

# Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, March 15, 2016

---

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on March 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  
Dale Rackham, Vice Chair  
TJ Jensen  
Curt McCuiston  
Troy Moultrie  
Greg Day  
Grant Thorson

City Employees: Noah Steele, Planner  
Royce Davies, Planner  
Paul Roberts, City Attorney  
Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary  
Jo Hamblin, Deputy Fire Chief  
Brian Bloemen, City Engineer

City Council: Councilman Mike Gailey

Excused:

**Visitors:**

Shawn Hartley	Eric Thomas	Trent Hartley
Brad Lasater	Patrick McReaken	Deanna Haskett
Blair Haskett	Adam Bernard	Con Wilcox
Ashley Page	Matt Reed	

[6:02:45 PM](#)

1. **Meeting Called to Order:**

Commissioner Day provided an invocation. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Rackham.

[6:03:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Day advised Commissioner Vaughn that he will need to recuse himself from discussion on item #4 when it comes up.

[6:04:10 PM](#)

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

[6:04:25 PM](#)

2. **Meeting Minutes:**

**March 1, 2016 Regular Meeting & Work Session**

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGULAR AND WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 1, 2016. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:05:01 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.

None

[6:05:45 PM](#)

4. **Public Hearing, General Plan Map Amendment R-1 to R-2 Residential - Criddle Farm Estates property located at 715 S 4000 W**

Commissioner Day excused himself.

[6:06:59 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated this is a General Plan Amendment for property located at 715 S 4000 W. It currently is not annexed so it does not have current zoning it is under the jurisdiction of the County and the applicant wanted to see how the General Plan change request went. Current General Plan for that area is R-1 and the request id for R-2 and the reason for the request are to get additional lots, if they were to develop under the R-1 they would get approximately 82 lots and under the R-2 it would be approximately 107 lots. It is on the west edge of the City and is known as the Criddle property. The existing General Plan the show it is not annexed into the City and West Point to the north and to the west there is a pocket of County land and to the south is a PRD project that will be coming through the pipeline soon. To the east there is similar zoning in R-1 and R-2 and it is near Rock Creek Park.

[6:08:55 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked staff if the big slab of gray west of the PRD as he understands is currently in West Point's annexation boundary. Planner Steele stated yes. Commissioner Jensen asked if it was currently annexed into West Point. Planner Steele stated he did not believe so. Commissioner Jensen stated so it is still under the County.

[6:09:54 PM](#)

Eric Thomas, 875 E 3588 N in North Ogden, Chair and Commissioners appreciate the opportunity to speak with them today. They have requested and are working with the Wilcox Family the property owners on this piece of property and requesting the zoning change have had some discussion and design as they have gone through and the property works with the R-2 zone, they are not, with the design and the Master Plan of the Trail and everything through there in order to make this property work and blend with the property to the south that is a PRUD they are asking for that Map Amendment change not a rezone since it is not in the City currently and would like to put it into Syracuse City with this zone attached. Does believe that Doug's place is going, that little notch out is going to go to the same zone, that is the plan, the little notch on the map is where one of the family members lives and that will go with the overall, when it is annexed in, it will go with the same zone so there won't have a little notch out that is different. Believe the surrounding properties what they have planned is very similar to what they see down at Bridgeway Island down to the south as far as lot size that they are trying to accomplish. Eric Thomas stated he wasn't aware that Rock Creek was an R-1 and asked staff is that was actually an R-1 Cluster, since their lots will be bigger. Planner Steele stated it was built before his time, but believes it was developed as a Cluster. Commissioner Jensen stated it was developed as a Cluster. Eric Thomas stated as a reference point although both R-1's in the surrounding area are actually smaller than today's R-1 zone, they would probably be more in line with an R-2 or even smaller lot size so it is really a fit for the surrounding neighborhood of that similar lot size and development.

[6:12:28 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated when they put the notice out that little notch out wasn't included in the noticed area, but also wants to have that little notch out included as part of the R-2 request. Eric Thomas stated yes, as this being a Map Amendment and not a Rezone so think if his property isn't already in the City maybe that is why it is different but when it comes in, it will come in with the like zone. Commissioner Jensen stated the General Plan does contemplate properties that are outside of the City currently so they certainly could accomplish that today, that wouldn't change the current zoning but if they are going to change it, now is a good time to talk about it. Planner Steele stated that the noticing that was sent out to add that notch in wouldn't have changed the noticing list significantly.

[6:13:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan opened up the Public Hearing

[6:13:57 PM](#)

Public Hearing closed

[6:14:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated when the PRD that was proposed there to the south and this will tie into the discussion tonight so bear with him, when that was annexed into the City as an PRD there was an annexation agreement that went along with that but at the time they had a lot of residents which were opposed to having a PRD out there in any form and the reason that PRD was located there is because the Planning Commission at that time when that General Plan was approved felt like they wanted to scatter some higher density developments throughout the City but since that has been done they have had extensive push back on anymore PRD's in the City and especially the ones that were outliers and before they change the General Plan they did actually remove all of the other developed PRD's from the City except for this one and the only reason they didn't do this one from his stand point was the person was already trying to get it annexed it and didn't want to pull the rug out from under them essentially and have the General Plan show a different zoning than what is currently there since it would be a higher zoning but where they have had so many residents push back on the PRD would like to make the suggestion that since this R-1 to the north is not annexed in yet that would like to see the applicant lower the density on that PRD to an R-2 in order to get the change the R-1 to the north to an R-2 to make it congruent with the adjacent properties otherwise as a Commissioner and the other Commissioners may have their own opinions on this don't think and have had neighbors contact him and they really feel that west of 4000 west that is there that they do not want to see R-2 crossing that line and they did not want to see the PRD either but there is an annexation agreement so think that through an annexation agreement they could accomplish changing the zoning on both but just know that they have the General Plan for a reason and if they keep changing it, why even have a General Plan.

[6:16:31 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated he has a question for his own benefit, knows that they plan density and the City Engineer and City Planners will put together proposed utilities and improvements based on what they feel total build out will be and wondering as they adopt more in and change zoning and go above their initial planned cap if that is going to present a lot of extra stress upon the Engineer and the Planner to accommodate these new developments of if that shouldn't be a concern of the Planning Commission because it is something that is relatively easy to fix and wondering if the City Engineer or Planner could comment briefly on that. Planner Steele stated with any development there is additional load on our system and transportation systems, water, secondary all those things and the efficiency of single family development isn't as efficient as strictly speaking of utilities as efficient as higher density but they do charge impact fees to try to compensate for some of those increases in capacity that might be needed in the future.

[6:18:035 PM](#)

Brian Bloemen, City Engineer, stated it is always a concern when increasing densities, in this location though is not as concerned with it, not talking about that many more roof tops so from a public utilities stand point think what is in 4000 W can serve either an R-1 or and R-2, so it shouldn't require and major upsizing of existing utilities to serve this.

[6:18:32 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated one other point he noticed and checked West Point's General Plan and looks they are planning R-1 to the north as a data point.

[6:18:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked Commissioner McCuiston if he knows what the density for West Point's R-1 is. Commissioner McCuiston stated he didn't look that up. Commissioner Thorson stated their R-1 is a little less dense than Syracuse.

[6:19:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated he agrees with Commissioner Jensen in that we have a plan and in planning a City in his opinion go denser in the middle and go less dense on the outside and have said it before when they were talking about the Black Island Properties the dense stuff shouldn't go at the end of the roads and the roads get more stuff this is extending a denser population, 4000 W is a great place to draw a line and keep a zone together and if they go R-2 they create that R-1 island at Rock Creek Park. Is against it in that they have a plan and assumed it was a well thought out plan and when they break the boundary at 4000 W don't see another boundary really for the next subdivision or the next place.

[6:20:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated had a couple questions for staff, this particular property right now is not in the City as we well know, it is the City's sphere of influence, does the City's sphere of influence extend to the west beyond this property, knows West Point is to the north, but what do they have to the west and coupled with that because they would have infrastructure going into this property would it be the intention if they do have a sphere of influence to the west would they be putting in or recommending a through road through this parcel to already preplanned servicing the next lot to the west. Planner Steele stated the west edge of those two properties is where the sphere of influence would end, in the annexation declaration document there is a map attached and it ends and is defined by the edge of this so that would be West Point's territory of what they plan on annexing. There is a road, 700 S that borders the property on the north and there may be some road improvements needed once that gets further down the line, can't speak to specifics but that road does already go through and then per the ordinance for Fire service and emergency response anything over 25 homes requires 2 access points so it doesn't say that they would have to have stub over there but good planning that would be worked out in the subdivision phases, the concept and preliminary phases of their subdivisions plan would work those details out of where stub roads and cul-de-sacs and right now are primarily trying to decide if want that extra density in this location, already determined that are okay with residential homes just whether or not want the extra density at this location.

[6:22:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated he will predicate his first question based upon an assumption, the numbers they have, the projection on the factual summation if they go R-1 it is 82 lots, R-2 it is 107 lots, is that based on the newest sizing that they did in the zoning just a month or two ago. Planner Steele stated yes, it was changed to gross and so it just a simple multiplication of the 2.3 versus the 3, gross acre that is not including roads and things, so that is not saying exactly, that is not saying that is what, how many lots would be in the subdivision, but that is the very rough math and in addition there is a minimum lot size that would be enforced there as well, but that is something staff would have to look at more with the specifics of the layout of what they propose.

[6:23:23 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated that now they have adjusted the lot size, is the developed project on the east side of the street that is showing R-1 on the map, are the new lot sizes, how close are they to the old designation of R-1. Basically saying would the new R-2 be about same size as the old R-1. Planner Steele stated if they go with a broad brush think generally yes this would be a similar sized lot neighborhood but haven't done that analysis, could but being that wasn't involved with that subdivision to the east do not know what the density is or what the lot sizes were on that.

[6:24:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated that R-1 to the east is an R-1 Cluster which was used to create Rock Creek Park and at that time that that Cluster was done they had a 25% open space requirement under the old Cluster ordinance when it was built and so the density is significantly higher though because essentially the density of those lots even with the park there is higher than what an R-1 would normally allow. To answer the other question, when they changed, adjusted the R-1 and the R-2 from net to gross, the actual densities did not increase in fact the R-1 dropped from 2.33 to 2.3 so not to carry the extra .03 but the only significant change is that the minimum lot size went from 10,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet, however in both cases the average lot size was still over 15,000 square feet so the average lot sizes never changed.

[6:25:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated that was going to be the second part of his questions in regards to any credits because of Rock Creek Park and then if know it, know what an R-1 lot size or R-2 lot size is in West Point, which would be the adjacent property to the north. Planner Steele stated he does not. Commissioner McCuiston stated he was looking for that info. McCuiston stated he found 2.2 units per acre for R-1 in West Point and R-2 is 2.7 units per acre.

Commissioner Jensen asked if they list the minimum lot size or do they have that. Commissioner McCuiston stated he did not have that info. Planner Steele stated pretty comparable.

[6:26:43 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated there is one other thing he wanted to bring up although they have not been privy to that document as of yet for those who have been following the progress of the Parks Master Plan the recommendation from JUB Engineers recommended there be a small neighborhood park somewhere in this area which think under the R-1 ordinance could be accomplished very easily using the Cluster however on the R-2 they might be some wiggle room but the resulting size of that park would be significantly less so the thought of Rock Creek Park is fairly close there but for the residence that are over by Bridgeway that is a bit of a walk for them and they generally like to try to have a park within a half mile and would be more than a half mile walk to get to there and this area might actually be a good place for a small neighborhood park as the Parks Master Plan identified. There is some land that was going to be set aside in the PRD for a park but combining that with the R-1 to the north could accomplish a pretty nice little amenity there. Planner Steele stated the Parks Master Plan did come back saying needed more parks and more neighborhood parks and the R-1 Cluster could be applied to this property if that is what they wanted to do but that would be up to the property owner if that was something they wanted to pursue. It sounds like they are willing to help with the Trail Master Plan going through, sounds like they are planning on extending that through the property.

[6:28:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked the other Commissioners in regards to an R-1 or R-2 is to ask themselves the question would a 25% increase in lot size which would be also an increase in traffic count, intersection would remain the same, water and sewer would increase by 25%, storm drains negligible, electric and power by 25%, fire protection potentially by 25%, garbage collection by 25%, would that be enough to change from a positive or a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding this project and if find it either way in a proposed motion if could have a finding as part of the motion that it does or does not affect the existing infrastructure and public services as mentioned. Since the Commission does not get many opportunities to make a recommendation like this to City Council so want to make sure we cover all our bases.

[6:30:00 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked Commissioner Rackham who as on the General Plan Committee if he had any thoughts on this. Commissioner Rackham stated looking at the change they did to 10.20.060 General Plan Amendment and as part of the proposal they are supposed to provide an impact statement to cover the items Commissioner Vaughan just discussed.

[6:30:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated again does think this area does need to be looked at a little bit more holistically, the General Plan will be open again in January of 2017 since this is the first time they have actually officially closed the General Plan. Again looking at that PRD to the south and know the residents don't want it, between the PRD and the R-1 to the north the land owner is already getting effectively R-2 on the density and is just not comfortable, at some point the General Plan needs to mean something and as have said before at this time just don't see the need to increase this to an R-2, R-1 is a marketable property and haven't had any residents here to push back on this but at some point they have to say that the General Plan means something.

[6:31:28 PM](#)

Commissioner Moultrie stated he agrees. They need to stop changing the General Plan and they also need to think about the citizens, the people out there. Always looks at 3 things when he is making some kind of deal. It has to be good for the seller, it has to be good for buyer and has got to be good for the other individuals who might be part of the sale, if it is not for all 3, it is not a good deal and think this is a one sided, it is good for the seller, it is not good for the buyer, a lot of the citizens want larger lots and want a place for kids to play, they want a backyard, they don't want their kids playing in the street, they already have crowded roads, schools are already crowded, lets stand by what the citizens want and what is good for the citizens and go by what they have already put out as far as a General Plan goes and stop changing it.

[6:32:37 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER THORSON MADE A MOTION THAT THEY RECOMMEND **DISAPPROVAL** TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON AN R-2 GENERAL PLAN MAP CHANGE BASED ON THE CONFORMANCE TO THE GENERAL PLAN AND RETIANING THE GENREAL PLAN INTACT AS R-1 AND THE IMPACT TO THE INFASTRUCTURES. MOTION WAS SECONED BY COMMISSIONER JENSEN. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:34:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Day returned to the Commission. Commissioner Vaughan advised Commissioner Day of the previous motion.

[6:35:00 PM](#)

5. **Public Hearing, Site Plan Approval - Utah Onions property located at 850 S 2000 W**

Planner Steele stated this project is on 2000 W and this is a building that has been here for a really long time and the use has been here since the 70's, back when there was a lot more onion farms than there are now and they would like to bring their building into code compliance with the addition of a new facilities, their existing building is really old and they are proposing on the site there is processing storage facility on the diagonal where the rail used to previously serve that and has since been removed and they have a 18,000 square foot facility on the corner of the property and are proposing a 3 phases. In the first phase they would like to building another 18,000 square foot building and in phase 2 they would like

build a larger building, 48,000 square foot and then in the final phase to demolish some of the older portions along the street. 2000 W is going to be expanded this next year and the front setback will be really slim on that and that is some of their most aged, the oldest part of the facility. That is there overall plan but for this application they are applying just for the first storage facility and have established a phase boundary that will be requiring everything within that phase to be up to ordinance. So this is considered a non-conforming use, some things such as landscaping and paving, fire hydrants are not up to code but with this building they will be required to bring proportionate amount around this facility up to code and everything within that first phase and then as the second phase they will add more things and will make a non-conforming use less non-conforming. They have a landscape plan and one of the things they will be doing is creating a dense vegetation buffer between them and the homes to the west along with a 6 foot wall. There is an existing wall there and have had conversations as to what is useable and what isn't and have said anything that is not a 6 foot wall will be required to either replace it or make sure as per code requires a 6 foot solid masonry wall. So they may be able to reuse some of the wall and may be required to replace some of the wall. They will be pouring new concrete around this building for loading areas and forklifts which will reduce some of the dust that comes off of the site. The architecture of the building, the west will be primarily masked by vegetation and the south and north elevations are almost identical to what was already built. They did have an Architectural Review Committee meeting to review the project and somethings were discussed concerning their architecture and with the recently updated Steel building requirements it is still an industrial building. One thing that would like the Commission to weigh in on is the interpretation and from the ARC is the interpretation as to what is considered street facing. The ordinance says that 25% of the front street facing exterior walls needs to have brick, rock, stone or glass. Now this is going to be over 600 feet back from the road and the ARC was sympathetic for them being that it is so far off the road they were wondering what the Commission would interpret the ordinance as it not being street facing and will leave it up to the Commission as far how want to look at that because they are proposing no brick, rock or stone on the front of this building so that would be a point that would not meet the ordinance currently.

[6:41:05 PM](#)

Staff has received a number of letters from surrounding residents concerned about the noise from the exhaust fans on the building which is one of the comments and then truck noise and of course there is the smell, these letters were included in the packet. So there are some things that can be addressed if the Commission wanted to put any additional conditions on their approval that are directly tied to those potential nuisances. The fan locations on the building are facing north, some of the residents have expressed concern that those fans face north and towards their houses and that increases the amount of noise. Another concern was drainage from surrounding residents that it drains off of the property and their grading plan they are proposing to create a new catch basin, detention basin in the rear. The City Engineer has reviewed the plans as well as fire. Also in the packet they have included a summary of addressing all of the concerns that have been brought up for them. One of the things that will affect the project is that UDOT will be expanding 2000 W and they will be redoing the curd and gutter and the entrances and so that is one of the reasons they are starting back off the road because they want to wait for UDOT to finish their project to see how it will affect their phase 2 and then with their phase 2 site plan they will have to address the entrances. Staff has asked them to restrict their entrance down to 35 feet because the way the site is right now it is all kind of gravel and the exits and entrances are quite wide, which can cause problems for pedestrians. They have included a set of industrial performance standards that is required by ordinance that talks about their process and a little about what goes on the site and some of the potential hazards so they are documented as to what to expect and addressing some of the things they do to reduce those impacts. Along with the letters from neighbors and a few additional phone calls, but thinks have summarized their concerns with what said so far.

