

**Syracuse City Planning Commission Meeting**  
July 7, 2009  
Minutes

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

Planning Commission Vice Chair Kenneth Hellewell 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. G.J. LaBonty offered the prayer, and Judy Merrill led the pledge of allegiance.

Members Present: Vice Chair Kenneth Hellewell, Tena Campbell, Nathan Miller, and Craig Jenkins as well as Community Development Director G.J. LaBonty, GIS Specialist Troy Moyes, and Administrative Assistant Judy Merrill.

Excused: Chairman Robert Whiteley and Jamie Nagle

Visitors: T.J. Jensen            John Hammond            Dallas Buttars            Matt Gertge  
                 Doug Graham            John Wilhite            John Lewis            Heather Dill

Vice Chair Hellewell informed everyone that Commissioner Evert Cook resigned earlier that day due conflicts with his work schedule.

CRAIG JENKINS MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE JULY 7, 2009, AGENDA AS OUT-LINED, SECONDED BY NATHAN MILLER; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the May 19, 2009, meeting.

CRAIG JENKINS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 19, 2009, MEETING AS WRITTEN, SECONDED BY TENA CAMPBELL; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the June 2, 2009, meeting.

TENA CAMPBELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2009, MEETING AS WRITTEN, SECONDED BY NATHAN MILLER; ALL BUT CRAIG JENKINS VOTED IN FAVOR SINCE HE WAS NOT PRESENT AT THAT MEETING.

Vice Chair Hellewell realized this meant the Commission did not have a quorum to approve that set of minutes and asked for a new motion.

TENA CAMPBELL MOVED TO RESCIND HER LAST MOTION AND TABLE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2009, MEETING UNTIL THE COMMISSION HAD A QUORUM TO VOTE ON THEM. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Frozen Bliss Public Hearing and Conditional Use for Signage

No one came forward to represent this item.

NATHAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO MOVE TO ITEM 3 ON THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY TENA CAMPBELL; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

NATHAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO MOVE BACK TO ITEM 2 ON THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY CRAIG JENKINS; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Heather Dill, owner of Frozen Bliss, appeared before the Planning Commission requesting Conditional Use approval for building signage on her new business at 1089 West 1700 South Suite K.

Director LaBonty explained that the applicant already had the signage installed, and the business was now open. Based on building dimensions for this store, staff calculated the allowable signage as 90 square feet. The requested signage was only 26.66 square feet. Notices of the public hearing were mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the business 10 days prior to this meeting, but staff received no responses.

Commissioner Jenkins understood that the sign company installed her signage prior to receiving the Commission's approval. Mrs. Dill explained that the company called her three or four days prior to installing the sign and asked if she acquired the proper approvals. She told them no and that the meeting was July 7. A few days later, she received a call from her landlord saying the sign looked great.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

NATHAN MILLER MOVED TO GRANT CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL FOR THE PLACEMENT OF BUILDING SIGNAGE AT 1089 WEST 1700 SOUTH SUITE K FOR FROZEN BLISS

SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND USE ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO SIGNAGE. CRAIG JENKINS SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

CRAIG JENKINS MADE A MOTION TO MOVE BACK TO ITEM 6 ON THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY NATHAN MILLER; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. John Lewis Public Hearing and Conditional Use for a Two-Family Dwelling

John Lewis, 2330 South 950 West, approached the Commission requesting Conditional Use approval to rent his single-family home as a two-family dwelling.

Director LaBonty indicated that the applicant converted his home for the purpose of renting out the basement but failed to acquire the necessary approvals. The City notified him of these violations, and he submitted applications for both a building permit and conditional use approval. The Building Department granted the applicant occupancy for the basement as a separate dwelling unit, so he was now before the Commission for conditional use approval. The lower level of the home had 1,600 square feet with a kitchen, living room, three bedrooms, a bathroom, laundry room, and storage area. The apartment had a separate entrance and furnace as well as two off-street parking spaces. Notices of the public hearing were mailed to nearby property owners within 300 feet of the residence ten days prior to this meeting but staff received no responses.

Mr. Lewis promised to screen applicants very carefully and rent mostly to students and young families. His neighborhood was a quiet area, and he had no intention of renting to families with a lot of children, since he and his wife would live upstairs.

Commissioner Jenkins emphasized the need for Mr. Lewis to make it clear to his tenants that they were not to park on the street in front of that fire hydrant and to use the off-street parking spaces provided. He then asked Mr. Lewis if he already had renters in the basement. Mr. Lewis informed him that he was currently renting to a family displaced by the Syracuse Road widening.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

NATHAN MILLER MOVED TO GRANT CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO JOHN LEWIS FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVERTING HIS SINGLE-FAMILY HOME, LOCATED AT 2330 SOUTH 950 WEST, INTO A TWO-FAMILY DWELLING SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SYRACUSE LAND USE ORDINANCE SPECIFIC TO TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS. CRAIG JENKINS SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4. Public Hearing of Proposed Amendments to the General Plan Map for a Town Center Overlay Zone

Director LaBonty explained that, in reviewing the Town Center Master Plan, staff determined there were no explicit zonal boundaries defined in association with the Master Plan. On June 2, 2009, staff presented the Commission with proposed amendments to Title X for the creation of a new Town Center Overlay Zone that would supplement, not override, any existing zones. The Commission was unanimous in recommending approval of the new language and forwarding it to City Council for consideration on June 23, 2009. The Council was also unanimous in adopting the amendments. Staff then prepared the proposed amendments indicated on the General Plan map, which correlated with the new language for the Town Center Overlay Zone and explicitly identified the geographic boundaries where the zone restrictions would apply. These changes to the General Plan map would represent an "overlay" zone and, as such, not affect any existing zones previously established.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing.

T.J. Jensen, 3242 South 1000 West, came forward in support of the amendments.

No one else stood, so Vice Chair Hellewell closed the public hearing.

CRAIG JENKINS MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN MAP, REGARDING THE "TOWN CENTER OVERLAY ZONE," AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. TENA CAMPBELL SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5. Public Hearing of Proposed Amendments to the Current Zoning Map for a Town Center Overlay Zone

Director LaBonty explained that, based on the history he outlined in the previous agenda item, City staff prepared these amendments shown on the Current Zoning map, which correlated with the new language for the Town Center Overlay Zone and explicitly identified the geographic boundaries where the zone restrictions would apply. He again noted that these changes represented an “overlay” zone that would not affect any existing zones previously established.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

TENA CAMPBELL MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CURRENT ZONING MAP, REGARDING THE “TOWN CENTER OVERLAY ZONE,” AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

6. Syracuse Car Wash Public Hearing and Site Plan Review

John Hammond, owner of the proposed carwash, and John Wilhite, the architect, stood before the Commission requesting Site Plan approval for the Syracuse Car Wash, located at 1818 South 2000 West.

Director LaBonty summarized the request by stating that the proposed location would be Lot 6 of the Gertge Business Park, also known as the Lakeview Plaza. The applicant appeared before the Architectural Review Committee on June 23, 2009. Staff’s primary concern regarding the plans was the lack of direct access from a public street. All customers would enter the site from either the south, crossing through the parking lot of the existing professional office building, or the north, crossing the parking lot of the proposed Iceberg Restaurant. Other issues of concern were parking for staff, lighting of the vacuum bays, landscaping, and site lighting. The applicant received unanimous approval from the Committee with conditions as outlined in a letter from Epic Engineering. The applicant did not have color renderings available at the time of architectural review but committed to having them available for this Commission meeting. Staff reviewed the application and drawings and provided the following comments in a memo dated June 17, 2009: **Applicant submitted and paid the application fee of \$614.16 on June 2, 2009. Upon further review, the plan sets submitted were incomplete. Staff requested the missing information, which they submitted June 17, 2009. Plans were given to the Building Official, Fire Chief, and City Engineer. Staff recommends the following changes and corrections: 1) Show name and address of proposed project on Title page. 2) Provide names of adjacent property owners on Sheet 1. 3) Provide location and design for all exterior lighting, since plan shows only one existing light pole. Indicate whether there is lighting on building. 4) Show location of employee parking since plans only show stalls for vacuum bays. 5) Indicate sharing of dumpster between the two buildings and provide agreement to City between both property owners. 6) Address concerns of cross traffic movement between lots 5 and 6 and main roadway for entire project. 7) Provide detailed sign plan for site.**

The City Engineer reviewed the drawings and provided the following recommendations in a letter dated June 23, 2009: **1) Show heights of all proposed and existing buildings. 2) Lot 5 is currently unimproved, yet vehicular entry and exitways are shown going through this Lot. All improvements required for the carwash through this area will need to be completed as part of these improvements. No drainage shall go from Lot 6 onto Lot 5 unless shown in drainage improvements. 3) Add index. 4) Add snow cleats to roof to prevent snow from falling over entryways or vacuum areas. 5) Identify owners of adjacent lots. 6) Add project name and address in Title. 7) Show required ADA parking stall and add note that all sidewalks and parking stalls shall comply with ADA requirements. 8) Provide access agreements from Care-A-Lot Subdivision Lot 2, since plans show no parking for proposed development, and agreements for employee and customer parking on adjoining lots if allowed. 9) Provide agreements with Care-A-Lot Subdivision Lot 2 for sharing the garbage dumpster and that lighting on south side of proposed development is acceptable and will not cause undue glare onto Lot 2. 10) Provide details for meter vault and inlet box according to City standards. 11) Add stop sign to west exit. 12) Change line type or make note proposing curb and gutter along northern and western sides of property and south entrance to development, rather than current marks indicating improvements exist. Remove note indicating existing curb, gutter, and landscaping along eastern side of development, and define where improvements end. 13) Show relocation of ADA stall from Lot 2 and reconfiguration of striping. 14) Show all required concrete striping. 15) Add median with landscaping on northeast corner of development, approximately the size of a parking stall. 16) Extend median, on north side of carwash, east approximately 30 feet since proposed width for restaurant drive-thru is only 19 feet, which would not allow two vehicles to pass and therefore not a viable exit from the vacuum stalls.**

17) Add note to saw cut all existing asphalt edges prior to joining with new asphalt or concrete. 18) Show size of all existing utility lines. 19) Call out material type on all proposed utility laterals. 20) Acquire approval from North Davis Sewer District for sewer main. They may require sediment trap and oil/grease separator. Internal plumbing for indoor restrooms and other indoor standard plumbing must bypass separators. 21) Show existing light pole in correct location and secondary and culinary water meters next to each other. 22) Since meter boxes and control valves to secondary water will be in middle of exit, add note that they will be H-20 capacity rated and to set them to asphalt grade, which may require installation of new manholes and lids. Provide detail drawings of these boxes and valves. 23) Replace note labeling secondary water main as a lateral, and verify location of main and label accordingly. 24) Install standard curb and gutter storm-drain inlet into curb rather than a 2x2 box. 25) Add note to relocate existing Qwest pedestal box in exit approach to the west. 26) Show TBC elevations for curb and gutter, including curb and gutter along southerly entryway, the road across western portion of project, the new curb and gutter next to garbage dumpster, and all medians. 27) Provide grades and drainage for Lot 5 to ensure waterway will work for drainage from carwash onto Lot 5, and add note that construction easement or agreement for waterway will be required for work on Lot 5. 28) Add flow-line elevations to waterway every 50 feet. 29) Add detail for waterway. 30) Show details for different curb types proposed. 31) Add note and show locations of heating coils in concrete. 32) Change berm adjacent to 2000 West showing existing and proposed landscaped areas as part of this project. 33) Change tree types located in median to conform to City Ordinance. 34) Evaluate landscaping next to vacuum bays, since that area would receive very little sunlight, and change if necessary. 35) Remove Norway maple from plans per Architectural Review Committee recommendations. 36) Show connection to secondary water service lateral and location of main secondary water control valve.

After further discussion of the lot north of this development, the City Engineer amended his review letter, dated June 30, 2009, to include the following items: 37) Add lights on property line with Lot 5 on both east and west sides, since they would benefit both developments, and work out cost-sharing agreement. 38) Prior comments requested median with landscaping on northeast corner of development and extension of median on north side of carwash approximately 30 feet eastward. Instead of 30 feet, extend median to leave 28 feet between it and median installed along east side of property, for arrival/departure access to carwash from restaurant, and reduce median between buildings to a minimum 4-foot width.

The applicant submitted revised plans, and staff reviewed the drawings to determine whether they addressed all comments in the City Engineer's letters dated June 23 and 30. Based on that review, staff provided the following comments in a memo dated July 6, 2009: 1) Address all issues outlined in Epic Engineering's letter, dated June 23, 2009. 2) Apply civil stamp to all plans. 3) Show proper placement of extension line on measurement 29.5 on Site Plan page for west side of building and specify from where that measurement was taken. 4) Show location of other two parking stalls since Project Notes indicate six but plans show only four. 5) Place "One Way" signage in dumpster area since there is only 15 feet of clearance between edge of container and curbing. 6) Indicate ALL radiuses within project, including improvements to adjacent lot. 7) Submit traffic access agreement between development and Care-A-Lot Subdivision Lot 2 as well as shared garbage-dumpster agreement between development and restaurant. 8) Show detail of meter vault or inlet box according to City standards. 9) Show size of connection for secondary water.

Director LaBonty explained that the applicant was not seeking approval for any signage associated with this project at this time and would apply for that at a later date.

Mr. Wilhite stated that the building colors would match those of the Sparetime Family Fun Center.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked if they received all the comments from City staff and Epic Engineering. Mr. Hammond told him he did and that the only issue he had was the concern with traffic flow. He had another carwash in a similar big-block setting with a lot of other uses, and he found such cohabitation with different businesses as being very simple with regards to traffic flow.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing. No one came forward, so he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller referred to Mr. Hammond's other carwash and asked if it had the exact same configuration. Mr. Hammond told him yes and that it was in Elko, Nevada, in a large shopping center with Smith's, Office Depot, Taco Bell, and other businesses. Commissioner Miller conceded that it might work in other places, but he had concerns with the access points. Vehicles might enter from 2000 West on the north side and end up crossing through Lot 5 to exit back on to 2000 West without necessarily stopping at the carwash. With pedestrians crossing back and forth, this was a concern as far as traffic patterns, although either entrance would work well for just the carwash itself. Commissioner Jenkins voiced the same concerns for pedestrians, since he knew how difficult it was to see through a dirty windshield when heading to a carwash.

Mr. Wilhite asked if they understood UDOT's preferences regarding cross-access agreements. UDOT discouraged drive approaches from signal light to signal light. The main entrance into the complex was north of this development, past the future restaurant. The curb cut was already there for the office complex to the south because of cross-access agreements already in place for each of those parcels. He understood the commissioners' concerns with parking on the east of the restaurant, just north of the carwash, but pedestrians simply needed to be aware of traffic since that was how UDOT handled cross-access agreements.

Commissioner Jenkins believed that closing off that driveway approach could actually be better for their business because it would prevent accidents among drivers coming in from the north and south all while competing for position in line at the carwash. Mr. Wilhite reminded them that most drivers cut through empty stalls when driving through large complexes, with lots of parking spaces, rather than following the designated traffic lanes. This complex was small enough that there really was just one area through which to drive. As vehicles turned in, patrons should be traveling slowly enough to maneuver safely with the space available. Vice Chair Hellewell asked whether the City or State owned the portion of 2000 West fronting the Lakeview Plaza. Director LaBonty advised him that the City controlled that section. Mr. Wilhite reminded commissioners that the curb cut was already there and designed for cross access.

Vice Chair Hellewell explained their idea, which commissioners discussed during the work session, of widening the southern approach on 2000 West for better access and eliminating the 28-foot access on the north. Drivers would enter from 2000 West and follow the designated traffic pattern to exit onto the access road to the west. Mr. Wilhite asked if the City had the authority to tell the property owner on the south, who already had landscaping, curb, and gutter installed, to allow an adjacent property owner to widen their existing approach. Commissioner Miller pointed out that the same person owned all three parcels. Mr. Hammond agreed but asked commissioners to allow him to keep both accesses, since he believed it would be of greater benefit to his businesses.

Commissioner Miller hoped the carwash would be successful enough to attract a lot of vehicles and worried about those busy days negatively impacting the adjacent restaurant with cars backed up to that 28-foot entrance from Lot 5 while waiting to pay. The additional vehicles entering from the north would impact the restaurant by blocking the parking. Mr. Hammond explained that the proposed carwash could service 120 vehicles per hour with the two lanes, so he would be shocked if he ever had more than 3 cars waiting in line. Commissioner Miller still worried about it happening and the impact it would have on another business due to poor planning. Commissioner Jenkins stated that the applicant may be correct with the City's current population but worried about the potential for this situation as the City grew. Mr. Hammond pointed out that the restaurant asked to use the carwash area for overflow parking in the evenings since the carwash would not be open, so both businesses would help each other keep traffic flowing. He also worried about drivers entering from the north, realizing they could not get to the carwash from that direction, and having to turn around to get back into the 2000 West traffic to access it further south. Some drivers might even try to drive over the curb to avoid such a hassle.

Dallas Buttars, with Landmark Surveying, stepped up to state that he already did all the site work on this entire project. In the beginning, City staff asked him to limit the accesses, so he designed those lots for cross access inside the project. He believed it important to leave both entrances open in keeping with that master plan.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked which access they anticipated being their main entrance. Mr. Hammond believed most of their customers would come from the south entrance; however, the north access would benefit them due to patrons of other businesses deciding to wash their cars before leaving. The north access would avoid requiring these potential customers from having to exit the Plaza to enter on the south from 2000 West. He chose this location because of the cross-access agreements.

Vice Chair Hellewell suggested working with Mr. Gertge to widen that main approach on 2000 West and narrowing the 28-foot entryway on the north to 26 feet to emphasize the southern approach as their main entrance. Commissioner Jenkins did not believe that would resolve the problem because customers parking at the restaurant could not back out of those spaces if the carwash queue backed up into Lot 5. Commissioner Campbell agreed because the restaurant drive-thru exited right at that access point as well. If the queue had a line all the way into Lot 5, the drive thru would be shut down. Mr. Hammond offered his guarantee that he would not allow that to happen since they could move cars through so quickly. Vice Chair Hellewell asked

how many vehicles the carwash could stack before getting to that point. Mr. Hammond told him eight in each lane, for a total of sixteen. The carwash also offered a VIP lane that would not require drivers to stop for very long. They would have a sticker with a computer chip that eliminated the need to wait to pay a machine. He offered to place that VIP lane on the north side next to the restaurant to prevent any lines. Director LaBonty suggested flipping the plan 180 degrees so the main entrance would be on the west, after entering the Plaza from 2000 West from either entrance.

