

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, August 4, 2015

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on August 4, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present:

Commission Members: Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Dale Rackham, Vice-Chair
TJ Jensen
Curt McCuiston
Troy Moultrie
Greg Day
Grant Thorson

City Employees: Noah Steele, Planner
Jenny Schow, Planner
Brian Bloemen, City Engineer
Jo Hamblin, Deputy Fire Chief

City Council: Mike Gailey, Councilman

Excused:

Visitors: Heidi Ray Zaugg
Adam Bernard

1. Meeting Called to Order:

Invocation was given by visitor Heidi. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Moultrie.

PLANNER SCHOW ASKED IF THEY COULD AMEND THE AGENDA TO HOST IN WORK SESSION CONFERENCE ROOM AND NOT IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS DUE TO PROJECTOR TECHNICAL ISSUES. COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA LOCATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR; THE MOTION CARRIED. (No time stamps from CD audio recording)

2. Public Comment: This is an opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding your concerns or ideas, regarding items that have not been scheduled for a public hearing on this agenda. Please limit your comments to three minutes.

No public comments were made.

3. Public Hearing- Municipal Code Title X Amendments pertaining to residential zoning.

Planner Schow stated from the last meeting they opted to go ahead and move them to public hearing tonight and for the Commission to act on a motion. The code amendments are listed and as requested the general plan separately on the work session. One that might need to be revisited is the cluster subdivision ordinance. Commissioner Jensen stated he did have items on section 10.20.070 (E) that were not in the packet. Commissioner Rackham stated there was an R-1 setback that was discussed regarding it being changed to 30 and change it back to 25. Commissioner Jensen suggested they take the 10.20 items until further review, with the redline copy. 10.20.050 & 10.20.060 are in the packet. Commissioner Jensen stated he made some changes to 10.20.070, under 2, adding that any changes made are also consistent with general plan map and updating the language. Commissioner Vaughan asked if they were comfortable discussing 10.20.070 since it was not in the packet. Commissioner Rackham stated they should wait until next meeting to discuss the changes. Commissioner Vaughan states he thinks the Community & Economic Development Director should also be present to go through the code changes. Commissioner Jensen also stated it would be beneficial for the new City Attorney to weigh in on all the changes as well.

Commissioner Jensen stated the numbering changes slightly because of the standards were broken up for the general plan and general plan map and changes are consistent with both as well as updating language to be more specific. Commissioner Rackham stated these changes should be in the zoning map and not the general plan map. Commissioner Jensen stated the language should be changed in the zoning map making sure it conforms with the general plan, that the standards make more sense and not just universal for both. Changing the language in what the City Council should consider when looking at zoning changes. Commissioners and Planners agreed to table items on 10.20.070 until next meeting for the City Attorney to be available for review.

Planner Schow stated the first section is regarding Noticing, 10.20.050. Commissioner Moultrie stated it has to be voted on by the full City Council and unanimous, all members, all in favor to open it back up. Commissioner Rackham stated if it's not on the scheduled opening. Commissioner Thorson stated that's a pretty high bar to meet. Commissioner Rackham and Planner Schow stated that was the intention, so they don't add another step to open it up every time. Commissioner Jensen stated in far of the map, that every other year was sufficient for the map and 5 year from the general plan language, but the general plan language isn't changed all that often, the map changes more often.

Commissioner Thorson asked about on section 10.20.060 new section C, new part stated 'only applications submitted at least 10 days prior' is for the plan. Is there an application process to change the plan or just a backlog of amendments that they have going and not really applications. Commissioner Jensen and Vaughan stated correct, that's how it used to be done. Commissioner Rackham and Planner Schow stated there is an application on the website that's used mainly for the map, but could be used for wither one, but they have never had anyone want to change language in the general plan. Commissioner Thorson asked if they have a backlog of changes, do they have to fill out an application. Planner Schow stated no the City doesn't have to. Planner Schow if they were only allowing a 10 day opening for applying. Commissioner Rackham stated applications can be submitted anytime up to 10 days, but at 10 days prior it is closed. Commissioner Rackham stated the application currently online can be used for both. Commissioner Rackham asked if the 10 days is adequate time to notice. Planner Schow stated probably not, but there will be different factors that will depend on the type of application, they might not all be on the same agenda. Commissioner Rackham stated it was just a cutoff date. Commissioner Jensen stated they would usually have joint meeting with the Council and Planning Commission in trying to draft the final proposal.

