

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Work Session, September 6, 2016

Minutes of the Syracuse City Planning Commission Work Session held on September 6, 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 McCuistion Grant Thorson Greg Day Troy Moultrie
City Employees:	Noah Steele, Planner Royce Davies, Planner Paul Roberts, City Attorney Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary
City Council:	Councilman Maughan
Excused:	Councilman Gailey Gary Bingham
Visitors:	TJ Jensen

[6:19:22 PM](#)

1. **Department Business:**

[6:19:33 PM](#)

a. City Council Liaison Report

Councilman Maughan stated Councilman Gailey wasn't unable to attend. Appreciates the Commission taking a look at and reviewing the PRD Zone and the Council feels like it is needed and reviewed it and made some changes, specifically for some clarity, there has been a development that basically there has been quite a to do about what access to a development really means and was surprised that was flexible but would like to make it more clear so it is not taken advantage of. Some other things the Council was concerned about and wanted the advice of the Commission on would be things like common space and open space, it seems to be pretty consistent that at least open space has been taken advantage of to mean anything that is not a building including yard space and so would like some more specific language that kind of clarifies and the Councils interpretation was that it wasn't meant to be anything that wasn't occupied but again common space has its own weaknesses and could like to see some clarity there. Would also came up against the issue with a shared drive and the Council has at least taken steps that intend to make change to the limit of what can be on a shared drive so it is not just a free for all and that has been an issues that has come up in a couple Council meetings is what is the ordinance and what does it mean.

[6:22:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated they have eliminate the definition and use and call out of open space from the ordinance, is it the City Council's request that they add in an open space requirement separate from common and keep that 2 distinct definition. Councilman Maughan stated no but it keeps coming up and so for some reason that is being brought to the table as a separate item but agrees with him that they don't need 2 separate defined spaces. Commissioner Thorson stated because in his mind and thought the way the conversation was going open space happens. Councilman Maughan agreed. Commissioner Thorson stated just can't fit that many by virtue of density requirements, open space is there and so we are focusing on the common space amenities only, eliminating open space. Councilman Maughan stated think the issue that keeps coming back up is when say more than just the common space needs to exist. The interpretation that he was given, right or wrong, is that open space was a plus amount on top of common space needed somewhere within a zone and not sure if that is actually something they need to define and maybe should be measure defined on common space but will leave that up to the Commission for discussion and advice and will take it back to the Council.

[6:23:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated in discussing open space and common space are they discussing this solely within the parameter of the newly proposed zone or are they talking about open space and common space in general. Councilman Maughan stated no in the newly proposed zone they still have a lot of things to discuss and what constitutes what and so just in general the Council wants to get a better definition from the City as both bodies agree on whether need to require open space at all or that is just okay as it happens and how do they define common space just a little clarity there and if already have a good definition is good an just need to stick to it okay, but it keeps coming up for some reason.

[6:24:55 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated to add some clarification as far as the open space and common space with City Council don't know if have had a chance to review the changes in depth of what Planning Commission has already reviewed and agree with Councilman Maughan and have some proposed language where would just look at common space as an amenitized.

Open space definition is still in there and still valuable it is just not something that are going to be counting meticulously as before. Common will still count and make sure they have the required amount but also in the next item will address some of the other things that Director Mellor passed on that was something that the Council wanted them to address in the PRD so could just do one ordinance and get all of the PRD amendments in 1 instead of 2, because there are open and common space items but there is also the private driveways and access to arterial roads, so in this packet hopefully staff has addressed everything.

[6:26:17 PM](#)

Councilman Maughan stated there are times when things don't get passed onto the Council as quickly and doesn't remember having reviewed the updates. Planner Steele stated they have had some other items and Council sent them back down to staff to piggyback on the initial ordinance adjustment that has been reviewed by the Commission. Councilman Maughan stated the Council appreciated their help.

