

Syracuse City Planning Commission Meeting November 1, 2011

1. Meeting called to Order and Adoption of Agenda

Planning Commission Chair Gregory Day called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m., indicating that City staff posted the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting and delivered copies to all Commission members. Tyler Bodrero offered the prayer, and Gary Pratt led the pledge of allegiance.

Members Present: Chairman Gregory Day, Vice Chairman Gary Pratt, Kenneth Hellewell, Tyler Bodrero, Braxton Schenk, T.J. Jensen, Dale Rackham, and Curt McCuiston as well as Community Development Director Michael Eggett, City Planner Kent Andersen, and Administrative Secretary Judy Merrill

Visitors: Garrett Vance	Bjornn Tolman	Derek Vance	Cody Hill
Stacey Hill	Craig Johnson	Troop 126	

Commissioners reviewed the November 1, 2011, Planning Commission meeting agenda.

GARY PRATT MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE NOVEMBER 1, 2011, AGENDA AS OUTLINED, SECONDED BY T.J. JENSEN; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Approval of Minutes

Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the October 18, 2011, meeting and work session. Commissioner Bodrero pointed out that the minutes reflected correctly that he was not in attendance to either of those meetings. Commissioner Hellewell then stated that he would be abstaining from the vote, since he also was not in attendance at those meetings.

T.J. JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 18, 2011, MEETING AND WORK SESSION MINUTES. DALE RACKHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH KENNETH HELLEWELL ABSTAINING.

3. Recommendation of Planning Commission Bylaws

Commissioner Jensen referred to the last City Council meeting where they pointed out that the Commission's bylaws were for the public to see, so he suggested that City staff keep a copy available once adopted by City Council. He then referred to a previous discussion by commissioners regarding electronic attendance. He remembered the consensus as being to allow participation electronically but not voting. He suggested adding language, under meeting attendance of the duties of members section on Page 3, that said "In instances where members made arrangements to attend electronically beforehand, they may participate in discussions but may not vote." Vice Chair Pratt did not believe it necessary to add such a provision under meeting attendance, since a meeting would be a meeting regardless of location, electronically or offsite. He preferred not having to spell out everywhere a meeting could take place. Commissioner Jensen pointed out that such language was already called out in City Code for the City Council but not for the Commission. If they were going to allow electronic participation, he believed it needed to be reflected in their bylaws. Vice Chair Pratt asked if the Commission had any obligation to be tied in electronically like the Council and if that really was something commissioners needed to decide. Director Eggett explained that electronic participation was only an obligation of a legislative body, not a recommending body. The conference room was the only place in City Hall with the capability of allowing someone to join a meeting electronically, and work sessions did not involve action items. Vice Chair Pratt preferred to present their bylaws to City Council as currently written. If the Council felt strongly about the Commission including a provision for electronic meetings, commissioners could discuss it in a future meeting without having to hold up the entire set of bylaws at this point. Commissioner Bodrero agreed with Vice Chair Pratt. Chairman Day asked if the bylaws as written would prevent electronic attendance. Commissioner Bodrero believed they would exclude that possibility. Director Eggett explained that, since the Commission would not be establishing a way to operate electronically, the State would dictate how they operated. Commissioner Schenk preferred to leave the bylaws as written. Commissioners could amend the bylaws as issues arose, and they were already nine pages long. He recommended keeping them simple.

GARY PRATT MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN, WITHOUT THE INCLUSION OF ELECTRONIC ATTENDANCE, AND FORWARD IT TO CITY COUNCIL. DALE RACKHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4. Presentation of 200 South Committee Planning Report