[6:44:23 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked staff regarding the proposed 3 phases, which phase covered the landscaping and fencing. Planner Steele stated phase 1 will have all of the landscape and fencing on the west and up to the edge of the first 18,000 square foot building and then phase 2 landscaping will include everything north of that on the west edge and the entire north edge will have a fence and landscaping and then some landscaping in front of the phase 2 building and then phase 3 once they demolish the old building they will have room for some additional landscaping.

[6:45:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked staff the phase 2 and phase 3 did the ARC talk at all about making sure that those comply with the existing ordinance as far as the front facing. Planner Steele stated yes, in fact the applicant said that if they are not required to put the rock on phase 1 they would be willing to take that extra effort and out it on the phase 2 building above what were already planning on doing and then phase 3 doesn't have any additional building but they would be require to repair whatever was between what they demolish and the ruminant building. Commissioner Jensen asked staff if knows how wide the entry way is off 2000 W. Planner Steele stated 35 feet. Commissioner Jensen asked if there was going to be any type of screening to either side of the entry way. Planner Steele stated on the landscape plan they are proposing street trees and haven't gone into much detail on the front since it will be in the future phase but for purpose of this are counting this towards their landscaping. Commissioner Jensen asked staff if know when they are contemplating putting in that screening. Planner Steele stated with the phase 2 facility. Commissioner Jensen asked if phase 2 was waiting until UDOT was done or the timeline on that. Planner Steele stated from their proposed timeline on the plans and it revolves around the onion crop and are trying to get each new phase in place before the onion crop is mature so phase 1 they have an ambitious goal of being done by July of this year and then phase 2 they would like to be done by February of 2017, so it is a pretty accelerated timeline. Commissioner Jensen stated so within a year essentially, just wanted it on the record. Planner Steele stated since this is part of the industrial zone these uses are approved uses and what is under

staff's prevue is to talk about how they meet the ordinance and how they can reduce those impacts of their use to the surrounding area, staff can't say they can't do their use that has already been pre-approved for so many years.

[6:48:39 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated he has a few questions and as a disclosure he is on the Architecture Review Committee and did meet with the applicant and other representatives Monday of last week and then also was out at the location yesterday to do an onsite inspection to physically look at the property and while he was there came in contact with one of the people that was at that meeting and is assuming will speak tonight. He did not do any lobbying and didn't ask him any special favors just a pure discussion and asked questions and was given answers. Have approximately 6 questions and don't know if staff can answer them or if the applicant will need to answer them. Number 1, the Flurer property on their east facing wall, a concrete wall, along that wall there are approximately 5 dead Aspen trees, 30-40 feet tall, they are in the current state of pushing the wall off the foundation, it is now leaning at a 5-15 degree angle onto the property. The question would be whose wall is that, will that wall be replaced and who is responsibility is it going to be. Number 2, at the corner of where the Flurer property goes from straight north south bending to the southwest there is approximately a 100 gallon fuel tank about 8 feet up in the air, it is not labeled and don't know what is in it and don't know what the fuel capacity is and it is sitting on dirt, and looking at the dirt it appears to be dripping or leaking or something to that effect. Number 3, there is different fencing in some parts of the property, there is chain link topped with barbed wire directly below the south properties that run to the farthest west corner of the long building towards 2200, will that fence be coming out, being moved and any other chain link with barbed wire topped fence or Concertina fence, will those be remaining in place. Number 4, will the driveway from 2000 W leading to this new construction be paved or will that be left the way it is right now. Number 5, with the construction of this new building they will no longer have field boxes stored outside, which would cut down on odor. Number 6, assuming this project does pass and go through do they have any indication or does the Commission have any desires to restrict hours of construction in as much as this project is directly up against a residential neighborhood. Lastly, in regards to the fences on the north south wall note behind the page and Estrada property that the fence changes from concrete block wall to vinyl fence, it appears as though the vinyl and concrete block wall are exactly sitting on the same lines so wondering, if the fence is on the home owners property will the developer or the applicant here be putting up another 6 foot fence along that or are they going to require that as part of the landscaping.

[6:52:59 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated he will take a stab at it, does not know the answer to all of the questions but will start with the fence. As part of phase 1, staff will require the block wall and fencing to be installed within, the ordinance says within 4 months of certificate of occupancy and will have them bond for those improvements so that can ensure that they will be occupying the building will have them bond for those improvement so that can ensure that they were done correctly and trees can enter a warranty period and can release the bond once it is completed. As far as who owns the wall to a certain extent it doesn't matter as long as there is a wall, do not know who owns the wall and haven't walked that line and don't know if it was part of the subdivision if it was part of the subdivision if it was then the applicant never had to build the wall and might if they can somehow repair or replace it that is up to them. As far as the fuel storage maybe Fire can comment on the appropriate fuel storage, wasn't aware that they had that storage and maybe even Engineering might know something about the effects on that on a detention basin. As far as the barbed wire on top of the fence, believe that barbed wire ends outside of the phase line and on a separate parcel and maybe the applicant can verify that when they come up. The driveway, there is a balance trying to make as far as the non-conforming use and what is appropriate. In future phases they have agreed to make sure that they have all of their parking requirements, parking stalls that are required in the ordinance table to be paved and striped. Since this is a warehouse facility, in the ordinance it doesn't require any additional parking spaces, they do have some existing paved spots but the drive isle is not paved so that is something that they have agreed to look at in the future phase, at this phase they weren't planning on paving the drive back to the future building, that is something to look at if feel that is proportionate to their non-conforming use to include as to what feels is appropriate for the requirements of the site. Planner Steele stated regarding the field boxes is not sure the applicant could tell them imagines that since the new facility will store onions a lot of the boxes will go inside but not sure if all of them will. Commissioner Vaughan asked if they have ever had to staff's knowledge had a vector control issue with harvesting and processing facilities like this. Planner Steele asked what vector control was. Commissioner Thorson stated rats. Planner Steele stated okay, thanks. Commissioner Jensen stated vermin control. Planner Steele stated he is not aware of any but that is a good question for the applicant or the neighbors. Commissioner Vaughan stated that is one reason they have a block wall as opposed to a vinyl fence so they have a positive aspect on that.

[6:57:29 PM](#)

Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated he would have to go out and look at the fuel storage, there are required it would have to meet if it is not meeting those requirements then could work with the building occupant or owner to bring that up to code but would have to go out and look at it and see what they have.

[6:57:53 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston asked regarding the northern most access would it make more sense during phase 2 to slide it more north to line up Heritage Parkway so there are fewer driver conflicts in the turning movement there. Planner Steele stated he thinks it would and have asked the applicant to provide them with a letter of approval from UDOT since it is a State road and they have submitted a request for the letter and are in contact and is something staff will require that UDOT approves but think that is a good idea that it will line up and would have to shift slightly to the north.

[6:58:57 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken, 2107 E 25 S in Layton, stated they appreciate the opportunity to address the Commission. The owners of Utah Onions are also present tonight Shaun, Red & Trent and they are able also to address any issues they would like to ask. In the renovation it is about 5 fold, the facilities as mentioned were occupied by Utah Onions back in 1977, they have had other occupancies before that not sure how old they are but from the 40's or 50's based on the construction type. The need though is to renovate the facilities by replacing them and starting a demolition project afterwards. As mentioned with phase 1 they will build a storage facility for the onions and a lot of the crates. Phase 2 they will build a processing plant that replaces a lot of the functions that are presently in this large older building along the old railroad track, that is going to be replaced, this is the processing function that will be in the phase 2 building in the future. Phase 3 then is removal of the older facility which is timber construction, type 3 constructions, ancient and needs to be replaced. The need also is in phase 2 they will install a new piece of automated equipment to help in the process, they will still have the same number of jobs however it makes the hours lesser as they process the onions. Their objective is to build an enhanced landscape buffer zone for the neighbors there that they see as being very critical, along with phase 1 and phase 2 will be a 6 foot block wall fencing. There is a need also to enhance the front entry way as noticed on the other plan there is a lot of landscaping in the front they are dovetailing with the renovation of 2000 W and will be fully landscaped to the City standard along that area there and through phase 2 and phase 3 landscaping. Phase 2 happens from the fall of 2016 through about the early spring of 2017. The demolition part and phase 3 landscaping starts in the spring of 2017 and should be done before the end of summer that is there objective and it is aggressive. One of their objectives also is enhancing the face to the public and the phase 1 building is 600 feet off the street it will be barely visible by the end of 2017 as the phase 2 and phase 3 projects are complete. Have been working with UDOT on the dovetailing of the projects, their 2000 W renovation will have the design complete in May 2016 and start construction after that and by the end of May expect to have enough information to complete the design for phase 2 and start the design for phase 3 so it well integrates with the UDOT plans.

