

Minutes of the Syracuse City Planning Commission Work Session held on July 1, 2014, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

**Present:**

Commission Members: TJ Jensen, Chairman  
Ralph Vaughan, Vice Chairman  
Dale Rackham  
Curt McCuiston  
Greg Day  
Trevor Hatch  
Troy Moultrie

City Employees: Sherrie Christensen, Community and Economic Development Director  
Jenny Schow, Planner  
Jackie Manning, Admin Professional  
Clint Drake, City Attorney  
Terry Palmer, Mayor

City Council: Craig Johnson

Visitors: None

### 1. Department Business

[6:41:27 PM](#)

- Director Christensen welcomed the new planning commissioners.
- Shared Solution meeting tomorrow (7/2/2014)
- Attorney Drake invited questions from the planning commissioners. He stated there will be training for the planning commissioners.
- Mayor Palmer recommended a meeting with the new chair, vice-chair, and staff to work through any deadlines issues.

### 2. Commissioner Reports

[6:47:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan commended city staff for their organization for Heritage Days. He stated The Rush Swimming Pool complex did not comply with the planning commissioners conditions. The requirement was for cinder blocks to be finished into some type of material. He stated there are open cinder blocks on the entire east end of the facility and possibly the north and south side. He stated the Letrono Gym was also required to have finished cinder blocks and are not in compliance.

Commissioner Vaughan discussed the receipt of packets. He would like to see more documentation to help the planning commission make the best decision regarding projects. Director Christensen inquired as to what Commissioner Vaughan would like to see in the packet and suggested a meeting with the Chair and Vice-chair to discuss which items they would like to see in a packet going forward.

Commissioner Jensen reported on the Davis County active transportation meeting. He discussed the differences in classes for trails, and status of the trails map. He discussed street plans and the tool available on streetplan.net.

### 3. Discussion Items

[6:57:59 PM](#)

#### a. Update on the West Davis Corridor Shared Solution Meetings

Director Christensen stated they met with the shared solution representatives in West Point, who brought forth a broad coalition of citizens, various city staff members, planners, elected officials, UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) employees, UTA (Utah Transit Authority) and did a 4 hour presentation and discussed the various transportation issues. She stated they will have meetings every 2 weeks that they will continue to attend. Chairman Jensen discussed the various components in the Shared Solution Meeting.

Commissioner Vaughan expressed concern in improper ex-party status for Syracuse City. He stated there are various groups and he did not want to sacrifice their ability to vote on the issue, because they have so many ex-party communications and other groups have not had any input to them. He stated as long as they are not members to any of these groups it puts them in a different setting. Director Christensen verified they are not members, but rather attendees. City Attorney Drake stated he was not concerned and did not see any issue attending these meetings at this time. There was discussion on where the new planning commissioners may go to obtain information regarding the West Davis Corridor and the Shared Solution. Chairman McCuiston suggested weighing the options and continuing research before submitting an opinion to the city council. Several planning commissioners agreed it may be a better idea to wait and review the information further before submitting anything to the city council.

**b. Title VIII and X amendments**7:08:30 PM

Director Christensen discussed the proposed amendments to the ordinances for Title VIII, as seen in the packet 7/1/2014. She reviewed the proposed changes discussed in the previous work session for the benefit of the new planning commissioners.

Commissioner McCuiston had a comment regarding 8.10.20(b). He stated there should be wording added that requires the plans to be stamped and signed by a professional civil engineer licensed to practice in Utah. He didn't feel the name of the firm or person preparing the drawings with their state license was enough.

Commissioner McCuiston stated under item (d) As Built Drawings, he suggested asking for electronic drawings in CAD format for city standards as approved by the city engineer so in the future the city could switch to a JIS system, or use the electronic files in another information format. Director Christensen stated they currently ask for both, but it isn't specifically in the ordinance. There was discussion regarding requiring CAD drawings and how they pertain to GRAMA (Governmental Records Access and Management Act) requests.

Commissioner McCuiston had questions regarding requirements in 8.10.050 (a) and (b), parks, open space, and other public areas. Director Christensen stated the proposed changes will put Syracuse City in conformance with the updated parks impact fees. She stated prior to the amendment they were charging a park purchase fee from the developer and at the time of a building permit they charged a park improvement fee. She stated when they updated the analysis, applicants were misunderstanding the differences and it appeared the city was asking for the fees twice. So it was recommended that it was combined in one impact fee that will be charged at the time a building permit is issued. There was discussion on the rewording of the section and funds tracking methods.

Chairman Jensen stated by ordinance developers are only required to have 2 entrances in a development. He suggested additional language that sets length standards to allow for more entrances, or stub roads if needed. He suggested researching neighboring cities. Commissioner Hatch discussed the potential negative impact of requesting entrances based on lot lengths for smaller developments. Chairman Jensen suggested putting a density component. There was discussion regarding the wording to allow for optimal development regarding through streets.

Director Christensen stated dead end streets only require turn around if it accesses more than one lot in depth. The fire code is 150 feet. The fire department would like the ordinance to conform to the same wording as the fire code of 150 feet. Commissioner McCuiston stated in regards to turn-arounds there is a 100 foot diameter, and he suggested taking the number down to avoid "heat" islands. Director Christensen stated the requirement is from the fire code. She stated it seemed excessive. Commissioner Day stated the standard is 50 foot radius.

Director Christensen proposed removing the exception option for dead end road length and having a flat length of 500 feet to avoid confusion for developers. She stated the exceptions are written in such a way that she didn't feel it would be granted, so if they removed the exceptions this would eliminate some redesign issues for the developers. Commissioner Rackham suggested revising and rewording exceptions versus taking them out completely. He stated there may be times when an exception is relevant. Chairman McCuiston stated there may be circumstances in which an exception would make a development better, but he felt they were rare, and to streamline everything would allow for a clear rule. Chairman Jensen suggested an exception pertaining public safety. Director Christensen stated another alternative to removing the exceptions would be to make the dead end length longer, such as 600 feet. There were discussions on the pros and cons of cul-de-sacs and how they impact traffic flow.

Councilman Johnson, Syracuse, Utah, stated the 500 foot cul-de-sac length was derived from the looping issue, and it was consistent with neighboring cities. He stated other cities do not have exceptions and he didn't feel they needed exceptions. Director Christensen stated the communities that have exceptions are due to geographical barriers. The planning commissioners took a head count for preference on the cul-de-sac length. Commissioner Hatch, Commissioner Rackham, Commissioner McCuiston, were for the removal of exceptions and the set length of 500 feet. Commissioner Jensen, Commissioner Day, Commissioner Moultrie, and Commissioner Vaughan stated they would like to see an exception for public safety, but they agreed with the 500 foot length.

Director Christensen gave a brief overview of 8.20 and the current process of submittal for developments in conjunction with the proposed changes for the new planning commissioners. Commissioner Vaughan stated he liked the proposed plan change. Commissioner Rackham inquired about 8.20.020 (3). He stated that density was changed to lot size, so he felt that would no longer apply in its current form. Chairman Jensen discussed old growth trees along Gentile Street that were over 50 years old that were destroyed to make room for a new development. Chairman Jensen proposed to add a site visit to the ordinance to allow preservation for natural features. There were discussions as to the appropriate wording for the proposed site plan addition.

Commissioner Rackham recommended the following wording to 8.20.030: "The developer and the Development Review Committee (DRC) shall review the Concept Plan of the proposed subdivision. The DRC shall consist of the Community & Economic Development Director, City Planner, Public Works Director, City Engineer, Fire Marshal and may include representatives of other City departments, special service districts and county representatives as deemed necessary by the Zoning Administrator. The Community & Economic Developer shall provide notice to the Planning Commission and City Council of the Concept Review meeting in order to provide an opportunity for input to be relayed to the developer via the DRC. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss any ordinances, standards, special requirements or other issues of concern to be considered in preparation for the preliminary plat. No binding commitments are made between Syracuse City and developer at Concept Plan Review as no formal action by the Planning Commission or City Council is engaged at this time." As amended by City Attorney Drake.

Councilman Johnson, Syracuse, Utah, proposed having a Work Session agenda discussion item versus putting the documents in the Drop Box. Director Christensen stated they could do that. Councilman Johnson suggested using this format with each meeting. Director Christensen stated if that is the direction they would like to go they may not want to have a Development Review Committee. Councilman Johnson stated he would like to see the Work Session discussion item versus having a Development Review Committee. Commissioner Vaughan stated they would be getting close to voting and getting into vesting if they adopted that format. Commissioner Vaughan stated the Development Review Committee would simplify and eliminate formal settings to allow staff to do as much as they possibly can to work through the issues before it is presented to the planning commission. There was discussion regarding the proposed changes with an emphasis on a clearer more efficient process and the potential appointment of a Development Review Committee.