Commissioner Bodrero summarized the events leading up to that evening, stating that the Commission authorized the creation of a subcommittee around November 2010 to include commissioners, a City Councilman, land owners, and adjacent business owners. They put a lot of time, research, and thought into planning that portion of the City to decide best uses of properties. The power corridor, adjacent the business park, would be a natural buffer between residential and other uses, since it could not have buildings. They hoped the City would utilize the open space/recreation area to relocate Founders Park. He then reviewed UDOT's plans to widen 200 South from Clearfield to 2000 West in Syracuse, with a center turn lane and a sound wall. There would be one access point into this subject area, and they were planning for that traffic to enter into the General Commercial section and branch off into the business park and open space. The plan included working with the Davis School District to share parking with the Syracuse High School and construction of an aquatic center or other community facility to the north of the school. Commissioner Hellewell then passed out proposed language for the new Business Park zone. The Committee used the format of the City's existing zones and compared them with five or six other cities to create this one. Light industrial would actually be a conditional use in this new Business Park zone with an overlay zone, from 1000-3000 West, that required review and approval by Planning Commission and City Council of a development theme with design standards to avoid a hodgepodge of buildings thrown together. He then asked to place the proposed language on their first agenda in December as well as District 8 of the General Plan for final recommendations and closure. Director Eggett expressed reservations with that plan due to complicating factors that might demand looking at District 8 in January or February. Staff was given approval to organize a stakeholders' group to discuss and review a concept plan for a potential major land owner in that area. The proposed sketch plan actually lined up well with the Committee's presentation. Since that group would review the architectural and design standards in the overlay, he encouraged commissioners to postpone their recommendation. Commissioners needed to be cognizant of some land negotiations taking place and give it time to finish and allow the future owners to provide input on the planning of their land. Vice Chair Pratt asked about the makeup of that stakeholders group. Director Eggett named MGBA as a professional planning firm that helped with the architectural design, landscape and corridor planning, and traffic flow in an effort to create a cohesive plan that would operate as best as possible for all three cities based on the land-use designations. Even though commissioners could disregard those forthcoming ideas, he expressed the importance of allowing those events to play out in order to prove the process, especially since the City would be expending grant monies to cover those expenses.

Commissioner Hellewell pointed out that MGBA agreed at their last Committee meeting to use the plan their Committee developed. Director Eggett advised him that MGBA would be presenting a plan very similar but not identical, based on marketing and research they conducted afterwards. Commissioner Hellewell emphasized the Committee's desires to move forward, stating that the land owners involved in the planning process were frustrated with having finished their proposals last April and knowing the City had not yet adopted it into the General Plan. Therefore, they asked him to bring it back to commissioners and get it moving forward again. Mike referred to the HUD grant awarded the City and his desire to be careful with those funds to get the best economic and planning result possible. They were able to work through about one third of the process but still needed to complete the goals identified by MGBA. In order to get a good document, their review required about a three-month process, which had to go out to bid with all three cities on board. Vice Chair Pratt asked how the City and MGBA were communicating with land owners. Director Eggett referred to a dedicated website/blog spot for the SR193 project area study and the many stakeholders meetings held to discuss study results.

Chairman Day believed there had been ample time for adoption of the proposed General Plan amendments in District 8 and considered it disingenuous to current property owners by not bringing it forth in a more timely manner. He did not feel it appropriate to delay much longer. Director Eggett encouraged com-

missioners to wait until January before closing it. Commissioner Hellewell preferred moving more quickly. He was fine leaving the overlay open, because MGBA would fall into the planning of that zone, but wanted the General Plan amendments in place prior to beginning any work on 200 South in order for the City to have a starting point for other cities to follow and blend in rather than take the lead, which upset residents during the DTEC planning process. The City invited all land owners to be a part of the planning earlier that year, and PRI declined to be a part of it. In May, the Committee wrapped up their work only to watch it languish since then. Director Eggett explained the delay as being due to new opportunities for the City to explore major changes that might require cooperation and compromise to acquire results that would be in the best interests of the City. Before the Commission closed District 8, he emphasized the value in waiting to hear from the prospective land owners and what they would try and bring to the City.

Commissioner Hellewell pointed out that if the Commission had been timelier and closed District 8 back in May, they would not even be having this discussion. Director Eggett disagreed, because the City knew something would be happening, which was why staff requested that the Commission wait. Another month would not create any negative impacts and could bring the most benefit to the City. Chairman Day countered with the comment that commissioners should not be basing decisions on timing of possible upcoming events. Rather, their decisions needed to be predictable and deliberate, and the length of any postponements should be more appropriate. Director Eggett assured them that, once the sale went through, the land owners already had a representative selected and scheduled to attend every Commission meeting.

Chairman Day asked if Commissioner Hellewell would agree to wait. Commissioner Hellewell explained that the General Plan designated that entire area, from 1000-2000 West, as C-2 because of a similar incident. A developer came in saying he was in negotiations to buy the church-owned property to develop something like Jordan Commons. It did not happen. Because they amended the General Plan to C-2 in that District, a land owner could apply the next day for a rezone, and the City would have to approve it. Therefore, the 200 South Committee decided to plan it from the citizens' points of view and what existing and participating landowners wanted to see in that area. He agreed to hold off but considered it unwise to leave the General Plan open for an indeterminable period of time for any potential land owner. Commissioner Bodrero agreed, stating that he would hope the future land owner could see the importance of participating immediately, at whatever level possible, in order to help shape the decisions to match whatever master plan they might have in place. Director Eggett pointed out that any applicant rezoning land to C-2 would also have to abide by a development agreement and that the area between the power corridor and 1000 West was currently an Industrial zone. Staff did not prefer the C-2 zone as currently designated on the General Plan and was trying to find a more accurate and flexible zone that would better fit the desires of Syracuse. City staff ultimately had the same goals as the Commission, just maybe different timelines and constituencies.

