

**Syracuse City Planning Commission Meeting**  
June 2, 2009  
Minutes

1. Meeting called to Order, Adoption of Agenda, and Approval of Minutes

Planning Commission Chairman Robert Whiteley called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m., indicating City staff posted the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting and delivered copies to all Commission members. Nathan Miller offered the prayer, and Jamie Nagle led the pledge of allegiance.

Members Present: Chairman Robert Whiteley, Vice Chairman Kenneth Hellewell, Tena Campbell, Nathan Miller, and Jamie Nagle as well as Community Development Director G.J. LaBonty, GIS Specialist Troy Moyes, and Administrative Assistant Judy Merrill.

Excused: Craig Jenkins and Evert Cook

Visitors: Melissa Green	Ross Green	Al Collins	Bruce Schofield
Elizabeth Green	Brian Bott	T.J. Jensen	Julie Apgood
Ray Zaugg	Pat Zaugg		

KENNETH HELLEWELL MOVED TO ADOPT THE JUNE 2, 2009, AGENDA AS OUTLINED, SECONDED BY TENA CAMPBELL; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

There were no minutes for the Commission to review.

2. Paul's Automotive Public Hearing and Conditional Use for Signage

Bill Leavitt, of Advantage Signs, and Kathy McBride, of Paul's Automotive, appeared before the Planning Commission requesting Conditional Use approval for signage on Paul's Automotive, located at 3938 West 1700 South. Director LaBonty indicated that, based on building dimensions, the lot would have 340.5 square feet of allowable signage while the application requested only 161.21 square feet. The sign would not be illuminated. The Architectural Review Committee reviewed this request on June 2, 2009, and recommended approval as presented.

Chairman Whiteley asked if there would be a separate pole sign in the future. Mrs. McBride said no. Chairman Whiteley asked about lighting the sign in the future. Mrs. McBride said they had no plans to add more lights other than those for the building to discourage criminal activities. The front had four windows and a glass door they needed to protect. The Chairman asked what type of lights they would be using, but Mrs. McBride was uncertain. She described them as the type that turned on automatically at dusk and off at dawn. There were three along the front, situated at a 93 degree angle, and the electrician made sure they complied with City codes and did not shine onto any adjacent properties. Chairman Whiteley asked for clarification that these were lights for the building rather than the sign. Both Mr. Leavitt and Mrs. McBride assured him the intended purpose of the lights was for security only.

Chairman Whiteley opened up the meeting for public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

NATHAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO GRANT CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO ADVANTAGE SIGN FOR THE PLACEMENT OF BUILDING SIGNAGE ON PAUL'S AUTOMOTIVE, LOCATED AT 3938 WEST 1700 SOUTH, SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND USE ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO SIGNAGE. KENNETH HELLEWELL SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. Creative Corner Preschool Public Hearing and Conditional Use Home Occupation

Melissa Green, 2486 West 2100 South, approached the Commission requesting Conditional Use approval to conduct a preschool in her home on Mondays and Wednesdays. Director LaBonty explained that the applicant would hold two sessions from 9:00-11:30 a.m. and 12:30-3:00 p.m. in her finished basement. The yard currently did not have fencing, but they were in the process of getting that installed. The applicant would be accepting children between the ages of 4 and 5 with 12 children per session. As a rule, she would not have other adults helping in class on a regular basis but would have volunteers occasionally. The subject property is a corner lot in the Hunter's Crossing Subdivision, and staff did not see any traffic issues for this location.

Chairman Whiteley opened up the meeting for public hearing.

Julie Apgood, 2082 South 2500 West, stood to voice support for this business and state for the record that she thought it was a great idea.

Chairman Whiteley closed the public hearing and asked the applicant to tell them her plans for fencing. Ms. Green told him she received one bid and was waiting for two more. She hoped to order a chain-link fence for now and have it installed within the next two weeks. If she were to have everything done by the end of the month, she could start in September. If not, there would be no way to acquire an adequate number of students and would have to wait until the next school year to begin. She expressed frustration with the City for not having a list of these requirements when she turned in her application. Chairman Whiteley pointed out that the affidavit she signed required her to initial each requirement, and he then explained how she could review any other requirements in the Land Use Ordinance on the City's website, Section 10-6-100.

NATHAN MILLER MOVED TO GRANT CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL FOR A PRE-SCHOOL IN MELISSA GREEN'S HOME, LOCATED AT 2486 WEST 2100 SOUTH, UNDER THE BUSINESS NAME *CREATIVE CORNER PRESCHOOL* SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND USE ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO PRESCHOOLS AND THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT HAVE A SECURE FENCE INSTALLED PRIOR TO RECEIVING A BUSINESS LICENSE. TENA CAMPBELL SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

#### 4. Annexation Petition 1900 South 3000 West

Brian Bott, of Richards Bott Architects, presented himself before the Commission requesting approval to annex 4.852 acres, owned by David L. and Cleone B. Cook, currently located within the unincorporated area of Davis County. Director LaBonty summarized this request by explaining that the property owners would be dedicating this land for the construction of a Stake Center for the LDS Church. The petition went before City Council on May 26, 2009, and received unanimous approval to proceed with all County and State requirements prior to final City approval. The Commission should provide comments and a recommendation to the City Recorder as to zoning of the subject property. The General Plan currently identified this area as future R-1 Single Family Residential, with churches, synagogues, and temples as permitted uses. City staff reviewed the plat submitted with the petition and determined that the parcel would have sufficient access to public utilities.

