

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, July 19, 2016

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on July 19 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 Chairman Curt McCuiston Greg Day Grant Thorson Gary Bingham | |
| City Employees: | Noah Steele, Planner Royce Davies, Planner Paul Roberts, City Attorney Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary Brian Bloemen, City Engineer Jo Hamblin, Deputy Fire Chief | |
| City Council: | Councilman Gailey Councilman Maughan | |
| Excused: | Troy Moultrie | |
| Visitors: | TJ Jensen Dave Porter | Adam Bernard Mike Waite |

[6:01:42 PM](#)

1. **Meeting Called to Order:**

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

[6:02:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan introduced the new Planning Commissioner Gary Bingham who was recently appointed to his first meeting.

[6:03:24 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER MCCUITION MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR JULY 19, 2016 MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:03:44 PM](#)

2. **Meeting Minutes:**

July 5, 2016 Regular Meeting & Work Session

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGULAR AND WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 2016 AS AMENDED BY CHAIRMAN VAUGHAN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCCUITION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. COMMISSIONER BINGHAM OBSTAINED.

[6:04:41 PM](#)

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

[6:05:09 PM](#)

None

[6:05:18 PM](#)

4. **Public Hearing, Code Amendment – 10.75.040, PRD Minimum Lot Standards**

Planner Steele stated this code amendment is something that they have been working on for a little while and the intent is clarify the language in the PRD ordinance concerning the open spaces and common spaces. They have gone through the proposed changes extensively and to summarized changes are that they are requiring a 20% of the gross acreage to be common space and 10 items of control or things that want to see with that common space area.

[6:07:38 PM](#)

Public Hearing opened.

[6:07:58 PM](#)

Public Hearing closed.

[6:08:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated he would just like to say on the common space based on what they have done in the other cluster would like to see it go up to 25%. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that would be keeping the overall 50% or just make it 25% instead of 20%. Commissioner Rackham stated instead of 30% just raise it to 25% just a little more common space.

[6:09:08 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated thinks 20% might be, if they look at it later on it is 10% and is 20% in a reasonable range or do they want to go higher not exactly sure, they are only allowing 6 units gross per acre so thinks they ought to talk that out before they have a motion. Commissioner Thorson stated his first thought is that they have eliminated the open space requirement, open space tends to happen anyway and what is concerned about is getting an amenity in there that helps either that subdivision or general public so would be in favor of upping it to 25%, for that reason.

[6:10:13 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE 10.75.040 PRD AS AMENDED WITH THE CHANGE OF A MINIMUM COMMON SPACE TO 25%. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER THORSON. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:11:12 PM](#)

5. **Public Hearing, Preliminary Subdivision Plan – Jackson Court, property located at 1958 S 2000 W**

Planner Davies stated this is the same zone they have been just been talking about, the PRD Zone. A proposed development to be called Jackson Court just west of here across 2000 W. The development is proposed to be 5.22 acres, 20 privately owned units and essentially an extension of Craig Estates an existing development there just to the south and west of this proposed development. This is currently pretty much all undeveloped ground and to the south there are some homes and the type of homes that are proposed as part of this development will be similar to those. There is a large common space area in the center of the development and there will be some benches and a covered gazebo type structure, basically it will be something more like a covered pergola with a grill in there with countertop and some seating. The landscape plan that has been included shows various trees throughout the development and one of the requirements of City code is any architectural monotony be broken up by landscaping and this appears to be met by the trees that are in between the homes. The comments from staff that have come through in the planning review for this submittal would like to see what those trees are on the cul-de-sac area and are appreciative that they are keeping some of the existing trees on the southeast portion of the development and that is always a nice thing a lot of times the new developments end up with small trees and takes a long time to mature. They had some discussions with the applicant as well a few weeks ago where discussed other amenities that were potentially to be included and this landscape plan does not reflect some of the changes that have been made to the actual plan presented. Based on that potentially there are more amenities and would want to discuss that with the applicant when they speak. Staff would like to see a little bit something more than just the sheltered grill area with the benches. Also from a landscaping perspective where the benches are exposed to the sun would like to see those shaded so some deciduous trees on the south and west side of those benches so have some shade in the summer and sun in the winter so that they are more useable. The only other significant issue and this has been discussed in depth with the applicant but talked about the access requirement that needs to access a collector or arterial as this is anticipated to be an extension of Craig Estates the applicant has proposed that is how they meet that code because Craig Estates meets 2000 W to the south of this proposed development. If this were a phase of Craig Estates which they are proposing that it is, it would meet that requirement as Craig Estates has a direct connection. Based on the traffic impacts here the intent of that code is for larger more dense developments which would bring in higher traffic counts so the intent of the code is to not have those kind of traffic counts going through regular residential neighborhoods or wherever they would be funneled down and then finally get out on an arterial, they want to have them directly going on to an arterial, but where this is 20 units they don't anticipate a significant traffic increase which would cause any significant traffic problems. Clearly meets the code with the exception of that one item which is up to the discussion of the Commission if feel that it does or does not that would be up for discussion but again as have said it is the applicants opinion that because they see it as an extension of Craig Estates it will be included in the Craig Estates HOA that it does meet that requirement because Craig Estates has a direct connection to 2000 W.