[6:26:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked if he would like to comment on discussions on the PRD across the street because it is still an active event. Councilman Maughan asked in what way would he like him to comment on that. Commissioner Vaughan stated not everyone in the room was at that meeting so they don't know what some of the discussions were that came up in regards to decisions made and Council opinions on what the Planning Commission opinion was because it approved by the Planning Commission. Councilman Maughan stated there were some issues with the Jackson Court development and one of the big concerns was and as had mentioned earlier with just PRD's in general would be the private drive, the idea that a private drive could service 18 houses seemed excessive to the Council and have been advised a few different ways but basically felt like that was probably a bad thing to go forward with. The Council looked at a few other developments in the City where the max that they think is probably a good idea and the Commission can tell them if they have reasoning to think otherwise but the general consensus among the Council was 3 per side of a shared driveway so if were all on one side maybe 3 if on either side 6 but shared driveway of 18 was probably too much. The Council felt like the ordinance as it was described to them allowed for anyone to call a private a drive any road that could access up to 100 homes and even more because there was no limit, so that was a concern in approving that development. One of the keys to having that approved that was a challenge was the fact that the private drive loops around from a cul-de-sac as their point of access so that would mean that if anything were to happen or exist that blocked access on one side suddenly have limited emergency access. In this case they have discussed and don't know that it is approved yet but there has been discussion about having a secondary trail that would be able to serve as an emergency access in worst case event so that there would be some kind of secondary access but the Council felt like going forward all subdivision or all approved developments should have a secondary access somewhere, that is at least the shared feeling of the Council right now and are probably looking for that to be a part of the City Code going forward. There was a great deal of discussion for what the size of a private road were to be accountable for because the width of the road is in question and don't think they had a problem with that development per se when compared it to other developments but know that was a point of discussion was what standard does a private road go by and does the City have a standard for a private road, so would like some input on how to attack a standardized road whether it be private, public or whatever, the City has standards for public roads but how should they handle private drives.

[6:31:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked the City Attorney Roberts if the City Council were to reject the project across the street with whatever finding they chose that would stand up under scrutiny would they have to reject it or would it come back to the Planning Commission or do they have the ability to refer it back to the Planning Commission for additional review. City Attorney Roberts stated if the Council finds that it does not meet the statute and deny it and that decision is not challenged or is upheld then the developer would need to come back with a new plan, so would come through the Commission again. Commissioner Vaughan stated and would then have the opportunity to thoroughly review and make recommendations on everything. Councilman Maughan stated the Council had asked for some other concessions but don't know that they were out of the ordinance per se but had asked that they take some steps to provide a trail that more integrated their community with the community they would be becoming a part of, that certainly wasn't something that they were obligated to do but where they were going to ask for some variance where the Council felt like it was definitely a variance to allow for a private drive off of a cul-de-sac that would like for them to make some other concessions like some walking paths to common areas or open space that wasn't really accessible otherwise.

[6:32:58 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated the Planning Commission would clearly be out of line if asked the City Council to reject the item but it is something could possibly take back to let them know that the Council does have the ability to do that and then some of the concerns that were discussed in that meeting could be addressed a little bit more thoroughly because several of the things that were brought up in the Council meeting were items that were not discussed in Planning Commission discussions and had they been brought up who knows the outcome may have been different or there may have been some additional comments but that is something may want to discuss with the City Attorney and with others powers that be just to see. City Attorney Roberts stated just as a clarification the City Code does allow the Council to remand the plat to the Planning Commission for further review but would need to have a good reason for doing so though that doesn't appear to be just to slow things down, it needs to be a legitimate reason.

[6:34:07 PM](#)

Councilman Maughan stated the legitimate argument that the Council found was access to an arterial access and that is why brought to the Commission that in the future would like the Code reflect that the City believes there should be

more than one access to a community, understand that if it a cul-de-sac of 4 houses or 6 houses that it really doesn't need a secondary access but this is 20 units and think that is to the point and need to figure out what that standard is but there is a point where some other way in and out is necessary. City Attorney Roberts stated that is in the City Code currently that if it is over 35 or more units then a second access is required under current code so that could be changed of course if feel like that is not sufficient but is currently in City Code 8.10.110. Councilman Maughan stated at the City Council level that was a great deal of discussion back and forth as what number is that too much and is this a problem, the Council has not taken a vote on this development yet so this will come up next week and think that the general feeling at the moment is that the Council will allow variance because this is probably like the Commission had stated is an effective use of this space in general but the core concern is an arterial access and limited access to this development. Commissioner Vaughan stated all of the Councilman Maughan's comments will enable the Commission to be able to bring this up as a discussion items at their next meeting and is quite sure that would be more than happy to act on those items on behalf of the Council.

[6:35:56 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated on the private roads the City Code states that a private road has to be built to the same standards as a public road as far as width and everything so the only way around that for the developer is to call it a private drive. Councilman Maughan stated that is what they had discussed at City Council was that because it wasn't originally intended to meet the standard of a road their way around it was to call it a private driveway and so that where they felt like if there is a private driveway there needs to be some limit to what a private driveway can be otherwise could have a road that goes end to end in the City and is just called a private drive and then it gets around the issue of being an actual road.

[6:36:58 PM](#)

b. City Attorney Updates

City Attorney Roberts stated nothing tonight.

[6:37:06 PM](#)

c. Upcoming Agenda Items

Planner Davies stated have an application in for Trails Edge and have a homeowner that basically wants to add the detention basin behind their lot to their lot so can build a little further back so it is a big enough amendment to the plat that are doing a Plat Amendment as opposed to just a property line adjustment. Are also going to be combining 2 lots into 1 but that would be on the next agenda. Commissioner Vaughan asked if that was all they had for their next meeting. Planner Davies stated yes. Commissioner Vaughan asked if they have any work items they need to cover, know PRD is fairly strong item just in case have no true action items for the main agenda. Planner Steele stated staff always have lots of things that are on the list to work on it is just a matter of getting to them and deciding if want staff to start working on them, some other things that have been discussed in the past are the Buffer ordinance, Sign ordinance, Conditional Use Permits, etc. Commissioner Vaughan asked the other Commissioner if they had any aversion to suspending the next meeting in case it just turned out to be a work session only. Commissioner Day stated he prefers that unless there is a specific purpose and reason for them to open and discuss prefers they not meet and perhaps there is but has fund that often times when they as a Planning Commissions just open ended discuss an ordinance that last way too long is a very ineffective use of time. Commissioner Rackham stated he will not be present next week. Commissioner Thorson stated it is his opinion that they load the meetings to make the best use of the City's time and money even to the extent of having multiple items on the agenda before have a meeting, short of pushing the time restraints and legal responsibilities of the Commission would think that monthly meetings would meets that requirement and don't see a reason to schedule a meeting for no agenda items and would even push 1 or 2 as long as it is within the legal timeframe to the next meeting. Commissioner Vaughan asked Planner Davies to pass that information along to Director Mellor and will use staff judgement to determine whether have enough meat to put on the plate in front of the Commission and don't want to waste time and use up the City's reserves and conduct business. Commissioner Thorson stated would like also say that one application fee does not pay for this meeting so multiple application fees would pay for the meeting and that is where it just doesn't justify the City's time and money to have so many meetings.

[6:40:28 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated they do have 1 application for next meeting so let staff know if would like to address that, have had the application for a while and would recommend having a meeting next week but will leave that up to the Chairman. Commissioner Vaughan stated if it is staff recommendation that they hear that item, they will hear that item. Planner Steele stated does agree generally with what the Commission has said, not meet just to meet. Commissioner Vaughan stated whatever Director Mellor feels is the appropriate action for the Commission to take are happy to do that. Councilman Maughan stated he does appreciate the Commission having the discussion of the PRD because that has been something that has brought some contention to the City Council the fact that ordinance seems to be very interpretable in many ways in some areas and would appreciate the Commissions input on whether that is a good thing to leave it open to interpretation, right now it appears the Council that is a bad thing but do have some people that have said it is a good thing because it gives options but the Council is worried that it leaves the City liable if don't nail it down but would like to hear the Commissions opinion.

[6:42:11 PM](#)

