coming in this phase. He didn't feel it should be added on as a phase 8 to Trailside, but should rather stand alone.

Commissioner Brodrero stated he would like to see better, usable, open space. He stated there were options in the southeast corner and southwest corner for configuration of open space. He suggested eliminating the private driveways. He stated ultimately the 26.9 percent of listed open space on the sketch is not accessible from the street, as is in phase 1 or phase 2.

Commissioner Jensen stated if the applicant is not in a hurry, and if the acreage could be acquired within a reasonable amount of time, he stated the triangular piece to the west could change the complexion of how phase 8 would look. Chairman McCuiston would like to remove the private drive way. He stated narrow streets can work as long as they are engineered correctly in a gridded network so there are multiple access points. He suggested connectivity of the trail network and open space.

MOTION TO TABLE THE SKETCH PLAN FOR TRAILSIDE PHASE 8, OVATION HOMES, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN, PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1900 W. 3100 S., R-1 CLUSTER ZONE, SO THE DEVELOPER CAN CONSIDER THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS RECOMMENDATIONS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINSEY, ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION PASSED.

- 5. Public Hearing: Rezone from R-1 Residential and A-1 Agriculture to R-2 Residential, Castle Creek Homes, property located at approximately 1200 S. 3000 W.**

8:20:14 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained this applicant came before the Planning Commission on May 6, 2014 for a General Plan Amendment. Following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council approved the General Plan Amendment on May 13, 2014. The applicant is proposing single family residential homes that will be in character with the surrounding area. City staff has no issues with the proposed Zone request. Planner Schow summarized the staff memo.

Mike Bastian, South Weber, Utah, stated the piece of property is the Wilcox property and the R-1 will be a part of this new development which will allow for a better traffic flow overall. He stated they will connect 1200 South to 3000 West.

Public Hearing Open.

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

8:22:32PM

Jana Smith, Syracuse, Utah, stated she lives on 1200 South. She was concerned about the rezone from an R-1 to the R-2. She stated because Antelope Drive is a nightmare to turn left on, more people will travel up 1200 South to get to 2500 or follow 1125 to go to 2000. She stated this will cause a lot more traffic on 2000. She expressed concerns regarding sewer water issues and school issues to keep condensing more homes. She stated when she moved in Syracuse she checked to ensure that it was an R-1, because she wanted more open space with a bigger lot. She felt that is being lost in Syracuse. Commissioner Vaughan requested Ms. Smith to show where her property is located on the map. Ms. Smith showed where her house was located on the aerial. She stated the traffic has picked up with the construction. Planner Schow stated 1200 South will connect to 3000 West, so that is one item that will help with traffic. She stated the lot sizes for R-1 and R-2 both have the same minimum lot sizes of 10,000 square feet, so the lot could not be any smaller. Commissioner Rackham stated he lived in that area and the majority of homes in the area are half acre or better. He stated the potential values of the homes could be affected.

8:27:08PM

Michael Reney, Syracuse, Utah, stated he lives on 3000 West and the traffic has tripled since he first moved in. He stated people will skip 2000 West because it is clustered. He stated if they build that road it will become worse. He stated there are a lot of little kids along the road. He stated the round-about will not work on 700 South either. He stated the water is already bad, and if those new homes go in he questioned if his water pressure would go down. He stated there is a lot of ground water down in the area when they irrigate that just sits.

Public Hearing Closed.

8:28:29PM

MOVE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL, BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN, FOR THE REZONE FROM R-1 AND A-1 TO R-2 RESIDENTIAL FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1200 S. 3000 W. SUBJECT TO APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY MUNICIPAL CODES. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BODRERO. COMMISSIONERS BRODRERO, VAUGHAN, KINSEY, MCCQUISTION, AND JENSEN VOTED YAY. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM VOTED NAY. MOTION PASSED.

Commissioner Rackham stated they are going to end up with a city with R-2 and R-3 if they don't look for the bigger picture. Commissioner Vaughan stated when developers, or property owners, submit applications to the planning commission their determination is whether or not they meet the city requirements of the code for submitting the application. The real determination for whether or not they should eliminating R-1 and favoring R-2 or R-3, rests with the city council. Commissioner Brodrero stated there is a mass misunderstanding between R-1 and R-2 minimum requirements.