[6:17:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Day asked if basements are anticipated in this development. Planner Davies stated he does not believe so, there will be 1 and 2 story homes is what is being shown.

[6:17:34 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked for clarification on the 2 existing homes, would they stay as is. Planner Davies stated that is his understanding, yes.

[6:17:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked if any of the amenities regarding common space would be in the development agreement and would the development agreement state what those would be and would that be available to the Commission. Planner Davies stated doesn't believe staff has specified that in the development agreement. Planner Steele stated the ordinance says that they have to have a development agreement and they have provided all of the bones, the concept elevations and the concept landscape plan and the Commission will have an opportunity to comment on any specifics for that development agreement but that is still in early, early draft phase so doesn't have anything to present at this time. Commissioner Thorson stated his comment and first look at this in the ordinance and it is in there now and it will say in there that landscaping alone is not considered an amenity and is seeing a lot of landscaping that is nice and this the park area in the middle will be nice the only amenity sees is 2 benches and a gazebo and so thinks part of their discussion tonight maybe with the developer might be to hash out what amenities would go into that development agreement that would be one of his goals tonight. Planner Davies stated as they mentioned they have had some discussions with the developer about putting additional amenities in so that would be something to discuss with them.

Commissioner Thorson stated he would also recognize the trail through there and connecting to the 2000 W and would consider that as well an amenity.

[6:19:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked if staff could go into a little detail about what proposed as additional amenities. Planner Davies stated they talked about a lot of things it is really it is up to the developer to propose things, one thing that was discussed potentially was an amenity on the southwest corner where there is an open space as part of Craig Estates and there is part of open space as part of this proposed development and if they put an amenity in there that kind of road the line more or less there is a lot of space there that could be utilized if they wanted to do a court of some kind or maybe an open seating area or something like that. Staff was also trying to think the target age for this development is going to be later age with children or empty nesters or older so kind think that demographic and what types of things do they like to do and so there are a lot of popular activities for them that vary a lot. Planner Steele stated the Commission will have an opportunity to weigh in on whether or not feel that these amenities as proposed are sufficient and have proposed a really nice covered patio and benches and even talking about a dog wash area, but that area hasn't been identified on the plan, so obviously this is the Commission's chance to decide whether or not that is sufficient or not. Commissioner Thorson stated thinks this conversation will continue with the actual applicant.

