

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 11, 2020 at 7:28 p.m., in the Council Conference Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham  
Corinne N. Bolduc  
Dave Maughan  
Jordan Savage  
W. Seth Teague

Mayor Mike Gailey  
City Manager Brody Bovero  
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

City Attorney Paul Roberts  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Fire Chief Aaron Byington  
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson  
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele  
Administrative Intern Brittany Morgan

The purpose of the Work Session was to review Syracuse City Code Section 10.92 pertaining to the Mixed-Use Development Zone (MXD); continued discussion/review of application for text amendment to Section 10.75 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development (PRD) projects; and conduct Parks and Recreation Department Biennial Review.

### **Review Syracuse City Code Section 10.92 pertaining to the Mixed-Use Development Zone (MXD).**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that on January 28, 2020, the City Council directed staff to place the Mixed-Use Development Zone (MXD) on the agenda for further review and a potential amendment. The City has two current applications for rezone to MXD and prior to voting on those applications, it was desired to review the ordinance based off concerns of residents and Councilmembers. The Council has tabled those two applications until the ordinance is reviewed. Concerns expressed during the meeting were related to the required minimum commercial allocation on site, allowance for drive through windows, required architectural variation standards of 15 feet was too close, and the required distribution of density on site. Upon closer review of the ordinance, staff found that drive through windows are not specifically prohibited, so therefore are allowed. Also, staff found that reference to requirements for architectural variation every 15 feet is not present in the ordinance. The ordinance does require 'horizontal facade variation' in the wall plane at least every 60 feet and variation in the roofline every 30 feet. If the architecture of the buildings is not attractive to council, specific feedback to the developer as to what changes are desired would be appropriate at this time. Staff recommends this strategy rather than lowering the codified architectural standards.

The memo referenced a redlined ordinance implementing potential amendments with exception to the two items mentioned above. If the goal of Council is to reduce the cost of the buildings in the project so that in turn, perhaps the developer could lower overall density of the project, staff recommends to more directly limit density through maximum height and/or units per acre. Lowering the cost of the building will result in a lower quality building.

The memo concluded the goals of the discussion are to review the attached ordinance and decide to table for further discussion in a work session, or to forward on to Planning Commission for a recommendation as required by ordinance.

Mr. Steele reviewed his memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of potential adoption of the redlined ordinance. There was a focus on the need to determine the appropriation definition of the term 'adjacent' for the purposes of considering co-location of different land uses in the same project or next to an existing development. They determined that rules for 'adjacent' uses should be imposed only when two property lines touch one another and that only buildings under two stories in height should be allowed within an 85-foot setback; any building over two stories in height must be setback greater than 85 feet.

Councilmember Maughan stated that when the zone was first created, he envisioned traditional commercial uses mixed with residential units. However, the plans that have been submitted for the two applications do not represent that vision and he wondered whether a mixed-use zone is viable in the City or if would be more appropriate for the Council to consider an apartment zone. Councilmember Bingham added that she is concerned that the higher traffic area of the City is

planned for intersections with the West Davis Corridor, yet assignment of the MXD zone near the intersection of 1000 West and Antelope Drive is contradictory to those plans and that approving a zone there may be 'setting businesses up to fail'. This spurred philosophical discussion and debate about the purpose of the MXD zone in the City and the appropriate locations for the zoning designation. There was a focus on the appropriate ratio of commercial to residential uses in a MXD project and whether to accept existing commercial uses on an adjacent site as the commercial component of a new MXD project; Councilmember Maughan stated that when the zone was created, the Council communicated they were comfortable with increased residential density so long as the City would benefit from new, quality commercial uses. He noted he is uncomfortable approving apartments or multi-family residential without the appropriate amount of new commercial use in the project. City Manager Bovero indicated the City could utilize tax increment funding to entice some desired commercial uses to the area in which the two MXD projects have been proposed; he suggested the Council think more about that option before the next discussion of this topic.

Councilmember Bolduc stated she feels it would be helpful for the Council to understand the benefits the City could expect to realize based on tax revenue of an MXD project. Mr. Steele stated that he can provide tax revenue projections for the residential component of a project fairly easily, but sales tax of a commercial business is a bit more difficult to project. This led to continued discussion about the type of commercial uses that would be acceptable in an MXD project; Councilmember Savage stated he does not feel that the current ordinance is 'broken' and that there are some good things about the two MXD applications that have been submitted. He indicated he would be comfortable allowing commercial uses to be grouped in another are of the project besides just along the road frontage, but he would want to see plans for that type of layout before approving anything.

Mayor Gailey summarized the discussion points; he noted he feels the Council has reached consensus on the appropriate adjustments to the ordinance for the purposes of clearly defining the term 'adjacent' when considering differing land uses abutting one another. He noted he feels there was good discussion about whether an MXD zone should be preserved or if it should be eliminated and replaced with an apartment zone, but he did not feel there was support among a majority of the Council for an apartments-only zone. Councilmember Maughan stated he was not advocating for an apartment zone, but he is concerned that the two MXD applications were mostly residential and very little commercial. Mayor Gailey stated he feels the feedback provided by the Council will be helpful to staff to further adjust the ordinance for continued discussion in the next meeting.

**Continued discussion/review of application for text amendment to Section 10.75 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development (PRD) projects.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Nate Swain with Blacksmith Development has submitted an application to amend the City's Planned Residential Development (PRD) ordinance. Specifically, in relation to ordinance 10.75.050 (B) that reads 'A planned residential development must have a minimum of 4.5 acres.' The City recently reduced the acreage requirement from five acres down to 4.5 in early spring of 2019. Mr. Swain is requesting that the acreage be reduced down to three acres. Not coincidentally, Mr. Swain is interested in developing an approximately three-acre site on 1000 W., south of Smith's, as townhomes. The applicant argues that the site is a good location for townhomes and that the acreage is sufficient for open space, parking, and the units. The General Plan has designated this location for 'Medium Density Residential' which would allow PRD zoning following a rezone approval, which Swain has also applied for. A minimum project size restricts the number of locations that the PRD zone can be applied to. Perhaps this was the city's goal in the past to limit multi-family development. Another site that staff has been receiving inquiries about for townhomes is located west of Walmart that is approximately 3.5 acres. Prior to constructing any PRD development, a zoning application would need to be approved which is a legislative decision at the discretion of City council following a recommendation by Planning Commission. Also, after rezone, the PRD project would go through a site plan approval if rental, or a subdivision process if condominiumized. This text amendment would not be site specific as it would affect the PRD zoning ordinance regulations on the books and any rezone applications for a specific site would be considered independently.

On December 12, 2019, City Council reviewed this item and decided to direct Planning Commission to take a closer look at this request. They expressed concern that removing or reducing the acreage would allow a townhome project to be approved in the middle of a single-family neighborhood. Staff clarified that if such an application were proposed, being a legislative act, could say no without fear of legal repercussions. Regardless, the Council would like to see 'location' qualifier

language in the proposed ordinance. Planning Commission reviewed the item on December 17, 2019 and January 7, 2020. They are forwarding a unanimous 6-0 recommendation to adopt the attached language. On January 28, City Council reviewed the application and tabled the item for further discussion with the direction to staff to provide a map showing potential locations where PRD may be requested in the future.

The memo concluded the goals of this discussion are to review the ordinance language being forwarded from Planning Commission. Decide if the item should come back in another work meeting for additional discussion, or be placed on the next business meeting for a vote.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo as well as a map of the City highlighting the total number of undeveloped parcels that could be developed as a PRD project if the minimum acreage were reduced to three. He stated there are 41 parcels above three acres, with an additional 45 parcels below three acres, but that do have some PRD development potential. He anticipates that those landowners may pursue a further reduced minimum acreage in order to develop their property.

Councilmember Maughan stated that he would not support another 86 PRD projects in the City and even the number of 41 potential PRD projects is concerning. There are already 34 properties that meet the current minimum acreage requirement for PRD development, and adding 41 more sites is not acceptable to him. He does not think that prohibiting PRD projects on properties that are smaller than 4.5 acres will negatively impact the City. Councilmember Bolduc noted that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the minimum acreage with the understanding that they and the Council can consider any PRD application and determine whether the location of the project is appropriate; if they feel it is not an appropriate location, the application can be denied. Councilmember Maughan stated his greatest concern in relation to PRD projects is access; he feels that a PRD project needs multiple points on opposite sides of the development. The smaller the property, the fewer access points and the greater the likelihood that the access points will be on the same road/same side of the development. This is a reason to maintain the larger minimum acreage requirement for a PRD project. Councilmember Bolduc stated that the same argument could be made for a commercial development; a commercial project could bring more traffic than a residential use. Councilmember Maughan stated it is important for the Council to keep in mind that an adjustment to the PRD ordinance will have City-wide implications; he does not want to focus on one property for the purposes of amending the ordinance.

Councilmember Teague stated that as the Land Use Authority, the Council should have the ability to consider project applications on a case-by-case basis; when a zoning petition is submitted, the Council has the ability to determine whether the type of project being pursued is appropriate for the area. For that reason, he is not opposed to reducing the minimum acreage as he believes the Council can deny a project that would be detrimental to an area. Councilmember Bingham agreed and noted that the 4.5-acre minimum acreage determination was somewhat arbitrary; she wants to give property owners the ability to consider multiple development options for their property, with the understanding that the Council can deny a zoning application if the desired use is not appropriate for the area.

Councilmember Savage stated that he agrees with both points of view; he does not think a PRD project can be successful on less than two acres, but he does see some areas where a PRD project would be viable on three acres. He is also concerned about traffic associated with PRD development, especially on a smaller lot. But, he accepts the argument that the Council can consider zoning applications on a case-by-case basis and he is not opposed to considering the reduction of the minimum acreage to three acres.

Mayor Gailey polled the Council to determine if they are supportive of entirely removing the minimum acreage requirement. The Council concluded they would support reducing the minimum acreage to three acres, but they were not supportive of completely removing a minimum acreage requirement. Councilmember Bingham stated it is important for property owners to understand that this does not guarantee automatic approval of a PRD project on a three-acre parcel; rather, the Council will consider each application on a case-by-case basis.

### **Parks and Recreation Department Biennial Review.**

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Director explained her Department is pleased to be able to present and discuss an in-depth review of the department with the City Council. Administration hopes the discussion yields insight and support for current and future services.

Ms. Robinson used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to discuss the organization, vision statements, goals and accomplishments, and recommendations for increased productivity and enhanced services in her Department. The mission statement for the Department reads as follows: "We are committed to providing citizens with a wide variety of recreational opportunities supported by our parks, personnel, and facilities. Our goal is to deliver superior programs and services that meet the needs of the community in a cost-effective manner." She reviewed the organizational chart for her Department as well as the City-wide and Department specific vision statements that apply to her Department. Several of her Department's

accomplishments were spurred by response to these vision statements. In the Parks/Cemetery Division of her Department, the Centennial Park interactive water feature project was completed, the 2000 West linear park project reached substantial completion, the Parks Master Plan was completed and implementation is underway, the Regional Park design was completed, a Five-Year Parks Improvement Plan was created and implemented, and the Linda Vista Park irrigation controller was completed. Additional accomplishments in Parks/Cemetery include the following:

- Rock Creek Restroom;
- Implemented New Cemetery Software and Updated Cemetery Ordinances;
- Continued Tree Initiative:
- Rock Creek Park (10 Trees)
- Linear Park (186 Trees)
- Linda Vista (5 Trees)
- Jensen (3 Trees)
- Centennial Park (8)
- Completion of Tuscany Park;
- Refined, & Enhanced, Parks/Cemetery Maintenance Programs;
- Installed Auto-Cleaning Irrigation Filters (4 Sites); and
- Created and Implemented an Athletic Field Usage Policy.

Ms. Robinson then discussed program offerings; existing programs were improved upon and augmented and additional programs were created, including adaptive soccer, pickleball, baseball/softball clinics and homerun derby, educational classes, and increased instruction using contractors. Participation in the City's program continues to increase steadily from year to year. A financial analysis was completed to determine the break-even point for recreation programs and offerings of the Community Center; net and gross profits have increased from 2018 to 2019 for all programs, while expenditures were reduced. Community Center enhancements and improvements include increased usage, redesign of the gym-floor layout, increased staffing and creation/implementation of a preventative/routine maintenance program, installation of an auto-cleaning irrigation filter, and integration of new software.

Relative to special events, the City's events have been enhanced; this includes the annual Easter Egg Hunt, Heritage Days, Pumpkin Walk, and various outdoor events. The success of these events rely heavily upon volunteer support. Additionally, volunteers dedicated 6,506 hours to complete 142 service projects in the community.

Ms. Robinson then moved to recommendations for increased productivity and enhanced services in her Department. In the Parks/Cemetery Division, she is pursuing continued improvement of the irrigation system to improve efficiency and address water pressure issues. She is also updating and enhancing amenities and recreational opportunities to correspond with the Five-Year Parks Improvement Plan. She needs to address staffing issues and noted that each year she faces a lack of seasonal help or applications for seasonal positions. Her Department also needs new equipment to aid in maintaining park space and she would like to continue with the City's tree initiative. Cemetery expansion and improvements are also on the horizon; the new maintenance facility will be very helpful for properly storing maintenance equipment and supplies. Increased productivity and enhancements are also planned for recreation programs and at the Community Center; this includes the addition of 'e-sports' programs, adaptive recreation, track and field running club, additional educational classes, additional pickleball leagues, and enhanced outdoor recreation opportunities. Sports clinics being planned will target soccer, volleyball, and basketball athletes. Maintenance and repair is needed at the Community Center, including carpet replacement, re-painting walls, roof/HVAC maintenance, and storage improvements. Additionally, she would like to expand the locker room and add showers as well as expand the exercise/weight room. Finally, special events will also be enhanced; she plans to add a City 5k/fun run program, a winter event, and many more outdoor events. The City's Museum will also be enhanced and the Arts Council offerings expanded.

Throughout her presentation, Ms. Robinson and Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation, Chad Smout, responded to comments and questions from the Council regarding various projects, programming, or operations of the Department. Councilmember Maughan emphasized his appreciation to Ms. Robinson and Mr. Smout for being responsive to the Council's request to carefully evaluate the Department to determine opportunities for improvements and program enhancement.

The meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

City Council Work Session  
February 11, 2020

---

Mike Gailey  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: April 14, 2020