6. **Public Hearing: Rezone from R-1 Residential to R-2 & R-3 Residential, Lakeview Farms 1 LLC, property located at approximately 700 S. 3000 W.**

8:32:39 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained this applicant came before the Planning Commission on May 6, 2014 for a General Plan Amendment. Following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council approved the General Plan Amendment on May 13, 2014. The applicant is proposing single family residential homes that will be in character with the surrounding area. City staff has no issues with the proposed Zone request. Planner Schow summarized the staff report.

Mike Bastian, South Weber, Utah, stated this property is a key piece in the development of feature ground with Syracuse, be it utility outfall, or the ability to do the regional detention basin at Rock Creek Park. He stated they would have the West Davis Corridor going along the west side of the property. Mr. Bastian referenced a letter from UDOT that stated they were aware of the rezone. It was read at the previous planning commission meeting on May 20, 2014. He stated they received there appraisal and are in negotiations with UDOT. He is asking for the split zones to plan for the future growth. He stated they were the original developers for this property in 2007, and at that time had planned to do R-1. He stated in 2007 the western boundary of the property was the trail, the Bluff, over-looking the golf course, and the lakes. He stated now as the economy has gotten better, the West Davis Corridor is now coming 150 feet give or take onto the Steed property. He stated instead of having the larger lots on the western property, now they have to plan for a large freeway. He stated the R-3 would provide a better buffer and blend into the R-2 from there. Commissioner Jensen discussed the differences in R-1 and R-2 with an emphasis on density sizes.

Public Hearing Open.

8:37:25 PM

Dave Brown, Syracuse, Utah, stated he lives on 700 South. He stated he is still concerned with the issues he presented to the Planning Commission on May 20, 2014. He requested clarification for why this project reverted back from being approved by the Planning Commission as R-2 only to the new rezone request for R-2 and R-3. He stated the residents have water restrictions and he felt increasing the amount of people in an R-2 and R-3 will not conserve water. He stated, "It is a poor example from the city to increase residents in an area that was already R-1. I

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

realize R-2, there is very little difference as far as the size of the lot and so I was in favor and accepted the proposal to go with an R-2 throughout the area.” He referenced the last meeting voting in regards to the R-3. He stated the density of the housing appears to be more of a financially driven motive for the developer. He stated the lots are smaller, so that would mean less expensive homes would go in that section. He felt it was unfortunate for the lower income housing to be next to the West Davis Corridor. He stated developers will utilize this as a model and line the corridor with low income homes with higher density. He stated, “It is a travesty that they view less income people as being more suited for a less desirable area in your community.” He stated he understands that the planning commission makes the recommendation, but the city council has the final say for the city. He stated the higher density will impact the traffic in that area, which already has issues. He referenced his May 20, 2014 letter in regards to code enforcement. He stated the enforcement is not good in Syracuse for residential homes. He stated he is not opposed to growth within well-developed subdivisions, because they are assets to the community. He stated they incorporated an element in the design that allowed for the community to deteriorate. He stated that development is a long term liability and so he opposed the higher density R-3.

8:47:01PM

Arthur Miller, Syracuse, Utah, stated there appeared to be 2 parties who would benefit from the development; the developer and the city of Syracuse. He viewed the city of Syracuse as separate from the residents of Syracuse. He stated he worked for a general contractor and loved to see construction because it meant he has a job. He stated wise development is better for the community than simply allowing the developer to build as many homes as possible, get the cash flow, and have the benefit of leaving and not dealing with the ramifications of his development. He stated the city of Syracuse will benefit from impact fees, additional tax revenue, etc. He stated, “I as a member of the community am being sacrificed by this decision.” He stated R-1 is the best alternative versus R-2 and R-3. He stated for the next 30 plus years he would stand to lose from this development. He felt it was “false” to make assumptions and make decisions of that magnitude for the community based on a potential freeway system. He stated he understood that the developer needed to take into account the potential of the freeway and protect his investment, but he didn’t feel that should be at the expense of the Syracuse residents.

8:50:35PM

Michael Renny, Syracuse, Utah, stated he lived on 3000 West, just beyond 700 South. He asked if they put the freeway in, would it be raised up. He stated because of the Bluff it would not be able to be flat. He stated R-3 will not buffer the freeway because the freeway will be raised up, so he suggested returning to the R-1. He stated the number of homes in an R-3 zone will create a lot of traffic. He stated there isn’t anyone regulating the faster speeds of 45 miles per hour. He stated the water sits in the R-3 area.