[6:21:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked about detention basins and if they have a detention basin on this property. Planner Davies stated yes there is a detention basin on the plan in the center area just behind where the covered pergola there is a detention basin area there in the center. Commissioner Vaughan asked that is all it is going to be just that area, is that indicating slope is that going to be grass slope or rock slope. Planner Davies stated it will be grass. Commissioner Vaughan asked with all that area particular would think there that there is tons of room for lots of amenities if not for a Tot Lot or something in there because as recall that was one of the things the Commission liked to see in detention basins is a Tot Lot or something or other. This particular common area that they have while they are talking about the center area there this is going to be a common area and an open space area available to all of the residents not just the 20 new homes that area proposed it is going to be available to the other 42 existing houses that are in the HOA. Planner Davies stated yes. Commissioner Vaughan asked what is the area comparison of this common area open space compared to the existing common area open space that is currently serving the other 42 residences in this development. Planner Davies stated the existing common space open area that they have in Craig Estates is almost 50% and that is why this and they looked at taking some common area from Craig Estates as part of this development and that they were so close on the minimum for what was required in Craig Estates that they weren't able to take any out so there is a significant amount of common space. Commissioner Vaughan stated can see that that takes care of this project but how does that pencil out as far as satisfying the entire project because by adding this as a phase the entire project has to stand brought up to the standards, does the entire project now meet those standards not just what are seeing here for this 5.2 acres. Planner Davies stated yes, there are 2 different zones and so they are analyzing this new project according to the PRD zone and the other one is in a Cluster zone but they do meet the open space requirement. Commissioner Vaughan asked how was the other Craig Estates built, was that built as a standard zone or was that a PRD itself. Planner Davies stated that was not a PRD, it was a Cluster Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Vaughan stated so they are mixing so there is no way to accurately merge the 2 of them or to say one matches the standard of the other because a PRD and a Cluster are different. Planner Steele stated staff did some preliminary analysis of the existing open space as part of Craig Estates as well as the analysis on the screen that was provided with the plans so the new and what is being proposed open space and common space combined is 52.7% of the project area so the existing Craig Estates that was built early 2000's and in a previous staff report provides some really conceptual numbers but they have a park space that is just south of the street along Craig Lane that is like 3-4 acres so the developer is approaching the 50% open space requirement mark as well in the existing so what is existing has already been built and been approved so can out the stamp of approval on that because it has already been stamped and approved a long time ago and then that is what this review is of the new stuff and that is what the stamp of approval on the new stuff is so add that to the existing. Commissioner Vaughan asked what the street width of 2015 W (Craig Lane) in front of the new tie-in is, is it 60 feet the same way the cul-de-sac is there, is it less than 60 feet. Planner Steele stated he sees a lot of really wide tree lawn so the City Engineer might be able to answer that but his guess is that it is a 60 foot corridor. Commissioner Vaughan stated so 60 feet also so this proposed new street is going to be the same width as what Craig Lane is. Planner Steele stated yes, their cul-de-sac meets those requirements and then the rest will be a private drive so the street standard cul-de-sac and then off of that will be an HOA maintained driveway which has the appropriate widths for fire code. Commissioner Vaughan stated he understands all the new development his concern is what width is the street on Craig Lane where the new development is dumping onto and trying to see if are running a funnel running a wider street into a narrower street that is now going to be carrying more traffic than possibly it was designed to. Planner Steele stated 60 feet so they will be the same right of way width. Commissioner Vaughan asked if there have been any design standards review or architectural commission review or any proposed on this or will this be coming back to the Commission for another phase in regards to design review. Planner Steele stated the Architectural Review Committee reviews commercial buildings, industrial buildings and public buildings or attached buildings, these will all be single-family homes so that won't be required to go before that committee. Commissioner Vaughan stated under 10.75.060 which is the Architectural Commissioner review there are design standards for these homes, basically the design standard for this home says 'no more than 50% of the front elevation can be dedicated to garage' in looking at the floor plans and measurements that are provided further on in the packet it clearly demonstrates that the garages are sometimes 6-8 feet wider than the balance of the house which would not comply with 10.75.060. Planner Steele asked if this was within the Architectural Review Committee guidelines or PRD. Commissioner