The City Engineer reviewed the plat as well and submitted the following comments in a letter dated May 21, 2009: 1) **Add vicinity map to plat.** 2) **Add owner's name to parcel of land.** 3) **Verify boundary description and change to agree with plat.** 4) **Utility Availability:** a) **10-inch culinary waterline in 3000 West that would meet required pressure and fire flows for proposed parcel,** b) **10-inch PVC secondary waterline in 3000 West for outdoor water use,** c) **8-inch City sewer line extension from 2025 South to Fremont Fire Station if evaluated to ensure it could benefit proposed parcel since line is shallow {If too shallow, there is an existing sewer line in Ranchettes to which they could connect},** d) **two storm-drain pipes in 3000 West, one on each side of road, with pipe on east side serving as irrigation and storm-drain lines and constructed to act as overflow {Prior storm-drain analysis showed sufficient capacity in west storm-drain line to take additional flows from proposed parcel, provided discharge was controlled and routed through detention basin. Grading and slope would need evaluating to ensure sufficient grade to place storm-drain pipe. Storm-water master plan for area shows extended separate storm-drain line through Section 17 to 2700 South where it would connect to main line. As future development occurs in this area, developers would need to submit a study showing new detention basin and plans for future piping},** e) **3000 West as minor collector, requiring 66-foot cross section right-of-way {Road fronting proposed parcel would need improvements to meet full cross-section requirements of City},** f) **land drain at 2025 South 3000 West intersection with flow going southward {If City does require land drain for proposed parcel, land drain would need extending}.**

Chairman Whiteley pointed out that City Council did not approve the petition. They simply accepted it and approved the applicant to go forward through the annexation process. Director LaBonty added that the Council would hold a public hearing for this petition at the time of their next review. Chairman Whiteley explained that the reason for this lengthy process was due to the number of entities involved.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked how soon the Church would begin construction. Mr. Bott explained the two-step process for building meetinghouses. His firm first worked with the real estate department in getting land through the city processes with conditional use or site plan approval. The real estate department then

purchased the subject properties and forwarded them to another department for creating work orders for designs and construction. The real estate department was currently purchasing lands for 1 to 3 years down the road. Consequently, the timeframe for this particular building would be some time in the next 3 years.

KENNETH HELLEWELL MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND ANNEXATION OF 4.85 ACRES OF LAND, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1900 SOUTH 3000 WEST AND OWNED BY DAVID AND CLEONE COOK, WITH AN R-1 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE TO MATCH THE CITY GENERAL PLAN, AND FORWARD IT TO THE CITY RECORDER. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5. Public Hearing of Proposed Amendments to Title X Land Use Ordinance

Chairman Whiteley went through each proposed amendment, explaining that the first one simply required applicants to submit more information for site plan review.

**10-4-090(D)1.** (e) Floor plans and elevations, including exterior finishes and colors.

~~(e)~~(f) Required engineer drawings for on- and off-site improvements as directed by the City Engineer.

~~(f)~~(g) Traffic study and Geotechnical study as directed by the City Engineer.

~~(g)~~(h) Each sheet shall be signed and stamped by a Professional Engineer.

During previous meetings, staff recommended a 40-foot distance from non-residential driveways to intersecting curbs as follows:

**10-6-060(B)** Visibility at Intersections. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Title in any residential district, fences, walls, signs, hedges, or other plantings may not encroach within the required clear-visibility triangle located at the intersection of two (2) roads or the intersection of a road and a non-residential driveway provided. ~~No~~ one shall erect, place, or plant anything or allow anything to grow in such a manner as to impede vision between a height of two and one half (2 1/2) feet and eight (8) feet above center-line grades of the adjoining street center-line surface elevation. Property owners shall maintain all tree branches so that none of them are lower than eight (8) feet in clear site triangle area. The configuration of a clear-visibility triangle is shown in Exhibit 10-6-060.a, and the length of each leg, measured along the curbline or edge of roadway or edge of non-residential driveway (indicated on Exhibit 10-6-060.a as 'x'), shall be ~~eleven (11)~~ forty (40) feet in residential areas, measured from property line, or based upon applicable speed limits greater than forty (40) mph as per AASHTO's "Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets."

Chairman Whiteley explained how the next proposed amendment for off-street parking provided guidelines for developments with narrower streets. Commissioner Miller asked how often developers proposed subdivisions with street widths less than city standards. Chairman Whiteley referred to two he dealt with in other cities the previous month with his primary employer. Vice Chair Hellewell pointed out that Sunset Park Villas could have made use of it but Syracuse had no regulations in place at that time. Commissioner Miller worried about such a requirement producing a lot of unused parking spaces throughout the City since most homes now had garages and driveways. Vice Chair Hellewell explained that this requirement would only be for developments that prohibited on-street parking. Chairman Whiteley added that the language would include a maximum and minimum number of off-street parking spaces. Commissioner Miller suggested a change to the verbiage to read "or from another parking area" or "Dwelling units shall not be more than 350 feet away from any parking area." Commissioners debated whether his suggestion really changed the current proposed language.

**10-7-080(B)** Additional off-street parking areas for common public use is required in residential zones and subdivisions where:

2. Street widths are at or less than thirty (30) feet of pavement in areas without curb, measured from the edge of asphalt or concrete. The layout, spacing, and number of stalls shall be recommended by the City Engineer and approved by the Land Use Authority and shall include:
  - a. A minimum of one stall for two dwelling units and a maximum of one stall for each dwelling unit.
  - b. A solid paved surface with proper dimensions, and painted markings.
  - c. Properly designed drainage into a storm water collection system and shall be subject to the same storm water detention requirements as the entire subdivision.

- d. ADA accessibility incorporated into the design based upon the requirements of the entire subdivision.
- e. Parking areas located no greater than three hundred and fifty (350) feet in walking distance on paved surfaces from any dwelling unit.
- f. A Home Owners Association (HOA) to maintain all off-street parking areas within the subdivision.

Director LaBonty distributed a copy of Orem City's language prohibiting billboards in every zone. Using this verbiage would eliminate the need for any other language regarding billboards in the Ordinance. Vice Chair Hellewell preferred such a restriction since billboards provided no financial benefit to the City. Director LaBonty agreed, stating that compensation typically went to property owners and billboard companies. Commissioner Campbell did not see a need for billboards in Syracuse, either. Commissioner Miller viewed billboards as litter along highways but knew they served a purpose for businesses. Chairman Whiteley preferred to deal with signs as currently outlined in the Ordinance for off-premise advertising. Commissioner Nagle worried about businesses in Syracuse losing some ability to generate revenue without more options to advertise. Although she was not necessarily advocating billboards, which she considered unattractive, she recognized their value. She asked if commissioners wanted travelers to exit into Syracuse or continue on to West Point or Clinton to patronize businesses there. Vice Chair Hellewell pointed out that most billboards did not advertise for businesses in cities where they were located. Commissioner Miller suggested eliminating billboards for now and amending the Ordinance after Legacy came through if needed. Chairman Whiteley reminded commissioners of the blue information signs along State roads that advertised businesses. Commissioner Campbell added that businesses paid a fee to have their logos on those State highway signs.

**10-8-030(G)1.** ~~Sign, Billboard. Designated or used for the posting of bills or temporary messages and covering over one hundred (100) square feet in area.~~ A sign not owned by the party who pays for the message on the sign that is designed for changeable messages which advertise or direct attention to a business, commodity, service or entertainment conducted, sold or offered elsewhere than on the premises upon which the sign is located or to impart any message for a fee. The billboard sign is usually larger than eight feet by four feet (8' x 4') in size and may be owned by a commercial company which leases or rents the billboard space for advertising purposes.

7. Sign, Temporary. Any sign, banner, pennant, valance, or advertisement intended for display over a period no longer than ~~five (5)~~ thirty (30) days to advertise special events, i.e., yard sales, promotions, etc.

**10-8-040(P)** Billboard Signs. Billboard signs shall be allowed in GC, C-2, Research Park, Industrial, Professional Office zones as permitted by conditional use. All billboards shall:

1. Be in conformance with all Utah State Codes regulating outdoor advertising;
2. Comply with the height standards established for pole and pylon signs;
3. Not exceed three hundred (300) square feet in total area unless an increase is specifically approved by the Planning Commission in conjunction with a Conditional Use Application;  
and
4. Be allowed two faces or back-to-back sign faces, provided there is no more than five feet (5') separating the sign faces;
5. Not be located any closer than five hundred feet (500') from any other billboard or off-premise sign. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if an existing billboard is currently within five hundred feet of another billboard, it may be reconstructed or relocated within five hundred feet of such other billboard provided that it is not moved any closer to such billboard.
6. Not be located any closer than fifty feet (50') from any other freestanding pole sign;
7. Not unreasonably obstruct any traffic control device;
8. Not overhang public property or public right-of-way;
9. Not be within two hundred feet (200') of any residential zone;
10. Be constructed and maintained with neutral color.

Director LaBonty referred to the final proposed amendment regarding the Town Center Overlay Zone and explained that Syracuse created the original zone in about 1991. They had an Economic Development Area (EDA) with certain incentives for developers. He read through the Town Center Master Plan and tried to connect it with the intent of the City's perception of a large zone with a unique town center. When he began accepting applications for businesses outside the EDA zone, he had no tools to enforce the desired

requirements of the intended Town Center. This amendment would legally define it by ordinance as an overlay that would not affect current or general plan zoning designations. Commissioner Campbell asked whether the required development theme would be consistent throughout the overlay zone or have different themes in different areas of the zone. Director LaBonty explained that his interpretation identified each development as a single entity, such as the Lakeview Plaza with its own similar theme. As developments went through the Architectural Review Committee, each commercial subdivision would have similar characteristics. Commissioner Campbell then asked if the Master Plan would have the same requirements as the Wal-Mart area or more generic. Director LaBonty expected the Architectural Review Committee to oversee those types of decisions with nothing specifically outlined to dictate particular materials, etc.

**(Note: The following is a new chapter and will require re-numbering of all subsequent chapters)**

**CHAPTER 20**  
**TOWN CENTER OVERLAY ZONE**

**10-20-010: Purpose**

**10-20-020: Development Requirements**

**10-20-030: Construction Requirements**

**10-20-040: Approval**

**10-20-010: PURPOSE.** This zone includes the land area as defined on the Syracuse City Current Zoning and General Plan maps. The purpose of the Town Center Overlay Zone is to provide a method for implementing special provisions regarding the establishment and promotion of a central core area of the community characterized by stringent design standards for buildings, public spaces, site design and landscaping with a harmonious and wide range of development opportunities that introduce a mixed-use concept. While the Town Center zoning classification is intended address new construction that may occur with the Town Center area, it is also intended to support the preservation and adaptive re-use of any existing historic structures; the preservation of existing natural features, especially trees; new development that blends in with existing conditions and enhances the traditional town center character; the advancement of architectural and site design standards that promote walkability and human scale; the creation and maintenance of historic town center identity.

**10-20-020: DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS.** Development requirements shall conform to the guidelines and standards as set forth in the Town Center Master Plan.

**10-20-030: PERMITTED USES.** Uses permitted within the Town Center Overlay Zone are those uses as permitted or conditionally permitted under current zoning or the uses as outlined in City's General Plan as adopted.

**10-20-040: DEVELOPMENT THEME.** Development in this Zone shall conform to an approved development theme. The theme shall be reviewed and recommended for approval by the Architectural Review Committee. Final approval of any development theme shall be by the City Council, and shall conform to the provisions outlined in the Town Center Master Plan.

**10-20-040: DEVELOPMENT PLAN.** To ensure development conforms to the Town Center Master Plan, City staff shall review and approve all development plans. Drawings should include the placement of buildings and their uses, landscaping, parking, lighting, and design guidelines outlined in the area's Master Plan. Before submittal to the Planning Commission for recommendation and to the City Council for final approval the all plans, elevations and architectural details shall be reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee. The Architectural Review Committee shall review and recommend any plans, elevations or details prior to consideration by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council.

**10-20-050: ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMITTEE.** All proposed development plans within the Town Center Overlay Zone shall be reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee. This Committee shall consist of seven (7) members appointed by the Mayor, with the consent of the City Council, to review development plans. Members shall be representatives of the community, City Council, Planning Commission, and City staff. The Committee shall be responsible to review the plan, elevations and architectural details and make recommendations to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Planning Commission will, in turn, submit their recommendations to the City Council for final approval.

Commissioner Campbell asked about Section A under Special Provisions since commercial lots did not have front yards. Director LaBonty assumed that this language came from the C-2 zone, which included residential, and agreed to change it to say "all required setbacks."

**10-20-060:SPECIAL PROVISIONS.**

- (A) All lots, parcels, or sites shall have a minimum fifteen (15) percent of the total area landscaped, including all required front yards, installed within four (4) months of occupancy and permanently maintained in good condition.
- (B) Temporary buildings shall meet the provisions of the currently adopted editions of the International Building Code and must be sufficiently anchored to withstand a one-hundred (100) mile per hour wind.

Commissioner Campbell then asked about Section C regarding grease traps/interceptors and asked whether maintenance of these devices was currently a problem for the City right now. Director LaBonty explained how he copied a lot of language from the current C-2 zone, which included this verbiage, and believed it to be a State requirement. Commissioner Campbell agreed that it was a requirement of the State and wondered why it needed to also be a requirement of the City. Since Director LaBonty did not believe the Ordinance would be weaker without it, he agreed to strike it.

- (C) Commercial uses that require grease traps/interceptors shall locate such devices on the outside of the restaurant or food service building and frequently and effectively service such devices to maintain them in satisfactory working order to protect the sanitary sewer system from excessive contaminants. A licensed hauler shall dispose of all materials removed from a grease trap/interceptor at an approved disposal site in a lawful manner. Restaurant, food service businesses, or commercial uses of used-fryer oil shall dispose of such oil into a self-contained oil-rendering tank for disposal and transport. Outside or "refuse/dumpster" storage of oil-rendering barrels or other containers is prohibited.
- (D) In order to minimize the possibility of commercial properties becoming blighted, retail establishments of forty thousand (40,000) square feet or greater shall enter into a Facility Use Agreement with the City prior to the issuance of a building permit. Additionally, the owner shall submit a facility maintenance plan as required in this chapter thirty (30) days prior to the owner vacating the building.
  - 1. The terms "vacant" or "vacate" as used herein shall mean that no business activity is undertaken from the retail establishment for a period of one hundred eighty (180) consecutive days.
  - 2. The Facility Use Agreement shall outline the responsibility of the owner to remove the building, should it become vacant for more than three and one-half (3 ½) consecutive years, and shall provide legal remedies to enforce the terms of the agreement. In the event a building is vacant for more than three and one-half (3 ½) consecutive years, the owner shall remove the building and restore the property to a safe and compatible condition. The Facility Use Agreement shall be in substantially the following form, which form is hereby adopted as part of this Title.

**Facility Use Agreement**

AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN \_\_\_\_\_, A \_\_\_\_\_,  
HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS OWNER, AND SYRACUSE CITY, A MUNICIPAL  
CORPORATION HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS CITY.

**Recitals**

- a) The Owner desires to construct a commercial facility, at approximately \_\_\_\_\_, in Syracuse City to conduct a business known as \_\_\_\_\_.
- b) The City has adopted ordinances to govern the development of commercial property within Syracuse City designed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the community.
- c) The City has valid concern that blighted conditions might occur should said facility or structure become vacant for an extended period of time.
- d) The Owner and City are desirous to minimize impact to the community should the building become vacant.

**Agreement**

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants, and conditions set forth herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the Owner and City agree as follows:

- a) Owner will provide the City a written facility management plan thirty (30) days prior to vacating the building which outlines plans to maintain the property according to City Ordinance. Failure to do so will constitute a breach of this Agreement and entitle the City to injunctive relief to enforce the provisions hereof.
- b) Should the building remain vacant for forty-two (42) consecutive months, the City shall provide written notice to the Owner, at the address as it appears on this Agreement, ordering Owner to remove the building and restore the property to a condition that does not distract from surrounding businesses.
- c) Should the Owner fail to comply with the City's request to remove the building within thirty (30) days from the mailing date of said notice to the Owner, the City may file suit for specific performance to enforce the terms of this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ (Signed, witnessed, and/or attested).

- 3. In the event, for any reason, the retail establishment chooses to vacate the premises for a period of six (6) months or greater, the owner shall submit a facility maintenance plan to the city thirty (30) days prior to vacating. The maintenance plan shall include:
  - a) The estimated time the facility will be vacant
  - b) Detailed plans to maintain the property during the time it will be vacant
  - c) Method of securing all entrances to the facility
  - d) Plans to restrict access to off-street parking
  - e) Plans to remove all advertisement and business signage
  - f) Plans to market the property

Commissioner Campbell referred to Section E next, under Subsection 5 regarding residential build-ings converted to commercial, and asked if all the residential properties in that zone were at least 110 feet wide or if there could be some that were less, which would prevent such a conversion of an existing home. She worried about the language being too restrictive. Vice Chair Hellewell agreed, since some portions in the south were R-2 and did not require 110-foot frontages. Director LaBonty offered to change the language to “minimum frontage as required by zone.” The Commission all agreed the new language would be better.

(E) Existing residential and accessory structures may remain in this Zone for commercial purposes if the property meets all the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed use for the structure conforms with the permitted use for this Zone.
- 2. The proposed use of the building does not adversely impact the surrounding area.
- 3. The primary residential structure adds appeal and character to the area, and the property owner ensures appropriate maintenance of all existing structures on the property as well as the entire property itself in order to keep the appeal.
- 4. The lot size has a minimum of twenty-one thousand seven hundred eighty (21,780) square feet.
- 5. The parcel has a minimum one hundred ten (110) feet of frontage on an existing public street.
- 6. Setbacks comply with the established minimum requirements for this Zone and receive approval with site plan.
- 7. The lot has an existing driveway access from a public street and receives approval with site plan for any proposed modifications to said driveway (The Utah Department of Transportation shall also approve any access located on a State road).
- 8. All off-street parking complies with the requirements in Chapter 7 of this Title and receives approval with site plan.
- 9. All signs and lighting complies with the requirements in Chapter 8 of this Title and receives approval with site plan.
- 10. All landscape and buffering complies with the established requirements in Chapter 6 of this Title and receives approval with the site plan.
- 11. The Building and Fire departments inspect and approve all plans and uses.

Vice Chair Hellewell suggested the Chapter include language stating that the underlying zone would take precedent in the event of a conflict. Director LaBonty agreed to add it to the end of Section 10-20-030 under Permitted Uses.

Chairman Whiteley opened up the meeting for public hearing.

T.J. Jensen, 3242 South 1000 West, came forward asking why the southwest corner of the Town Center boundaries did not extend all the way down to square it off. Chairman Whiteley pointed out the existing residential subdivision there that was fairly new, so the City had no need to include it since it would not fit in with the General Plan. Mr. Jensen then referred to Commissioner Miller's comment regarding the off-street parking distance of 350 feet. He felt his suggested language change made more sense because it clarified to which homes it referred when requiring the parking spaces to be 350 feet away. He ended with a comment regarding the tall detached structure along Bluff Road, which the City Council addressed during their previous meeting. Although the Hyatts decreased the overall size of the structure, it still blocked the same amount of view because of its height. He agreed with the Commission's decision to prohibit billboards and pointed out the small stretch of land south of Gentile outside the City boundaries that would still allow billboards.

Chairman Whiteley closed the public hearing and suggested the Ordinance keep the definition of a billboard.

KENNETH HELLEWELL MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE ORDINANCE WITH THE CHANGES AS DISCUSSED, AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

#### 6. 200 South Corridor Planning Workshop Presentation

In September 2008, in honor of National Community Planning Month, the local APA chapter solicited proposals from agencies to host sustainability workshops. The City applied and received a grant of \$500, so staff planned and hosted this event on January 22, 2008, in the Community Center from 6:30-8:00 p.m. The stated purpose was to provide an opportunity for residents and property owners to participate in long-range planning for a large undeveloped area along 200 South.

Sustainable growth is an issue that will become more prevalent in urban planning along the Wasatch Front as Utah's population approaches 6 million by the year 2050. More than 80% of the State's population will concentrate within cities along the Wasatch Front, which translates to nearly 5 million residents between Provo and Ogden by 2050. This type of density would take its toll on resources ranging from roadway maintenance and air quality to housing and water supply. Part of the solution includes planning communities that could sustain the anticipated population crush. Sustainable communities are not all about housing made from recycled aluminum. They are about planning and developing communities that are responsible stewards of the remaining developable land in the region. Each resident might have a vision for their community today, but sustainable communities carry that vision forward for future generations.

Staff searched for potential areas within the City that would benefit from such a planning opportunity and identified the 200 South Corridor for a number of reasons. UDOT identified this Corridor (SR193) on their long-range transportation plan as a "critical needs" project in order to address impacts to the transportation system caused by the explosive population growth that occurred and continues to occur in northwest Davis County. There were large undeveloped tracts of agricultural land along the Corridor that represented a significant portion of remaining developable property. Many parcels were within the City limits. As Syracuse looked forward to its inevitable growth, the City needed to plan for the eventual development of these remaining parcels. Plans had to anticipate the needs of both the City and region, such as housing, employment opportunities, attracting commercial businesses, and maintaining open space.

Improvements to this Corridor would have far reaching effects not only on Syracuse but on the surrounding communities of Clearfield and West Point. The City Council anticipated the need for cooperative planning along the Corridor and adopted a resolution, on October 14, 2008, stating, "The Syracuse City Council recognizes that the planned transportation improvements of SR193 (200 South) from I-15 on the east to Bluff Road on the west affect not only Syracuse City but also the cities of Clearfield and West Point and, the Syracuse City Council desires to continue to participate with the cities of Clearfield and West Point in a coordinated transportation land use and development planning effort along SR193." (R08-24)

Citizens were too often frustrated by limited public participation opportunities when major projects or developments were proposed. This frustration could be seen in projects ranging from neighborhood revitalization to large-scale commercial developments (especially if they were close to residential areas) to the

adoption of Master Plans or new annexations. People attended public meetings with expectations that their voices would be heard only to conclude that decisions were made for them behind closed doors. This attitude usually translated into comments such as, "They're just going to do what they want anyway, so why should I waste my time?" Planning commissions and city councils were often disappointed when crowds of angry residents complaining about having little prior input attended public hearings for large-scale, controversial projects. These situations generally resulted in contentious, time-consuming, and unproductive public hearings and antagonism between the various parties.

In order to prevent such a situation from arising with land use planning along the Corridor, staff used the National Community Planning grant to organize and host a table-top planning exercise or "charrette" (a collaborative session in which a group of students, professionals, or citizens drafted solutions to a design problem). As part of the preparation for this event, staff coordinated extensively with the planning and community development staff from Clearfield and West Point cities. Each ultimately provided critical input as well as staff to support the event. The charrette format chosen was a "toolbox" approach widely used along the Wasatch Front by Envision Utah, a public/private partnership created in 1997 to guide development of a quality growth strategy for the State. In workshops hosted by Envision Utah, participants were usually given a specific target area, identified on a large aerial photograph map. The target area could be as small as a neighborhood or as large as an entire county. The workshop participants were presented with goals ranging from the identification of major transportation corridors to the location of mixed-use developments for efficient growth along the Wasatch Front. The participants were also given some basic "tools" with which to experiment and explore various planning strategies. These tools consisted of adhesive-backed chips and tapes that represented a variety of land use and transportation options. The participants would work on the maps in collaboration with other participants at their table. The dynamic interaction among participants was crucial to a fruitful and productive workshop.

The study area identified for the workshop involved 225 acres in Syracuse currently zoned and used for agricultural purposes. The land runs along the south side of 200 South, between 1000 and 2000 West, immediately adjacent to West Point and Clearfield. The City General Plan identified this area for future C-2 zoning, defined in the Ordinance as a zone that provided for "...a wide range of development opportunities that introduces a mixed-use concept. Mixing commercial and residential uses creates an environment where people can live, work, and access commercial and civic facilities; thus, creating an activity nexus that promotes an urban environment."

