

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Work Session, July 19, 2016

Minutes of the Syracuse City Planning Commission Work Session held on July 19, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., in the Conference Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present:

Commission Members: Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Dale Rackham, Vice Chairman
Curt McCuiston
Grant Thorson
Gary Bingham

City Employees: Noah Steele, Planner
Royce Davies, Planner
Paul Roberts, City Attorney
Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary

City Council: Councilman Gailey
Councilman Maughan

Excused: Greg Day
Troy Moultrie

Visitors: TJ Jensen

[7:20:30 PM](#)

1. **Department Business:**

[7:20:35 PM](#)

a. City Council Liaison Report

Councilman Vaughan thanked Councilman Gailey for attending their meetings. Councilman Gailey stated it helps him be a little more informed at the City Council level to hear the debate here and there is good debate here and appreciates it. In looking back at the business of the City Council in the last 10 days have met new Planning Commissioner Gary Bingham and are grateful and welcomed him on behalf of the City Council and thanked him for accepting that appointment. A couple items that were forwarded to the City Council an ordinance related to on-site parking in residential areas and the City Council's actions there were to soften a little bit the side lot parking and as recall that was tabled and are still looking at it. They had a public hearing on the public right of way parking and that one moved forward. The San Melia subdivision parcel split was approved with the Commission's recommendation and with a caveat on that one that the CCR's of the Ivory Development that it be clear in that recording that whatever the restrictive covenants were in the building would be maintained and pointed out to future buyers of that situation. Yard encroachments that was a fun discussion, there is still some feeling and concern when an ordinance is and ordinance and when it isn't and if they call something out what they ought to do in relation to and one of the concerns that was expressed in that meeting was increasing the width of an overhang on a building but it was approved. The Council has been discussing wage scale with the City and have been through 3 or 4 hours of meetings on staff wage scale and trying to come up with a policy and are in the process of doing that and are reviewing 3 different plans and that has really been preoccupying the City Council's time for a long time. The development that is being proposed by Woodside Homes the Commission will continue to work that this evening, the City Council pretty much as a group find this a favorable thing for the City and know that there are some concerns among members of the Planning Commission about what the end product ought to be and whether or not as a matter policy the concept of this particular development coming in and the Council writing a zone for this particular development guess his feelings with this and opinions and the issues has for years grew up in Syracuse as a kid and doesn't know that area by any other name but the white elephant, it was considered and has been considered a white elephant for years and years and years because of an experience that TJ Jensen's father met with that all of the land below the Bluff over years has been the recipient of tail waters and those tail waters coming down have increased the alkalinity of that soil and soil that was back in the settlement days of Syracuse which was really rich is now very alkaline because of all the tail waters that have come there and leached through that soil. So in his years as growing up as a kid that area below the Bluff particularly to the south was known as the white elephant. Has been down and looked at the development at Foxboro and would like to see and it is generally the feeling of the City Council that they want a better product than what they are seeing down there. They've had someone come and ask them if on their menu they have mincemeat pie and we didn't and so the reason why are asking the Commission to look at this new zone is a means and a way to structure a development like this one coming in, in a way that is a better development than what are seeing down there and at the end of the day can be happy with what is there. Think most of the people, the old time residents in Syracuse would consider this to be a boon to the City in the fact that they all know of it as the white elephant and see nothing greater down there than salt grass and with aa situation with the sewer not being able to be serviceable to a good portion of that property and see that as a benefit. Now doesn't think they are at a point as a City Council where they know enough to even be disagreeable with each other they just think that need to look at this and it is still in negotiation there is a lot of information that can't provide because doesn't know it. Want to thank the Commission's consideration and that and are looking forward to the Commission's report on what bring to them in the way of a new zone.

[7:28:29 PM](#)

b. City Attorney Updates

City Attorney Roberts stated nothing tonight.

[7:28:42 PM](#)

c. Upcoming Agenda Items

Planner Davies stated staff has received an application for a subdivision called Grayson Ridge and that may be on the next agenda or the one after that is working on getting some soil issues taken care of, not that there are problems with the soil just getting the report and it is taking a little more time than anticipated that is down south of Buffalo Point Elementary School off Doral Drive. It is a fairly large subdivision about 60 lots or so but doesn't seem to be in a huge hurry right now but it could be in the next couple meetings will be seeing that one. Planner Steele stated there is also a Laurelwood Estates Final Plat coming in.

[7:29:22 PM](#)

2. Discussion Items:

a. Master Planned Community (MPC) Zone Creations Discussion

Planner Steele stated to echo what Councilman Gailey said with the new zone and hope have had a chance to read the staff report and reviewed the draft zone and understand that this is merely an idea for a tool and is something that staff has been asked to create and this is not something that staff is necessarily thought up and trying to push some new zone it is something that have been directed to do to explore the possibility of this tool and have been using staff's experience and knowledge as far as things that make good neighborhoods and have put all of the good ideas into this zone to try to make this a really, really nice product and a place where any of us would be happy to live. Have a short presentation of some of the items and just want to get the Commission's opinion of whether or not feel like what items really want staff to push as far as features and requirements kind of similar to the way they did with the PRD but that does come in exchange with some things that make us uncomfortable, some of the smaller lots and higher density but are trying to exchange that for some really, really great open spaces and really superior architecture. In the staff report brought up what the General Plan says because think it is worded really well, it says 'Syracuse City will always honor and welcome the traditional agricultural activities and heritage in the community, but the City must face the reality of the population growth. The City must strive to do it's best to preserve the historical nature and character of the community while at the same time respecting the property rights of those agricultural landowners who no longer wish to use their land for agricultural purposes.' Staff is receiving a lot of development pressure in those areas and so that is staffs charge here to try to find that balance and make a good recommendation and it is our opportunity to actually provide input for this tool that the Council has asked them to create. There is always the option of saying no and not recommending even making the tool but think that would miss the opportunity to provide input of something that looks like they are on board with creating. So Planner Davies has a presentation of some of those items that was talking about that are the things that think make good neighborhoods, street trees, front porches, nice fronts of the houses and walkable areas, amenities, street layouts, urban design, all of those things and with his presentation want to get the Commission's opinion a little bit further on where the priorities are and what feel should really push in the zone.

[7:33:11 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated is going to run through a little bit of what is in the zoning kind of the major points of what have put together in discussions and as Planner Steele had mentioned showing some examples. An Overview are going to talk about Zone Purpose, Permitted and Conditional Uses, Minimum Lot Standards, Community Master Plan, Architecture, Common Space, Landscaping and Urban Design, Traffic Circulation and Approval Process. The purpose of the zone is to kind of bring together a few things in order to get a few things. So basically the developer wants a density that is not currently allowed considerably smaller than what is currently allowed, the lot size. Also want to see some resilient property values with that, pack things together the property values can drop especially over time and don't want this to become a problematic area in the future. Basically the main points are going to be higher development standards, quality amenities, superior architecture, exceptional urban design and a community master plan. This is intended to be better than what currently allow because would basically give the developer something that wouldn't be allowed. The minimum development area would 100 acres so talking large master planned communities. The uses area all basic uses that are permitted generally in most of the other zones. There has been some discussion if would want to allow some minor commercial or what feel like would be a good thing in this zone. Just wanted to point out that these are basically the same uses that are permitted in the rest of the residential zones. Things likes churches and public buildings and pets and parks and so on. Conditional uses same type of thing, accessory dwellings and that might be something to think about with the smaller lots and may not be possible to get an accessory dwelling in there and may not want to allow those with the smaller lots but everything else is pretty much the same. Minimum lot standards that have been proposed is the basic density is 4 units per acre. Depending on the number of units and have seen a couple different proposals with what Woodside has set forth but some have been over 4 and some have been close to 4 so that would be the proposed density in the zone text provided. Minimum lots sizes being 10,000, 8,000, 5,600 and 3,500 square feet but no more than 50% of the total lots can be 3,500 square feet size and also have to be located closer to higher traffic roads and feel like that is good planning in general just to focus the density into where the traffic is. On the 3,500 square foot lots they would not have a standard lot frontage they would be fronting onto these common driveways that then access a public street. An example from Foxboro North from Woodside Homes down in North Salt Lake and what has been proposed by Woodside and to keep referencing that project but not into too much detail because not necessarily talking about their developments particularly but are talking about the zone in this discussion but on the example showing 3 units deep is roughly what is proposing. Looking at it from the sky looks like a lot of rooftop so what are trying to do is basically trying to mitigate the potential negative impacts that might come with higher density.

[7:37:42 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked if the examples shown are one-story. Planner Davies stated they are 2-story homes. Commissioner Vaughan stated because in this particular case isn't the applicant indicating they are wanting to go as high as 35 feet which would be 3 story plus a basement. Planner Steele stated just don't know exactly how many stories or what the front facades will look like yet, that is where can discuss here tonight what the max number of stories want to see, could potential go up 3 stories with the 35 foot height. Also in talking about this project if want to setup a field trip let staff know and can set up something similar to the tour that City Council took. Commissioner Vaughan stated he is not interested for a field trip right now perhaps the other Commissioners if they like to. These houses shown do they know the distances between the houses and what is the distance between the existing houses in the development that are east of the ski water lakes off Gentile. Planner Steele stated those are 16 feet and the proposed houses are 10 feet apart looks like. Commissioner Vaughan stated they are proposing to have them no more than 10 feet. Planner Steele stated minimum interior side yard is 5 feet. Commissioner Vaughan stated and up to a height of 35 feet, so they would be twice as close as what is off gentile and potentially another 12 feet higher. Planner Davies stated possibly yes. Planner Davies stated he also wanted to point out that these lots that are shown on the example believes they are 2400 sq. ft. lots so the developer is proposing 3500 sq. ft. lots so 1100 sq. ft. larger than these which would translate into from discussions with the developer into a deeper backyard as they don't anticipate spacing the houses further apart in their plan anyway. Basically those lots are going to be considerably smaller than anything that would allow here. Commissioner Vaughan asked what the front yard setback is on the example because think is being proposed at 5 foot. Planner Davies stated does not know but it is not a public street on the example so it is just a driveway. Commissioner Thorson stated he would say it is 5 foot to the garage and 10 feet to the living space. Planner Davies stated that is what staff proposed and will get into that next.

[7:41:27 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated staff would like to see because currently the development that are seeing that Woodside is doing they have a setback requirement which when it was setup as part of their development agreement they have 15 foot to the living space and 20 foot to the garage with the intention that there would be a jog there and the garage would be setback slightly but what they have ended up doing is just setting the whole thing back 20 feet and then just have a wall for the front of the house. So what is been proposed in the code is would have a 5 foot separation and the base of the garage setback is measured from the front of the house as opposed to from the property line so have the front of the house 15 feet back and then the garage has to be at least 5 feet behind the front of the house. Garages generally from an urban design standpoint unless they are all extremely decorative which is another option they tend to create kind of a street wall type of feel especially with smaller homes than with larger homes where the impact isn't as great but if have a home that is only 1400-1800 sq. ft. and have a garage that takes up 80-90% of the front then looking down the street and just looks like a bunch of garages and doesn't look like a residential neighborhood. Planner Steele stated the garages as far as an urban design principle it has an aesthetic impact which effects property values but also has a safety impact because if can imagine walking down a street where both sides are primarily garages that means that there are fewer windows of people looking out there so there is reduced visibility and just not a safe of a place as it could be if those garages were replaced by windows into the living space as a surveillance kind of thing that increases safety. Commissioner Vaughan stated basically a cell block. Planner Davies stated that is one of the things in the code that would help with the aesthetics and could increase that setback if feel like the 5 feet is not enough but feel like 5 feet would be a minimum that aesthetically is going to make a difference.

[7:44:07 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated community master planning there are 4 major parts to this, the architecture, open space and amenities, landscaping and circulation, transportation. Architecture, have the brick, rock and stone requirement which would still apply would have to have either 50% brick, rock or stone on the front of the house and then have to do stucco or some sort of concrete fiber board. What staff is proposing as opposed to allowing that and then allowing for the possibility because that does allow for vinyl siding or similar would require that all of the exterior of course the brick, rock and stone would apply for the facade but then the rest of the exterior has to be either stucco, masonry stone or concrete fiber board and that increase property values as those are more expensive materials and also appraise higher, so no vinyl siding would be permitted in this zone the way staff proposed it. Unit variation would also be required for example couldn't have 2 units that were the same floor plan next to each other and also couldn't have 2 units of the same floor plan across from the street from each. Examples pictures showing a bad setup where basically have the same thing repeated over and over and over, the curb and the street is the only thing that is the saving grace for that and doesn't look as bad and another example showing similar colors but the architectural plan is different which creates visual differentiation between the houses and creates visual interest which a great part of urban design. Commissioner Vaughan stated the houses they are seeing as examples have great setbacks and don't think there are much concern for houses that would be on a larger lot because they understand what the normal setbacks are but think the greatest issue that they have before them on this entire project is what is going to happen with those 3500 sq. ft. lots where only have 8-10 feet between the buildings and only have 5 feet in the front are talking about right up on the edge basically are zero setbacks. Planner Steele stated they can go through that setback table. Commissioner Vaughan stated any unit variation when 5 feet from the road is dramatically different and is going to be dramatically harder and hate to say it but think it is going to be a dramatic challenge for it to have interesting architecture when everything is just going to be jammed up against that front property line because want to maximize the backyard space. Planner Davies stated there is some great examples and didn't include any of those in larger cities on the east coast there are a lot of homes that have zero setback and that are actually attached along an entire street like brownstones along the New York City area but those have architectural design.

Commissioner Vaughan Stated they are not in Syracuse asking for their own specific zone, that is in a zone they have been using for years and years and are used to that, here they are giving away the farm potentially. Planner Davies stated guess what he is getting at is that even though those are close together there is significant architectural variation next to that so it works and o think there is a way and work out a solution to make this say aesthetically pleasing and maintain the property values so don't just have that row house look. Planner Steele stated as a minor clarification the minimum front yard setback on the smallest lots of 3500 sq. ft. is 10 feet not 5 feet and not that that is deep but just wanted to make sure are talking about the same thing and then 5600 sq. ft. would be 15 feet, 8000 sq. ft. would 20 feet and 10000 sq. ft. would be 20 feet setback as well.

[7:48:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked on the setback they were talking about 10 feet from the front, that does not include sidewalk are they excluding sidewalks in this developments. Planner Steele stated no they are requiring sidewalk but think are starting to and all have a lot of comments so let's just get through the presentation and that might answer some of the questions that are coming up and then will open it up for discussion.

[7:48:44 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated outdoor living would be required like a stoop, balconies would be another thing and one thing that has been expressed is on a smaller homes it would be a challenge to do balconies but could be beneficial, patios as well and roof top gardens provided that if there was roof top livable space or somewhat roof top doesn't have to be necessarily the top of the house to do that type of thing that would also be permitted. Another thing to kind of reduce the impact of the garage issue is to require some of the houses or all of the houses to either have side fed garage or to do alley garages. The side fed homes from the front can't see the garage but from the side can see the garage so similar to the garage setback so just another tool to use to mitigate eh visual impact of garages. Alley fed homes the front of these homes face the street and the alley is in the back with the garages and the backyards and side yards. Not saying have to use one or the other but those are options that area available for the code to mitigate the impact of the garage.

[7:50:24 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated common pace and amenities what has been proposed is 10% common space so this wouldn't be including any open space at all it would just be common space this is not necessarily going to be a shared open space type development because there will be individually owned yards so the common space is more geared towards providing amenities, quality amenities and places where people can gather in the neighborhood so an amenitized suburb basically. Remnants and small pieces couldn't be used would have to have large sections and can't use yard areas for common space so if it is part of a parcel that is owned by an individual that wouldn't be included. Could use churches, civic buildings and school areas as common space. Amenities would be required as part of those common spaces and if they didn't want to put an amenity in there they would have to show basically the use of the common space that is going to be used productively as opposed to there is grass as common space. Maximum distance form amenities that no home can further than 1/8th mile from any amenity and that is just drawing a concentric circle around it. Landscaping and urban design, street trees are an important part of maintaining property values and something that have been pushing for as a City so once trees reach their maturity they create an extremely attractive neighborhood and can help maintain and increase property values so proposed every 50 feet that seems to be a good distance for the way the canopies grow for most mature trees. All the major street accesses would have to have entry monuments 'welcome to the development this is a master planned community' keeping those attractive and those would have to be approved as part of the site plan process. The maximum fence height throughout the development would be 3 feet to maintain an open feel, especially in the more dense areas where have a lot of building area and building massing. Passive solar planting would also be important so planting deciduous trees so basically have shade during the summer and sun during the winter helps with energy and also helps with maintaining a more attractive look as well. The other thing that would be proposed to change would be the approval process so what this essentially does is it makes it so the City Council doesn't give away any vesting rights to early. A General Plan change doesn't vest anything, General Plan just makes it so that the rezone can occur. So the developer would bring in the General Plan and the concept plan at the same time and would review the concept plan as staff, look at the General Plan change, bring that through the process, if that gets approved then would have the table laid to be able to apply for a rezone and preliminary plan. So the preliminary plan would have the details of what the development is going to look like and would have all the layout and everything and then at that point if like what have brought forward then would approve the rezone if don't like what was brought forward then send it back. So that way don't have a zone that exists that can come in and just apply for something because the way the state code works is that someone comes in and applies for land use application and meets the code and is denied then can have that over turned, as long as they meet the code and it a permitted use then have to approve it. So if don't rezone it then don't have to give them approval so if hold off on the rezone until the time that come in with a preliminary plan then don't vest them to anything and don't provide a framework where can just come in and fly through an approval without liking the development.

[7:54:33 PM](#)

City Attorney Roberts stated one benefit to the developer that comes out of this is this can advance their construction pretty substantially so rather than going through essentially 4 processes where come through again and again and again they could do it all in 2 run through and what are hoping is that when they go through that initial General Plan concept plan run they can get input from the Commission and the Council of what is important and what want it to look like so that they have some level of comfort investing in the preliminary plan because that can be very expensive engineering all of that without the acknowledge that they are invested. One thing that get is the ability of that legislative decision of not

rezoning it if don't like what are bringing forward with their preliminary plan but they get the benefit of once they get preliminary they can start with their phasing and can go it is basically shovel ready development.

[7:55:31 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated that kind of wraps it up in an nutshell, it would be just a little different current way of doing things where have General Plan, rezone, concept, preliminary and then final. So again if did it the standard way and then rezoned would be saying could do whatever is permitted in this zone and could come in with pretty much whatever they wanted and get that approved so because this is a different type of development than have permitted already in the City would like to maintain a little bit more control over what is allowed and what isn't. Once they receive a preliminary approval then would have to come in with their final applications for each phase and include a site plan for the amenities that are associated with that phase so that is where would work out the specifics of what the clubhouse is going to look like for example and where will the trees be and what type of landscaping they will have and so on.

[7:56:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked since this would be out of phase with the general Plan review has the City Council put it on their agenda to open it up. City Attorney Roberts stated not sure if it is on the agenda but it is on the timeline that worked out with the developers with that specific project that they would come to the Council and ask them to open the General Plan in order for this to happen so it is part of the plan would be for them to open it. Commissioner Vaughan stated as a concern there is the timeline that was presented that they have seen was on the developers letterhead not the City's timeline but there timeline and are they adopting that, kind of bothers him that it is on their letterhead rather than from the City it gives the appearance as though are on their timeline. City Attorney Roberts stated it was really Director Mellor's timeline and sat down with the developer and looked at the timeline and it was on their letterhead but it was really Director Mellor who worked that timeline out, so think it is a reasonable timeline. Commissioner Vaughan asked about trees, had a gorgeous slide of a beautiful tree lined street, the national average is nay house that has a tree in front of it gets \$8,000 more than the house next door that doesn't and every house on the street that has a tree gets an average increase in value of \$22,000 so that is why are seeing a picture of a tree lined street to show maximum valuation, how are they going to have a tree lined street in a 3500 sq. ft. lot area where the setback is basically 5 feet from the street to the garage door, can't have a tree lined street in 5 feet. Planner Steele stated is right, the little garage areas are not going to be tree lined street but they do have frontage on dedicated streets and in the ordinance states the front of the home should face the street when possible. So for example if have some homes that are clustered together and fed by a driveway and then there is a dedicated street adjacent to it so would actually shift the floor plan so that the front of the home would face the dedicated so would have a similar street edge that looks and feels like a single family standard development and that is where the street trees would go. Commissioner Vaughan asked if any of the 3500 sq. ft. lots going to be on a side or alley fed. Planner Davies stated essentially where they would have street trees would be along the street frontage so there would necessarily be trees but could require trees in there though that is the nice thing about discussing this if that is a concern of the Commission then that is something that would want to require and can require trees that don't have as large of a canopy so they can fit in a smaller areas there are a lot of options. Staff would like to see more landscaping than less and more trees than less for sure. Commissioner Vaughan asked when says the Commission has the options are they asking the Planning Commission to dictate this or City staff or using the existing ordinances that they have because it looks as though are asking them to put aside all of the ordinances, forget them and just go by what is being proposed in this new zone. Planner Steele stated right now they have no requirement for street trees so this would be something that would be above and beyond the standard single-family development. Commissioner Vaughan stated that would be nice on the larger lots but what are they going to do in the 50% of the project that is going to be these high density structures, it wasn't that long ago they had the Stillwater project before them and they flatly rejected those high density this type shared driveway on those 2 or 3 times and got the density that they are seeing actually physically there on site is about 30-40% of what was originally proposed to the commission and now that those are built the way they are kind of reminds him of the old hippie song from the 60's 'they are all made out of ticky tacky and they all look just the same, there is a pink one and a blue one and a red one and a yellow one' and there is not architectural variations so basically this project, this zone is saying are going to have better elevations, better color, better siding than the product they see out there right now when it is the same developer, is concerned that it is going to be very hard to deliver that on a lot that is basically one half the size of what they see out there right now and 50% taller. Planner Steele stated those are good concerns and so have the option of coming up with ideas that will directly address those concerns and now is the time to talk about that.

[8:02:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham isn't the maximum height now 30 feet. Planner Steele stated it says as dictated by building code and think currently it is 35 feet for residential is the maximum height per building code currently.

[8:03:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked if they wanted to go through the new code section by section or line by line. Commissioner Thorson stated there was an image of the example and there is a clause in there that says 'shall face the street when possible' and on the example there were 4 of them in a row and each end lot could face the street but it was facing the drive and just concerned that the language is either not applicable or would be too hard to enforce really because it would be weird to have a lot on the very end that faced the road and have a driveway that passes their side yard and so wondering if the logistics of really making that possible would really work in the example used. Planner Steele stated think could look at tightening up the language, on the tour they did they drove around and looked at some of their amenities and saw some of the larger lots and then saw the smallest lots of 2200 sq. ft. and went in 3 homes and on the last home they went to the floor plan was rotated so it would face the street so know they have done that and maybe the

example shown they didn't do it on all of them but they did see one that was rotated so it didn't face the driveway. Commissioner Thorson stated so the footprint was the same but the floor plan was switched so it faced the other way. Planner Steele stated yes, so it kind of created like a boulevard feel on the sides of where go through all of those driveway homes. Planner Davies stated there are a lot of entryways and that is the intent of the code is basically to have the front door face the main street because the garage is going to have to face the driveway. Commissioner Thorson stated sees that now but would want to make sure that the side yard architecture would match what would be the front of the house rather than what would be the side of the house so if were driving down the street the feeling would be larger homes in that case would see a larger side of the home. Planner Steele stated he agrees. Planner Davies stated one benefit they do have already in the code for that situation is would require the front to have brick, rock and stone but on the corner lots would require that on both frontages so that would help. Commissioner Thorson stated he has another concern and they talked about tying General Plan with the concept and the rezone with the preliminary and worried that gets away from the idea of a zone earning its status based on merit. If the City wants zones to exist in a certain place have that zone in that place and it sets up the potential for a quid pro quo think of some corruption and is concerned about that. Wanted to know from the City Attorney If a developer came in and said is going to donate this or put this in and really end up buying a zone change from the City with amenities, maybe the City wants that, is that considered a corruption or. City Attorney Roberts stated no, they require dedications of a lot of things and Master Planned Communities and those types of zones are just different from the sort of more traditional zoning land use situations so Master Planned zones are very front loaded and they do a ton of work up front before they even get to the point of even getting that zoning approval. The idea is if they are going to do a Master Plan, Landscape Plan and Architecture Theme, Circulation Plan all the things that are required for the Master Planned Community then that is basically the same level of detail are going to get from a preliminary plan so the idea there is if are already doing the work let's give them the credit for already doing the work and approve those at the same time. At the same time if they bring forward a community that just do not like and make some suggestions but won't change it then they wouldn't get the zoning approval, it is a little different because if just gave zoning approval in the Master Planned Community then would sort of leave the door open for a wide variety of projects and what are looking for in a Master Planned Zone is want a Master Plan the City wants a community that the City wants. Commissioner Thorson asked if a developer came in and get a concept plan approved and get the General Plan changed and then bring in a Preliminary Plan that don't like but it complies with the code and the only thing between them and approval is don't like the plan doesn't see why a rejection based on not liking the plan is any different than a later approval through the normal process so is worried that would still end up with a liability and know the move in that direction might be to try to give stuff or trying to buy an approval and is concerned about that. City Attorney Roberts stated understands and the difference there is normally in the process they already have gotten the zone so then are only applying the code but with the Master Planned Communities they wouldn't have the zoning so wouldn't even have that entitlement that generally would have when get the approved zone. Commissioner Thorson stated they have a code an ordinance that says gets the zone if meet this code and get the Commissions liking and the liking part is the gray area that is worried about. City Attorney Roberts stated that is where the legislative, it would not be an administrative decision it would be a legislative decision which the courts look at very deferentially so if bring forward a community that the City does not like do not have to give them the zoning and if it is already zoned R-1 or something then they could come back and develop an R-1 development but would withhold the zoning approval pursuant to the City's legislative power. The main reason that is there is to give the developer a little bit of a benefit for all of the work they put into it so can at least accelerate to the point where once know what are building and have given the approval then can just go. Commissioner Thorson stated he is okay with this discussion just wanted to express his concern with that, don't see how it would reduce the City's liability and don't see how it, understands it gives the developer some benefits and a more fast track pathways but that is a concern.

8:10:20 PM

Commissioner Vaughan asked if they should go by sections. Planner Steele stated to add Planner Davies' presentation had a general procedure of how the process happens now and how it would shake out as proposed. Now the way it is set up now is would come to City Council and request the General Plan to be opened then would come to both Planning Commission and City Council with a General Plan change request then would come to Planning Commission and City Council with a Zoning change request then they would work with staff to submit a Concept Plan application and then would submit a Preliminary Plan application and that goes in front of Planning Commission and City Council and then after that would go to both the Planning Commission and City Council with a Final Plan that is the process are used to so the alternative is the applicant would still go to City Council and request the General Plan to be opened and then would submit a General Plan application and Concept Plan application at the same time and then would go before planning Commission and City Council and then would submit a Zoning and Preliminary Plan application and go before Planning Commission and City Council and then finally would do the same process of submitting a Final Plan application and go before Planning Commission and City Council. So just to lay that out there as far as what the standard processes are.

8:12:26 PM

Planner Steele stated have provided the draft ordinance that would be in place to regulate the administrative decisions of approval and the purpose of this zone is to maximize the development quality of large tracks of undeveloped land that will afford opportunities for more cohesive design and well thought out development pattern that may occur with smaller acreage development projects. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that doesn't apply to every development they see except the word large. Planner Steele stated not necessarily because a lot of the subdivisions staff sees are not 100 acres but are right in that want to see good design on all residential development. Commissioner Vaughan stated aren't mocking anything and if say purpose is fine, so think purpose is fine, can understand that. Commissioner Vaughan stated permitted uses is there anything that is new and different to what have now in say an R-3 zone, the tightest density.

Planner Steele stated not in permitted uses it is generally the same as in R-3. Commissioner Rackham stated when looking at accessory uses of buildings of 200 sq. ft. or less when look at the 3500 sq. ft. lot they only have 10 foot backyards so to put a 200 sq. ft. shed in the backyard would take half the backyard up. Planner Steele stated in parentheses it says 'minimum lot size of 8000 sq. ft.' so would be taking away the ability to do a shed if had a lot smaller than 8000 sq. ft. Commissioner Vaughan stated they wouldn't be able to do it under existing code as far as what the setbacks are currently anyway. Planner Steele stated could also add that to the code. Commissioner Rackham stated they could have a long narrow shed. Commissioner Vaughan stated that particular thing probably applies to the larger lots but think the key here is looking at everything here is looking at the small lot because if looking at 50% of 100 acres as small lots then that should be the focus of what they are looking at here and what are possibly giving away because don't think will have any problems with the larger lots if there is an 8,000 or 10,000 foot lot in there it is not much of a concern. Commissioner Rackham stated the concern came with the smaller 3500 sq. ft. lots so is inclined that if they leave it at 3500 that they exclude sheds from those. Planner Steele stated they could easily add that. Commissioner Vaughan stated they get to cut to the chase on lot sizes on the next section. City Attorney Roberts asked if there was any appetite for other uses that might be if looking at a Master Planned Community neighborhood commercial type uses like bakeries or convenience stores or corner cafes things like that if there is any interest now would be the time to talk about it if not it is not on the list currently but it would be good to get the Commission's input on that.

[8:16:17 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated in Conditional Uses, there wouldn't be any daycare centers, no child care, no commercial, no temporary commercial, no accessory dwellings so think they are good on conditional uses.

[8:16:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated next section minimum lot standards. Planner Steele stated are looking at 4 units gross and that is counting the park space that are giving and then the 50% is a number that could change depending on what the Commission's appetite was, 50% max of total units can be 3500 sq. ft. In general the smallest lots should be located closest to an arterial or collector road in order to more efficiently distribute traffic impacts. All lots shall have frontage along a publicly dedicated street with the exception of interior lots in the 3500 sq. ft. lots which may have frontage upon a shared driveway to be maintained by an HOA, frontage requirements on shared driveways shall be the same as if fronting on a public street, so would still have to have the same width of the lot. Commissioner Vaughan stated except for curbing and gutter and a verge strip. Planner Steele stated they wouldn't have the same cross section of a street it would just be a driveway but would still front on it the same way. Commissioner Rackham stated think allowing 50% for the smaller lots is a little excessive and would like to see it be no more than 25-30% somewhere in there, a quarter of the development basically. Commissioner Vaughan stated talking about the camel that is in the room by having 50% of the entire project being the smallest possible lot they are able to in some way not have to develop maybe 1/3 of the entire property because they can recoup all of that money they would lose in undeveloped land in the density that they would achieve in there. There is no free lunch so if the Commission wanted to cut back on the total number of units in the entire project or the entire ordinance there is 2 ways to do it. Either limit the total percentage in 41) B or in lot standards increase the minimum size lot and either do away with that SFD 3500 sq. ft. or raise it up to 4000-4500 sq. ft. Commissioner Rackham stated they haven't gotten to that point yet, his thought is they have 4 distinct zones in there and doesn't think anyone should be predominant think they should all be not to exceed 25%, does have some comments on lot size but want to get to that in a minute but wanted to discuss the amount for each proportions. Commissioner Thorson stated if they did 50% of the units are allowed to be tiny that would take up 10 acres of 100 acres so by area it is pretty small area but if they did the next smallest the other 50% would take up a total of 36 acres out of 100 so would have another 64 acres of whatever wanted to do with it but kind of like having some distribution requirements, the example shown had 24 out of 6600 for the large size and know they want to weight it to smaller side there are advantages by the linear feet of height have to development less acreage of units to get units in there but think if are going for a Master Planned Community and is touted as want to accommodate all lifestyles and want people living and think have to have a distribution and it is more than 50% of the smallest and 49% of the next smallest and 1% of the next smallest, think 25% is too low because would force each one to have 25% if do it by unit, but would agree that the 50% is a little high and would like to see some real distribution and see it be maybe it is no more than 35-40% of any one. Planner Steele stated they are talking units but there is also land area that could say to split it up by land area but don't know how that would shakes out by total units and as has been said there is a lot of ways of controlling the density something to consider the more and think always assume that developers will and is usually accurate but will always build if given unreined density that would build high rise apartments everywhere but don't know if that is necessarily the case but the intent here with the 50% is that think they would all agree that should limit them and just getting that percentage right is a good discussion.

[8:23:16 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated the number he wrote down was 30% that was his original amount instead of the 50%. Commissioner Thorson stated he likes it, might even apply to the next section as well. Planner Steele stated know they are not talking specifically Woodside but have seen their proposed numbers and they are proposing 49% of the smaller lots just for reference.

[8:24:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated ready for the elephant, so when looked at the lot standards the 10,000, 8,000, 5,600 and 3,500 his first thought was the first one takes a 20% jump and then goes quite a bit more so his inclination was to start at 10,000 reduce it 20% which would give 8,000, reduce the 8,000 20% which would give 6,400 and then reduce the 6,400 20% which would give roughly 5,100 so thinking 5,100 should be the smallest lot size.

[8:25:33 PM](#)

Planner Steele asked if that is what the Commission would like, assuming silence is no one opposes to it or silence is not disagreements. Commissioner Thorson stated in his mind thinks they are all going to look for bigger lots and think that in general want to see R-1, R-2 & R-3 like the rest of the City so the instinct is to go bigger lots for sure so agree with Commissioner Rackham and know this is a negotiation with potential properties. Commissioner Vaughan stated not trying to dissuade everyone but obviously this particular page is the most important page that they are going to be talking about and just wondering if can get the easy things out of the way if they should say come back to minimum lot standards and take care of the other things think can agree on pretty quickly, for example off-street parking and loading basically following what is on the code already.

[8:27:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated for the small lots they're not going to have much driveway and don't think are looking at much street, like PRD's had them put in additional parking not associated with a home and wondering if they need to consider some additional parking not associated with the home in the smaller lots. Commissioner Vaughan stated thinks would have to have a provision for that somewhere else. Commissioner Rackham stated right now have very little setbacks so they will get 2 cars in the driveway and that is it, is that in the ordinance. Planner Steele stated it would be 2.5 spaces on the smaller ones and 2 of them would be in the 2 car garage and so they would be required to do some other off-street parking. This parking ordinance is similar to the PRD requirement of 2.5. Commissioner Rackham asked if it provides for any off-site parking not associated with a home. Planner Steele stated yes the PRD requires some additional parking. Commissioner Rackham stated wanted to make sure that with the 3500 sq. ft. lots and have very little parking, is there anything and reference 10.40.040. for parking so is asking if there is anything to require additional off-street parking. Planner Steele stated in the table in lot standards there is a requirement for off-street parking and then in the chapter that it refers to it says if are building off-street parking they should be of a certain dimension and the stalls should be this big and more of that nature and there is a table but the Master Planned Community is not part of that table so would have to add it to it and that would be 2 ordinance changes so that is why added to the lot standards there.

[8:29:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated in the parking would like to make sure there is no on-street parking allowed in the private drives or is that something they do want to allow. Planner Steele stated doesn't think that is something that they would want but it is a private drive so could try to guide that. Commissioner Thorson stated a shared private drive and so pull in and have a party at your house and fill up the private drive with friends. Commissioner Vaughan stated could stop that in its tracks by designating it a fire lane, no parking period. Commissioner Thorson stated not sure would call it a fire lane but think should stop it in its tracks. Commissioner Rackham stated with it being private don't know if can, the HOA would have to do that. Commissioner Thorson stated guess so and maybe it gets taken care of somewhere else but that is a concern has with parking is private drives getting plugged with cars. Commissioner Vaughan stated no parking with a shared driveway situation. Commissioner Rackham stated when do that are saying no parking in your private driveway, that is a private driveway so the HOA would have to regulate that and don't think the City has any say in private driveways. Planner Steele stated can put it in the ordinance but it is a private drive so as far as enforcement goes it would be something brought up in the initial stages of development and ask the developer to include that in their HOA declarations.

[8:31:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Signs, assumes this follows the standard sign ordinance that have currently and for normal residential zones. Planner Steele stated this is the same language that see in all the other zones.

[8:31:53 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Development Requirements. Planner Steele stated the big points here are 100 acres and won't count it as being contiguous unless it is 200 yards of one another and if for future developments if want to essentially tag on can be considered part of the existing development if the development is compatible with the elements in this chapter and including in the existing HOA. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that basically means there could not be another project like this in the next quadrant down the next half section over so if a property sold and wanted to build this project according to this wouldn't be able to because they would be within 200 yards. Planner Steele stated it would be too far away from it but say the property right adjacent to it that is only 20 acres and don't meet the 100 they could become part of the development if they joined the same HOA and meet the same standards. Commissioner Rackham stated thinks the contiguous thing like Stillwater had the 100 foot canal and now can have a 200 foot canal. Commissioner Vaughan stated it sounds as though they are trying to block. Planner Steele stated except Stillwater is 2 separate HOA's so that would disqualify them. Commissioner Vaughan stated it sounded as though they would be trying to block another property owner from doing this basic same concept unless they are contiguous and unless they become part of this development so would be in control of it. Commissioner Thorson stated he doesn't understand it that way he understands if they don't become part of the same HOA they would have to live on their own merits meeting the 100 acres, that 100 acres is a pretty big tract of land and thinks it is an attempt to limit the number of developments like this could have. Commissioner Vaughan stated there are 5 parcels out there along that arc that could all fit into this. Commissioner Thorson stated if he was really in favor of the development like this and his input into what he thinks it should be, it would be 50 acres, think a Master Planned Community could go into 50 acres and could still come up with 200 lots. Commissioner Vaughan asked if other Commissioners are good with the first bullet point minimum land requirements. Commissioner Rackham stated he tends to agree thinks that 50 acres would be good and removing the contiguous, just say have to have a minimum of 50 contiguous acres but removing the definition that says it can be 200 yards away.

8:35:34 PM

Commissioner Vaughan stated Land Use Master Plan, shall be submitted congruently with a concept plat, basically just standard presentation format nothing unusual there. Planner Steele stated the only difference here is above what would traditionally get in a concept plan is that since have all these little subzones want to see a color coded map showing how they propose to break up the subzones, different lot sizes. Commissioner Vaughan asked if there was any great concession over what staff is doing currently in the department. Planner Steele stated no it is literally like a concept plan with color coded land use areas. Commissioner Rackham stated according to the engineering comment made today the push is to do those slanted curbs and get away from the hard up and down is that being pushed into here. Planner Steele stated not right now under traffic calming think there is a portion that talks about but not necessarily for low impact storm water design, so not currently but could add it is that was a priority and sounds like Public Works might be adding some of their own standards to incorporate some of that separately.

8:37:47 PM

Planner Steele stated Architectural Theme Plan, this is something that want with preliminary so the idea is start out with a broad brush and then work into the details and the developer doesn't necessarily know floor plans and elevations when are just trying to lay out the streets and so that is why here would require those details at preliminary plat and the things want in that plan include materials, roof styles that kind of thing that provides a sense of place and then of course the conceptual elevations and floor plans. Commissioner Rackham stated thinks it should say varying styles in the SFD zones and that also brings up a question, using the acronym SFD, what does that stand for. Planner Steele stated Single Family Development and in the lot standards in the table SFD is referred to Single Family Development or Dwelling. Commissioner Rackham stated so should have varying styles in SFD zone, so don't get the same house built over and over and over. Planner Steele stated below they have architectural requirements so those might meet what wants, skipping to that part, says a minimum of 2 elevations shall be drawn for each dwelling type difference between elevations may include roof lines, exterior materials, color schemes, use of porches, windows locations, shape or treatments and similar features that vary the appearance of elevation and also says where the same dwelling unit is to be constructed adjacent to or directly across the street a different elevation shall be used including a different roof line, exterior materials and color schemes, so does that meet what was referring to. Commissioner Rackham stated it is basically the same. Commissioner Vaughan stated could also put a number on the number of repeats, like a cloth pattern can say the pattern can only repeat every 4th-5th unit if wanted to put a number on it or just go by what have there. Commissioner Rackham stated he is okay with it there instead of above.

8:41:14 PM

Commissioner Vaughan stated Landscape Theme, stated it is pretty much what have now, anything that is dramatically different. Planner Steele stated this is just saying that want the landscape at preliminary and then down lower similar to the architecture have landscape requirements that go into a little bit more detail so this is just kind of a basic one asking for a plan and on the plan want to show where the trees are and where the sidewalk anything hardscaped anything landscaped, fencing to that detail it is not an engineered document at this point it is not showing grading or the thickness of sidewalks it is just showing where the basic layout of the open spaces are.

8:42:28 PM

Commissioner Vaughan stated Architectural Requirements. Planner Steele stated this is where more meat comes in, right now in a Single-family development have lot sizes, 35% brick, rock & stone which is pretty stringent and 2 car garage and those are the only requirements so here are really tightening the controls of what want to see. So this gets into a little bit more detail as far as the variety of the homes as they go down the side of the street. Applicable to the driveways, where have homes facing the driveway are trying to encourage them to rotate those to face the street, 'rear or side end facades that are visible to a street, park or trail shall include additional treatment such as a front facade wainscoting down the visible side facade additional fiber cementing, additional windows, pop outs in window or door. Also encourage side facing or alley fed garages but are requiring outdoor living spaces and part of the reasoning is want social interaction and want this to be an active neighborhood and where people know there neighbors and so want those outdoor spaces where people can do some front porch sittin'. Also when possible the front facade shall front a public street instead of an interior driveway so that is the other language and all of this is open for any suggestions. Commissioner Rackham stated in the past they have had alley fed garages come before them and have been able to turn those down because don't have it in any zones and aren't allowed in the City, by allowing it now are they setting themselves up that have to open it up for more. City Attorney Roberts stated no they can decide that it only belongs in this particular zone so wouldn't have a developer be able to come in and say it was allowed in the Master Planned Community zone so want it allowed in an R-3 zone and want alley fed and have to give it to them, wouldn't be able to do that. Planner Steele stated also is some direction want from the Commission, have presented the alley fed and side fed as something that is important for architectural variety but if don't feel like it is that important let staff know and can prioritize what the Commission feels is really important into this zone.

8:46:01 PM

Commissioner McCuiston stated wanted to suggest in trying to screen or take care of utilities, the power boxes and things like that a lot of developments have worked on they actually put them behind screening or fencing so that they are a little bit more hidden. Planner Steele stated would they be under landscaping or more of an air conditioner compressor unit. Commissioner McCuiston stated he is talking about the big green boxes that are on the sides of the roads and things like that, those transformers can be screened and enclosed in a fence with a gate, so can work on them and then close

the gate and don't really see them as much. Planner Steele stated that is a good idea and can add that to the landscaping requirements under streetscapes or something.

[8:46:51 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated along that same line are trash cans going to be inside the garages, stored inside or outside. Planner Davies stated when they toured Foxboro there were no trashcans outside so can generally assume they are inside it is generally the case when have these shared driveways. Commissioner Vaughan asked if there would be a common dumpster. Planner Davies stated the developers that he has had conversations with about this talked about this a lot where used to work, had multi-family units, it is a lot more effective and easier to sell if have trashcan inside the homes as opposed to someone has to walk out to a dumpster so if can have them put them into the garages that would be ideal for the smaller lots and that can be specified as part of an HOA requirement.

[8:48:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Common Space. Planner Steele stated 10% is what is proposed. Commissioner Vaughan asked if 10% is enough. Commissioner Thorson stated doesn't believe so and they bumped the other zone to 25% and one of his concerns and an example with 100 acres and the other things that count as common space with 100 acres if did all, and afraid it is too easy for them to gain even the 20% if have a church or school, get one school and have met the common space that is an amenity not for, for the kids and parents but not for the public enjoyment, it is valuable to the public, a church isn't an amenity for everyone and yet can take up an acres worth of church pretty quick and then all of the sudden the development doesn't have any amenities because 80% of the people go to the church and doesn't have a clubhouse or anything else, think it is too low and think specifically churches, probably schools and other religious uses shouldn't be included as ways to comply with common space, common space needs to be clubhouse, swimming pools, and sports facilities or amenities that everyone could use, public park think is a great amenity but it is too easy to gain acreage for the public park when put a \$20,000 playground and 20 acres and are there, 10 acres in this case if don't bump it up. Commissioner Rackham asked if he had a number he would like to see. Commissioner Thorson stated would take it up to the 25% just similar to what the PRD ordinance was and would eliminate some of these large acreage items out of, specifically religious, churches and schools, civic and educational are okay with, library kind of thing if they patriciate in other than just land donation. Commissioner Vaughan stated on 100 acre property there is not enough room for school, High School takes a minimum 40, Junior High is 30 and Elementary is 15 acres. Commissioner Thorson stated there are version of Charter Schools and such and think are allowing large acreage items to make up that 10% even if it were 25% are still very large acreage things that are going to be preferred by them and are going to much prefer to put in a soccer field than put in a clubhouse by cost now if they decide there are other things that would be in there that would be valuable and help them sell it can do those and like the example they have, that Woodside presented have large acreage things but also have a clubhouse so want to focus more on the hard amenities rather than just, some of these things think are just too liberal on acreage and too specific, exclusive in a way, churches, schools, religious things. Planner Steele stated can take that out for sure, there was a qualifier there as far as the civic kind of things, states land donated for those things and has to be donated and know that the developer would give that and so the ideas is when creating a community actually want to encourage those uses in there since it kind of creates more of a complete community but is correct that there are a lot of churches that don't have any park space on there so that is why the second qualifier of provided developed and publically accessible common space so if didn't have like some churches have a little softball field next to them or a big pavilion so if didn't have that it wouldn't count even if gave it or could take the whole thing out. Commissioner Thorson stated likes that they would be willing to donate those things and think they are good just think it gets them away from some and that could be part of the development agreement and other things that are negotiated just think it gets them out of providing other amenities and almost to the point that it would be beneficial to donate 10 acres rather than develop a clubhouse. Commissioner Vaughan stated would it be fair to say that they are talking about this type of land under common space area, are talking about on-site as opposed to off-site donations or mitigated so that if wanted to donate 10 acres but it was not inside the bounds of this district wouldn't count towards their common space or are talking about common space specifically. Commissioner Thorson stated is happy if they donate land but don't think large acreage should be a common space period. Planner Steele stated think that helps clarify it but seems like the sentiment is should just take it out of the dedicated part for schools and stuff, just remove it.

[8:54:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated they are 5 minutes to 9 o'clock does anyone have any objections to extending 30 minutes. Commissioner Rackham and McCuiston did not want to extend that long. Commissioner Vaughan stated they need to move rapidly if are going to end at 9 o'clock in as much as if are trying to follow the time table to have all of this stuff ready to go as an action at the next meeting if that is the case where want to then need to spend their time looking at lot standards. Commissioner Rackham stated he can go 15 minutes.

[8:54:59 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER THORSON MADE MOTION TO EXTEND 15 MINS. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED WITH A MAJORITY VOTE 4/1. COMMISSIONER MCCUISTION VOTED NAY.

[8:55:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked on common space what percentage would the Commission like to see. Commissioner Thorson stated 25%. Planner Davies stated wanted to point out for this proposed development that Woodside is looking at doing is approximately 200 acres so if they did 25% it would be 50% of amenitized basically HOA maintained open space just so know the scale they are talking about. Planner Steele stated they want to make sure it is a good development but at the same time don't want to make it so they can't even and is a useless zone so there are 50 acres that is being

proposed to be given to us by Woodside but that is not improved so the actual improved acreage is far less so that just gives them an idea where the appetite is of what is actually feasible and what will get, say go as high as possibly can but would just caution that don't just make it so no one does anything. Commissioner Vaughan stated appreciate staff saying that but know one of the things the Commission is thinking about is the project has to be within the bounds of the property line but also know that no matter what they pass it is subject to further review by the Council and if in their wisdom they decide to alter a number or percentages or anything like that they certainly have the prerogative to do that would respect that. Commissioner Thorson stated his motivation is to make with the PRD they just went with and yes it is 50 acres but they are developing 200 acres so the scale goes up proportionally. Planner Steele stated give them a number of what their recommendation is and can put that in and can go from there. Commissioner Rackham stated he has 20% but will go with 25% more is better. Commissioner Rackham asked if was going to delete that common space areas may include land donated, with churches, that bullet. Planner Steele stated yes, gone. Commissioner Rackham stated and the next bullet stated was donated instead of dedicated, land donated to the City. Planner Steele stated the dedicated is probably the right term.

[8:59:49 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated for hypothetical under this zone a developer would want to give them 20 acres on the other side of clearly off-site within the boundaries of this particular project is that what they are talking about or are they talking about giving 20 acres somewhere else then that counts towards open space or common space inside the project. Planner Steele stated might also want to clarify whether are just giving the City land or are giving it and improving it. Commissioner Vaughan stated are they talking about on-site land inside the boundaries of the project or talking about land outside that could either be adjacent, a mile away or on the other side of town. Planner Steele stated inside the development is the assumption. Commissioner Thorson and Rackham stated thought it was a contagious thing. Commissioner Rackham asked if the park part of the common space and according to this it would be. Commissioner Thorson stated and according to this it doesn't have to be developed. Commissioner Rackham stated thinks they need to make sure that is clarified. Commissioner Vaughan stated within the boundaries of the proposed project. Commissioner Vaughan stated land dedicated to the City would have to be land within the boundaries of the project to count towards common space credit.

[9:02:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated required Amenities. Planner Steele stated they gave a list of what think are amenities and those have to be in every single piece of common space and have to be distributed throughout so that every house has access to them within an 1/8 mile, and that is a common walking distance as far as someone is willing to walk to. Commissioner Vaughan stated an 1/8 of a mile is 660 feet so basically 300 yards. Planner Steele stated and are doing that as the crow flies not as a pedestrian would walk so realistically in some circumstances might be a little bit further walk to get there. There would also be a detention basis that would count for open space and make sure they stick something good in there.

[9:03:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Property Maintenance HOA Required. Planner Steele stated discussed adding trash management in that section.

[9:03:46 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Landscape Requirements asked if were doing monuments thought they were doing away with monuments on some projects. Planner Steele stated the City does not want to maintain the land but is okay if the HOA maintains them. Commissioner Rackham stated is inclined to say sometimes they look nice but don't think they are necessarily and is inclined to just delete them and not require monuments. City Attorney Roberts asked if they want to change it to that they may place them at main entrances instead of requiring it. Commissioner Rackham stated if they want to that is fine but don't think it should be required. Planner Steele stated could say encouraged. Commissioner Rackham stated encouraged means if do it the City will like it so should just make them optional. Planner Steele stated entry monument signs are indifferently accepted by the City. Commissioner Vaughan stated anything that they delete from this is going to be picked up by someone that is reviewing it to see what was added and subtracted.

[9:05:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Fencing, same as in 10.30.080. Commissioner McCuiston stated when get this dense and this close together think it is important in his opinion to have detailed lot by lot grading plans submitted so can make sure are not draining back into window wells and that all the drainage goes out to the public street not to the backyard of the next guys lawn especially when are this tight to have a detailed grading plan done by an engineer is very important. Planner Davies stated they have included that in the ordinance as well because have had some recent issues with other homes to make sure have good drainage so that is a good point.

[9:06:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Tree Lined Streets, but not every street is going to have trees. Planner Steele stated every street will have trees but the driveways aren't streets so aren't saying they had to have trees there but could. If it winter time they can escrow the amount for those improvements.

[9:06:57 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Traffic Circulation. Planner Steele want to provide a good hierarchy, a lot of times see in proposed subdivisions that come in they think it is a bad think to have a local collector through a subdivision and that they add all of these little right angles and turns and things to make it as hard as possible to get to the back of the subdivision and so are just saying that want to have a good hierarchy and is okay to still have some of those calmer areas

and on those streets that might have higher traffic want them to do some traffic calming and listed several traffic calming measures. Commissioner Vaughan asked if they were all standard things that staff wants. Planner Steele stated yes they are good proven measures some of them are not common in Syracuse but are all proven measures that are done elsewhere. Commissioner McCuiston stated is wondering if a traffic impact analysis is warranted for a site that is 100 acres plus and might be a good idea. Commissioner Thorson stated he thinks it should be required, it is required for a lot smaller subdivisions and don't know what it wouldn't be required for something like this. Planner Steele stated right now it is kind of up to the discretion of the City Engineer but would be a good to spell it out, 100 acres is a lot of people. Commissioner Rackham stated on the alleys is wondering if should limit the number of houses that can feed so don't have a problem, maybe feed 4, 2 on each side, had 6 on some of them. Planner Davies asked if were talking about an alley way or talking about the shared driveways for the dense lots. Commissioner Rackham stated shared driveways. Planner Steele stated if they limited the length that would naturally limit the number of homes they could put on there. Commissioner Vaughan stated on alleys being a maximum 16 feet in width, what is the standard width for a shopping center parking lot between parking spaces. Planner Steele stated drive isles are 26 feet on a 90 degree. Commissioner Vaughan stated is just trying to figure people backing out of their garages will they have enough room to back out and would they have as much room as have in a shopping center parking lot. Planner Steele asked if are talking alleys or driveways. Commissioner Vaughan stated either, wherever people are backing out if are going to be backing in a common driveway would like for them to at least have the same amount of room they have at Walmart or any other Shopping center. Planner Steele stated could put a minimum. Commissioner Vaughan stated if the standard is 20 foot inside a parking lot that should be 20 foot for the alley unless they really want to get friendly with each other. Planner Steele stated the Fire Marshall might have a standard for that too. Commissioner Thorson stated doesn't think the requirement is the same the situation is not the same. Commissioner Vaughan asked if could have staff research that and pencil in whatever number it is for the shopping center standard. Commissioner Thorson stated it is just not the same situation a shopping center is high volume people coming in and out, adjacent to blocked cars, cars blocking views and in this case they are going to be backing out of a driveway where will have a clear view for 10 feet and is lower volume, think the situation is different. Commissioner Vaughan asked if 16 was good. Commissioner Thorson stated if that is what is proposed doesn't have a problem with it. Commissioner Vaughan stated if thinks 16 is good will accept it and can call him if anyone has an accident. Commissioner Thorson stated 16 is pretty small for 2 cars to pass regardless. Commissioner Rackham stated thinks they should let the Fire Marshall comment on that. Commissioner Vaughan stated agrees should go with whatever the Fire Marshall suggests. Commissioner Rackham asked if that would also include the multiple driveway units or just alleys because right now it just says alleys. Planner Steele stated they can add that.

[9:12:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Block Size, do they agree blocks shorter than a ¼ mile.

[9:12:32 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Trails. Commissioner McCuiston stated his comments on trails is asphalt is not as long lived as concrete so whoever is maintaining them has to put extra money into repave asphalt, concrete will last a little bit long do they really want asphalt. Commissioner Vaughan stated that is HOA problem. Planner Steele stated that kind of depends if it is a trail on the Trails Master Plan and ask them to do it most likely they would but if it is something snaking in their open space areas then it is probably going to their responsibility. Commissioner Rackham stated so if they just said hard surface and let them decide. Planner Steele stated sounds good.

[9:13:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated Sensitive Areas, everyone accept that.

[9:13:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated back to Minimum Lot Standards. Commissioner Thorson stated he would recommend that they take Commissioner Rackham's suggestion that start at 10,000 and reduce by 20% through the 4 areas. So that would make it 10,000, 8,000, 6,400 and 5,100. Commissioner Bingham stated he agrees with that. Commissioner Vaughan stated to make sure will say 20% reduction throughout. Commissioner Thorson stated he just sees this as a bone of contention are not going to be happy with it in 30 seconds and so thinks that what they do. Commissioner Vaughan stated 20% reduction from the 10,000, everyone agree on that. Commissioner Rackham stated the lot width do they need to adjust that at all then for the change. Commissioner Vaughan stated if they give them the lot size think they can adjust that and will come back to them and sure they are going to want to see what said tonight, very sure they are going to want to see what said tonight. Commissioner Rackham stated was looking at the 42 if had to bump it up to at least 45.

[9:14:47 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated thinks they got all the changes and have been talking some good notes and can bring something back next time. Have the 10,000, 8,000, 6,400 and 5,100, are hiding the utility boxes, no parking in private drives, getting rid of the church dedication, asking the HOA to have trash inside the garages, adding the 25% common space, okay with 3 foot fences, require traffic impact analysis, maximum homes on driveway is per Fire Marshall, tails hard surface, entry monuments not required. Commissioner Thorson asked if next meeting will be a public hearing for their portion and an action. Planner Steele stated yes.

[9:16:02 PM](#)

3. Commissioner Reports

None.

[9:16:04 PM](#)

4. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER THORSON MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.