Vaughan stated yes, 10.75.060. Planner Davies stated what they have in the document is basically the proposed elevations and those can be modified and the Commission can propose changes to be brought back or can approve with conditions to be changed can do either one. Commissioner Vaughan stated in looking at and trying to stay away from cookie cutter but all of these the exact same footprint they are 2400 sq. ft. and they are all exactly a 2 car garage basically with a 20 foot driveway and in looking at the diagram can see that the pad is over half of what the frontage is or the front elevation of the property and then when go to the floor plan can see that the garage is over half of what the front of that. Planner Steele asked what ordinance he was referring to about the 50%. Commissioner Vaughan stated 10.75.060. Planner Steele stated he is not seeing 50% and that has been something they have talked about, 10.75.060 says 'The Land Use Authority shall approve the required common building theme. The design shall show detail in the unification of exterior architectural style, building materials, and color and size of each unit; however, the intent is not to have the design so dominant that all units are identical. Residential dwellings shall comply with SCC 10.30.020.' Commissioner Vaughan stated it may be the next section. Planner Steele stated 10.30.020 is the part of the ordinance that requires the percentage of brick, rock & stone and 2 car garage so just wanted to make sure they are talking about the same ordinance requirements as to compare apples to apples. Planner Steele stated in the ordinance discussion coming up there is some discussion about 50% of the facade there. Commissioner Vaughan apologized he confused his notes, it is 10.75.040 B, subsection G and basically it says the garage is not the major architectural feature and if it is over 50% would call that the major architectural feature. Planner Steele stated if the Commission feels like the garage is the main architectural feature that is something to address. Commissioner Vaughan asked about flag lots and because these are a private road a flag lot does not apply because they have the 3 corners other than Craig Ln connection the upper left lot 3, lot 9 and lot 13 & 14 these would traditionally be called a flag lot, common driveway. Planner Steele stated these would not be considered flag lots, in general a flag lot has an existing home with a deep back yard and create a driveway to get behind that and this would not be that situation. Commissioner Vaughan asked on the property that is up against 2000 W the open space directly north of the Troy Barber property it is listed as open space only, it is not to be used as common space so that would mean that unit 20 has a huge amount of open space but it is not common to everybody else so no one else can use that except for that lot because if it is common the other residents can't go in to that area and then the same thing applies down at the back in the southern corner by the Madsen property directly to the west of there that is also listed as open space only not common that means that unit 14 has a huge open area and no one else can go in there except for that lot because it is not common. Planner Steele stated open spaces are still available for other people the emphasis is just not to have an amenity on it and that is a good point to bring up and something for discussion for this Commission on the south portion the big side yard there is a fence there and they could remove the fence so that it merges with the other open space of the other development so there is that too. Commissioner Vaughan stated the northern open space only area that is between lot 20 and the Barber house does staff the know the width or the height of that or the frontage exposure is on 2000 W. Planner Steele asked if he meant how wide is the trail corridor access. Commissioner Vaughan stated yes, how much is the frontage of that open space, is that 60 feet by any chance or just pretty close to it and wondering and think that might be a better access complying with access onto an Arterial rather than coming off of the corner and trying to bend the corner and asking the Commission to make a decision on something that has already been decided. Planner Steele stated that is something to consider but believes there is an existing lane there between the homes that they are probably trying to utilize and looks like the proposed driveway is 30 feet so that little corridor through there is also 30 feet. Commissioner Vaughan stated and the small little open space directly north of that area to the east of unit 20 that is open space but not common but maybe they are planning on making those premium lots because they have a sheltered area where everyone in the neighborhood can't go can understand that. Commissioner Day stated open space is not for an individual it is just does not have an amenity so it would be available to others. Commissioner Vaughan stated if that is open space and it belongs to the HOA then that could be an access if nothing else a pedestrian or a walkway or a trail access onto 2000 W. Planner Steele stated that is also something they could consider, all good points for discussion. Commissioner Vaughan stated there are some major concessions being given here especially the concession of being allowed to put this development onto Craig Lane instead of putting on a major or minor arterial collector and noted in the City Engineering comments that apparently the decision to have already been made to be able to grant that or accept this as a waiver or condition to allow this to go onto a regular surface street rather than an arterial. Planner Davies stated no decision has been on that, it hasn't been approved yet. Commissioner Vaughan stated according to City Engineer Bloemen's comments basically the decision has been made by the City Council. Commissioner Vaughan asked staff to pull up the comments on the screen. Commissioner Vaughan stated sorry, it says if approved, so if the Commission approves this they are automatically going to accept it. Planner Steele stated the Commission can make a recommendation as far as what the impact to the health, safety and welfare of the community and if feel like that traffic is going to be creating an undesirable impact that is something can forward on to City Council. The development agreement will need to detail it out because the ordinance is pretty clear that it should go onto an arterial or collector and Craig Lane is not one of those so that is something that will have to be addressed in a development agreement since that is contrary to what the ordinance is saying. Commissioner Vaughan stated so this project could fall if the Planning Commission chose to turn it down with a finding that because it does not connect to an arterial. Commissioner Thorson stated it would still be appealed to the City Council. Commissioner Vaughan stated obviously. Commissioner Thorson stated and they have already overridden the Commission. Commissioner Vaughan stated it has a history and have already been overridden. Commissioner Day stated they are just the recommending body and recommend to the City Council.

[6:41:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated as he had previously mentioned to the Chair he needs to leave early from tonight's meeting but to give his thoughts on this application thinks this is great and have done a great job and would support it. Doesn't think adding an access to 2000 W would materially change and a 60 foot right of way and the roads are plenty wide to handle a lot of traffic and isn't traffic engineer but wouldn't think that this would overwhelm Craig Lane, so would support this as it is currently presented.

[6:42:27 PM](#)

Mike Waite, Syracuse, appreciate all the Commission's comments and as staff has mentioned they are still wanting to make some changes that work well for amenities in this project and are working with the HOA of Craig Estates and think it is important to make sure that being they are the ones that are going to take it over for the maintenance and the care of these amenities that they try and make it what is good for this entire development and when talk development want to make sure that the existing 42 homes are included in all of these decisions. Had mentioned a Tot Lot earlier and have heard some comments from the HOA that that isn't something that they would like to see not necessarily anyone individually but think that is maybe a consensus there and so don't think that any of these amenities are set in stone and they would like to work well with the HOA and the City and make sure that this development is something that turns out really nice and useable by all in the community and around this area. Appreciates the Commission's comments and wants to work well with the City and do the things that they need to do to make sure this turns out good. Agrees with Commissioner Day about the traffic and has a lot of experience in traffic and by the time that would misalign the streets out onto 2000 W a 60 foot right of way and adding 18 homes, not 20, adding 18 homes to that traffic on Craig Lane would not significantly impact the traffic flow but there is a potential that if add 18 homes and talk about the vehicle trips per day that enter onto 2000 W with a misalignment and in looking at the aerial of this area and misalign these streets and have so many people making right hand turns and left hand turns and have the adjacent streets it made some good sense to use Craig Lane as the way that these 18 homes would get into the subdivision so that is why they presented it that way. Thank you for your time, appreciate it.

[6:45:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked the applicant when they heard of this development before the president of the HOA was also present and had mentioned that there was a letter from them in the packet and mentioned coordinating with them, what amenities have they been interested in or has that come up with them. Mike Waite stated they are also here tonight. Dave Porter, Craig Lane HOA President, stated that is something that haven't even addressed as far as amenities, the gazebo is a good amenity but have noticed in their HOA that not everybody uses the park for example that more non HOA members use it more so than HOA members but they haven't really explored all of the amenities that could be possible. They have a committee made up of the Vice President of the HOA and talks this sort of language, he is a broadcaster and doesn't talk this kind of language and doesn't understand all the number and that kind of thing and so the Vice President is involved in that along with 2 other residents that understand this and they are going to be working primarily with the developer to make sure everything is cool. Commissioner Thorson asked if they anticipate any of the amenities being restricted to HOA members only. Mike Waite stated no.

[6:47:29 PM](#)

Public Hearing opened.

[6:47:38 PM](#)

TJ Jensen, Syracuse, wanted to point out that there are a couple of what he sees as issues with this development. The first one is and wants to call the Commissions attention to 10.75.040 A, where it says the development shall provide a standard right of way 60 feet shall include curb, gutter and sidewalk. Now certainly what they have done here is they have that entering the development but then have 17 homes all sharing what essentially is a driveway because it is not a road it is not 60 feet wide it doesn't have sidewalk on both sides and certainly from the City's standpoint if was running a snowplow think the City responsibility for plowing that for that would end at the cul-de-sac because that is a private driveway and really concerns him that have 17 homes sharing the same driveway. Certainly there are examples in Syracuse that have 4 or 6 homes sharing a driveway and that is one thing and specifically thinking about the development next to Smith's and also Stoker Gardens but those have the standard 60 foot right of way going through the subdivision except for the shared driveways they all basically use that road that has sidewalks on both sides. In this particular case none of the homes are fronted by sidewalks so are going to have pedestrians that are going to have to cross the street to go to that park to get to a sidewalk and are really increasing the chance of ped, vehicle interactions there and think this really violates the spirit of the ordinance and it should be a 60 foot right of way throughout the majority of the subdivision not just in one corner. Secondary as to the argument that this is an extension of Craig Estates should point out that Craig Estates is not a PRD, as staff has indicated it is an R-2 Cluster but that is a completely different zone than this and the PRD should stand on its own merits as far as having the direct access. Not arguing the merits of whether Craig Lane can handle the traffic but Craig Lane isn't a PRD and this also brings into the concept of tacking on additional phases onto a development, Cluster subdivision which is essentially done and in fact in the ordinance it says when do a Cluster subdivision have to designate all the phases at that time, that was a change that was made a couple years ago, so really can't marry this with Craig Estates, certainly if they want to share HOA's that is fine but there is a huge question as to who is going to be responsible for all that snow and just see a lot of problems with pedestrian vehicle interactions with this design. It is not a bad design but think it violates the PRD ordinance in a couple respects. Thank you.