After discussing the different zoning options, Commissioner Hellewell mentioned another idea their Subcommittee developed regarding potential land swaps of some City park land to PRI in order to increase a commercial area they had in another part of the City. Director Eggett expressed appreciation for the idea and said it had a lot of value. Staff favored the adoption of some type of Business Park zone to transition from General Commercial to Industrial zones. Commissioner Hellewell stated that an overlay zone would regulate that specific area while the Business Park zone would be broad enough to apply anywhere in the City.

Commissioner Jensen asked for Commissioner Hellewell to explain the advantages of a Business Park Zone over General Commercial. Commissioner Hellewell advised him that the Business Park Zone allowed uses such as corporate headquarters, which none of the City's current zones allowed. The C-2 and Industrial zones sort of allowed such uses, but this Business Park Zone would allow something similar to Legend Hills. Director Eggett agreed that the Business Park Zone was a great document and starting point but wanted to explore variants of industrial and commercial zones in order to get the best products possible that would create the most flexible zoning available for property owners.

Vice Chair Pratt suggested recommending approval of the Overlay and Business Park zones to City Council and let them table it if necessary and desirable in order to accommodate a future land owner. Director Eggett explained the importance of finishing the planning process for the Overlay zone. The most important element staff was trying to push was the architectural design standards for Syracuse to drive and

have the other cities follow, since Syracuse had the most to gain or lose by it. Staff forwarded the overlay document to MGBA for their review.

Commissioner Hellewell asked staff to place the General Plan and Business park zone on the December 6, 2011, agenda for a public hearing and recommendation. If City Council chose to hold it for some developer, it would be their responsibility, and commissioners would be moving the process along. Vice Chair Pratt agreed that moving things forward would not damage relationships and would support the decisions made previously. Council could then remand it to Commission for tweaking, based on additional information from new land owners. Planner Andersen pointed out that forwarding it to Council did not mean they would remand it to commissioners if new information came forward, and he felt that staff would be remiss in not providing input from the Commission on such new information.

Commissioner Hellewell proposed forwarding recommendations for District 2 and holding just District 1. Director Eggett stated that commissioners would still want to see the conceptual design from MGBA and discuss it. Although the land negotiations only involved District 1, he saw value in letting a potential property owner weigh in on the submitted proposals and provide input to commissioners for discussions of both Districts so that the Commission could forward the very best recommendation possible.

Commissioner Hellewell pointed out that, even if they held a public hearing on December 6, they could table it. Commissioner Jensen agreed, explaining that commissioners could consider all the information over the holidays and forward recommendations in January or later. Since this would be a significant change to that area, he wanted to make sure residents had ample time to provide input, along with the 200 South Committee's recommendations, to help them make the best decisions. Commissioner Hellewell suggested holding the overlay zone, because MGBA would provide input on it, and having public hearings for both the Business Park zone and General Plan changes. Commissioner Jensen requested it also include the Light Industrial zone in order to move it forward as quickly as possible, since it provided commissioners with the tools and flexibility to build the City in the most effective way.

Chairman Day proposed waiting until November 15 to decide on scheduling a public hearing in December in light of information provided by the applicant. He also proposed placing the Business Park and Light Industrial zones on their next work session agenda for discussion. Commissioner Bodrero preferred to schedule the public hearing for December 6, for planning purposes and moving it forward, and then postpone it, during their November 15 meeting, if commissioners considered it appropriate. Chairman Day believed the Business Park language needed discussion and asked if commissioners thought it advantageous to place it on the next work session agenda in order to have it ready for a public hearing. Commissioner Hellewell believed it appropriate to have both the Business Park and Light Industrial zones on the next work session agenda.

Commissioner Jensen disclosed his plans to work towards bringing a Crystal Inn to Syracuse at the intersection of 3000 West and Antelope Drive, next to the proposed West-Davis Corridor.

5. Adjournment

T.J. JENSEN MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 7:30 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Gregory Day
Planning Commission Chair