Commissioner Rackham asked if they wanted to vote on each amendment or as a packet. Commissioner Vaughan stated they should vote on item per item because if they try to do it all at the same time, is going to be a giant mess. Commissioner Vaughan stated that they should postpone it until the new Community Development Director is online and has an opportunity to review all of it and fluent enough to talk to the existing Planning staff as well as the new City Attorney who starts on August 10th, has the opportunity to review certain key things and questions that may be brought up. Commissioner Vaughan stated it might put them back but it might be better to have the two people who will be dealing with the document the most in the future online at the beginning, so they are party to what the old was and what the proposed is. Commissioner Vaughan stated this is something they only want to submit to the Council one time.

Planner Schow stated something to consider is that the next meeting is on August 18th, which gives another meeting before the Council meets on 25th to review. Commissioner Vaughan stated it would be prudent to outline the issues or changes so they can be up to speed on those items. Planner Schow stated she thought they were pretty confident in what they had gone through last time. Commissioner Rackham agreed. Commissioner Rackham stated if the City Council won't get it until the 25th, they can vote on them with the exception of 10.20.70 that will be included in the packet for the next meeting so the recommendations can be sent at the same time.

- 10.50, establishments of zones, no changes.
- 10.55, no changes.
- 10.60 R-1, changing setback from 30 feet back to 25 feet.
- 10.60 A-1, Commissioner Jensen is okay with it being .5 per gross acre, since it is a zone that doesn't get developed very much anyway and makes the calculations easier. Most wanted to keep it the same.
- R-1, 10.60.030 had a formatting issue, paragraph instead of list.
- R-2, no changes.
- R-3, no changes.
- Cluster, lot size 1,000 smaller than R-3, but density is bigger. Cluster was created for an open space for a common use for all the residents. Changing open to common was also another change since in cluster and PRD they were backwards and the definition section had them overlapping. Multiple discussions on common space percentages, bonus densities and development uses. Commissioner Rackham stated his recommendation is to take out the bonus density table and just use verbiage.

Commissioner Rackham would like table removed and would be okay with moving the density up to R-1.

Commissioner Jensen states the bonus density could be increased to 4.75 with the incentives doubling and the remainder being applied to the trails incentive bonus.

Commissioner McCuiston stated he would like to raise the density up as well.

Commissioner Moultrie stated likes what was proposed but to change language of 1-3 as requirements and 4 & 5 as bonus incentives and might increase the density.

Commissioner Thorson stated leave it how it is and increase it to 4.75, the City get some amenities from that.

Commissioner Vaughan stated he likes the proposed numbers and strengthening it, making it simpler to understand and tighter on the developer on the standards.

Commissioner Jensen asked about other incentives that could be added, regarding trails. Planner Schow stated the City has a Trails Master plan and anybody developing within that plan should be required to install that section of the trail as part of their development instead of getting little bit and pieces of trails for a bonus density that might not connect to anything may not actually be beneficial. In the general plan update it should be clear that if developed in the Master Trail it should be started in phase one and required to go in and documentation should be more strict.

Commissioner Rackham asked regarding Trail Side, some of their trails don connect to anything and who is responsible for them. Planner Schow stated the HOA and that is an item Director Mellor has notes on, a lot of HOA's went under during the recession and asked about what recourse the City has in the event a developer goes belly up in the essence of the HOA.

Commissioner Vaughan stated it's easy to defend Commissioner Jensen's desire to have the trail incentive because they have the map, they know which open spaces are on that trail and they can put in there for the undeveloped properties that fit into the trail system, they're allowed the incentive but if they are not in an area where they would be able to connect with the trail then they don't qualify for. Commissioner Jensen stated that is why the density is the way it is, walking paths connecting to the City trail, an island property that is nowhere near a City trail they wouldn't qualify for the

density bonus. Commissioner Vaughan stated that preserves a strong desire for all of them to want trails and this way they are protecting it, so they get both.

Commissioner Jensen stated it applies to Cluster but it should be applied to all zones but has never been in the ordinances. If a developer is going to be asked to pay to put in a City trail, there needs to be some mechanism to incentivize them to do so and make sure the developer isn't being unduly charged to put that trail in for the City, it should be actable and spelled out in the ordinance.

Commissioner Rackham stated it should go in all of the zones that they need to connect to the trail system, if it is in the master plan.

Commissioner Jensen made a motion to table these items until the next meeting. Commissioner Vaughan stated since it was a public hearing asked if anyone had any comments

Ray Zaugg, Syracuse, who was also on the zoning committee, stated one of the things they struggled with on the Cluster subdivision, in reference to developers that all they want to do is maximize their density and people who want to move to the City and have a nice size lot, so how do they incentivize the developer so they will build those lots for those types of people will come to Syracuse. Also regarding people who have large trailers and RV's and would like to park them in their lots, behind their house, next to their house but the way the setback are on the sides there isn't room, especially with an R-3 where the developer is going to go 16 feet between the two houses and that is not enough room for either person to put an RV in. Several people have mentioned they would like to find bigger lots, not just a big house on a small lot but not enough space to recreate behind the lot. Cluster gives people the option to have open space without the yardwork. That's why the committee tried to incentivize a little bit and thinks they should encourage larger lots for developers, but they'll build what people will buy and there are a plethora R-3's and if they have a R-1 Cluster that is equal to or more dense than an R-3, maybe they're defeating the purpose.

Adam Bernard, Syracuse, stated he had some concerns for the time frame on the general plan map. Construction for these projects doesn't necessarily take two years to do in between phases and in changing the map, does that stop all progress unless going to the Council and ask for a unanimous vote to get the project done, so it stops the progress of the construction projects more or less. Also on Clusters, if the table is removed and take away the 50% and get this benefit, don't really have the ability to say what is in that 50%, it's hard to say that in the language and suggests keeping the table and incentivizing the amenities they want to a higher extent, like the trails raised up higher than the others, such as requirements and incentivizing the trail system.

Commissioner Jensen stated when developers come in and propose subdivisions they get the zoning or their entire subdivision before they start the phases and that wouldn't be too much of a road block but for the developer who is jumping from one project to a second project to a third or fourth project and is not planning more than six months in advance they may have to wait 6-18 months if they want to try to change the general plan that could be a problem but in general most of the developers plan very far ahead and wouldn't be a problem.

Commissioner Rackham asked Commissioner Moultrie in bonus density calculations, it states 'the density incentives must at a minimum contain 1-4 in the table' so it is there, the trail part is the extra.

Commissioner Moultrie stated he has seen developments with internal trails that are really nice and people go there as a destination rather than. Commissioner Rackham stated it's an option rather than mandatory.

Commissioner Jensen stated they might want to add some options in the Cluster for the next meeting. Commissioner Vaughan asked if Planner Schow could put together some numbers for the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE CHANGES TO TITLE X UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING AND INCORPORATE ALL THE CHANGES THAT WERE DISCUSSED. COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR, COMMISSIONER RACKHAM VOTED NO. MOTION PASSES WITH A MAJORITY VOTE.

4. **Adjourn.**

COMMISSIONER JENSEN ASKED FOR A 5 MINUTE RECESS BEFORE ADJOURNING INTO WORK SESSION. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Audio stopped)

Ralph Vaughan, Chairman

Stacy Adams, Admin Professional

Date Approved: _____