The toolbox approach involved the identification of a variety of land uses, including open space and transportation options, and presenting them as tools in planning for the area. The basis for these general land uses came from the permitted and conditional uses in the C-2 zone: 1) business services and professional offices, 2) community or civic services, 3) hotels and motels, 4) public and quasi-public buildings, 5) public parks, 6) restaurants and fast food services, 7) retail trade, 8) theaters and amusement facilities, 9) single-family dwellings, 10) two-family dwellings, and 11) medical and other health facilities. In order to make the list more manageable for participants, staff consolidated the land uses into the following types: 1) retail and commercial trade, 2) offices, 3) single-family dwellings, 4) two-family dwellings, and 5) open spaces, parks, trails, and water features.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked if participants were told it had to remain C-2. Commissioner Miller, who attended the workshop, said no. Director LaBonty added that staff did not dictate percentages either. Vice Chair Hellewell asked about the two residential options and whether they had an option that represented R-1 with fewer homes than four per acre. Director LaBonty told him no and that the C-2 zone did not dictate density. Chairman Whiteley explained that participants were simply given a blank sheet and building blocks.

Staff illustrated examples of land uses on large boards throughout the room and in a handbook participants received after signing in. There were eight tables with the following tools: 1) a large aerial map of the area (with no indication of existing zones or municipal boundaries), 2) a large note pad and markers to track comments, 3) a set of adhesive-backed chips representing various permitted and conditional land uses, 4) two types of colored tape to represent roads and trails, and 5) blue markers to represent various water features. Staff encouraged participants to consider all the tools provided before making decisions as to what they would place on the map and to discuss their ideas with others around their table before peeling and applying chips or tape. This was done to prevent premature decisions by a select minority with strong opinions about

where to locate certain land uses. The workshop's goals were to determine participants' values for their community and what they deemed necessary and desirable and for participants to allocate the tools according to those values. Each table was given the same proportion of land-use and transportation tools, but the allocation of those resources was entirely up to the participants. Staff encouraged them to discuss ideas with others around their table before forging ahead with placing chips and tape on the maps.

While staff did not participate directly in the planning exercise, moderators at each table encouraged participants to consider incorporating the most judicious use of the land available and to think about the term "mixed use" as they considered various land use locations. Moderators also reminded them of the exercise objective and to not just place various uses on the map but to locate them in a way that met some needs of the larger area, namely jobs, housing, retail, and recreational opportunities. There were eight tables and each one had anywhere from six to ten participants. While some looked for participants they knew and sat at those tables, others did not know anyone and sat with participants who did not necessarily share their same values and goals. This dynamic of "strangers among friends" gave discussions a well rounded and balanced feel. The dialogue was always civil but everyone did not always agree about future land uses in the area. By the end of the exercise, most participants felt they were heard and the end result reflected at least some portion of their visions. Each table produced a map that was unique to the values and ideas discussed at their table and indicative of the varied and independent ideas that made a community successful.

Staff reviewed the results of the workshop maps and considered using three basic criteria given to participants, including: 1) the built environment, 2) transportation movement, and 3) open space. Staff then assimilated the ideas brought forth in the workshop into broad concepts for the study area. Based on the maps and comments, there was an overriding desire for a balanced mix of uses. All but one map provided diverse solutions involving more than one building type. Each solution also included designs that showed a variety of open spaces distributed throughout the area and illustrated a willingness to investigate alternative solutions that did not involve a single building type. This openness to a mixed-use solution provided the framework for future land uses in the study area that would not only meet the needs of growing communities surrounding the land but a sustainable growth pattern through build out.

Movement through the site, while indicated on many of the maps with tape, was not as thoroughly detailed as the location of building types. However, staff was able to garner sufficient information from the orientation of land uses and building types to provide an outline of some transportation solutions. The most encouraging result was participants' desires for alternative transportation movements (trails, walking paths, etc.). These alternatives provided flexibility in the layout and planning of land uses. Alternate transportation options between various land uses provided opportunities for some residents to live and work in the study area and move about without automobiles.

There were some basic assumptions that could be drawn from the information collected. While the City would not adopt just one plan in its entirety produced during the workshop, each plan contained significant components that contributed to a larger master plan for the area. These maps and this exercise were just the first step toward creating such a master plan. Staff developed a few generalized maps that represented components from each of the eight plans broken down into basic land use elements considered; namely, transportation, open space, housing, commercial, and retail.

The distance between 200 and 700 South was more than 2,500 feet, and the distance between 1000 and 2000 West was more than 5,000 feet. This large area would need consideration in its entirety as the City developed a master plan. In order to facilitate convenient movement throughout the site, a primary arterial class road in a north-south direction would be necessary to connect 200 with 700 South as well as another arterial class road connecting 1000 to 2000 West.

Open space was an important component to each plan. Ideas ranged from leaving it all open for continued agricultural use to strategically-located parks, trails, and water features. In general, they considered the area beneath the Rocky Mountain Power Corridor a reasonable location for open space, trails, and water features. Another open space area common to many plans was near the existing high school for ball fields and a recreation facility. Most indicated some type of inter-connected trail system throughout the site and a balanced mixture of both single- and multi-family housing. At least two maps incorporated mixed-use housing (i.e. housing and retail combined in the same location), introduced as a concept, into their layouts. One map even presented the idea of a small-town 'main street' with multi-family housing above small shops

along a tree-lined avenue. In general, they clustered single-family housing toward the center and south ends while locating multi-family housing closer to major arterials.

Some questions asked during the workshop indicated a lack of understanding between 'commercial' and 'retail' uses. Staff worked with each table explaining how commercial was more professional office and campus-style buildings while retail was more of a shopping center. With that distinction, many participants envisioned more of the commercial development occurring east of the power corridor with some commercial mixed in and retail along major arterials. Most participants had a clear understanding of what retail land entailed; namely, small, medium, and big-box stores. All but one map recognized the corners on 200 South at 1000 and 2000 West as key 'anchor' locations for retail establishments. The majority also reflected the nature of 200 South as a future commercial corridor, so most participants located retail components there. They also recognized 2000 West as a future, high-traffic commercial corridor.

The participants were each given land uses representing 'institutional' facilities that could range anywhere from churches and schools to indoor-outdoor recreation facilities. Participants located them in various parts of the site without any real discernable patterns. Once on the map, some identified the chips with markers indicating the type of facility they envisioned. Those hand-written uses included: 1) pool and recreation center, 2) trade school, 3) elementary school, 4) church, and 5) soccer complex. By far, pools and recreation centers were the most common use of the institutional chips, followed closely by schools and churches.

Director LaBonty displayed a concept map that contained elements of all the maps produced during the workshop. He emphasized its use as only a point of discussion rather than a representation of any conclusions with regard to an ultimate layout for a master plan of the area. The maps presented a varied and diverse range of opinions with regard to specific locations of land uses. However, as shown in the concept sketches, there were some common denominators. The maps represented the first step in soliciting feedback from the public as to how they wanted their community to develop. The maps clearly showed a desire for a variety of purposes in this area.

Director LaBonty then went over each map from the workshop. The first identified an agricultural research center for Utah State or the University of Utah. The second provided some mixed uses throughout the area based on Dr. Bryan Dorsey's presentation of sustainable developments by mixing residential with commercial uses in levels, which this table embraced. The third provided retail along major arterials, housing clustered towards the center, and some commercial or professional offices. The fourth clustered housing and institutional together with multi-family and retail on the east. They offset the road, which might actually be a solution UDOT would consider. They provided landscaping and a trail in between. The fifth provided a good mixed-use design showing retail and housing together on the west side, by institutional uses, because they began thinking about transportation through this area. The sixth provided another good mixed-use development with housing clustered around the school, a water feature on the east, and retail along the arterial road. The seventh included lots of trees buffering the different land uses, with commercial along 2000 West and 200 South, a professional office campus on the east, and recreational amenities clustered in the middle. The eighth did not utilize many stickers but wrote commercial retail along 2000 West and 200 South. Participants were given approximately 1½ hours to complete the exercise, and this table had a lot of people engaged in conversation and knew what they wanted but ran out of time. Director LaBonty then displayed a final map created by the Weber State University students, with the Department of Geography, who came with Dr. Dorsey to provide staff support. They submitted a robust design utilizing all land uses. Upon completion of the exercise, staff recognized the participants for their efforts and provided an opportunity for them to sign up for notices of future meetings regarding the matter.

The workshop provided staff and administration with tools to plan a small area master plan with property owners and developers. Such a plan would provide a baseline for future development that reflected core values and principles identified in the workshop while accommodating the need for sustainable growth. Prior to moving forward, staff recommended the publication and distribution of this report and a follow up seminar or workshop to present these findings and solicit further input. Staff could then use any additional feedback to refine a final draft. The Council could then adopt the plan by resolution. However, even after adoption, it should remain a living document to adapt for changes in factors that could affect the ultimate development of the area (i.e. economic development opportunities). Any subsequent changes to the plan should be subject to public hearing with due notice given all adjacent property owners.

Vice Chair Hellewell advised Director LaBonty that participants of the workshop complained to him about staff from Clearfield making them uncomfortable with questions as to why participants were choosing certain options. They believed the staff members were trying to lead them in certain directions, so he asked that Director LaBonty instruct all staff members from other cities to be more aware of that perception and not lead the public at all.

7. Planning Commission Business

Director LaBonty reported on the last City Council meeting, stating they reopened the Hyatt issue that they tabled during a previous meeting. They dismissed the appeal because staff determined the modifications eliminated the need for conditional use approval, which made the appeal moot. The Council could not do anything about the height of the detached garage. Council accepted the annexation petition and adopted the proposed General Plan amendments. They also instructed Director LaBonty to tell commissioners that they did a great job on the proposed changes.

Director LaBonty then referred to a comment the Mayor made during the last Commission meeting regarding daycares. He discussed the issue with staff members and Administrator Worthen who agreed the City could not craft language that restricted the number of sessions per business. The applicant might have given the impression that the subject daycare would have 64 children at one time, but it would only have 16 at the most per session. Director LaBonty warned the commissioners of discriminating against residents of a cul-de-sac. Chairman Whiteley again suggested requiring a simple traffic plan so applicants knew the importance of handling traffic problems with their clients.

8. Adjournment

NATHAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:48 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

---

Robert Whiteley  
Planning Commission Chair