[6:50:32 PM](#)

Public Hearing closed.

[6:50:48 PM](#)

Mike Waite stated with the 18 homes in here and the HOA has already addressed the snow removal concern they are not concerned about getting the snow removed off of the street and the width would not change whether or not people are going to need to cross the street or not. Where the common space is regardless whether there is a sidewalk on both sides of the private drive they are still going to cross the street and so they need to make sure that they cross the street safely but at the end of the day they are still going to cross the street whether there is sidewalk on both sides or not they are still going to cross the street to get to the place that they recreate the most and so that would be just maybe something to add to it.

[6:51:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked about the snow removal has already been addressed, does the HOA remove snow out of the road. Mike Waite stated they would remove the snow out of the loop that is the private area. Dave Porter stated they have had very little discussion about that and need to make sure that they are able to handle all of that because originally the plan did not include the private road around the subdivision and so they weren't aware at that particular time that snow removal was necessary except for the driveways and sidewalk around there so that is still something the HOA needs to come to grips with because they have a service that helps them with the yard as well as snow removal and unfortunately they are very low on the totem pole when it comes to snow removal during heavy snow storms and they need to make sure that they are in a position to be able to handle not only the existing 42 homes but the extra 18 homes so that everybody is satisfied. Commissioner Bingham asked if it was anticipated that the HOA fees are going to increase significantly because of this development or is that. Dave Porter stated that the desire is not to increase the fees, one thing that they are doing that will help them is they are studying, getting a management organization to help them to run the entire HOA. Currently the HOA board is run by people who have jobs and do it very part time. The snow removal has been an issue for all their residents to the point that they have had to some of them with their own snow blowers go out there and not do the driveways but also the sidewalks and things like that. The great concern that he has personally is whether or not they can actually move the snow on that private driveway but that is something that they still need to address and they are open to addressing it not shutting it down.

[6:54:25 PM](#)

City Engineer Brian Bloemen stated would like to make the comment that the Planning Commission does have the authority to designate alternate cross sections as far as the street cross section goes, right now the City's responsibilities are going to end at the cul-de-sac and all the private driveways would be owned and maintained by the HOA. One of the things that this development is actually providing for the City is low impact development which the State is really trying to ramp on with the storm water quality and are going to have to try and start implementing more of these things into their developments as they come in. So the 26 feet of concrete meet the low volume local cross section as far as the street width goes and really the only difference beyond that is the City has asked them to put in basically just a flat curb so that can run the water straight off of the road in through a grassy swale through the grass which is supposed to help filter out pollutants and things like that before it gets into the storm drain, so that was actually a request from Engineering to not install a high back curb in this instance.

[6:55:55 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked where is the snow for these 18 houses going to be deposited. City Engineer Bloemen stated thinks there is plenty of room to push it towards the end of all of the hammerheads towards the end there, in the Engineering comments requested that the hydrants be moved to the side for that reason anticipating that they would basically just push all that snow straight forward. Commissioner Vaughan stated so they would be keeping it within the private road area or common area. City Engineer Bloemen stated correct. Commissioner Vaughan stated as opposed to pushing it out into the street, just concerned about creating an iceberg there in the cul-de-sac. City Engineer Bloemen stated with all the open space in the middle and having the end of the hammerheads there is plenty of room to put snow and would prefer if all streets were this way. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that would be an Engineering requirement request that would like to see that snow be deposited on their own common area as opposed to bringing it out to the street. City Engineer Bloemen stated yes could certainly make that a requirement if would like.

[6:57:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked the Deputy Fire Chief if there would be an issue as far as fire safety should snow be pushed into those dead-end hammerhead areas or would there be any requirements of how far snow could be deposited in them or how little they could not go beyond. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated like City Engineer Bloemen mentioned the hydrants are the big concern any snow that is pushed to the end of those hammerheads would potentially block access to the hydrants down there however as noted in his review this subdivision has excessive amount of hydrants in here for the amount of houses and could probably drop it down to 2 or 3 hydrants and fulfill the requirements in the IFC. If the snow was pushed to the end of those and they still had access to that last unit on the hammerhead that would be sufficient for Fire but that would have to be all the way to the end of those hammerheads to where they stop.