2. Discussion Items:

a. PRD Zone Review

Planner Steele stated this should address some of the issues that have been discussed. In the packet is the potential packet, the black is existing ordinance, red is proposed as had previously hammered out, which took a few months to go through and compile. It addresses the common space and open space issues, are requiring 20% and this is what has been passed onto City Council but they have not voted on it yet and will review how propose to address these issues. The first is development design shall include a direct connection to a major arterial, minor arterial or major collector roadway by way of a full width and dedicated right-of-way designated for the movement of automobile traffic and feel like that nails it down pretty good. The next one is street design, the land Use Authority may approve an alternative street design so long as it maintains the City's minimum rights-of-way, the developer shall dedicate all street rights-of-way to the City, private driveways services more than 1 unit shall meet the Fire Code as directed by the Fire Marshall, built to support the weight of a fire truck and other heavy service vehicles, service no more than 6 units, 3 per side and be no longer than 160 feet. Planner Steele stated 160 feet is based off recommendation from the Fire Marshall. The number of units is coming from City Council but that is also another item that can discuss of what really want to see, if this development exists they want to make sure that these residents have the appropriate means of getting their services and getting rid of trash and having an emergency response, also want them to feel like they are part of a community, if the drive goes way back and don't have frontage they are not an official resident or what not have discussed that don't want this ordinance abused and have 100 units on there and thinks 6 is a good number and actually currently have in Stoker Gardens believe 12 so that would be a non-conforming use that would create but just couldn't build any more that way and another development similar is Sunset Park Villas.

[6:45:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated there is another alternative that is not on the agenda or as part of the discussion item in regard to PRD and that is a guillotine, could recommend if wanted to the elimination of the PRD and would not have PRD problems and would be functioning solely upon the standard, common zones just mentioning that as an alternative so could say if nothing else the Council liaison can take it back and mention it was brought up as an alternative. PRD's have caused more issues or dissention in regards to land use and think any other single item that can recall, so it is a possibility.

[6:46:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated has a comment on a general idea of a PRD. The Council and the Commission find themselves in trouble trying to justify acceptance or refusal or rejection of the PRD because when it doesn't say it should be done one way or will be rejected don't have, if the Commission recommends disapproval or approval the Council would reject but when it comes down to the legal terms they have to say what part of the ordinance the rejection is based on and when the PRD doesn't say the road has to be 20 feet and has to have this or that and not defined super well there is no way to say it is rejected based on the PRD ordinance that they don't like that subdivision and that doesn't hold up and so it is really hard to reject it and so struggle with giving this planning option to the developer but retaining the legal option to reject it and don't think there is a way to do it without getting rid of it. There is not a way to release power and retain power both, can't do it and so could probably write some wording that does that, retain the option to reject based on liking but don't know how well it would go over but that is what they are running up against always in PRD discussion and the Master Planned Community how do they reject something they don't like if they meet the letter that isn't written.

[6:48:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated using the last item as an example there was one particular satellite photo where there was the red, blue and yellow lines showing speeds and distances in regard to the map, they had the absolute ability to kill that particular project based upon the yellow line which was the distance from the center line of the cul-de-sac immediately to the east of the primary entrance into that project and think it was something like 30-35 feet short but they didn't officially waive it but because the project was approved that was automatically waived because they specifically did not say they did not like it. Likewise, at the last City Council meeting it was mentioned from the audience by a speaker that if the Council wanted to kill it they could use that but there were some argument and the argument he used that because the entire project was approved it was thought by the City Council that the Planning Commission approved that particular waiver on that particular item. Now that isn't a PRD requirement that line distance, that is an ASHTO standard that isn't part of the City but could have done that, there are ways to do it but it is just how brazen or how bold do they want to be. The Commission can fine tune this and pass it forward but if they are having a discussion, the City Council listens to what they say and read their minutes so they at least know they talked about the possibility because a PRD has to go before the Council for final approval vote there are just as familiar as the Commission is as the problems that a PRD causes.

[6:50:41 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated he would like to share a few thoughts on this, looking holistically at the roles and responsibilities as Planning Commissioners and really as them building a community certainly think there is a place and a need for a PRD ordinance. Think because this body struggles with it or City Council struggles with it don't think that is a good enough reason and will articulate that for a couple of points. His experience here in Planning Commission and many other Planning Commissions is that will never have people come out and support a development. They just had an applicant come forward that is a very strong member of the community that wanted half acre lots and there was not one person come out in support. So if they are saying that are judging the opinion by people coming out in favor of PRD was actually surprised of the PRD development that are talking about actually had the support of the HOA and many of the members of the Craig Estates people come out and support of their application. So the idea that they need to get rid of the PRD don't feel that is responsible in terms of the community because have person instance of friends in his neighborhood who have gone through different life challenges that cause them to have to move and they had to leave the community and then commute with their children to schools because can no longer afford their previous place of

