

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Regular Meeting, September 6, 2016

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Planning Commission held on September 6, 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
Troy Moultrie
Greg Day
Grant Thorson

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 Maughan

Excused: Councilman Gailey
Gary Bingham

Visitors: TJ Jensen Brodie Panter

[6:01:50 PM](#)

1. **Meeting Called to Order:**

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

[6:02:53 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 6, 2016 MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOULTRIE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:03:40 PM](#)

2. **Meeting Minutes:**

August 2, 2016 Regular Meeting & Work Session

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGULAR AND WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 2, 2016. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RACKHAM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:04:20 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.

[6:04:48 PM](#)

TJ Jensen stated had a comment on a work session item but before then it is good to see the Hamblin's are adding a couple more lots to the little street there the Hamblin's are one of the old families in Syracuse. It is kind of nice to see that there are still some people keeping the roots here in Syracuse and has a lot of respect for the Hamblin family. Regarding the PRD Zone Review during work session there are a couple changes in there that look good and just wanted to give some thoughts on one of them, based on the PRD that the Council is currently working on and the one that was recently approved it was suggested that driveways, shared driveways be only limited to 6 units which is what is in the packet and think that is a good change. Basically as it stands right now the developers can, won't say abusive might be too strong of a word but basically get around the right of way restrictions by just calling it a private driveway and adding houses on it and just don't think that is a good change. With the development that was recently approved could have easily done it another way and basically had houses sharing 5 or 6 to shared driveway rather than 17 units sharing the same driveway. The one change wanted the Commission to think about it is what was suggested was 3 per side and think there is going to be some situations where may have an odd shape lot where 3 per side might not be practical so would probably suggest maybe bumping that to 4 so can do a 4/2 split if need to due to weird lot configurations. The second thing would like the Commission to consider is on the recommendation a few weeks ago felt like the issue with the road access to 2000 W wasn't adequately dealt with, that can easily be done and in fact submitted a drawing to Chairman Vaughan which showed a way which that could be done exactly and would still have the same number of units but the argument as made by staff that since it is a 35MPH road that they didn't want to put it on there, the speed limit in that area can easily be dropped to 30MPH to meet the 7.5 second requirement in which case that would have been linked in just fine and an argument could be made that that road probably should be dropped from basically the driveway behind the City Building here to the traffic light and probably should be dropped to 30MPH anyway because of school children, the Community

Center, the City Building and multiple businesses and a couple residences all sharing the road right there and they are multiple driveways that are not within that 7.5 second requirement so think in the interest of safety that whether or not whatever happens and what Council decides to do with the recommendation to move forward think it would be a good idea to drop the speed limit 30MPH but might not also hurt since a few Councilmembers have some strong feelings about it one way or another about whether or not that subdivision should have access basically to 2000 W and maybe should send a letter to Council to let them know your thoughts.

[6:08:08 PM](#)

Closed

[6:08:12 PM](#)

4. **Final Subdivision Plat – Hamblin Haven, property located at 3230 W 2700 S**

Planner Davies stated this is part of a subdivision that was preliminarily approved in August of 2006 so they have currently built out 4 of the lots and are looking to add 2 more. Both of the lots exceed the minimum lot size, more than double the minimum lot size and meet all the other requirements of the R-1 Zone. The only other comment that have and is in the staff report is if looking at the area generally basically there is a future not issue but something to be aware of for the applicant and for the Planning Commission when future phases come through on this subdivision. There is a maximum 500-foot requirement for putting a cul-de-sac in and what is built now is just over 600 feet long that road so that wouldn't qualify for a cul-de-sac so they would have to continue it up and then the maximum lot distance is about 1300-feet which it is not there yet so once there are lots are built out it will be 800-900 feet so they do have a way to go before they would be required to put a road a crossroad in there, they would need some sort of an intersection. Basically there is a stub road on the west and another stub road on the north and another stub road on the east are kind of the closest vicinity stub roads that have. Not saying it has to be this way but if add a road in the future would like to see some sort of a connection, if bring in 2 more lots that are the same dimensions as the current lots are proposing with this final plat that would exceed the 1300-foot requirement so either those lots would need to be shortened or would need to have a road put in and then the lots. Doesn't affect the current situation because this currently meets the code and there are no problems with it that are proposing but just for future reference just want to make sure it gets on the record so if there is any question in the future that know what is going on there. They are showing 2 lots on the plat with a hammerhead turnaround easement which currently exists in the current development so this is basically just mirroring the 2 lots in the current development and just bringing it up one more lot.

[6:11:27 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked there is a preliminary plan in there that shows a cul-de-sac with these 2 lots going in, is there a reason it is deviating from that, was that a staff recommendation for connections or how did that change come about. Planner Davies stated wasn't here when that was originally approved. Planner Steele stated think it predates both of them but remembers that there was a cul-de-sac length discussion before started to shorten up the length of the cul-de-sac so that wouldn't be legal to build that way anymore and think that is why it was changed. Planner Davies stated there are a couple of codes that have been printed off from certain years and previous Planners have been fairly good about doing that but doesn't have the code for the year this was approved and the only code was able to find from that time period was a year later and it required a 400-foot length maximum for a cul-de-sac so that obviously wasn't the code applied to that as it was approved. Digging through the file not exactly sure why it was approved the way it was approved other than would assume the code was allowing that. Planner Steele stated thinks generally a stub road and having an interconnected roadway network is better planning than having a small dead end like that and brought it up in the report just so the applicant is aware and is on the record if they continue expanding they will have to do a stub road in the next phase, and by stub road mean not another stub road to the north but to the east or west stub road.

[6:13:33 PM](#)

Brodie Panter, currently live across from Jensen Park and his wife Cambri is a Hamblin and so her Dad owns all that land and just decided it is time to build down so will probably just follow suit with everybody else that is down there.

[6:14:36 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated it seems that the City Planner has been diligent and put forth all the requirements that will be required in the future and this development before them seems to meet code at this time and doesn't have any suggestions.

[6:14:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked on the hammerhead does the ordinance say 22 feet. Planner Davies stated it is a fire turnaround so it wouldn't be used for regular vehicular access so it doesn't meet the regular vehicular access standard but it does meet the IFC, to his understanding. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated per the IFC the hammerhead only needs to be 20 feet in that section so it actually exceeds it by 2 feet. Commissioner Rackham asked if there a type of surface they have to put on there. Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin stated it would have to be maintainable surface that would support the imposed load of a fire apparatus so a road base can be that that is going to be maintainable surface to put on there.

[6:15:49 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated with the easement in mind would that easement go away should that property be developed in the future where the hammerhead turnaround is proposed or would that stay in perpetuity or when the property does develop. Planner Davies stated if understand correctly is asking if they develop 2 more lots to the north where the hammerhead is located how would it affect the easement. Currently they do have one actually so the property line on the southern side is the exact same set up and have a hammerhead that is on these lots and so once these lots

are approved and recorded with the County that easement will go away and this easement will appear. So when further development occurs then the easement will go away and just continues to move forward north as they work on future phases. Commissioner Vaughan stated so on lot 201 & 202 don't show an easement on there now but that will go away automatically when gets approved. Planner Davies stated right and actually one point on that with the hammerhead easement currently staff drove the area a couple months ago and there were just some things that were stored in the turnaround area and so just so the applicant is aware need to keep that clear and would recommend putting some signage out there or something that says and can be part of the motion to recommend with a condition that signage be put out there to designate it as a fire turnaround and no parking or storage of materials. Deputy Fire Chief stated that has been addressed in his letter as well.

[6:18:02 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE REQUEST OF A 2 LOT FINAL SUBDIVISION, HAMBLIN HAVEN PHASE 2 LOCATED AT 3230 W 2700 S, R-1 RESIDENTIAL ZONE CONDITION UPON ALL REQUIREMENTS BY STAFF. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOULTRIE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

[6:18:58 PM](#)

5. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COMMISSIONER RACKHAM SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. MOVED STRAIGHT INTO WORK SESSION.

Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Date Approved: _____

Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary