

Syracuse City Planning Commission Meeting November 15, 2011

1. Meeting called to Order and Adoption of Agenda

Planning Commission Chair Gregory Day called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m., indicating that City staff posted the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting and delivered copies to all Commission members. Gregory Day offered the prayer, and Dale Rackham 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, City Engineer Robert Whiteley, Fire Chief Craig Cottrell, Police Chief Brian Wallace, Building Official Tex Couch, and Administrative Secretary Judy Merrill

Visitors:	Sam Shafter	Melissa Shafter	Connor Whitesides	Kylie Shafter
	Wade Stoker	Natalie Argyle	Matt Smythe	Chris Cave

Commissioners reviewed the November 15, 2011, Planning Commission meeting agenda.

T.J. JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE NOVEMBER 15, 2011, AGENDA AS OUTLINED, SECONDED BY TYLER BODRERO; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Day pointed out that the packets included minutes of the October 18, 2011, meeting and work session, rather than the November 1, 2011, meeting and work session.

T.J. JENSEN MOVED TO TABLE THIS ITEM, SECONDED BY BRAXTON SCHENK; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. Stoker Gardens PRD Subdivision Preliminary Plat

Chairman Day addressed those in attendance, stating that there had been numerous public hearings regarding this development, but the review that evening would not include public comment. However, those wanting to voice opinions or comments would have opportunity to do so in a future City Council meeting. Planner Andersen then explained how Castle Creek Homes submitted a preliminary plat with colored elevations and landscaping plan, which staff included in their packets as well as staff's review, the City Engineer's comments, letters from the Fire and Police Chiefs, some emails from residents, a letter of opposition signed by 61 residents in the Harvest Point Subdivision, a letter of support signed by 24 residents in the Antelope Run Subdivision, and a map showing the road connection to 2150 South. Staff had many conversations with residents who signed the petitions for and against this development, and a lot of it surrounded the road connection.

Chairman Day invited Kyle Hamblin, representing Castle Creek Homes, to present the preliminary plan. Mr. Hamblin introduced Chris Cave, of Reeves & Associates Engineering, who was also in attendance. After sketch plan, he said that Mike Schultz took to heart a lot of the comments from commissioners and staff and made the following changes: 1) Increased the number of units with two-car garages, previously around 50%, to 42, based on Commissioner Hellewell's comment that market demanded larger garages. Just 24 units, or 36%, would have one-car garages. That change also increased their number of off-street parking, which alleviated another concern identified in the letter from Harvest Point residents. 2) Changed elevations but not footprint. Renderings would have rock and either stucco or hardiplank on front facades and either stucco or hardiplank on sides and back. 3) Added monument on north corner of entryway. 4) Shifted road northward to address the potential for bottlenecking at 2075 South. They also planned to enclose the development with a tan fence and hoped to work out a cooperative agreement with Chris Thurgood to help with the fencing on the southern side of the Subdivision.

Vice Chair Pratt asked about the issue with ownership of Lot 68. Director Eggett explained that the City would not issue building permits for any lot without street frontage. The new owner planned to resolve it later by vacating it from the Stoker Gardens Subdivision plat and adding it to the Harvest Point Subdivision plat. This preliminary plan showed the relocation of the required easement for that lot and cell tower.

Chairman Day asked about the potential for restricting rentals in the CC&Rs to a specific percentage. Mr. Hamblin explained that residents of these townhomes would have the same property rights as others in any subdivision. Although they did not want it to turn into a rental development either, they were uncomfortable trying to impose a restriction that would prevent parents from purchasing units for their adult children, etc. They planned to use Lot 66 for a model home and maybe Lot 65 because of its smaller garage. The HOA would govern maintenance, insure exterior facades, and exact strict guidelines on outside storage and use.

Chairman Day asked about manipulating a development agreement to prevent the Subdivision from becoming a rental street. Director Eggett agreed that such an agreement would have some influence. Vice Chair Pratt mentioned that these types of agreements could prohibit 'For Rent' signs, and commissioners discussed the possibility of prohibiting all yard signs and only allowing signage in windows.

Commissioner Rackham asked if the elevations met the exterior requirements of the Ordinance. Director Eggett was unsure but assured him that staff would verify that at the time of final plan review.

Chairman Day asked staff to comment on the petitions from Harvest Point residents, regarding their opposition to the connection of their Subdivision to 1000 West, and the Antelope Run residents requesting another access from those neighborhoods to major collector and arterial roads. Planner Andersen advised him that access to 1000 West from that area was very limited. Most drivers had to use the Allison Way 1475 West route to reach Antelope Drive, which was an issue for general access and emergency services. He referred to the letters from the Fire and Police departments that supported the proposed connection from 1000 West to the Harvest Point Subdivision and the fact that this was not the only access needed to that area. The City anticipated development of another road from the north and one from the south as well as more in the future. Director Eggett pointed out that the City had multiple accesses from the east, six or seven, but only one from the west. If approved, the City would add a four-way stop at the 2150 South 1230 West intersection and a stop sign in Stoker Gardens as well as require speed limits of 25mph in order to slow traffic and prevent through traffic. Fire Chief Cottrell added that roads were not the problem—speeds produced the problems. Chairman Day agreed, stating that more accesses would be better for emergencies.

City Engineer Whiteley explained that long strips of roads encouraged traffic volumes and speeds; however, by planning this road with the 90-degree configuration and t-intersection, speeds would remain slow and discourage traffic from far away. Local drivers would accept the slower speeds, angles, and stops as being worth it, because accessing 1000 West would still be faster than accessing Antelope Drive. For dispersing traffic, this road configuration was good planning for residents and traffic calming. The petition's concerns were valid, but this street was necessary for access and beneficial for looping utility lines and interconnecting them, because it helped the overall system network and function well and improve service. It would help improve the infrastructure to maintain continuity.

Police Chief Wallace reminded everyone that dispersing traffic over a wider area allowed more ways to provide safety services. Currently, every driver wanting to travel east from that area had to either go south or go north, to 1475 West and then to Antelope Drive. The Antelope Run residents had been enduring the pain of hundreds of vehicles passing through their neighborhood for several years now. The City recently increased enforcement and installed some bicycle lanes and a four-way stop to slow traffic, rather than installing speed humps that had their own downsides. One resident brought in an entire bucket of auto parts left at the hump in front of his home. Once this area was finally built out and had four egresses onto 1000 West, nobody would have a lot of traffic. Drivers close to that development would go east on this road but others would still go north to Antelope Drive.

Vice Chair Pratt referred to the concern in the letter of opposition regarding property values and the goal of the Ordinance to protect those values. In some respects, he believed that such an argument had validity; however, one could also argue that such a road stabilized values by providing better utilities, emergency services, and quality of roads and sidewalks that penetrated the neighborhoods, and access for residents to public transportation and other public assistance. The City had to consider all needs.

Commissioner Jensen asked Chief Cottrell if he could provide estimates for home insurance percentages. Chief Cottrell explained that insurance companies considered travel distances from fire stations, proximity of hydrants, and the number of hydrants passed on the way to a home. Access was a huge factor. When the City did road maintenance, water line repairs, or other services that required blocking a street, adding another access to this area would also give residents an alternate route for ingress and egress.

Commissioner Jensen asked if staff felt that the developer addressed all identified issues. Engineer Whiteley stated that there were only three of his concerns left that had yet to be resolved. The first was the sewer main, which tended to become shallow at the west end of the development. The applicant needed to verify that the main could adequately serve all the homes without creating vertical crossing conflicts with other utilities. Chris Cave advised him of their sewer analysis. Engineer Whiteley asked to see a profile and any cross conflicts on final plans. Another issue related to an existing 36-inch storm-drain pipe in a 20-foot easement along the southern property line. If the back walls of those buildings were only 5 feet from that south property line and the City had to dig down 8 feet to service the pipe, the townhomes would be too close to excavate. Mr. Cave said they would adjust the footprints. Engineer Whiteley stated that the last item regarded easements for sewer and water mains extending into shared private driveways. All the rest were minor issues that the developer could address on final plans. Mr. Cave explained that everything not a roadway or building would be a blanket easement. As for City staff's review, Director Eggett explained that the applicant still needed to identify the type of materials intended for the easement next to Unit 35, keeping in mind that staff preferred concrete or sod to avoid the nuisances and mischief that gravel tended to produce. Another issue was Item 19, regarding land drains, due to drainage concerns for the west end of the development. He mentioned the uncertainty of the fill level and pointed out that the east elevation of the Subdivision was higher and would impact Lot 68. Staff requested a drainage plan that would eliminate those concerns. The applicant still needed to identify the height of the average unit, as required in Section 10-50-040(F), and identify ADA parking on the plat. City staff also wanted an opportunity to review the development agreement and HOA language as part of their final plan review in order to see how the HOA would operate. Another review item asked how ingress and egress to the park area would function between units 42 and 43 with that shared driveway. Mr. Hamblin explained that each unit would have 20 feet of their own specific driveway before reaching the point where they met and combined. Director Eggett listed the final review item as the landscaping plan, which required treescaping. Due to concerns with tree roots infiltrating that large pipe within the drainage easement along the southern boundary line, the City was willing to waive that requirement or change it to shrubs. Vice Chair Pratt pointed out that there were plenty of ornamental trees they could plant that would not impact pipes.

When asked about homeowners installing their own fencing, Mr. Hamblin explained that the units would already have fencing around the back patios but homeowners could fence to the property line if desired. Vice Chair Pratt asked about storage sheds, and Mr. Hamblin did not believe the HOA language would allow detached structures. Director Eggett asked Engineer Whiteley about potential issues he could foresee with homeowners fencing to the property line along that drainage easement. Engineer Whiteley admitted such fencing would negatively impact access and require greater effort on the City's part by having to take down fences, but he did not believe the City could prohibit them.

After further discussion of nearby residents' concerns and of possible ways to prevent the appearances of rentals, commissioners expressed a level of comfort in approving the preliminary plan.

GARY PRATT MADE A MOTION TO GRANT PRELIMINARY PLAN APPROVAL OF THE STOKER GARDENS PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2040 SOUTH 1000 WEST, SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY MUNICIPAL CODES, AS IDENTIFIED IN THE CITY STAFF REVIEW DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2011, AND THE CITY ENGINEER'S COMMENTS DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2011. BRAXTON SCHENK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Commissioner Bodrero left the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

4. Setting Next Agenda

Commissioner Jensen requested that commissioners approve the scheduling of another meeting that month to hold the work session they were not able to have that evening. Planner Andersen pointed out that November did have an extra Tuesday on the 29th. Chairman Day requested a discussion item on their next agenda to schedule a public hearing for Districts 1 and 2 of the General Plan. Director Eggett mentioned a meeting he had with Eric Rice, project manager for the 215 acres just purchased in District 1, and explained that Mr. Rice showed every desire to come and participate in all future City meetings. Director Eggett asked

for a presentation at the next Commission meeting, and Mr. Rice planned to do that on December 6. Planner Andersen added that The Ninigret Group expressed interest in receiving comments from commissioners as well. Commissioner Jensen preferred having that happen prior to discussing Districts 1 and 2. Director Eggett assured commissioners that The Ninigret Group wanted to understand the desires of the City for that area and that the MGBA process could begin to move forward again.

Director Eggett mentioned Ovation Homes' work towards finalizing an agreement to purchase the Trailside Park Subdivision and their plans to amend Phase 2 and change Phase 3. However, before the City could accept application for those requests, the Commission and Council needed to amend Title 10, regarding cluster subdivisions, by adding the R-1 zone back into it. Even if commissioners held a public hearing on December 6 regarding Title 10, he stressed the point that the Commission was under no obligation to advance language forward if they were not comfortable with it.

After further discussions with commissioners, Chairman Day directed staff to schedule public hearings on December 6 for Districts 1 and 2 of the General Plan and for proposed amendments to Title 10 for cluster subdivisions and to place discussion items on their Work Session agenda for proposed amendments to Title 10 for the new Business Park and Light Industrial zones and for animal regulations. Everyone agreed to hold a work session on November 29 at 6 p.m. to discuss sign regulations.

5. Adjournment

DALE RACKHAM MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 7:28 P.M.; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Gregory Day
Planning Commission Chair