Doug Graham, of Landmark Surveying, appeared at the podium claiming he worked on these drawings for the layouts and gathered the information on these sites. The Syracuse Engineer directed everything laid out on the plans before the Commission, including the island, the 28-foot access, and the access between the two buildings. A lot of time went into these drawings, reviews, and revisions directed by City staff, so he did not believe it appropriate for anyone to suggest flipping the plans at this stage of the process. Vice Chair Hellewell explained to him that Site Plan review was the exact time for this to happen. Staff simply provided guidance and recommendations to applicants to help them present a plan the Commission might recommend for approval. Commissioners had the responsibility and prerogative to require changes, if necessary, based on concerns brought up by that body. He appreciated their time invested in this project, but they needed to address commissioners' concerns as well before receiving a favorable recommendation. Mr. Graham thought the reviews and recommendations they were given by City staff were the same people advising the Commission. Vice Chair Hellewell told him he was correct and that the Commission then considered all of that while deciding whether to reject the plans, accept them subject to those reviews, or require changes. Commissioner Miller emphasized the fact that Syracuse had a good City Engineer as well as staff, but the Commission had to answer to the citizens if something did not work well. By thinking this through now rather than later, commissioners were better able to ensure each project developed appropriately so that residents did not complain. Mr. Graham believed this to be a viable site plan that would function well between lots and the development as a whole. Success was everyone's goal, so no one was throwing something together. Vice Chair Hellewell understood his point but explained how the Commission wanted to avoid repeating a situation where the designed traffic flow ended up working very poorly, which made commissioners more critical now in order to prevent such negative impacts by one business onto another.

Commissioner Jenkins asked if both lots 5 and 6 would develop simultaneously or whether traffic would cross an unimproved Lot. Mr. Graham advised him they would also be developing the Iceberg Restaurant on Lot 5 at the same time.

Matt Gertge, owner of the Gertge Business Park, came forward explaining that the Architectural Review Committee discussed these same concerns when he presented plans for the Iceberg Restaurant. He worked closely with the Restaurant and Eric Tuttle, the architect, and understood the Commission's concerns with traffic going behind the parking stalls. He then pointed out that they would have the same situation on the other side of Arby's when that corner developed. He had to provide an access behind the Arby's drive-thru for that corner lot. Drivers just needed to be careful when backing out of parking spaces. The Restaurant was aware and comfortable with the adjacent carwash site plans. In fact, the original drawings did not have the land strip with its 28-foot access between the lots. The Committee required that to keep cars from traveling in different directions.

Commissioner Campbell referred to Epic Engineering's letter, dated June 23, regarding the lack of parking on Lot 6 or a shared parking agreement. Typically, parking accommodated the use of the building. Because the business activity would occupy parking area, she asked if there would be enough spaces for employees as well as the eliminated handicap stall. She also asked where they relocated that stall and how they would address required employee parking. Mr. Hammond identified the back four parking stalls for the Sparetime Fun Center as their employee parking area. Specialist Moyes pointed out that the updated site plan before the Commission did show those four stalls on the adjacent lot as well as the handicap stall on site.

Commissioner Jenkins expressed relief in knowing the restaurant owner was aware and comfortable with traffic flow. Vice Chair Hellewell still preferred a wider approach on 2000 West to emphasize that as their main entrance. Specialist Moyes advised him that widening the approach would eliminate some parking spaces, result in left-turn/right-turn issues in a very tight area, and create traffic problems, which was why all those accesses lined up. Vice Chair Hellewell suggested the motion include a condition to designate the north side as their VIP lane. Mr. Hammond agreed since it did not matter which one they used as the VIP lane.

TENA CAMPBELL MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND SITE PLAN APPROVAL OF THE SYRACUSE CAR WASH, LOCATED AT 1818 SOUTH 2000 WEST LOT 6 OF THE GERTGE BUSINESS PARK, SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SYRACUSE LAND USE ORDINANCE AND THE CONDITIONS THAT THE APPLICANT ADDRESS ALL ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY CITY STAFF, EPIC ENGINEERING'S REVIEW LETTERS, AND THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE PRIOR TO RECEIVING A BUILDING PERMIT AND THAT THEY DESIGNATE THE NORTH SIDE OF THE FACILITY AS THE VIP LANE, AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

#### 7. Iceberg Restaurant Public Hearing and Site Plan Review

Matt Gertge, of Elk Valley Construction, appeared before the Commission requesting Site Plan approval of the Iceberg Restaurant, located at 1792 South 2000 West.