[7:04:23 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated can also address the issues brought up earlier by Commissioner Vaughan. The fence area over on the west with the Flurer property there are 5 trees as mentioned starts to lean the fence over, that fence on the west is a full 6 foot and on the east it is just short of 6 foot. The ownership of the fence is not sure if it is a real issue, it might be but have to work with their legal folks to find out what their responsibility is in that area, if the trees on the neighbors side are pushing the fence over will have to see how legal sees it but they would like to work with the neighbors and to work with the best answer for the final. The fuel tank that is out there have viewed that as a piece of equipment, it is not a piece of real property, still though it does need a dyke which needs to be installed and that is perhaps an oversight, it out to be made more of a fixed facility rather than a mobile structure and they need to fix that area and should be accomplished in phase 1 and will add that into the project. The fence is a block fence that starts down on the neighbor's lot on Sorensen Construction and runs up through along and stops as being CMU and then from there on up it is vinyl and vinyl off to the north. In phase 2 they will build a 6 foot high masonry fence north south and along up to the street area. It will either be 8 inch block wall or what was mentioned at the architecture review meeting having a Simtech wall and have found other manufactures and plan to have that as an option to the block wall fence but will bring that to the ARC as they meet for phase 2. The driveway as mentioned is 35 foot width in their plan which believes is the maximum allowed by Syracuse. They are making a short in-house study to see if that will meet their truck needs or if it needs to be a bit wider and if it needs to be wider from their study they will approach staff to see if that is a possibility. UDOT allows up to 60 feet but they would like to stay at 35 feet if it meets their needs. The field boxes a lot of those boxes that are presently stacked in the yard area a lot of those will be housed in the new facility in phase 1 and also in part of phase 2 facility once it is operational in the spring of 2017, not sure if they will all fit in there but that is their objective, they want to enclose things, they want to have an enclosed operation to minimize the odor drift if you will and watch out for their neighbors that way. Their desire is to restrict the hours of operation on the construction of phase 1 and not operate after what would be reasonable say 6 o'clock at night however as he states that on the one hand they need to get the phase 1 building up and operational by the 1<sup>st</sup> of August, that is their objectives, that is the start of harvest season and the trucks are arriving. So they need to temper that to just use the hours that they need but not 3 in the morning of course that is not a doable thing for them either. The north entry is not what the traffic engineers would say is aligned with Heritage Parkway, they are concerned about that and are working with UDOT. In their past operations they have found though that the offset helps them somewhat and will let the owners address that but having the offset from Heritage helps them somewhat in the entries. What their objective is to have the trucks enter from the north, drive into the new staging area for the trucks to park and they will back up offload onions in the new phase 2 building and will then drive out through the south exit. Their understanding of how the traffic has worked in the past is it was really beneficial having the vehicles drive in from the north and not turn immediately through a traffic signal that might be there in the future. The exhaust fans in the past in the building that was built about 5 years ago, the fans on there had a barring problem, once they heard about that they had the barring replaced and the noise thinks subsided, it was fixed at that point. Their objective is stay up on the maintenance to make sure the mechanical equipment operates properly and they hear of things themselves or hear of things from the neighbors they are going to fix those. Thank you that is all I have.

[7:12:32 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated they are talking about phase 1 today but asked regarding phase 2 there are going to be some truck loading docks all along the south side of that building, is that how that will work. Patrick McReaken stated yes, they will have about 4 docks places somewhere along the north building that will face south. Commissioner Jensen asked if those are going to be paved where the trucks will back in. Patrick McReaken stated they will be paved and also down set will be the beds match up with the dock. Commissioner Jensen stated had talked about a new staging area and

removing the old timber building in phase 3 so the new building is going to be a lot farther away from 2000 W than the current building. Patrick McReaken stated the old building will be demolished and they will reface the front of the other building so it matches with the City standards. Commissioner Jensen stated so it will just become a staging area for trucks. Patrick McReaken stated right. Commissioner Jensen stated it sort of applies to this phase but since they will be coming back to them for phase 2 and 3, would like at the very least see the very east portion of that paved, so the trucks in the staging area have a place to clean off before they get onto the road. Commissioner Jensen stated it has been about 2 decades now but used to work for Sorenson Construction so know that their entire back area is essentially packed rock for their pavement and that works just fine there is really not much stuff getting tracked out onto the road but that last couple 100 feet or so is paved so can pull the truck up onto the pavement so if it is a really wet year or something can take the time to clean the truck off that would be his only concern and won't hold this up today but would like to see the eastern portion of that paved. Staff had asked the Commission what they may think about having all of it paved and as far as, as long as it is hard pack surface or road base or whatever is sufficiently deep that trucks aren't going to be sinking into it doesn't see an issue with that. The main thing is want to make sure the stuff that is up against 2000 W that there is a pavement pad there so the trucks can. Patrick McReaken stated the entry way has to meet the UDOT standard, thinks it is GW-04 or something like that and it calls for a concrete surface that meets all of the geometric standards of UDOT. Pavement on this area that is a large budget item and not sure how that will fit in but will have to deal with that economically. Commissioner Jensen stated his main thing is they talk about staging area for the trucks that they have a place where they can park on pavement so when they can conduct cleaning. Patrick McReaken stated they would like to have it that way, they would like to. Commissioner Jensen stated doesn't think the entire thing needs that but would like to see when they come off the road they can stay on pavement until the staging area and then they go to the truck docks everything else is flexible on since staff had asked the question.

[7:16:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked the applicant how does the operation increase by truck volume, onion volume do they have a metric they could give that would or are they just replacing existing. Patrick McReaken stated it is a renovation project it is not an addition or an alteration for a new mission, it is a renovation of existing facilities. Commissioner Thorson stated so really not harvesting and processing any more onions. Patrick McReaken stated there is the same number of farms around here so. Commissioner Thorson stated on the architectural elevations of the new storage building in phase 1, back to the fans and louvers, the louvers are located on the north side of the building, is that a strategic placement or is there a reasoning that can't give them the noise instead of the neighbors to the north. Patrick McReaken stated it is and can ask the onion experts on that.

[7:17:50 PM](#)

Brad Dall, 868 W 2300 S Syracuse, stated the fans are basically they need the exhaust fans to keep the onions in the storage as part of the curing process and just storage so they will be good later on in the year when they pull them out and process them. They proposed doing it to the north just because of the fact that that was how the other building was there really is not a reason why they cannot consider turning them around that way that was just something they were building it like the other building that is existing.

[7:18:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated wanted to state that he does like Commissioner Thorson's idea of relocating to the south don't think it is going to be, the odor is going radiate no matter where it is but if it to the south it might give it a little bit more dispersion area to those north west residents and of course the flip side is that those on the south might get a little bit more of it, but already dealing with quite a bit there as it is, if they could locate it to the east that might be a better thing but the east is kind of the pretty side so don't know if necessarily want them on the east. Patrick McReaken stated there was a statement he recalls in the early weeks of the project that if light hits the onion it starts the green growth and start to go back, with the fans on the east or the south or the west side there is a possibility of getting light through the veins and that would harm the onions, now that is not a huge risk but it is a possibility and that is a lot of the reason as he recalls as to why it was on the north side of the first building too but that is why there are no windows on the buildings, there is no fenestration what so ever.

[7:20:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated he looked at that as a possibility to mitigate noise that the neighbors expressed and asked if it is a strategic placement for kind of that reason because it is, even wind direction can make a choice like that strategic so. Patrick McReaken asked if they can revisit that. Commissioner Thorson stated he had another question in the staff report, the written staff report it talks about a landscape architect stamp and have to decide if they care to have or require. Patrick McReaken stated it is already done. Commissioner Thorson stated in one of his responses he stated it would be in the final plans and is that the case. Patrick McReaken stated it is on the plan, takes that back, it may not be on there, depends on how the plans were copied, the one he handed in had a stamp of a landscape architect and was right beside his stamp to the left. Planner Steele stated it was not on the plans he had but is willing to. Patrick McReaken stated he believes it was on the plans he handed in to Planner Steele. Commissioner Thorson stated it was described to them that they have to decide to push it and since said would have it just want to make sure it was resolved and didn't have to worry about it. Planner Steele stated he is willing to do it and sounds like he already sent it to him through email and will review that. Patrick McReaken stated he sat down with the landscape architect and gave them input and put it on the plan and he stamped it, will get staff that plan if don't have it.

[7:22:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated it sounds like the fence, is the fence going to be half and half whatever if it is exiting that works are they going to keep it. Patrick McReaken stated that is there thought right now based on economics and budget, knows it is an older fence. Commissioner Thorson stated he sees the fence and coordinating fence replacement with neighbors as being one of the biggest things to keep neighbors happy and so don't have a requirement other than a recommendation to pay attention to that. Patrick McReaken stated the vinyl fence starts to the north and along that wall up north and there are 2-3 lots that are involved with the vinyl fence. Now if the vinyl fence is on their lot and they want to keep their vinyl fence because ours is an ugly masonry wall, if they think it is ugly would recommend to let them keep that but will have a block wall installed along where the vinyl fence presently stands along there and along the north, the vinyl fence stops there but will all be masonry or the Simtech substitute.

[7:23:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked the applicant if it was their preference to basically have a masonry wall on the entire length if it turns out the vinyl fences are setback from the property line, a preference to make a masonry wall on the entire length of the fence. Patrick McReaken stated yes believes that is what is in the City zoning ordinance and Syracuse though will accept the Simtech as he understands. Just to bring that up though as he did having the office areas to the north of them and having a new really nice looking wall on their phase 2 north side it seems to them both financially and pragmatically that perhaps having a masonry wall would meet the standard of the City but it may not be that effective for what the purpose is, think the purpose of a masonry wall is to block the sound that generates on site and there is some and helps make a nice landscaped appearance but the wall on the north side think will also meet the City standard it will look like a structured nice looking wall and having the masonry there would meet the City code but it may not pragmatically be needed so offer that to them as well. Commissioner Jensen stated once they get up against the commercial property there or Business Park or Professional Office there think the purpose of having some type of barrier between those is to screen the industrial use from the non-industrial uses but do like what was suggested if they could get some architectural pleasing on that very eastern side from the residential to the professional office and certainly when they come back to discuss phase 2 the ARC can have a purview of it at that time but the purpose of the ordinance is to specifically screen the industrial uses from all of the other uses it is just that from a business use to a business use is a little bit different from a business to a residential and that is something that staff would discuss with them but wouldn't mind seeing a pretty rock wall up there but would want to see what the buffering requires. Patrick McReaken stated he appreciates that.

[7:26:19 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated the industrial uses have impacts to the surrounding community like was touched was and most of those impacts are created by the actively that is going to be happening to the south of the building so the argument is what about if the building is going to be blocking all of those activities from the north is the fence really needed and just to clarify the back of that building, the north side of the facility is not going to be, that will have impact to the community too so that is what that wall will be, it is not only to buffer the trucks and the stacks of onions and all of that but it is to also buffer and soften that edge of that big steel building that will be 20 feet from the boundary there.

[7:27:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated on top of that also although the building and facility have been around since the early 50's doing tomatoes and potatoes this is an industrial zone so the ordinance is set to cover the zone in case Utah Onions is not there in another 70 years and still may be another industrial zone and don't know what type of business would go in at that time so they want to make sure that the industrial portion is protected for future years not just for. Patrick McReaken stated they agree with that, if they could bring in an idea during phase 2 to the ARC that might show what they have in mind.

[7:28:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan opened the Public Hearing.

[7:28:24 PM](#)

Matt Reed, 877 S 2125 W Syracuse, their property is on the map where it says 'not for construction' so they don't actually back, their property line doesn't touch Utah Onion and to be honest this whole process, have talked with Brad a few times and has been really receptive but kind of feel a little taken like with the first shed that was built they received a letter in the mail saying they were going to build a 'shed' and thought like a Tough Shed and thought sure they can build a shed little did they know it was this massive warehouse that was right next to their property line. Even then when they moved in, they have been in their house about 12 years in now, when they moved in it was just the crates so at least the building looked a little nicer than the crates and then they heard the noise. Talking about the fans that go non-stop at least from the fall to spring and they are so loud again sometimes it sounds like a low hum in your house so in the winter time when the doors are closed can hear the fans which sounds a little louder than their furnace but if they are outside it is almost deafening at times. You couldn't communicate with someone out behind the house, couldn't play ball with your son or anything like that it is that loud. AS the building has gotten older, think Brad mentioned that now the fans are not only just loud with white noise but also squeaky so now there are rattles and bearings that are going out and so to them that has been the biggest issue is the fans luckily they don't go in the spring or summer because it would make their backyard unusable, they couldn't use it. Another real concern and this hasn't, knock on wood, hasn't happened but one of their neighbors had some water come off the Benchmark Buildings the property next to Utah Onion before they finished their curb and gutter, they had a big rainstorm and all of the water from one of those building came down through the field at the time and into their basement. So with this building they were really hoping that they would put in some kind of permanent water like curb and gutter something not just basically and has some pictures that would like to show the

Commission. The first photo can see the size of the building from their backyard and they have 6 of these huge fans that are again constantly blowing. The second picture is the 20 feet from the property lines to their shed and basically all they have done is just kind of sloped the ground a little a bit with the hopes that the water will go back to the middle of their property but all it is, is just a slope there is nothing permanent, if it was a lot of water it would erode that and go into the houses and there is a little closer picture of that as well. The pictures were handed to staff. In talking with the City Planner they heard about phase 2 which are even more concerned about, again, with all of it are concerned with the fans. That is his main concern and other neighbors have other concerns because they actually back the sheds but can't imagine any more fans blowing than are already blowing. Really wish and don't know if it is possible or not or how much it would even cost but really wish they could even move those fans that are existing facing north to face a direction where there aren't houses don't know if or what the cost of that would be but it would certainly help their sanity. It looks like in phase 2 with the massive structure is 3 times the size of the existing structure and again if all those fans, assume they would have to face north or south so would strongly recommend that they face south if they have fans in that structure and then would really hope that they could get those other fans in the existing structure moved if possible. Again they have been pretty receptive but they shouldn't have to deal with that kind of noise. Often times they will get woken up in the middle of the night and look outside and there's, guess they are on timers or something because they kind of rotate which ones are on but will get woken up at 2 in the morning and look outside and there are 4 fans going and don't really know why there are 4 fans needed in the middle of January but it is enough to wake him from a sleep. That is his 2 cents and just concerned about the drainage and concerned about the noise.

[7:33:26 PM](#)

Deanna Haskett, 1011 S 2125 W, on the map her family is going to be really impacted by this new building. They are right north of the Flurer's house, so where the corner one is, so the building is going to kind of on the south side of their property line. Now just like Matt Reed said they were frustrated as a community when this building came in because the letter they received like he said, said a 'shed'. Nobody came to the City meeting assuming, they are good neighbors and they all have pride of ownership with their properties and figured a shed, no big deal, they didn't want to make a big deal for Utah Onion and then they have this monstrosity building built. Now Matt Reed has a different issue than her family has, it is not a 6 foot wall, it is a 5 foot wall, I am 5'4" and I am taller than the wall and so on Utah Onions side the property or the grade level is anywhere from 1-2 feet higher so when they are working or walking on their side of the wall, it is literally like they are in her backyard. When they go back, there is kind of a peninsula of concrete right now, now that they built that building they actually process right there so when they are processing in the fall she literally feels like they are in her backyard which is really hard for her because she doesn't feel safe having her kids in her backyard and having to watch them and having all of these strangers back there and worrying that literally they can hop a wall really easy. That is a concern to her is the size of the wall, if it is put into a 6 foot wall, what side does it have to be 6 foot on, if it is only 6 foot on her side that is only a foot more on their side so it is only a 4 foot wall on their side and that isn't going to help with noise reduction at all on her side and that is a huge concern for her and her family. Another issue was the noise, if they put the fans on the north side of the building that noise is going to reverberate between the facility that is currently there and the new facility so their master bedroom is on the north corner, the north east corner so that is going to face and reverberate between that and into their bedroom every night. So if it is not a big deal for them to have to put a nice east facing because it is so far back off of the road, it shouldn't be a big deal for them to have all of the fans on the east side of the building and have that noise face out because they don't have any homes on the other side of 2000 W right there and off of Heritage Lane it is up a little bit, so it will be a lot less of a nuisance if the fans are on the east side than if they were on the north or the south side of that building and especially if they were on the west side of the building. Her concern is as a neighbor that has been extremely impacted by where that building is located and having to look at the construction, they have people out there at 6:30 in the morning beeping their horns between that warehouse and the main building which don't know what City ordinances are about the hours of operation, when can make noise, but have them waking her up at 6:30 in the morning with their horns, which drives her crazy but haven't complained because they try to be nice neighbors but is concerned about how much more noise that is going to create for her and her family if it is not a taller wall. She would request as a citizen for it to be a 10 foot cinder block wall that way it does actually reduce noise and it is going to be a tall enough wall that it will impact, because if it is a 6 foot wall like she said, they usually say it is 6 foot from the lowest point and if you go out there and actually measure where it is at it is only going to be a 4 foot wall on their side and for as much industrial as they are planning on putting back there, that is not going to help reduce any noise, they are going to have so much more noise. Also is a realtor and knowing the impact that these buildings, understand buying their home that it was a commercial, but looking at the onion crates verses having all or more of the industrial noise and having those big buildings does impact their property value substantially more than what is already existing there and talking about before that initial building was built. They love their home, they love their neighborhood and they have no plans on moving any time soon but having a taller wall will help their sell-ability when that time comes to be able to sell their home and not have to worry about the wall. The Flurer's actually tried selling their home about a year and a half ago and their biggest problem and every complaint because that cinder block wall is so short that they see all of the activity back there so know that is going to be an issue when they go to sell their property with all of the other phases being completed and seeing how much are going to hear and see semi's and have all of that extra noise added to their property. So that is a huge concern to her and does ask that it be taller than a 6 foot wall on the short side. Another issue, her neighbor Ashley Paige and not sure if she will be speaking, but they live just north of her and the building is mostly behind her house right now, she has a huge glare from that white building into her house in the summer so with the sun setting and it is almost a very irritating almost blinding type sense, she has to close her blinds and everything because of how bright that light is that comes in and that is a huge concern to her and is another reason why she wants a taller wall so that she won't have the

effects, know they are planning on putting shrubbery in but those plants and trees are going to take 10 years to mature and actually grow up to where they are going to block the building and so would like and is the biggest thing that making sure it is a tall enough wall that it really is going to make an impact and make a difference so don't think 6 foot is nearly substantial enough. Was concerned about the water drainage as well, her home is a quarter acre but only have about 25-30 feet between her house and the cinder block wall and would be concerned if they don't have proper drainage that if any water rolls off of that building that it is going to come into their house since are such a close proximity to their back property line and want to make sure they do have proper water drainage that her basement doesn't flood sometime during rainy seasons. Thank you, I was nervous and shaking, have never done this before, thank you and really hope they take it all into consideration for them as a community.

[7:42:14 PM](#)

Adam Bernard, 1845 W 2700 S, Syracuse, don't currently live close to the Onion factory right now but did grow up on 700 S just up the street from this facility and his main concern is not necessarily the house to the west but his concern is on 2000 W. Having grown up in Syracuse and gone, walking to school and walking home from school, riding his bike to school and whatnot his concern is and this, hoping this gets better as they go through their phases. That sidewalk anytime that gravel, anytime there is gravel there, it disappears, the kids walk closer to the street than what that sidewalk actually is. Remembers that sidewalk going in and within a couple months that sidewalk was gone because the gravel gets carried over from the trucks. Am concerned and hoping that problem gets solved as more of the development happens towards phase 2 & 3 that that sidewalk becomes more visible and more usable for the children that do walk that section of road. As Commissioner Jensen was talking about would prefer and hope that they have an asphalt or cement of some type so that the gravel does not reach that sidewalk and disrupt the path that is meant to provide and protect the children of Syracuse.

[7:43:58 PM](#)

Deanna Haskett wanted to ask another question for Utah Onion's, would like to know where the processing is going to happen. Had mentioned how since they build the newer building how they do a lot of processing right there and literally feel like they are in her backyard. Almost wish had a picture to show the Commission because of the grade level how it really does feel like they are in her yard. Want to know are they going to be processing in that same spot or are they going to move the processing to the east side of the new building and do most if not all of their processing there.

[7:44:49 PM](#)

Shaun Hartley, 697 W 2400 S Syracuse & Trent Hartley, 952 N 50 E Kaysville and Brad Dahl. It will probably take combination of all of them to answer the questions since they are each involved in different parts. Commissioner Vaughan wanted to make sure there were no more general questions from citizens.

[7:45:37 PM](#)

Ashely Paige, 919 S 2125 W Syracuse, agrees with her neighbors as far as concerns of water drainage and the fans, don't necessarily hear the fans because is directly west of the newer building they built 4-5 years ago. Does get the glare that Deanna Haskett told them about which is a little difficult to deal with and probably the only one who has that problem because the building is a little wider than the width of her backyard, so her other 2 neighbors don't necessarily get that glare. Just for, know it will only affect a couple people that this building will be by but don't know if there is a chance of maybe just doing a gray building or something other than white might change that, it might not but that would probably be one suggestion she would have just to help those affected with the glare. Does have the same concern as her neighbors as far as the fans, knows that with this new building if the fans are on the north will definitely hear them where don't hear the ones now because are directly west of them.

[7:46:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan closed the Public Hearing.

[7:47:16 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked staff regarding the newer building that they are talking about that went in on the corner there which isn't part of the application today, when was that built. Planner Steele stated that is a good question, approximately 5 years ago, before his time. Commissioner Jensen asked staff if it was an industrial against residential isn't there supposed to be a bigger buffer there. Planner Steele stated yes. Commissioner Jensen asked so that would need to be legal non-conforming because don't think they have changed the buffer ordinance in that respect in a long time. Planner Steele stated it would have been a required 40 feet. Commissioner Jensen stated that might fall with the purview of this application but maybe something they can revisit. Commissioner Jensen asked City Attorney Roberts regarding the industrial zoning noise standards if that is not something that falls under legal non-conforming, they just have to comply with that, correct. City Attorney Roberts asked if they have to comply with the noise ordinance in the industrial standards, yes that is not something that can grandfather in. Commissioner Jensen asked City Engineer Bloemen talking about noise, 10.120.070 'Noise. No use shall emit or cause the emission of sound from a stationary source such that the one-hour equivalent sound level of resultant sound measurement, at the lot line of the establishment or use, exceeds, by six dB(a) or more, the one-hour equivalent sound level caused by ground transportation as estimated for that point of measurement and that time of day, pursuant to FHWA- Highway Traffic'. To help him understand that it says can exceed by 6 decibels in a normal case but it talks about the ground transportation so how does that determine, if farther from the road does that number go down or is there consistent number on that. City Engineer Bloemen stated to be quite honest have never looked into sound transmission, if it is something he would like him to look into, he can but not sure where those numbers are derived from or where. Commissioner Jensen stated down below it does talk about it can't exceed 80 decibels, 80 decibels is pretty loud but the previous number is what is looking at because 6 decibels increase

is not that noticeable of an increase and living along 2000 W certainly have a fair amount of ground traffic listening to but just trying to figure out to enforce that because it sounds like that number should go down the farther away from where the ground transportation is but not sure. The other points talking about impulsive sounds are a little bit different but these citizens are talking about fans running for months and they are saying there is an issue there sounds like might be dropping the ball there as far as measuring the sound to lot line and certainly if the buffer had been built would have helped some because could have mitigated with trees but don't know.

[7:50:36 PM](#)

City Attorney Roberts asked if that was a question. Commissioner Jensen stated sort of is, trying to figure out where they are on that. City Attorney Roberts stated he didn't quite follow what the question is, when read the section on noise and really don't think they can address the existing building tonight at all, wouldn't be appropriate, and should focus on the new application. Commissioner Jensen stated would certainly expect and would direct staff to look into this because they have residents who are obviously being affected by the noise of the fans but the new building is going to have to meet this standard and would like to understand what that standard is exactly, see the 80 decibels down below but it is the first paragraph talking about ground transportation that is kind of, it is a fuzzy thing and not sure what that number is. City Attorney Roberts stated in that section, it is measured at the lot line of the establishment or the use, so it doesn't matter if the transportation noise is right next to the lot line then measure it at the lot line, if it is far away then it is right at the lot line so would measure it at the lot line. As far as what these, how measure decibels or what a one hour equivalent sound level is, that is not his expertise. Commissioner Jensen stated looking at the first number because if understating the first part of it essentially would basically figure out the ambient noise level would be for the traffic from 2000 W at the lot line at that point and then could exceed by 6, that is what is reading but not sure, can't find a target out of it, is it 55 decibels, is it 70 decibels, what decibel is it. Commissioner Thorson stated don't think they need to figure that out tonight. Think the point is they may have a violation of a noise ordinance in the Land Use and code enforcement needs to go check. Commissioner Day stated he would agree with Commissioner Thorson, think that is something that can be handled outside of this meeting, not belabor this. Commissioner Thorson stated the property owner at the same time is advised there new building is going to have to comply with the same ordinance that the adjacent residence have a tool that they didn't know they had before. Commissioner Jensen stated the reason he brought this up is because if they are doing a Site Plan approval if they need to get some sound mitigating fans or something to make sure they comply with that ordinance that does apply to the new building that is why that is why is bringing it up. Want to make sure that the new building is in compliance with the ordinance and if need to get an environmental study on that to measure those noise levels before they do the approval is why is bringing it up.

[7:53:04 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated he agrees and wanted to interject that the options the Commission has are to table to get more information about the decibels of the fans and if there is anything directly related to the new building of measures, like guards, don't know, smooth bearing fans, or some other ideas that could be applicable, requiring the trees to be a certain height at installation, building color, wall height those are all things that are in your purview that could address come of the concerns at hand.

[7:54:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Day asked if the applicant could come forward perhaps he would be better quick to answer those questions. Commissioner Day addressed the applicants that they have heard several comments from the residents would mind giving a response or ideas to help some of us understand these.

[7:54:06 PM](#)

Shaun Hartley stated the fan issue is a concern that they are willing to look into, they are industrial fans, and they are put into the buildings to ensure the longevity of the onion durability late into the spring. What the fans do is keeps the air circulation going into the onions which allows the onions when processed to look at a higher grade. Don't think they have very many answers tonight on different types of grades of fans, if there is a certain type of fan that is used for onion storages so they will have to do some research and be able to see if there is something that will not make as much noise, can't give an answer on what type of fan there is to do that. One thing that they are really conscious of is if there is an issue with a fan with the bearing going out they are very hands on to make sure that their neighbors are taken care of because they know what a loud greasy, loud bearing going out sounds like. Maybe Brad or Trent have an idea more about the fans but think it is going to have to be something that they will have to look into and be able to, don't see a reason why they could not put them on the south side on the new building compared to the north side where the existing building is right now. The south side they would like to either have them on the north side or the south side for better circulation of the air but think on the south side would be okay.

[7:56:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated in the various food harvesting industries there are one standard that is used basically throughout especially in apple land over in Washington and that is to adapt on the outside of every fan the same thing that everyone here has on the back of their dryer at home, a 90 degree directional shield. So as air comes out of the fan it is directed in any direction that want and in this particular case think the sound tunnel that Mrs. Haskett was referring to if that was aimed towards the east that would have a tremendous impact on that and something that with the cooperation of the applicant, can't force them to, it is something that they might possibly might want to consider for the existing building on that north side also but that would be solely up to them. That would be the quickest, easiest and least expensive fix and one that is used throughout the food industry. Commissioner Jensen stated the sound tunnel was brought up by citizens and are absolutely right are going to have sound ricocheting between the existing and the new storage facility and

some of that sound is going to go to the west and to the south can have the same issue certainly the lots are little, well essentially the cul-de-sac lot there, that knuckle lot is going to get a lot of that. Actually like the idea of pointing the sound to the east because that is the biggest area for the sound to dissipate in and know that is sort of the face of the building but going back and looking at the elevations don't think that would be too impactful and not sure from the industrial scale about fan design that is not his area of expertise, on a smaller scale the concept is the same but talking orders of magnitude but for CPU cooling for computer often time putting a larger fan operating at a lower RPM will move the same amount of air but not generate nearly as much noise because not forcing the sound through at such high velocity so there may be some things there that basically some quieter design fans that can still move the same amount air that needs to be moved but can do it more quietly. Commissioner Vaughn's suggestion would serve two fold purpose in directing sound downward or direction away from the houses that can also accomplish that shading effects so don't get direct sunlight going into the storage facility as well as trying to redirect the sound so it is not a straight shot to wherever it is heading to but do think that it is within the purview of the Planning Commission to basically request an environmental analysis on the impact of the new fans, that is certainly within the purview under the industrial zone and wouldn't mind seeing that before they approve the site plan. The Planning Commission is the approval in this it does not go to City Council, so it is within their purview to make sure it is taken care of, sounds like it got missed on the old building and that is up to staff to resolve that but have to deal with the new facility now and will also apply to phase 2 so the answers they get with phase 1 also apply to phase 2 so do think they need to, the applicant needs to look at this and maybe come back to them with this that would be his suggestion.

[8:00:28 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson sated he would agree with that and this isn't, the Planning Commission isn't going to say put the fans on one side or the other and are good, the rule is have to meet the noise ordinance and it is a performance spec and can build a building and put several hundred thousand dollars into it and then come back and we say can't use it and it doesn't matter what kind of fan they have if it is too noisy or where the fan is pointing, it is too noisy, so it is in the applicants best interest to figure that all out and appease the Planning Commission.

[8:00:53 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated to the applicant to go ahead and respond and will consider it their rebuttal period to some of the comments that came up on that and please hold comments to rebutting things that were spoken, don't bring up anything else. Asked the City Attorney to write down the noise section the complete title of the noise section so if any of the citizens here can pick that up from him so they can look that up at home so they can be aware of it themselves.

[8:01:35 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated they appreciate what was stated and is exactly right and noise and sound is injuring properties and can engineer so it meets the standard or lower and would like to submit an engineering analysis which may include deflecting the noise or getting a low zones rating on the fans and give an analysis of what should be done. The other large item mentioned was the water drainage what happened years ago the fence was 6 foot as they understand it. They built up the ground to the first 10 feet away from the fence on their side of the fence to 1-2 foot above that to help deflect the water so it didn't flow through the fence line but it is apparently not working that well if the water flows over that way, they apologize. Their landscaping though will have a built up area with a 6 ml black vinyl under the rocks or under the mulch that they have landscaped there for 20 feet. That will be on the whole sloped area away from the fence line so it should help meliorate that but they owe it to the neighbors to keep their water on their side of the fence. The reflection off of the sunlight on the wall, think that is a big issue and they would probably want to get their heads together and revisit that white wall color on the west side. Looking at the elevation on the west it has 2 dark brown stripes and there is a white wall between the brown and they will readdress that and perhaps have a talk with the neighbors also outside of this meeting and ask them to help evolve that color. The horns in the morning are a management issue they need to address themselves and will get back to you on that.

[8:04:39 PM](#)

Shaun Hartley stated not to get too off track here, but they usually do not start before 630 in the morning when it comes to their practices or their operation, they do have timelines to meet from a management standpoint, that is also only from probably August until sometime in March but it is something that they sometimes work a lot later too, it is a very demanding operation and just wanted to put that into the record.

[8:05:20 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated perhaps the last large issue is about the hiding of the sidewalk where the kids walk to school and appreciate that being brought up. They will address that in phase 2 as they pave more of the open area. Phase 1 will end add pavement on the back of the lot however think the rocks on the far east side of the lot are the ones that are the ones that end up on the sidewalk when they do. The sidewalk is not very long, presently goes down to, an existing sidewalk there just north of the entry, it stops at the entry point and they don't think that walk goes under the entry at least it is hidden by the gravel anyway. In the UDOT renovation they are addressing that as will they to fix up a sidewalk along the whole frontage for the pedestrians especially kids and will address the paving of the lot as they move through phase 2. Phase 1 like has said is going to pave some of the area on the back side of the lot but phase 2 they will address more of the paving on the east side of the lot.

[8:07:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked Commissioner Thorson mentioned something about not seeing the environmental review. Commissioner Thorson stated staff mentioned one of the 3 things that were lacking was they didn't see an environmental report. Patrick McReaken stated he gave it to staff at the beginning of the meeting. Commissioner Jensen

stated as a Commissioner he would very much like to see the results of that report and before they do an approval would like to see that in the packet. Planner Steele stated it is in the packet. Commissioner Thorson stated that is just a timing thing. Patrick McReaken apologized they just got that report in. Commissioner Thorson stated just tying up all the loose ends.

[8:07:47 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked staff is it a City ordinance that they retain storm water on site with each developed property. Planner Steele stated knows that most projects have a detention basin and the City Engineer could probably answer that better than he can.

[8:08:10 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked staff if they got a revised packet since last week. Planner Steele stated yes, he received the report late and added it today. Commissioner Jensen stated that is a little sudden and would like to have more time to review it. Planner Steele agreed the option was either just put it in today or withhold it from the pack and chose to put it in.

[8:08:39 PM](#)

City Engineer Bloemen stated every development is required to have a detention and they currently do have detention, it is not really a traditional detention basin where can see the sides actually dug into the ground it is more of a flat elongated kind of detention basin but the volume is there and will require them to upgrade the outfall to meet the current SWPPP standards.

[8:09:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked staff since they are talking about the fence along the property line along the eastern building would there be any advantage to putting a higher fence in that corner, would that help mitigate the sound at all and can they require an 8 or 10 foot fence. Planner Steele stated yes, the Commission could require a taller fence anything that is directly related to those impacts to the neighborhood that is proportional. Commissioner Jensen stated the fans might be mounted so high it might not help though but certainly if there are some trees there to deaden it but would have trees right up against the building if tried to put something there. Commissioner Moultrie stated would like to see at least an 8 foot fence on their side at the highest point so that way the neighbors do get a legitimate fence not a 4 foot fence and if he lived there would want that just for safety reasons. Commissioner Jensen confirmed wanted 8 foot from the highest point on either properties line side, so it would have to be 8 foot on whoever has the higher elevation. Commissioner Moultrie stated correct.

[8:10:34 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated he would like to table this item and think it might be a good thing to give the applicants more time to respond and asked the applicants if they were opposed to that at all. Commissioner Vaughan asked under what specific items want to table because they are required and the amount of time would want to delay this item as for discussion with the Commission. Commissioner Vaughan stated if the applicant has or would like to table or continue can let them know and possibly suggest the amount of time think would need. Commissioner Day stated he would like their opinion on how long they think it will take to.

[8:11:07 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated as had mentioned in the briefing the onion harvest starts in August and they are really froth to get their operation enclosed so it gets more drift protection on odors and installs the landscape and helps out the City in that direction. Think the nature of the items that have given them can make responses to all of those items within a week, 3-4 days but the Planning Commission won't meet for 2 weeks they realize. Commissioner Jensen stated actually 3 weeks because they have a 5<sup>th</sup> Tuesday. Patrick McReaken stated that causes them some issue on their schedule and it is a very, very tight schedule and they don't want to operate late into the evenings protecting the neighbors and as they delay another cycle, 3 weeks maybe, it may push them into the next harvest season and not sure have to talk with the owners about that to find out if that is a fact or not so it really causes them some hardship if need to postpone it for that long. Think can make responses in the next few days and if could appoint, if ever work this way, but have a quorum of the Commission meet to review, no, okay. Or if could rely upon the staff as their intermediary to say they have addressed the issues appropriately or needs more work and help them out a little bit that way if could.

[8:13:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated they understand that unfortunately they can't have staff act for them it has to be something that comes from the Planning Commission itself and have to vote on it. Commissioner Jensen stated before he seconds Commissioner Day's motion think the applicant is pretty clear as to what they would like to see as far as and they need time to review the environmental report but definitely want to see if the sound issues can be addressed and the buffering and the fence height and would like them to come back for that. They could theoretically call another meeting in order to revisit this in 2 weeks since they do have a 5<sup>th</sup> Tuesday that would be an additional meeting but that would be sufficient for noticing, essentially this has already been noticed for a public hearing so it is really more for the benefit of the Commission than anybody else since they got the public input but they could even do it next Wednesday or something, it is a suggestion to throw out and would like to second Commissioner's Day's motion.

[8:14:10 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated one thought also to throw in is there is about 5 items or so that are the hot ticket items, the sidewalk, the noise, the glare, the water and the fence. Think each one of those there is an answer that is in mind and they have to meet ADBD's or whatever that evolves into that has to be met that is an engineering analysis to meet that. On the height of the fence if thinking would really rather see an 8 foot could speak with the owners offline and if they feel

like 8 foot is doable then just move ahead but if it is not doable then can wait until the next meeting cycle, it puts a burden on them to make a decision on that. On the noise issue with the horns in the morning that is a fixable thing an operational thing and is not really part of the project.

[8:15:21 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated one of the things that can be done is they are obviously taking minutes of this and are also making an audio recording so all of the major points that have come up are available for them as soon as staff is able to process and turn it into a CD so could listen to all of those things if wanted to. It would make it easy, think easier if the applicant would request to delay this to possibly the next available meeting and staff would be able to give a target date to get those items in within 72-96 hours that would give them enough time to post if could get it in 4 days then they have sufficient time for staff to review them and then post them as part of the next package for the next meeting as an example. If that is something that they think they could do.

[8:16:26 PM](#)

Patrick McReaken stated that would be fine. Commissioner Vaughan asked if he would like to request that. Patrick McReaken stated yes he would like to request that.

[8:16:32 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated they do have a motion and a second but before they vote on that. Commissioner Day stated he never made a motion, just want to clarify that, just asked if they would consider tabling it but never made a motion. Commissioner Jensen stated thought he stated he would like to suggest they table it, which sounded like a motion. Commissioner Thorson stated he didn't think it was a motion. Commissioner Jensen stated okay then it is moot but are the Commissioners amenable to meeting in 8 days is his question.

[8:17:11 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated he doesn't think, he can emphasize but doesn't think that is a proper protocol for the body to make these types of exceptions. Commissioner Thorson stated he would agree and thinks they table it until the next normal meeting the first part of April. Commissioner Jensen stated that is 3 weeks and they had indicated they are on a timeline, thinking 3 weeks is a little long, if the Commissioners don't want to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in Tuesday, it is kind of a moot point or whenever they want to have that meeting, next Tuesday would be problematic because of City Council uses the chambers but would still like to make the motion to table until they can get the questions answered and officially make the motion.

[8:17:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated would ask the maker of the motion if could also add a phrase in there if possible before they act on it would be to say 'at the applicants request to table' as opposed to the Planning Commission. Patrick McReaken stated they are acceptable with that.

[8:18:20 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE UTAH ONIONS SITE PLAN APPROVAL UPON THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST DUE TO NEEDING MORE INFORMATION UNTIL THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING. COMMISSIONER THORSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[8:18:47 PM](#)

Planner Steele advised the applicant the next regularly meeting is scheduled for Tuesday April 5, 2016 and all documentation would be due into staff the week before that by March 29, 2016.

[8:19:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated for the record has no opposition to Utah Onion business, think they are a great thing for Syracuse just want to make sure that the concerns get addressed.

[8:19:43 PM](#)

**6. Code Amendment Title X 10.120.020 - Pertaining to Industrial Zone permitted uses.**

Planner Steele stated this is a continuation of a proposed ordinance from last meeting. The issue is the possibility of having live in manager units in a storage unit complex and last meeting they had some wording and talked a lot about the possibility of increasing the number of units allowed in the storage unit complex or discuss the possibility of even doing some sort of ratio based allowance or capping at a flat number. Did a little research and made some phone calls and that info is included in the packet. Found on average on the high side there is a complex in Roy that has a 1,000 units and they have 3 apartments associated with the complex and some of the smaller ones that more in the 100 unit range didn't have any live in units, but on average anything between 250-300 and higher would always have at least 1 management unit and tried getting as nosey as possible and some felt a little uncomfortable when asking how many bedrooms and stuff they had but on average they have at least 2 or 3 bedrooms and a lot were families could hear kids playing in the background so it is usually a family thing, a husband and wife management couple that do it and usually a younger couple and think is a good deal for them a lot of times because they get their lodging included in with their pay so a little bit of a raise there. One option is to put a flat cap on it or with the data included to do some sort of ratio, 1 per 200 or what they thought as well as some additional research in making it a little more detailed which isn't a bad idea either. Included is some additional language for more detailed info regarding manager units and so are a few options to choose from.

[8:23:57 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked Planner Steele where found the language for the second option somewhere. Planner Davies stated that is similar to what they had in Pleasant Grove, they had a similar item come up looking for care taker facilities and that was what they came up with, modified it a little bit to match this situation a little bit better. Commissioner Jensen stated he would like to change the number from 1 to 2 can call it good, but do like the language in the second option it is a little more wordy but covers the situation quite nicely.

8:24:43 PM

Commissioner Vaughan stated basically from looking at it they have pretty much 2 choices, does any other Commissioners have any particular favorites right now. Commissioner Rackham stated he favors version 2 but leave the number at 1. Commissioner McCuiston stated he likes version 2 and have it be for 1 dwelling unit per 350 storage units. Commissioner Day stated doesn't see it as a problem so doesn't really care the way they go doesn't see storage units turning into apartment complexes so will go whatever way. Commissioner Moultrie stated would say up to 2 but wouldn't want to do any more than that and the only thing would include would add the language 'not to rented or leased'. Commissioner Vaughan stated thinks number 2 would be the winner the only question on that would be item #7 do not think they should restrict it to the rear if they are not in the second story for security reasons they need to be in charge of the gate, they need to be in charge of where the cameras are so think putting them at the back of the complex particularly if they have x number of units and if familiar with the one by Pizza Factory those isles are almost a 100 yards long and think is too far for managers office from the front gate but other than that think almost have a number for a vote. Commissioner Jensen stated on #7 the way understands it and correct him if wrong but the building can still be located at the front of the parcel it is just that it has to be at the back side of that building so not the back of the development just not visible from the road essentially, is that the goal there. Commissioner Vaughan stated they should not be relegated to the back of the property. Commissioner Jensen stated they are not relegated to the back of the property they are relegated to the back of building which is at the front. Commissioner Vaughan stated if they are near the front gate and cameras is happy. Planner Davies stated that was the intent of it just didn't want to have it be basically the primary use of the building wanted it to be subsidiary to keep it at the back of the building.

8:28:20 PM

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE THE MOTION THAT THEY ADOPT THE 2<sup>ND</sup> OPTION FOR THE CODE AMENDMENT TITLE X 10.120.020 WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL WITH ONE CHANGE OF '1 DWELLING UNIT PER 350 UNITS PER STORAGE FACILITY PROJECT'. COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION SECONDED THE MOTION. COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN AND COMMISSIONER RACKHAM VOTED NAY. MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY BY 5/2.

8:29:31 PM

Commissioner Vaughan asked Planner Steele to introduce the new voice at the microphone. Planner Steele stated he is our new Planner Royce Davies and are very excited to have him on board and he has a lot of great experience as a City Planner and came from Pleasant Grove and before that worked with Bountiful City. Planner Davies stated he is happy to be here and it is good to meet all of you and look forward to working with everyone.

8:30:32 PM

7. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN STRAIGHT INTO WORK SESSION IN THE CHAMBERS. COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ralph Vaughan, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_