residence because that housing choice isn't available to them, they were great members of our community who in a sense are kicking them out because are not providing a housing choice. With that being said and as a background is not saying they open the flood gate for these type of things but think the discussion of do they get rid of it, don't think that is a very prudent or proper thing for the Planning Commission to recommend. The easy thing for them to do in this community in particular is to say every land use should be 5 acre lots that would be the easy decision but that would show lack of leadership on this body. So in terms of that discussion those are his feelings on that. Commissioner Vaughan stated he appreciates his thoughts and that is one of the great things on this Commission they are not afraid to say what is on their mind and then act accordingly, to that end let's put that particular thought to rest in regards to doing away with PRD and let's work on the one staff has provided.

[6:53:23 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham asked what exactly does dedicated right-of-way mean to the City, does that mean they maintain it and own it. Planner Steele stated yes. Commissioner Rackham stated so based on this it requires that the PRD dedicate that to the right-of-way so that would have eliminated it right there, right. Planner Steele stated could just put a period after right-of-way. Commissioner Rackham stated he just wanted to make sure he was understanding it right. Planner Steele stated in the engineering standard there is a standard right-of-way width, sometimes they fluctuate but right now it is 60 feet for a local road and 66 feet for a collector. Commissioner Rackham stated it becomes a City road at that point.

[6:54:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated he has an opposing view on this, doesn't believe it is necessary that all PRD's have access to a collector or arterial road, think it is prudent that they have proper access but to say that they should have direct connection to it an arterial or collector, is not his opinion. Commissioner Vaughan stated he thinks it should have direct access. Commissioner Moultrie stated he agrees with Commissioner Day. Commissioner Rackham stated he tends to agree and thinks they should have access and do not believe that the road should in anyway shape or form be a private road, private driveway, private anything, should be a public access road into it and out of it. Commissioner Thorson stated the wording is being added because the black lettering staff didn't feel was strong enough to require that it be a road connection for Jackson Court and so are trying to strengthen it to force it to be a road and the actual requirement that it be a road should be based off level of service and need for the road that is connecting to it. Could go through and say if it is more than 10 have to have 1 direct access, right now it says if it more than 35 have to have 2 direct accesses. Don't have an opinion whether they require that there be an access but it is pretty easy to say do a traffic impact study to determine whether it reduces the level of service of that adjacent road below what should be expected by the public and then don't have to pick a number. Although could get in trouble where an engineer may not recommend an access that they think should.

[6:56:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked the City Attorney say that they did enact #5 the way it is written in red, would an applicant have the ability to come forward and ask for a variance of this to the Commission on this particular item. City Attorney Roberts stated this body wouldn't consider variances, that would go to the Board of Adjustment if there was some extreme problem with their lot and the requirements for a variance are very strict and very seldom met, can always apply for a variance that is always an option but it is very rare that would actually qualify for one. Commissioner Vaughn stated so even if they did pass this an applicant would have the right and ability to come forward and ask them for a variance. City Attorney Roberts stated they could ask the City for a variance yes, not the Planning Commission. Commissioner Vaughan stated yes, they would have the right to be able to do that, so are not totally slamming the door on an applicant. City Attorney Roberts stated maybe not slamming the door but it is going to be hard for them to crack the door, variances are just per the code really hard to get one. Commissioner Vaughan stated they all know variances are difficult but it is something that is possible. City Attorney Roberts stated sure.

[6:58:05 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated thinks Commissioner Day raised an important point of consideration of whether or not it is even necessary to have the connection onto an arterial road, what wouldn't recommend is having a 200-unit development in the middle of a residential area with all of the traffic going through a local road, but something like what is being propose with Jackson Court really don't see that it would propose a really big traffic concern for those residents with those 20 homes added. That is the challenge with writing ordinance is try to think of all of the different situations that might occur and run the risk of just painting yourself into a corner or being too broad, so here are drawing a pretty hard line and just saying all PRD has to come onto an arterial and that will limit the land use choices but that is up to the Commission. Don't think it is necessary except for the largest and at 6 units per acre don't know if will ever be able to create that much impact but if the density ever gets increased and do have a multi-family project that is off of an arterial that might pose a different story.

[6:59:36 PM](#)

Planner Davies stated just one suggestion on that, there is a standard in the code that may be changing for the secondary access where have 35 units and have a secondary access, might be worth looking at something like that over a certain number of units maybe 235 whatever they end up changing it to if change that part of the code to use that as part of the threshold. Planner Steele stated that is a good idea, could just say for developments with more than X number of units the design shall include a direct connection to a major arterial.

[7:00:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated as listening to this discussion see 2 things. One think Commissioner Thorson brought up a great point is to get a professional opinion might help satisfy some of these questions but also the role of the public might

also deter the ability of someone to get a PRD zoning. For example, could see a scenario of 100-unit development seeking a request for a rezone and trying to get access onto a local road and think the public outcries purpose would be to try to diminish an applicant's ability to get that rezone, so think the role of the public would also help kind of guide the ship of what should and should not be zoned.

[7:01:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated in regards to that is the PRD something that the City establishes as a rule that it wants or is this something that they are writing to make it comfortable and easier for land owners to be able to get something that normally wouldn't fit under standard zoning. It seems as though they are trying to do, his opinion is that the City should set a standard and that is the standard, period. If a piece of property does not work there are still outlets available for a property owner, one they can sell it, they can build according to what the zone is for that area or could do an assemblage, so it is not a case of where someone is completely shut out but it is a case of setting a standard. Now a PRD is part of the General Plan that a committee labored over for over a year and then the Commission labored over it for a number of months and they adopted it and here they are the sun hasn't even set, the ink isn't even dry and are already changing it, are loosening it, being proposed that they loosen it. At what particular point are they going to say this is the ordinance, period. If want to do business in Syracuse, this is how you do business. The philosophy is how desperate are they to have someone come and develop in town, that is not them that is up to the City Council but as far as the Commission in regards to what the code is, this their opportunity to speak as to how they would recommend this would be done by the City Council. Again don't know if want to call him a hard liner but in this particular area the code is the code. They had a very distinguished group of people work on the General Plan for a long time, it was well debated and that was what they chose to do and there it is. Think are trying to accommodate people when should be setting a standard. Commissioner Day stated he is okay if they don't touch the PRD, perfectly okay with keeping it the way it is, has no problem with it. Think that has been initiated by the City to change the PRD. Commissioner Thorson stated this change on item #5 think came because they set a standard of having a connection to an arterial and it was abused because the connection to an arterial wasn't clearly a road and so are trying to clear it up and make it a road, however is it necessary for smaller PRD's. Now a PRD minimum size is 5 acres, so would generally have 30 units, in this case has 20 because they undershot his possible density probably for fit reasons but they set a standard and it got abused because it wasn't clear enough and so are trying to clear up with this road issue and is okay with it the way it is and is okay with the red, is okay with making it dependent on the City concurrence with a traffic impact study, is okay with 100 different things, doesn't think it matters.

[7:05:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked on item #5, rough poll from the other Commissioner do they accept or deny the red changes. Commissioner Thorson stated he would accept it. Commissioner Rackham stated he would support it. Commissioner McCuiston stated he is in favor of a traffic impact study for developments over 35 units, but would support what is proposed. Commissioner Day stated he would prefer it would state something like professional opinion or something like that but honestly it isn't a make or break thing for him. Commissioner Moultrie stated he is okay with it. Commissioner Vaughan stated he is in favor of it.

[7:06:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated the next item street design. Planner Steele stated this is addressing the private driveways and trying to since there is not anything in the ordinance describing what would like to see for private driveways this is trying to clarify that. Commissioner Thorson asked was there really not a limit to what a private driveway could be or how many units, was that really not defined at all. Planner Steele stated nothing, just had private streets. Commissioner Thorson stated no definition for private drives anywhere. Planner Steele stated think Syracuse is a growing City and are going to see more of this but up to right now it has just been something that was addressed with Site Plan or the Subdivision design process. There has been some very broad language that has allowed staff to weigh in if thought it was too much but this really defines it.

[7:07:38 PM](#)

Councilman Maughan stated wanted to add the City Council would have liked the idea that they did not have a private drive need but clearly it is something that is going to come before them. They prefer that road standards were always met but because it is here the Council feels like and because there was absolutely no limit given to them as a legal opinion because they did look for the outlet that could use that as a reason to deny the proposed PRD but because it wasn't there at all are now realizing something has to be set.

[7:08:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated if this is not addressed it should be and like it the way it is and would accept it.

[7:08:38 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated he is just wondering how this came up, the applicant could come up and say want to have a shared driveway, it seems to be just a semantics issue. Commissioner Thorson stated or they could call it a carport. Commissioner McCuiston stated what they have to do is say what don't want them to do is share driveways are silly and turns into a fist fight over who is going to shovel it, how get garbage up there, do they need them at all.

[7:09:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Day asked if this was a bad thing, is it a bad thing, what is the motivation, have they had bad experiences with it, is it just an unknown and don't know. Commissioner Vaughan stated this is a loophole that has been called to their attention and have been requested to address it, if it was a good thing don't think they would be called to scrutinize it. Commissioner Thorson stated doesn't know whether it is bad or good. Here is the problem sees happening 2

neighbors disagree with how their driveway gets handled and the governing authority isn't a government, it is an HOA which then acts like the City so are giving up the authority over the citizens and letting an HOA become the governing authority, do they like that or not. Commissioner Day stated that is a great point actually, that is a very logical issue. Commissioner Thorson stated would say anything serving more than 1 house is not a driveway it is a road, now could have a private road and could call it a private road and could give options for alternative road designs. Planner Steele stated Public Works has weighed in and has said they actually like that there is less being dedicated to the City as far as maintenance. Commissioner Thorson stated the City would love to not do as much work and still get the taxes. Commissioner Day stated would think that the IFC requirement is something like 150 feet, anything more than 150 feet requires some sort of turn around, so thinks there is some self regulation in terms of how this works and think that should be part of their approach, but likes the way it is written and doesn't have a problem with the way it is written.

[7:11:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated he has a problem with it, believes they should say private driveways may service one unit, does not think should have a shared driveway in a PRD. Commissioner Vaughan asked if he could accept it, but would prefer if it was strengthened. Commissioner Rackham stated he couldn't accept it.

[7:11:35 PM](#)

Commissioner Moultrie stated would have to agree, wouldn't want a shared driveway in PRD would make the houses even tighter so would say no shared driveways. Commissioner Vaughan stated thinks they have an opinion to accept it like all things when are discussing a whole bunch of sub-ordinances at one time there is going to be some concessions but at least can agree with the majority of them could support this.

[7:12:08 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated if like could go on a driveway tour, go visit a bunch of shared driveways and see what think or could set up some HOA meetings and see what the problems are. Commissioner Vaughan stated on behalf of Commissioner Moultrie and Commissioner Rackham do they want to set it at zero. Commissioner Rackham stated they want private driveways to service one unit not multiple units, just like a regular home just one unit. Has been to places that have shared driveways between units and if someone parks in the wrong spot it creates havoc, backs everything up and makes a mess, it is just something as a City should impose upon homeowners to have to deal with. Commissioner Vaughan stated he could accept that if it appears that a majority of the Commission appeared to support that premise. Commissioner Thorson stated thinks that a drivable surface servicing more than one unit is a road and would call it a road and make it be a road the other objection to this wording is it is clearly a reference to the pretend but not specific subdivision they have been presented, it is clearly a reference to that and is where it came from and would object to the layout and can see this layout being restricting to other people with different. Commissioner Vaughan stated in all fairness this would correct a loophole that has existed that has allowed other developments that are fully built and occupied that are known in hindsight looking at and saying shouldn't have that, like Stoker Gardens as a prime example where if went to 1 unit per driveway that would eliminate another Stoke Gardens being repeated.

[7:14:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated one option they could do on this is if they are going to come up with private drive standards they could actually come up with private drive standards requiring that 2 car garages and driveways where could pull into the private drive and then could park 2 vehicles outside of the unit, they could really set standards could talk about snow plows and area for snow storage, have to have an area for trash and dumpster, if they want to go that route could actually develop standards for private drives. Commissioner Vaughan stated using Commissioner Day's option, could they accept that. Commissioner Day stated that would take some time and thought. Commissioner Thorson stated in his opinion those standards would a lot like a private road. Commissioner Rackham stated that was his envision there would just describe a private road and could not support that. Commissioner Day stated he thinks the City roads are too wide, think 60 feet is awfully wide. Commissioner Rackham stated he would tend to agree but still is opposed to shared driveways.

[7:15:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated looks like have support for the red text the way it is but don't have the support for a single residence.

[7:15:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Rackham stated would like to discuss the number 6 then. Commissioner Vaughan stated the second line of red, service no more than XYZ. Commissioner Rackham stated 4 units, 1 would be ideal but think 4 would be the limit. Commissioner Vaughan asked if could accept 4. Commissioner Day stated thinks it is kind of arbitrary, if they do a townhome and can have a 4plex think that is the max it would make sense to do a townhome and could go up to 8, so kind of going in the opposite direction. Commissioner McCuiston stated he has already said he has seen problems with them like snow removal and who pays for the upkeep there is just trouble so could go with 4 but preference would be not to have them. Commissioner Rackham stated would have to agree private driveways should serve 1 but there is no way would support 6 going forward. Commissioner Thorson stated he doesn't like shared driveways, think it is a road. In the context they are going to have a motion that includes all of the changes to the PRD ordinance and is bordering on and just doesn't like the PRD ordinance growing into more and more dense, would like it to be 1, this might be a no for the whole thing and really doesn't like the shared driveway and thinks this a rouse. Commissioner Vaughan stated right now going in they have a consensus on where could accept 6 units and are offering the opportunity to drop it down to 4 units, could support 4 if others on the Commission did, are there 4 others would who also like 4 units. Commissioner Day stated he is waffling and going in the other direction and think it is bad policy and struggling and if it was 4 would vote no. Commissioner Vaughan stated they will stick with 6 then.

[7:19:25 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated those were all the changes. Commissioner Day asked if they needed to bring it back for the next business agenda. Commissioner Vaughan stated this is a discussion and will be on the next agenda with the changes that they have indicated are supporting tonight, hopefully in anticipation of being able to have a quick vote on it with minimal discussion.

[7:20:00 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated TJ Jensen in the audience would like to talk and think his input would be valuable and would ask that the Chair recognize him to speak briefly. Commissioner Vaughan stated normally they wouldn't have but at the request of Commissioner Thorson Mr. Jensen may come forward.

[7:20:25 PM](#)

TJ Jensen stated to the Chairman point of order that this is a work session and not a regular meeting so have the ability to recognize whomever choose. Had a couple thoughts and one was way back in the beginning thought that the planning Commission had agreed to get rid of the open space but require 25% common space, not 20% so if it was supposed to be 25% might want to speak up. In relation to these 2 issues the first one as far as the road issue the reason that is in there is for 2 reasons. One is to limit the placement of PRD's so they have to be along the collectors and arterials and so think that is important and don't want PRD's anywhere in the City they have to be on a major road. If want to separate that from basically the connection issue from that issue could change the language to say something to the effect of 'PRD's must be located along an arterial, major collector' rather than saying having a direct access, that would free up the ability to use other roads but if like the idea of forcing them to use the arterial as road access that is fine but just wanted to point that out. That is an option can keep the placement of them on the major roads but just change the language so it says must be located along the arterial and not a direct connection. The second point as far as the shared driveways are concerns do have 2 PRD's in the City, Stoker Gardens and Sunset Park Villas and both of those utilize shared driveway concept. When talking about multi-family unit and a compromise might be if like 6 units, could say 6 single family units and then in multi-family units would say no more 12 units may share a driveway. Those are just his suggestions.

[7:22:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked Planner Steele to present that to the Commission to act on at the next meeting. Planner Steele stated they will add that to the agenda at the next meeting as a public hearing and then can forward it formally to City Council for approval. Also wanted to let the Commission know about the APA Conference on October 7th in Farmington and if any of the Commissioners are interested in attending please let staff know and can get them registered. Just for clarification, will be having a meeting on November 1st, dispute the Presidential Elections.

[7:24:56 PM](#)

3. Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Rackham stated he will not be at the next meeting. Commissioner Day stated he would like to compliment the Chair and feel like the last 2 months the meetings have been very effective and efficient use of time, prior to that felt like they were just going to 9 o'clock just because and would just like to compliment the Chair, has a terribly difficult job and have done a great job, so thank you.

[7:25:35 PM](#)

4. Adjourn

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