8:51:59PM

Dave Brown, Syracuse, Utah, stated he gave the copy of the letter to the commissioner and asked if it was forwarded to the city council. Director Christensen confirmed the letter was forwarded to the city council.

Public Hearing Closed.

8:52:20PM

Commissioner Jensen suggested the residents attend the work session for District 2 discussion, and express their concerns about remaining R-1. He suggested they write letters as well. He stated if they built everything to 10,000 square foot lots they would have a 4.356 net density and neither of the densities are anywhere near there. He stated effectively you have about 12,000 square foot lots in an R-2, and about 14,000 square foot lots in an R-1. He stated the density is approximately a 33 percent increase. He stated for culinary water Syracuse City receives about 8,000 gallons per minute that Weber Basin delivers above ground. He stated they run pumps on the well about 4 months out of the year. He stated when the pump was tested it basically could deliver potentially 15,000 gallons per minute if they needed it. He stated the result is even at build out, the city can adequately meet the culinary water needs. He stated as far as secondary water, the developer has to submit 3 shares an acre in order to develop, otherwise they are not allowed to develop. He stated water pressure is a separate issue that Public Works will need to review.

Public Hearing Reopened

8:55:46PM

Michael Renny, Syracuse, Utah, stated when he moved to Syracuse, between 2500 and 2000 there were no homes. He stated the homes have been built within the last 15 years and his water pressure has decreased by half. He stated his concern for the future residents located below him.

Commissioner Jensen invited City Engineer Bloemen to address the water pressure for culinary. City Engineer Bloemen stated there will not be any pressure issues in that location. He stated pressure is based off the elevation of the tank and so the further you are west the bigger difference in elevation. He discussed potential issues that could prevent pressure, such as, cleaning filters, or ensuring the line is not kinked. He stated the standard in the PR-V is 50 PSI. He stated it didn’t matter what they had in the city main lines, because they were set to cap at 50 PSI.

Commissioner Vaughan stated water is not something the planning commissioners can take into account when considering making a decision on whether to approve or deny a rezone request. City Attorney Drake shook his head yes. Commissioner Vaughan stated he understood the issues of water, but there certain issues that planning commissioners by law are forbidden in taking into consideration. He suggested the residents present their concerns

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

to the city council, as they are able to take those items into consideration. Commissioner Jensen stated if the city is unable to deliver to the infrastructure that would be a reason to stand on. City Attorney Drake clarified Commissioner Vaughan was referring to water pressure and the city engineer already had stated there was sufficient pressure for that area.

MOVE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR THE REZONE FROM R-1 TO R-2 AND R-3 RESIDENTIAL, BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN, LAKEVIEW FARMS, PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 700 WEST 3000 SOUTH, SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY MUNICIPAL CODES. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM VOTED NAY. COMMISSIONER KINSEY, VAUGHAN, MCCUITION, BRODRERO AND JENSEN VOTED YAY.

MOTION TO EXTEND TO 9:30PM WITH A 5 MINUTE BREAK, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSION RACKHAM. COMMISSIONER JENSEN, RACKHAM, VAUGHAN, BRODRERO, AND KINSEY VOTED YAY. CHAIRMAN MCCUITION VOTED NAY. MOTION PASSED.

7. **Public Hearing: Rezone from A-1 Agriculture to R-2 Residential, Dennis Higley, property located at approximately 3000 S. Bluff Road.**
9:07:47 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained this applicant is requesting R-2 Residential zoning, which is in accordance with the Syracuse City Master Plan. The City Staff has no issues with the proposed zone request. Planner Schow read the staff memo.

Dennis Higley, Syracuse, Utah, stated it is currently 1 lot and he wanted to subdivide it into 2 lots. He wanted to do an amended plat for Kara Estates to add the 2 lots. He stated the piece directly behind the lot is a holding pond and it has gone to weeds. He wanted to restore the holding pond and add it to the lots. Commissioner Rackham asked Mr. Higley how to access the property. Mr. Higley stated you can access it on Bluff Road. He stated the home will face Bluff Road.

Public Hearing Open.

9:10:28PM

No comments were made. Public Hearing closed.

MOTION TO APPROVE REZONE REQUEST FROM DENNIS HIGLEY, FROM A-1 TO R-2 RESIDENTIAL, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN, PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 3000 SOUTH BLUFF ROAD. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL IN FAVOR, NO OPPOSED. MOTION PASSED.

8. **Public Hearing: Rezone from R-1 Residential and A-1 Agriculture to R-3 Residential, Mark Sandberg, property located at approximately 3250 W. 700 S.**
9:11:40PM

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained this applicant came before the Planning Commission on April 15, 2014 for a General Plan Amendment. Following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council approved the General Plan Amendment on May 13, 2014. The applicant is proposing single family residential homes that will be in character with the surrounding area. City staff has no issues with the proposed zone request. Planner Schow read the staff memo.

Donald Sandberg, Bountiful, Utah thanked the planning commission for extending. Commissioner Jensen asked about the plan for the development. Mr. Sandberg stated there were some minor changes to the plan specifically working with the city engineer. He stated the cul-de-sac located on 3250 West is changing from 50 feet to 60 feet, per cities request. He stated 2 properties, the Bytheway property and the Bradshaw property are wanting to be included into the plat, but are not requesting any rezoning. The street plans will be generally the same.

Public Hearing Open.

9:14:11PM

No comments were made during the Public Hearing.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR A REZONE FROM R-1 AND A-1 RESIDENTIAL TO R-3 RESIDENTIAL, FOR MARK SANDBERG, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 3250 WEST 700 SOUTH. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRODRERO. ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION PASSED.

9:31:36PM

Eric Snyder, West Point, Utah, stated he represents Snyder's Bluff Golf Course. He stated the R-3 residential appeared fine. He was concerned that 700 South will go down through that area, and if it were not to be wide enough in that area, it would render the front 9 of the golf course and make that area useless to the golf

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

course. He stated it would make the assets something they would want to sell and not continue running as a golf course. He stated, "As long as it is zoned good and you guys plan enough room for the road to go through there, if per chance it goes through there, it would be money; and they would have no issue with that." Chairman McCuiston stated if Mr. Snyder wanted his comments heard by the developer he should attend the city council meeting. Commissioner Vaughan recommended Mr. Snyder put his comments in writing and submit them to city staff to allow the information to be included in the packet presented to the city council.

9. Final Plan: Still Water Lake Estates Phase 6, Irben Development, property located at approximately 1500 W. Gentile, R-1 Cluster Zone. Commissioner Jensen recused himself from the item.
9:15:06 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development explained this application is for final plan approval recommendation for the Still Water Lake Estates Phase 6 subdivision located on 1500 W and Gentile. The subdivision consists of 2 ski lakes, 30 homes a walking trail and two private parks on the area labeled Boundary A. Boundary B, The Cottages, consists of 165 single family lots, a walking trail and two private parks. The development is 86.55 with a net density of 2.78 DU/AC.

The recommendation on the Final Plan for phases 4 & 5 was made on May 6, 2014. The City Council has not acted upon that recommendation and is awaiting the State Property Rights Ombudsman's legal opinion. If this phase is recommended for approval it will be added to phases 4 & 5 for the Council's consideration. Phase 6 was applied for at the same time as 4 & 5 but was pulled from the approval, based upon a request to adjust the phasing for access. Director Christensen summarized the staff memo. Director Christensen addressed concerns of Mr. Pratt's previous comments. She stated when the project was originally filed in April, it was filed at phase 4, 5, and 6 along with the Final Plat and the Conditional Use Permit application. She stated upon staff review and recommendation they asked the developer to change the phasing of phase 4, 5, and 6 specifically 5 and 6 to realign the phase lines. She stated when the realignment came in, phase 6 had changed and they were lots that hadn't been reviewed by staff. She stated they needed to change it to allow duel access from phase 5, so they pulled phase 6 from the agenda in May and continued with phase 4 and phase 5. She stated the council has not voted against or for the project. She stated the city council had a work session with the developer whereby the developer was given some indications of how the council felt about Still Water Estates and the inconsistencies. The developer then filed with the state property rights Ombudsman to address the concerns the council had and they have yet to receive the final report back. She stated if they choose to make a motion on phase 6 it will be added with phase 4 and phase 5 when the council does finally hear it (after they receive the full report from the Ombudsman).

Commissioner Vaughan asked if all the concerns, requests for improvements, changes, additions, etc. been reviewed and accepted by staff. Director Christensen stated for phase 6, yes. Director Christensen showed the overall phasing of the project on the projector.

Commissioner Brodreo discussed the idea of not taking action on this item tonight, because the city council had not acted on the other phases. City Attorney Drake stated it shouldn't have a huge impact one way or the other, because the city council will make their determination within the next week. He stated the applicant requested to be on the agenda therefore the planning commission does need to act. He stated if there were legitimate reasons for tabling the project, then it could be tabled.

Taylor Spendlove, Kaysville, Utah, stated he wanted to include phase 6 with the previous approval, so the council could act upon all the phases at once. Commissioner Brodrero stated it appears, in reading the staff's memo, that the applicant has met and addressed outstanding questions, so he found favor in moving phase 6; with the recommendation that the council can review all the phases together.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FINAL PLAN SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FOR PHASE 6, BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN. LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1500 WEST GENTILE STREET, SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF SYRACUSE CITY ORDINANCES AND STAFF REPORTS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION PASSED.

10. Final Plan: Gailey Farms, K.W. Advisory Group, property located at approximately 750 S. 2000 W., R-3 Residential Zone. Commissioner Jensen returned.
9:24:43 PM

A staff memo from the Community Development showed the following timeline:

General Plan Amendment

Planning Commission	February 4, 2014
City Council	February 10, 2014

Rezone Approval

Planning Commission	March 4, 2014
City Council	March 11, 2014

Sketch Plan Approval

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2014

Planning Commission March 4, 2014

Preliminary Plan Approval

Planning Commission April 15, 2014

Planner Schow summarized the timeline and stated there were a few pending items that needed to be addressed. She stated they met with the engineer and all the unaddressed items were smoothed out, so drawings will be updated prior to the city council approval. City Staff, including the city engineer, is ready to move with final approval.

Steve Fackrell, Layton, Utah had nothing to add. Commissioner Vaughan complimented the applicant with his patience and willingness in working with the planning commission and city staff for better plans regarding safety. Commissioner Jensen stated he appreciated the applicant working with staff. He stated he still felt it was a mistake to have lots 22, 23, and 24 facing the high school.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR FINAL PLAT, FOR GAILEY FARMS, KW ADVISORY GROUP, BY COMMISSIONER BODRERO. PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 750 SOUTH 2000 WEST, R-3 RESIDENTIAL ZONE, SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY MUNICIPAL CODES AND STAFF REVIEWS AND COMMENTS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED.

MOTION TO MAKE ITEM 11, HARVEST POINT PHASE 8, BE THE FINAL ITEM, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN.

Director Christensen requested he include voting on meeting minutes, as well as a brief discussion of future work session scheduling. Commissioner Jensen clarified that was not included in his motion.

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINSEY. COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN, KINSEY, RACKHAM, AND JENSEN VOTED YAY. COMMISSIONER BRODERO AND MCCUISTION VOTED NAY. MOTION PASSED.

9:30:37PM

Eric Snyder, West Point, Utah approached the planning commission and asked if he could make a comment on the rezone request from Mark Sandberg. He stated he missed the item due to the brief intermission.

MOTION TO REOPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEM 8, BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

11. Final Plan: Harvest Pointe Phase 8, THR Investment, property located at approximately 1070 W. 2150 S., R-3 Residential Zone.

9:35:12PM

A staff memo from the Community Development showed the following timeline:

Sketch Plan Approval

Planning Commission May 7, 2013

Preliminary Plan Approval

Planning Commission June 2, 2014

Planner Schow summarized the timeline. She stated there were a few minor amendments to be corrected for the plat prior to recording. She stated the abandonment of the irrigation turn out, which she will require a letter prior to recording as well.

Jared Thurgood, Roy, Utah, had no additional comments.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, HARVEST POINTE PHASE 8, THR INVESTMENT, BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. PROPERTY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1070 WEST 2150 SOUTH, R-3 RESIDENTIAL ZONE. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL IN FAVOR. NO OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

Adjourn

9:37:34 PM

Curt McCuiston

Jackie Manning, Admin Professional

Date Approved: _____