Director LaBonty summarized this request, indicating the building site would be Lot 5 of the Gertge Business Park (Lakeview Plaza), directly south of the Arby's Restaurant. The proposed building height was 35 feet—the tallest allowed by building code for this type of structure. The exterior materials would include stucco and brick, with metal panels at the top, similar to the municipal building. Staff directed Eric Tuttle, the Architect, to provide a detailed description of the building's exterior lighting. The stars would have neon rope lighting around the edges, like the Fun Center and Arby's.

The City Engineer reviewed the site plans and provided the following comments in a letter dated June 24, 2009: 1) Show heights of all proposed and existing buildings. 2) Provide detail for inlet box. 3) Add stop sign to west exit and both north exits. 4) Show all pavement striping required for restaurant. 5) Add landscaped median, the approximate size of a parking stall, to south side of drive thru, extended east approximately 30 feet, to be constructed by Lot 6 on southeast corner of their development. 6) Add note to saw cut all existing asphalt edges prior to joining with new asphalt or concrete. 7) Add radius information for curb and gutter, islands, and curbing around restaurant and, as a minimum, label PC, PT, and radius points. 8) Show size of all existing utility lines. 9) Call out material type on all proposed utility laterals. 10) Acquire approval from North Davis Sewer District for sewer main. They may require sediment trap and oil/grease separator. Internal plumbing for indoor restrooms and other indoor standard plumbing must bypass separators. 11) Install standard curb and gutter storm-drain inlet into curb rather than a 2x2 box. 12) Verify storm drain plans and correct accordingly, since Lot 6 showed a waterway instead of an inlet box in curb and gutter at west entryway. 13) Show TBC elevations every 50 feet. 14) Add flow-line elevations to waterway every 50 feet. 15) Add detail for waterway. 16) Show details for different proposed curb types. 17) Show location of main secondary water-control valve.

The City Engineer revised his previous review letter to add the following comments from the Architectural Review Committee meeting, held June 30, 2009, but specifically stating that all previous comments were still applicable from the prior review: 1) Show detail for trash container, including detail material type and colors, and verify whether garbage truck can access dumpster easily. 2) Provide information on lighting at time of signage application, and remove neon lighting from stars. 3) Consider adding lighted bollards, more patio space for landscape planters or pots to enhance building décor, and other items as spacing allows. 4) Eliminate southwest access to site, which requires new curbing extended along area, and include new TBC elevations and drainage plans. 5) Add lights to shared property line with Lot 6 that will benefit both developments, and work out cost-sharing and lighting-style agreements with developer of carwash. 6) Show changes requested for Lot 6 to install median with landscaping on northeast corner of development and extend median on north side of carwash eastward, leaving 28 feet between it and median installed along east side of property, for arrival/departure access to carwash from restaurant. 7) Add buffer strip along parking on west side so bumpers do not overhang onto shared roadway. 8) If shifting building either direction or installing landscaping berms for drive-thru vehicle storage, provide a minimum of 36 feet from end of parking stall to front of TBC. 9) Consult City Ordinance for list of permitted trees in parkstrip.

The applicants submitted updated plans on July 2, 2009, and staff reviewed them to determine whether they addressed all comments in the City Engineer's letters, dated June 24 and 30. Based on that review, staff provided the following comments in a memo dated July 6, 2009: 1) Apply civil stamp to all plans. 2) Add stop sign to both north exits. 3) Add note to saw cut all existing asphalt edges prior to joining with new asphalt or concrete. 4) Add radius information for curb and gutter, islands, and curbing around restaurant and, as a minimum, label PC, PT, and radius points. 5) Remove screened dumpster from Utility Plan on northwest corner of lot and consider landscaping around proposed dumpster site. 6) Add width to 12-foot clearance of drive-thru lane on west side of building next to waterway. 7) Call out material type on all proposed utility later-

**als. 8) Show correct location of storm-drain inlet in curb and gutter rather than in waterway. 9) Show location and size of main secondary water control valve. 10) Show detail for trash container, including detail material type and colors. 11) Add lights to shared property line with Lot 6.**

Director LaBonty explained that the applicant was not seeking approval for any signage associated with the project at this time and would apply for that at a later date. Mr. Gertge indicated that only signage would have the rope neon lighting, and the stars would be back lit.

Vice Chair Hellewell opened up the meeting for public hearing.

T.J. Jensen came forward again stating that it appeared the applicants would have some parking to the north of the building, which should help alleviate the Commission's issue with the carwash. Also, the applicants for the carwash could move that 26-foot access to the west 5 or 10 feet to help accommodate drivers backing out. As for the Restaurant, he did not believe parking would be a problem. Commissioner Campbell referred to Mr. Jensen's comments after realizing there would be only two accesses for Lot 5 if the Commission had required the carwash to eliminate the shared access between the two lots as suggested, which would most likely cause some congestion within the site. She believed that the parking stalls in the back of the Restaurant made sense.

No one else wished to speak, so Vice Chair Hellewell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jenkins asked about their timeframe. Mr. Gertge told him both projects were ready to begin as soon as they received approval and building permits.

Commissioner Campbell referred to Epic Engineering's comment regarding the closure of one access on the southwest and asked if that was the new location for the dumpster. Mr. Gertge told her yes, explaining that it lead out to the west to that shared roadway and created some conflict with traffic direction, especially with the drive-thru coming around.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked if there would be only one entrance to the building. Mr. Gertge told him there were two—one on the north and one on the south side, with the south side as the main entrance. Commissioner Campbell asked if the doors then on the west were for employees only. Mr. Gertge said that was correct.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked if he had any issues with the staff or Epic Engineering's reviews, to which Mr. Gertge said no. Specialist Moyes confirmed with Mr. Gertge that he received all staff comments and asked for his response to the recommendation of widening the 12-foot drive adjacent to the 2-foot waterway that provided just a 10-foot section through which to drive. Mr. Gertge admitted he did not look that closely to all the review comments and that they just added that strip. Mr. Graham interjected, stating that he also received those comments and brought the revised drawings with him that showed the curb, closest to the restaurant, 2 feet farther east, to provide 14 feet of space. This change only eliminated some of the landscaping on that side. Vice Chair Hellewell asked if that meant it would be a 12-foot drive with a 2-foot water feature. Mr. Graham explained that it was actually between that curb wall and a regular type curb and gutter on the other side, so it would have 14 feet between the curb wall and back of curb.

Vice Chair Hellewell asked how patrons would access the west parking stalls. Mr. Gertge advised him that vehicles would drive in from the north side over the waterway, which was just a type of ditch rather than a raised water feature.

**CRAIG JENKINS MOVED TO RECOMMEND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE ICEBERG RESTAURANT, LOCATED AT 1792 SOUTH 2000 WEST, SUBJECT TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SYRACUSE LAND USE ORDINANCE WITH CONDITIONS THAT THE APPLICANT ADDRESS ALL ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN EPIC ENGINEERING'S LETTER, DATED JUNE 30, 2009, THAT INCLUDED THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CITY STAFF'S MEMO, DATED JULY 6, 2009, AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. NATHAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.**

#### **8. Planning Commission Business**

Vice Chair Hellewell pointed out that there had been two City Council sessions held since their last meeting. Summary notes of those sessions were provided to commissioners earlier.

Since Evert Cook resigned from the Commission, City staff would be notifying the Mayor to fill that position.

According to the schedule, Commissioner Nagle should be attending the next Council meeting and reporting to commissioners.

Vice Chair Hellewell reminded everyone that the Commission elected a new Chair and Vice Chair every July, so they would be voting on that during their next work session.

Director LaBonty noted their request to add a discussion item for the 200 South corridor planning effort on this agenda, but Chairman Whiteley asked him to postpone that so he could be present at that meeting.

9. Adjournment

NATHAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:09 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

---

Kenneth Hellewell  
Planning Commission Vice Chair