City Attorney Drake stated he would like to change "at this meeting the developer will be notified of any ordinances, standards or special requirements, or other matters of concern" to "the purpose of this meeting is to discuss any ordinances, standards, special requirements, or other matters of concerns."

Director Christensen discussed various deadline resolutions pertaining to making the packet available to the planning commissioners. Chairman Jensen stated he wanted the packet available 2 weeks in advance. He suggested having the agenda ready for the following planning commission meeting, the public hearings would already be noticed, and items could be added as needed. He at least wanted to see a draft of the agenda for the next planning commission meeting. He suggested putting a revised packet out a week before the planning commission meeting with the suggested changes. Planner Schow expressed concerns about having multiple packets posted, as a lot of work goes into putting them together. Director Christensen stated there were a lot of corrections and work between staff and the developer. She stated putting the packet together with the staff report and then having the planning commission make suggestive changes would negate the purpose of the staff report. She stated she would be happy to move the deadline back and get the packet to the planning commissioners a week earlier to allow for more review time and more time for comments.

Commissioner Vaughan stated at another county he received the packet 8 days in advance and it allowed for proper research and review. Director Christensen recommended a trial period in which the packets would be available the Wednesday one week before the meeting and then it could be adjusted as needed. She felt it was more of a policy versus ordinance. Commissioner Day stated he felt the current Friday before the planning commission meeting was sufficient. Commissioner Moultrie stated he would like to see the packet within 8-10 days. Commissioner McCuiston stated the current deadline is fine. Commissioner Rackham stated he usually reviews the packet on Friday before the planning commission meeting, but to receive the packet the Thursday before would be nice. Commissioner Hatch stated Wednesday or Thursday would be good to allow for more time, but he kept staff's capability in mind. Chairman Jensen directed Director Christensen to produce the packet the Wednesday before the next planning commission meeting.

Commissioner Rackham recommended a change in 8.25.010. He suggested adding after "scheduling a public hearing for consideration thereof..." "until after a complete documentation is received" to the ending paragraph of that section.

Chairman Jensen suggested continuing discussion for cluster subdivisions in Title X until next work session to allow time to discuss the remaining work session items.

#### **c. General Plan District 2 Update**

[8:55:38 PM](#)

Director Christensen stated she is working on a timeline for a general plan update. Chairman Jensen suggested getting a committee together to study the general plan, review cluster zoning, and overall density of the zoning for the entire city. He suggested the committee be made up of a couple city council members, a couple planning commissioners. Chairman Jensen requested staff post on the city website inviting volunteers for a sub-committee to discuss the general plan update. Director Christensen stated she will work with the mayor in regards to the sub-committee. Chairman Jensen suggested having a moratorium, until they know what direction they will go with cluster subdivisions; no more conditional uses proof of cluster subdivisions until there is a new ordinance. Director Christensen stated in order to have a moratorium they needed to adopt the temporary ordinance, so the council would need to do that legislatively. She stated she will take that information to the council. The planning commissioners stated they would like both R-1 Cluster Subdivisions and PRD Cluster Subdivisions discussed.

Commissioner Vaughan stated moratoriums pertain more to extreme circumstances, being major or urgent. He didn't feel for planning purposes they could justify setting a moratorium. He felt it may be premature. Chairman Jensen stated with looking at an ordinance change he felt it was adequate. City Attorney Drake stated one of two requirements must be met to successfully pass a moratorium. One, it is a compelling interest. The council must make a finding on that. Two, it is a subject that is currently unregulated. He provided the example of smoke shops. Director Christensen stated they can apply a pending ordinance, per statute, as long as the ordinance is finished within 6 months of the day it is started. Chairman Jensen suggested having one more work session for discussion of the ordinance change and the general plan update.

Commissioner Vaughan stated the planning commission needs to put in a united front when submitting the ordinance changes to the city council in order to be more effective. He asked the commissioners if there were any other changes or additions the planning commission would like to see with the ordinance. He felt that the next time they meet would be appropriate to have the proposed changes/additions in final formatting. Commissioner Rackham stated he would like to be able to review both ordinances one more time.

#### **d. Future Work Sessions/Training**

[9:06:42 PM](#)

Chairman Jensen proposed additional training for the new planning commissioners and discussed schedules.

---

MOTION TO EXTEND THE WORK SESSION MEETING AN ADDITIONAL 10 MINUTES BY COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN. NO SECOND. MOTION FAILED.

**Adjourn.** [9:08:54 PM](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
TJ Jensen, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jackie Manning, Admin Professional

**Date approved:** \_\_\_\_\_