[6:58:47 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston asked about how garbage and mail would be handled within the development and feel like the garbage truck can make a good sweep through there and pick those things up. City Engineer Bloemen stated if it can handle a fire truck it can handle a garbage truck. Commissioner McCuiston stated yes, just wondering if a firetruck is able to traverse through there without cutting over curbs and running over those little back curbs and into the common area landscape area. City Engineer Bloemen stated hasn't actually mapped out wheel paths or anything but is sure that is definitely something that can put as a requirement to show those wheel paths and make sure that they do.

[6:59:40 PM](#)

Public Hearing closed.

[6:59:55 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated guess would like to see the wheel paths mapped out and then some grass pave or some type of reinforced turf so that the trucks don't get bogged down as they come around those corners and start running up the curb and gutter and breaking things. Also feel that if it is going to be part of this community the fences that connect it to the community should be removed as part of this project connecting all open spaces on all sides that front Craig Estates and would like to see a better discussion of the amenities, it seems like they are a little premature on some of these things.

[7:00:41 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated the arterial connection that has already been discussed is a concern, the curb and gutter and sidewalk is there any effort to change the City's zoning and things like that to that to that type of curb and gutter. City Engineer Bloemen stated yes, they are going to have to look at some kind of changes to the City's engineering standards this kind of situation isn't always applicable, don't want to be running water into people's front yards and flooding out people so this is kind of a unique situation where are able to get everything to sheet flow into the center and filter it through the grass before it gets into the storm drain so guess the short answer to the question is Engineering is going to have to look at some kind of modifications to meet the new storm water permit. Commissioner Rackham asked if there were no requirements right now or nothing required. City Engineer Bloemen stated there was requirements in the old permit for LID's but they are really ramping them up now with this new permit and so have until the end of the year until they have all of the new standards up to date and start implementing these with new developments. Commissioner Rackham stated as brought up before attaching a phase to a Cluster that is definitely not allowed in the ordinance and then private roads they don't allow private roads, likes the development but has concerns the way it is presented.

[7:02:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated his thoughts similar to Commissioner McCuiston, like this development and think the way it is laid out is probably the best case scenario for this however have technical issues, access, adding to a cluster and then discussing more amenities and is in favor ad comment that if are going to have open space might as well eliminate the fence so it connects so would say anything adjoining the Craig Estates would be no fence required there. In general is not opposed to this other than on technical grounds and don't know what the Commission's options are to overcome them legally or with liability reasons but there are options that the City has but kind of feel that they are above the Planning Commission.

[7:03:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated they do have options it can easily turned down or it could be continued at a later time where the applicant could decide that wants to withdraw it to perfect these things or can send it forward with their fingers crossed that all of the deficiencies they have pointed out are going to get addressed and is disinclined to the last.

[7:03:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated his instinct is to a motion to reject based on technical grounds only with the expectation that it may get overruled but just feel that it is not their job to come up with ways to vary away from the code, think City Council has that responsibility and they are responsible to the public when they do that and really wouldn't disagree with that but would disagree with that variance but as a Commission member they are here to make sure that it follows the ordinances, everything within their realm is address and that they have opportunity for input but on technical grounds it falls short. Commissioner Vaughan started by technical grounds mean following the code. Commissioner Thorson stated yes, very specific just the black and white isn't there, which is the same thing that came up when the concept and zone change came through that was really the Commission's grounds there too.

[7:05:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked if the Commission is inclined at this particular point to try to give another opportunity for the applicant to come forward with modifications or are they inclined to close it down at this particular point. Would like to think that these things can be overcome but think there are a couple issues and Commissioner Rackham brought up one key issue that basically cannot be adjusted by fine tuning a map or adding another picnic table.

[7:06:00 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE JACKSON COURT 20 LOT PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT IN PRD ZONE UNTIL CAN ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING ISSUES: ARTERIAL CONNECTION, CURB AND GUTTER SIDEWALK, ATTACHING NEW PHASE TO A CLUSTER, PRIVATE ROAD, ADDITIONAL AMENITIES PROPOSED, ACCESS OF SERVICES AND SNOW REMOVAL BY HOA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[7:07:13 PM](#)

6. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN INTO WORK SESSION IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS WITH A 5 MINUTE RECESS. COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Date Approved: _____

Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary