

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, November 15, 2016

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on November 15, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present:

Commission Members:	Ralph Vaughan, Chairman Greg Day Curt McCuiston Gary Bingham
City Employees:	Noah Steele, Planner Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary
City Council:	Councilman Gailey
Excused:	Commissioner Thorson Commissioner Rackham City Attorney Roberts
Absent:	Commissioner Moultrie
Visitors:	None

[6:03:45 PM](#)

1. **Meeting Called to Order:**

Commissioner Bingham provided an invocation. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner McCuiston

[6:04:55 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER MCCUITION MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 15, 2016 MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BINGHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:05:29 PM](#)

2. **Meeting Minutes:**

November 1, 2016 Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 1, 2016. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCCUITION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:06:10 PM](#)

3. **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.

[6:06:38 PM](#)

None

[6:07:35 PM](#)

4. **Public Hearing, Code Amendment – 10.28.220 Architectural Standards for Industrial Buildings**

Planner Steele stated City Council asked the Commission to look at the Architectural requirements on Industrial buildings and potentially making it a little more practical since had made an amendment earlier in the year and this is kind of a litmus test of practicality and a developer has provided some input saying are close but maybe could move it a little bit and so the current text says, 25% is required for the front and street facing exterior walls must be finished with brick, rock, stone or glass and so it is proposed to change to 15% on the front and 10% on the street facing and has worked with a potential applicant and developer and feels that this would be practical and goes along with the other requirements in the City for homes where the home has a stricter requirement for the front and lesser from the side but still do have at least some sort of requirement. In addition to the materials there is also requirements for architecture variation, in colors, textures and pop outs and that kind of thing, so it is more than just the materials that go into creating a nice building. That would be slightly reduced there and then the other one wanted to since are loosening the primary materials thought it would be a good idea to tighten up what mean by what a pop out is considered and so are defining that as 2 feet projection or recess from the wall plane.

[6:10:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked under this new ordinance, how many projects have they actually had that have been forced into complying with this. Planner Steele stated zero. Commissioner Vaughan asked if staff has had any inquiries from developers, builders, property owners, real estate people in regards to Industrial land or area in Industrial zones. Planner Steele stated they have spoken with Ninigret occasionally and do get phone inquiries but think that this applicant is the most serious that they have seen since the new zone has been adopted. Obviously IPW and Pacific Steel are under construction but they went in before the change was made for the 25% requirement. Before it just simply said what didn't

want basically blocky buildings with no variation in materials. Commissioner Vaughan asked staff if had any idea what the standard front exterior wall dimensions are, of the last few Industrial buildings that have been put up what is their total facade area has been of their facing walls. Planner Steele stated not exactly but Pacific Steel that is about a 25 foot tall building and the wall plane that runs east to west is probably a good football field long and then IPW is much smaller the street facing facade is probably about the same but much smaller. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that was their front exterior wall that are talking about, the super long side, thought they were a domino shaped building and thought the short wall was going to be the so called front. Does the code have a very strict definition of what is the front of a building, does it mean it is the main entrance. Planner Steele stated main entrance, yes. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that was a pedestrian entrance or does that necessarily mean where the docks are or where people park. Planner Steele stated it is a combination of where the front entrance is and usually on a building like that the rest of it is so boring and plain it is completely clear what is the front because it is a warehouse so they will put the architectural features along the front. Commissioner Vaughan stated his though there on this is dropping down from 25% down to 15% that is a 40% reduction. And considering that 25% isn't very much to begin with of a building facing to start with if are talking about 1,000 feet of front exterior wall and 25% so that would be 250 feet would be the 25% of that and if reduce that by 40% that brings it down another 80 square feet, now are at 160 feet, so a whopping saving to them is an exterior finish on less than 100 square feet of surface area. Planner Steele stated he ran this by the developer and that was kind of the instruction from the Commission last meeting to see what was feasible and if remember the street side where left it last time 5% so actually increased that by 10% on the street side and then the front side were down to 20% so that actually went down a little to 15%. In answering the question of if it is a cost savings, don't know exactly what the cost savings is for that but do have a developer that is comfortable with these proposed percentages and was not comfortable with 25%.

6:15:13 PM

Commissioner Bingham asked if there are situations where the front exterior wall would be the same as the street facing wall. Planner Steele stated yes. Commissioner Bingham stated then the rest of the building wouldn't have a need. Planner Steele stated yes, if wanted to come back and try to negotiate higher could it is just are kind of walking that line where want the tenants and want the economic development and jobs and want to be able to be competitive because of the surrounding competitions, larger cities and a little bit more convenient but ultimately in the past Syracuse City has had the attitude that are not opposed to growth but if it is going to happen then it better be really nice and so see a lot of the buildings, like the library or Wendy's or other buildings has been the attitude that will have a high architectural standard for buildings and there has been a lot of pressure recently to continually reduce things as a Planner are trying to create sense of place and retain property values and health, safety, welfare and just try to give the facts for the Commission. Ultimately it is the direction that the elected officials want to take the community and so are trying to, are not desperate but are really see the advantages of having a daytime population because businesses have struggled so much so they are willing to start loosening that up. Don't know if there is a direct correlation with high architectural standards and the high vacancy and lease rates that are demanding from that higher standard, could be. Personally, has a background in design so think it is important but don't think it is compromising too much going down to 15% but ultimately it is whatever the Commission wants to recommend to City Council and is happy to try to analyze what the recommendation is and provide the facts.

6:17:39 PM

Commissioner Vaughan stated forgive him if is getting too specific is not trying to find out exactly the pad they are talking about but is this in an area where currently have no Industrial buildings or for a lack of better term the Ninigret area. Planner Steele stated it is not secret they haven't applied or anything so the drawings aren't something that could be put in the packet but it is directly adjacent to IPW and Pacific Steel on the parcel to the north so the buildings would be fronting SR-193 or the fronts might be shifted so some of the buildings will face either east or west and the majority of the buildings will face north towards SR-193. Commissioner Vaughan stated in this particular case or in this instance in this theoretical situation where might be talking about a developer as opposed to an actual user of the property is not his burden to be able to make payments or is doing that is trying to handle a build to suit and with the addition of 10% this is going to put his tenant in a higher rent bracket and that is going to keep him from coming in. Planner Steele stated the developer told staff that these would be spec Industrial buildings and said is trying to find a build to suit type situation which if have a bird in hand and they want to come that is usually that is where can work with that brand and company because they want to establish their headquarters and are willing to usually fork out the money required to make their flagship building look nice but where it is a spec building sometimes are small businesses or businesses that are relocating and their main priority is not necessarily the amount of brick on the facade, so have to protect the City's interest and also try to find the balance. As far as spec buildings go, the CED Director Mellor is really in on the Economic Development side and get copied in on emails from EDCUtah and they work with companies from out of state and attracting them to Utah and have will give code names for projects like 'Project Eagle' and are looking for x number of square feet and provide 200 jobs an need this much traffic counts, etc. and there is a trend with these companies they are looking for spec space, they are looking for something that is already built, so this is big boon for the City to actually have some space that is available ad open, Industrial space the City has plenty of little commercial spaces, but Industrial space where these companies could locate could really be beneficial for the City. Commissioner Vaughan asked if have had any requests for the Council or any individual members for the Commission to consider dropping this requirement or is this just something that is originating from an applicant. Planner Steele stated the applicant has met with a couple Councilmembers and then the Council pushed it out via email and then asked the Commission to look at it. Commissioner Vaughan stated is just concerned that they have an ordinance that haven't even used it yet and are being asked to change it. Planner Steele stated that is exactly right. Commissioner Vaughan stated what did they create an ordinance if 2 weeks later are changing is, is part of his concern there but on the other hand for the benefit of fellow Commissioners is

willing to make adjustments and amendments if staff is in a position to tell them to land something that the City is definitely interested in, if that is what it would take to get them in would be interested in doing that. On the other hand, if they make the adjustment and do not land this particular applicant then the day after says is not interested would ask for it to be put back on the agenda to raise it back up again. Planner Steele stated think the existential question of whether or not are amending the ordinance think that has already been determined by the City Council for them, they are amending it, they want to do it and have asked for a recommendation so really what have on the table here is, does this language work, not work or would they make a suggestion to change it. Commissioner Vaughan stated sees no reason that they can't support this.

[6:23:44 PM](#)

Public Hearing Opened.

[6:24:01 PM](#)

Public Hearing Closed.

[6:24:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated he sees no objection if this is something that they have and trusts in staff if this is something that would be beneficial for the Commission to do, is totally in support of it.

[6:24:31 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO THE CHANGE AS PROPOSED IN 10.28.220. MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BINGHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:25:19 PM](#)

Public Hearing, Code Amendment - 10.30.080 Buffer Yards

Planner Steele stated this one contains a lot of detail, last meeting reviewed the table briefly and received a little bit of direction to work with and other staff members to continue and revise it. In the packet is the existing ordinance that is 11 pages and has some fuzzy images and a lot of options. Staff tried to consolidate it down to make it more simple and more direct and the challenge with this is there is a lot of different circumstances and a lot of different places where the standard buffer doesn't make sense. The first step is to identify the land use category of the existing land uses so would look in table 1 and it is consolidated into 6 categories and that is independent of zoning, it is more based off of the building type or the use. Then the second step is to refer to table 2 and see the situation that is at hand, so a SFD next to A-1 would require no buffer, so these required buffer types something that staff went through and tried to anticipate what the needs are and figure out what the right separation is. Table 3 has letters that correspond to the previous tables to see what is required. Now there is kind of a preference if someone is already there and established so the person that is bringing the potential conflict of land uses is the one that has to bring the buffer. For example if have a farm field next to a proposed residential development obviously are not going to make the farmer put up the fence, it would be the developer that puts up the fence or if it is an Industrial in existing and propose to put residential it is the residential developer that would be required but vice versa if there is a housing complex and the Industrial user wants to go next to them it is the Industrial user that would have to put up the buffer. Hopefully have had a chance to review the different circumstances and can go through that, it is very detailed so is open to any questions if see a particular circumstance where disagree and can make a different recommendation for that type of buffer or if see that in the buffers there is a certain type that would like to see like a moat with a 20 foot wall with crocodiles could create a new type for that one if felt was necessary.

[6:30:04 PM](#)

Public Hearing Opened.

[6:30:19 PM](#)

Public Hearing Closed.

[6:30:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated wanted to thank staff for the effort put into this and after reviewing it think that it would be a great addition and great simplification to the City's very complex Buffer ordinance. Commissioner Vaughan stated first off, his compliments to staff for being able to synthesize it down to a much simpler state, great job to staff that was tasked to do that, it is not easy dealing with those checkerboard charts. One of the things he does note that have lost chain link fences and chain link fences with slats think that is a major improvement and when weigh something like that against 10% on an Industrial building would much rather lose chain link fence than retaining something else like that so think this will make a big, big difference.

[6:31:34 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER MCCUSITION MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL THE ORDINANCE REVISION FOR BUFFER YARDS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BINGHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED WITH A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

[6:32:07 PM](#)

5. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER MCCUSITION MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN TO WORK MEETING. COMMISSIONER DAY SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Date Approved: _____

Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary