

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on October 24, 2023, at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 846 8515 8281, in-person in the City Council Conference Room at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham  
Jennifer Carver  
Jordan Savage  
W. Seth Teague  
Paul Watson

Mayor Dave Maughan  
City Manager Brody Bovero  
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

City Employees Present:  
Administrative Services Director Stephen Marshall  
City Attorney Brienne Brass  
Fire Chief Aaron Byington  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley  
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele  
Communications Specialist Kara Finley

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; introduce Shannon Busse as the new Communities that Care (CTC) North Davis Advisor; discuss annexation petition for property on 3000 West between 1700 South and 2700 South.; review pre-application development for property located at approximately 2400 S. 2750 W.; review and discuss recommendation from the Planning Commission for a General Plan Map amendment at 1557 W. 1700 S.; discuss Planning Commission recommendations related to zoning for properties located at 1557 W 1700 S., 1188 W 2500 S., 2425 W. 2700 S. and 322 S. 2000 W.; discussion and review of Syracuse City Code Section 10.92 pertaining to Mixed-Use Development (MXD) zoning; discussion regarding dog park project; discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Syracuse City Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024; discussion regarding proposed updates to the Syracuse City Personnel Policy Manual and amendments to the employee wage scale for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024; discuss amendments to the Syracuse City contracting policy; discuss amendments to the Syracuse City Annexation Policy Plan; and discuss the possibility of communicating the City's desires to the State Legislature relating to housing and land use authority laws.

#### **Public comments**

There were no public comments.

#### **Introduce Communities that Care (CTC) North Davis Advisor Shannon Busse.**

Mayor Maughan welcomed Shannon Busse as the new CTC North Davis Advisor and invited her to introduce herself to the Council. Shannon discussed the ongoing efforts of the CTC and asked for continued partnership and cooperation with the City given the upcoming turnover on the City Council due to municipal elections.

#### **Review/discussion of Annexation Petition 2023-02 for property on 3000 West between 1700 South and 2700 South; petitioner David Cook:**

A staff memo from the City Recorder explained on July 31, 2023, David Cook filed a petition for annexation of 129.496 acres of property on 3000 West between 1700 S. and 2700 S. The City Council accepted the petition on August 8, 2023 and referred it to the City Recorder's Office for certification. The petition was certified on September 8, and a notice of certification was delivered to the City Council and the petitioner, published in accordance with the Utah Code, and delivered to all affected entities; notices were also be mailed to each residence and property owner within one-half mile of the subject property. The notices outlined the protest period. The 30-day protest period has expired, and no protests were filed during that time. The proposed annexation, zoning ordinance, and an annexation agreement can now be considered by the Council. A public hearing must also be scheduled before final action can take place; pending the outcome of the work session discussion, staff recommends the public hearing be scheduled for November 14, 2023 during the City Council meeting scheduled for that

evening. The Planning Commission has reviewed the petition and has forwarded a zoning recommendation for Council consideration. For the northernmost 32 acres of the property, they have recommended commercial zoning. For the remainder of the property, they have recommended agricultural zoning.

The Mayor stated that Davis County was concerned about the division of the ownership of the roads surrounding the annexation area; he communicated that the City has worked with the engineer for the project to amend the annexation plat to address the County's concerns.

The Council expressed support for the application moving forward to the next step in the process, which includes a public hearing and vote to accept the annexation area at a future business meeting.

**Planning item: Pre-application development review for property located at approximately 2400 S. 2750 W., requested zone change from Residential R-1 to Residential R-3**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained any landowner or designee may apply for and receive a pre-application consultation with the City Council about a development opportunity that would require a zone change. The consultation is voluntary, informal and non-vesting. The pre-application consultation will occur during a public, non-voting meeting and individual Councilmembers will provide their input to the applicant.

Mayor Maughan invited Keith Lindstrom and Dave Erickson with Leisure Villas to explain their project and answer the Council's questions. Dave Erickson stated he is requesting a zone change from R-1 to R-3 to allow six lots with 80-foot frontage widths. City Manager Bovero explained that a development agreement could be utilized to maintain the R-1 zoning, or potentially R-2 zoning, while allowing a certain number of units on the property.

Councilmember Teague asked Public Works Director Whiteley if he has any concerns about drainage in the area given the number of lots and requested frontage widths of 80 feet, to which Mr. Whiteley answered no.

**Planning item: Recommendation from the Planning Commission General Plan Map amendment for property located at 1557 W. 1700 S., Low Density Residential to Commercial**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the applicant is requesting an amendment to the General Plan Map to support a proposed rezone. The current General Plan Map designation for this property is Low-Density Residential which does not support the applicant's desire to rezone the property to GC (General Commercial). The proposed General Plan Map designation of Commercial would allow for the following potential zones:

1. General Commercial
2. Professional Office
3. Mixed-Use
4. Neighborhood Services

The size and shape of the property limits the uses in each zone due to buffering, setbacks, and parking requirements, but the applicant intends to utilize the GC Zone to pursue a retail-focused use. Amending the General Plan Map does not ensure that any of the zones above would be applied to the property. The Planning Commission is recommending approval of this item. The Planning Commission held a public hearing and discussed the application on September 5, 2023. They found that since the property has frontage on Antelope, it made better sense to plan for commercial uses than residential.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the General Plan Map amendment; he explained this parcel does not have direct access to Antelope Drive and traffic access would go through an existing apartment complex. Mr. Steele explained that the Planning Commission recommended approval of this General Plan map amendment, but they were not aware that this parcel would not have direct access to Antelope.

Councilmember Watson expressed concern about commercial traffic moving through the apartment complex; several Councilmembers agreed and discussed alternatives. Councilmember Bingham added she doesn't believe that commercial is the right fit for this location. Councilmember Teague stated some commercial uses would not be a good fit, but professional office space or a neighborhood services use may be appropriate. Councilmembers Watson and Carver agreed.

Mr. Steele summarized the options available to the Council regarding this application; Mayor Maughan stated there is not a clear consensus on the matter tonight, but the application can move forward to the next voting meeting for continued discussion and action.

**Planning item: Recommendation from the Planning Commission zoning map amendment for property located at 1557 W. 1700 S., Residential (R-1) to General Commercial (GC).**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the applicant is requesting an amendment to the Zoning Map from R-2 to GC, the applicant is proposing a drive-through restaurant. The Planning Commission reviewed the item during their September 5 meeting and voted to recommend denial. They expressed

concerns over parking and access. They doubted that adequate parking would be able to be accommodated on site due to the narrow size of the lot. They feared that inadequate parking would result in one street parallel parking on Antelope which could be dangerous as no on street parking is currently allowed on Antelope. Also, there is not currently a driveway cut into the curb on the south side of Antelope and UDOT would need to approve all access points. If UDOT added an access driveway at that location, it is possible that UDOT would force a center median restricting left turns in front of the site but as well as extending east and west. This restriction may impact existing business access and the apartment complex to the west. Also, the applicant was unsure who the end user or business would be, which also gave concern to the commission. A public hearing was also held, and no public comments were received.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and emphasized that this is the same property as the previous agenda item; he facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the request to change the zoning to General Commercial; the Council reiterated their concerns about traditional commercial uses on the site, but indicated a willingness to hear from the applicant a future business meeting regarding his ideas for the property.

The Council agreed on needing to know what business specifically would be going into that location before they could consider a zone change.

**Planning item: Recommendation from the Planning Commission**  
**Zoning Map amendment for property located at 1188 W. 250 S.,**  
**Industrial (ID) to Business Park (BP)**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained City staff has self-initiated a proposed rezone of approximately five acres at approximately 1188 W 250 S. The purpose of the rezone is a proactive measure to prevent additional storage units from being built north of the Bear River Storage project that is nearing completion. The land area north of the Bear River Storage project has frontage on SR 193 which increases its value and market viability for higher use. There is also an agreement in place with UDOT to allow direct access from the highway to the parcels. Storage units, while a needed service for residents, underperform from a city economic development perspective compared to other land uses. Storage units occupy large tracts of land, have a low number of jobs, and low assessed property tax revenue per acre compared to other land uses. Flex industrial buildings along the frontage of the highway would continue the look of the existing Antelope Business park. The new buildings would also increase the available cross parking for the existing industrial buildings. The city had entered into a development agreement with the developer of the storage units in 2019. The agreement was that the city would allow the storage units only if they provided flex industrial to the north. A good faith effort was made to bring an industrial developer to the table. Both the industrial flex and the storage unit projects received site plan approval and building permits simultaneously. However, the storage unit project broke ground but the flex project was stalled because of lending issues. The development agreement had a three-year expiration period and therefore was found to be expired. The flex developer is still reporting their intentions to build the project as approved but is still experiencing delays in securing lending. Without a zoning amendment, there would be nothing stopping the flex developer from selling to a storage unit developer. Storage units are a permitted use in the Industrial Zone which the property is currently zoned. Financing is available and demand is strong for storage units. An amendment to the Business Park would allow the same approved buildings to be built as designed, but also take the locally unwanted land use off the table as a precautionary measure. The Business Park zone allows similar uses that are common tenants in flex office/industrial product. The memo concluded rezones are a legislative matter under the purview of the City Council but require a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed this item on Sept, 5, 2023 and recommended approval of the proposed zoning map amendment.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the subject matter. The property owner joined the meeting and indicated his intent to proceed with construction of the business park. If the zone is changed, his property could be impacted. He is trying to maintain flexibility in terms of the types of tenants that could be allowed in the project. He is willing to re-engage and comply with the development agreement.

Councilmember Carver stated that she has had a lot of people reach out to her that are interested in a tattoo parlor, but that use is only allowed in the City's industrial zone; she feels this could be a good spot for this type of use.

Councilmember Watson inquired as to the terms of the original development agreement. Mr. Steele explained that the original development agreement was with Bear River Storage, but the City was concerned about the total project area being storage units in what is viewed as a prime commercial area. This change has been recommended in order to protect the City against the storage unit use. He noted that he was not aware of the intent to break ground by the current owner and noted that the project has been delayed several times.

Mayor Maughan stated this is not a voting meeting; if the property owner chooses to proceed within the bounds of their building permit and development agreement, that is yet to be seen. He indicated he will move the item to the next work session meeting for continued discussion.

**Planning item: Recommendation from the Planning Commission  
General Plan Map amendment for property located at 2425 W. 2700  
S. from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the City has received an application for a General Plan map amendment located at approximately 2425 W. 2700 S. The proposed amendment encompasses a previously approved project called Sadie's Glen. The project was proposed as a 21-lot single family R-3 zoned development and had final plat approval from the city. Since the approval, the applicant acquired the property to the north from a UDOT surplus land sale. The applicant's proposal is to develop both properties together as a PRD zoned development. The new project acreage is 23.5 acres with a proposed 34 single family lots and 84 units of 'Active Adult Villas', which is a four unit attached, one-story, age restricted, for-sale housing product. The proposed density is 5.01 units per acre. Staff has completed an analysis of the plans for compliance with land use ordinances. General Plan map amendments are decided by the City Council after recommendation by Planning Commission. The Planning Commission held a public hearing and discussed the item on October 3. The Commission voted to recommend approval with a vote of three to two.

Mayor Maughan facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the application, acknowledging that each Councilmember has met with the applicant regarding this project. There was brief discussion about flag lots in the project area, shared driveways, and whether there will be an age restriction on the project to limit ownership to 55-and-older residents.

Councilmember Carver stated that there are only a few locations in the City that are suitable for this type of project and can serve this demographic. She believes the conceptual plan is appropriate and is supportive of the application. Councilmember Teague agreed, but noted that he feels that the full green space requirement should be imposed on the project area. Councilmember Savage disagreed and stated that he does not support the concept because it is denser than anything around it; he does not believe it creates a community feel and there are no additional amenities, such as a club house or pickleball court and it does not meet the definition of a Planned Residential Development (PRD). Mayor Maughan agreed with Councilmember Savage and stated that the shape of the property is odd and is not suitable for a PRD project. Councilmember Watson explained his concern is that approval of this application would require the City to review the General Plan Map for the surrounding area to determine if other areas should be changed to reflect the proposed use of this property. Councilmember Bingham stated she is not concerned about the shape of the property, and she feels there is a need for this type of project in the community. She supports adjusting the General Plan map to allow for this type of project.

Councilmember Teague stated that he feels the requirements of the R-1 zone are untenable in the current market; developers can not afford to subdivide based upon the R-1 requirements and residents can not afford the types of homes located in an R-1 zone. He noted that there is a housing crisis in the State of Utah and the 55-and-older population is vulnerable and they need housing. These are the types of projects that provide opportunities, and he advised the Council to not vote based upon their 'own checkbooks', but upon the financial means of the residents of the City. Councilmembers Bingham and Carver agreed.

The applicant, Mr. Frost, explained he would be willing to comply with the 20 percent open space requirement and would work with the Council address their concerns.

Mayor Maughan stated he does not disagree with the points made, but he wondered if this is the appropriate location for this type of project; he indicated more discussion of this application is needed and he will include it on a future work session agenda.

**Planning item: Recommendation from the Planning Commission.  
Zoning Map amendment for property located at 322 S. 2000 W. from  
Residential (R-1) to General Commercial GC.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the City has received an application for an amendment to the zoning map located at approximately 322 S. 2000 W. The applicant is Ian Cahoon with CW Urban. Application and payment was received on September 20, 2023. The requested amendment is consistent with the General Plan. The application crosses multiple property boundaries but all properties are owned by the applicant. The previous zoning map boundary was a result of a rezone for a proposed hotel in connection with the Monterrey West MXD project. The following statement was provided by the applicant: "The proposed uses are retail, food, flex, and a hotel (the hotel is already rezoned). The three main reasons for this Rezone Request are: (1) aligning the General Plan with the current zoning map. (2) Increases economic activity and economic independence by growing the City's tax base. (3) Opens the door for more and new retail and other commercial users to become closer to the residents of the City."

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the zoning map amendment. The Council agreed to maintain the current R-1 zoning designation until there is more information regarding the type of business that would be located on the property if it is zoned GC.

**Planning item: Discussion/review of Syracuse City Code Section  
10.92 pertaining to Mixed-Use Development (MXD) zoning.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained a request has been made for a review of the City's Mixed-Use Zone (MXD) ordinance. The minimum project acreage and commercial to residential ratios have been the subject of recent discussion. The ordinance was amended in May of 2022 making various amendments including adding hospital to the list of permitted uses, adding location qualifiers, and increasing the commercial to residential ratio from 36 to 56 sf per 1,000 sf residential. Staff is seeking suggestions from the City Council regarding the items and issues to be considered by Planning staff and the Planning Commission.

The Council requested to hear what the Planning Commission recommended as changes for the Mixed-Use Development (MXD) zone, Councilmember Watson noted the Planning Commission suggested having a minimum lot size and increasing the ratio between residential and commercial uses in the MXD zone. The Council made some additional adjustments and Mayor Maughan sensed a consensus to refer this item to the Planning Commission for a formal recommendation.

#### **Discussion regarding dog park project:**

A staff memo from Administration explained the City has received numerous requests for a dog park, staff and council have had multiple discussions regarding different sites for a dog park and decided the best option for a dog park would be Fremont park. The site is currently not considered developed park land and would add approximately 1.7 developed acres to our Parks Master Plan. Moving the trail and lining it with a double tree path is proposed to add separation for the homes adjacent to the park. Basic features necessary for a dog park:

- Fenced area
- ADA accessible
- Trail connection
- Signs including rules
- Trash receptacles

Minimum desired dog park features:

- Grass with irrigation ; this is to keep the dog run surface from becoming muddy and making it an undesirable place to take one's dog
- Trees for shade; trees are the most requested feature in parks
- Benches
- Water station for dogs
- Walking path inside the fence for patrons
- A concrete walking path serves as a stable surface, provides a mow strip, and is a stable base for the fence, Gravel/road base is also an option. It is ADA compliant but is higher maintenance.
- Doggie Pot Station

Commonly requested dog park features

- Dog play structures
- Dog water feature
- Shade structures (pavilion or shade sails)
- Tables for patrons
- Themed Park ornamentation

Mayor Maughan communicated to the Council that he had reached out to some other sources to see if they would be able to help with additional funding so the City could go through with the minimal design. Mayor Maughan facilitated discussion amongst the Council. Councilmember Teague inquired about shifting the park to the south to use the existing trail as part of the walkway and Mayor Maughan explained that this plan would maximize the usable space. Mayor Maughan mentioned the total for the project is an in-house estimate and the City could go out to bid on this project and wanted to know if the Council was interested in a bid. The Council concluded that they would like to send this out for a bid and see if they can get the cost lowered.

#### **Discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Syracuse City Budget for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024.**

A staff memo from Administrative Services Director Marshall detailed the capital projects that have recommended changes. In this budget opening, these are carryover projects from the prior year that weren't completed and updates to approved projects as follows:

- Carryover – 2000 West Improvements - \$18,200
- Carryover – Bluff Road Improvements - \$14,500
- Carryover – 2000 West Interchange Utilities - \$5,000
- Carryover – Antelope Drive/Bluff Road/3000 West Utility - \$647,000

City Council Work Session  
October 24, 2023

- Carryover – 3000 West Improvements - \$30,000
- Carryover – 4000 West Overlay (Sewer District to Antelope) - \$100,000
- Carryover – Bluff Road Trail Crossings - \$168,000
- Carryover – 500 West Widening - \$323,000
- Carryover – 1290 South 12” Culinary – \$810,000
- Carryover – New Secondary Reservoir Ph 1 - \$1,665,000
- Carryover – New Secondary Reservoir Ph 2 - \$11,437,000
- Carryover – 1575 South Street / Stoker Project - \$609,000
- Carryover – 1250 West Street / 1350 South Street - \$886,000
- Carryover – 1000 West 2075 S to 2700 S - \$2,025,000
- Carryover – 3000 South Utility Improvements - \$274,000
- Carryover – Land Purchase for Secondary Reservoir - \$550,000
- Carryover – 4000 West Waterline loops - \$325,000
- Carryover – 3329 S 200 West Storm Drain - \$280,000
- Carryover – Dallas St / 1350 S / 1300 S / 1800 W - \$356,000
- Carryover – Shoreline Trail Phase I - \$393,000
- Carryover – EOC Upgrades - \$119,000
- Carryover – Design for WDC Aesthetic Impr. - \$68,000
- Carryover – Station 32 Eng / Arch Design Costs - \$418,000
- Carryover – Park Maintenance Facility - \$2,066,000 this includes an increase of \$188k for the additional fence / wall around the lot behind as well as \$200k for asphalt around the park maintenance facility.
- Carryover – BMX Course and pump track - \$2,125,000
- Carryover – Cemetery Expansion Design - \$22,000
- Carryover – Stoker Parking Lot Impr - \$644,000. Includes additional 200k to restore / replace grass.
- Carryover – Stoker Park Pavilion Replacement - \$100,000
- Carryover – Stoker Park Restroom Replacement - \$181,000
- Carryover – Stoker Park Tennis Court Renovation - \$90,500
- Carryover – Founders Park Impr including booster pump - \$128,000
- Carryover – Fremont Park Pavilion Replacement - \$60,000
- Carryover – Fremont Park Playground Replacement - \$90,000
- Carryover – Regional Park Design - \$342,000
- Revised – Culinary Radio Conversion – from \$150,000 to \$300,000. The radios were not available to purchase last fiscal year.
- Revised – Dog Park – from \$100,000 to \$472,000 as discussed on other agenda item.
- Revised – Antelope Trail – Env Study – from \$90,000 to \$120,000
- Revised – Firehouse 32 Construction – from \$7,150,000 to 11,500,000 as discussed on previous agenda items.

The memo also referenced a detailed vehicle and capital listing for the updated capital projects fund budget changes:

- Revised vehicles – Adding 3 Radar Trailers - \$27,000
- Other changes listed above.

The memo summarized proposed changes to operational budgets:

- General Fund – major changes:
  - \$50,000 –Interest income increase.
  - \$10,000– Court Fines increase.
  - \$20,000 – Fire station and city hall remodels
  - \$30,373 – Gym Floors extra cost and parking lot resurface
  - \$22,000 – Carryover cemetery fence project.
  - \$25,000 – Reduction in election expense (no primary)
  - \$12,576 – Increased cost of magazine contract
- All Other Funds – Significant Changes
  - Park Maint. Fund - \$78,135 – Infield mix, trail maintenance, tree maintenance and planting.
  - Secondary Fund - \$17,000 water share cash contribution
  - Secondary Fund - \$4,860,000 – ARPA and Bureau Grants
  - IT Fund - \$84,905 –carryover budgets from prior year, Utopia in parks,

- camera and access control in parks.
- MBA Fund - \$4,350,000 increase in station 32 construction expenses.
- Capital Projects Fund - \$75,000 interest income increase.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Mayor and Council regarding the purpose of the amendments to the budget. There was a brief discussion regarding the design error on the pole barn with the Parks Maintenance Facility, Mr. Bovero explained that the architect gave a credit on the services with the Fire Station.

The Council concluded they are comfortable with the proposed budget amendments and can take action in a future meeting.

**Discussion regarding proposed updates to the Syracuse City Personnel Policy Manual and associated amendments to the employee wage scale for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024.**

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained periodically City Administration and Department Heads propose changes to the personnel policies and procedures manual. We have additional changes to the new Battalion Chief Position as noted below.

- 5.010 – Stating in policy that Battalion Chiefs will be classified as exempt employees and the City may compensate them with additional straight time for extra hours worked.
- 5.090 (a) – Again states that exempt Battalion Chiefs may qualify for additional straight time.
- 5.090 (c) ii - Policy that explains that Battalion Chiefs when working approved overtime emergency call back or emergency shift coverage they will have the option of choosing additional straight time pay or accrue comp time.
- 5.090 (d) – Policy explains the overtime compensation rate for Battalion Chiefs is set at straight time and is only when they have approved overtime for emergency call backs or emergency shift coverage.
- 5.100 (b) – Policy explains the comp time rate for Battalion Chiefs.
- 203.110 (b) – Correction on resident milage based on prior approval of policy for on-call and take-home vehicles.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and explained that these changes mirror the Battalion Chief position proposal. City Attorney Brass explained the City has chosen the exempt classification based on their job position and reviewed what an exempt employee classification is.

Mayor Maughan indicated this could move forward as a consent agenda item at a future business meeting.

**Discussion regarding proposed amendment to Syracuse City Contracting Policy**

A staff memo from City Manager Bovero stated staff is proposing an amendment to the Procedures Section (1)(b)(ix) of the Syracuse City Contract Signatory Delegation Policy which delegates signatory permission of grant agreements to the City Manager. staff is proposing the following change:

- ix. Grant agreements., unless otherwise delegated.

Staff is proposing the change due to the VOCA grant requiring more frequent certified assurances be executed over the grant cycle by the authorized signatory and rather than having the City Manager be the only authorized signatory, staff is requesting the change to reflect that the authorization could be delegated. If Council would prefer to keep the signatory authorization for grant agreements as it is written, an alternative amendment could be to add another item under (1)(c), which specifies the situations in which department heads have signatory authorization.

- vi. Certified assurances for grant agreements.

The policy, with both proposed changes included with the staff report.

Mrs. Brass reviewed her staff memo and indicated that she would like clarification from the Council on if they would like to go with option A, to allow signatory permissions to be delegated or option B, under the Department Head the specific provisions for certified grant assurances. The Council indicated they are comfortable with the signatory permissions to be delegated and agreed to move this to consent agenda for action at the next business meeting.

**Discussion regarding proposed amendments/updates to the Syracuse City Annexation Policy Plan.**

A staff memo from Administration explained Utah Code Ann. § 10-2-401.5 requires cities to adopt annexation policy plans in order to annex unincorporated areas into the city. In the plan, cities are required to develop an expansion area map and plan for future growth of the community for the next 20 years. The plan is intended to aid cities in planning for future expansions. Syracuse City adopted its first Annexation Policy Plan (the “Plan”) in November of 2002, since its adoption, there have been changes to the city such that a review and update of the Plan may be warranted to best capture the city’s current vision for the next 20 years of growth and expansion of the city. Some of the areas indicated on the Map attached will need to be updated to reflect properties that have already been annexed into the city. The Character of Syracuse

section can be updated to include the 2022 Census numbers with the approximate population of 35,560 people, along with the other defining characteristics that accurately describe the city today rather than in 2002. One of the requested proposed additions to the Criteria section would be a more explicit statement indicating the city should not annex county roadways for the sole purpose of gaining contiguity for applicants when the applicant's property is not itself contiguous to the City. The intention behind this request would be to avoid the situation of the city taking on the maintenance and responsibility for an entire roadway to simply serve and access only one property while the surrounding properties remain in unincorporated county.

- For example, criteria number 6, which deals with public facilities could be amended to: assures availability, maintenance, extension, and/or adequate capacity of public facilities and services, including assuring the City is not adding burdensome maintenance and services such as annexing unincorporated rights of way for the sole purpose of creating contiguity to the City to serve only one or two properties.

Another update for the Council to consider might be the inclusion of more specific criteria related to the City's policy when extending services for properties developing in the county and the requirements for adding improvements such as curb, gutter, sidewalk, and laterals, etc. in anticipation that the property might be annexed into the city, but not be developed after incorporation.

Mayor Maughan reviewed the staff memo and explained that Davis County was willing to let the City annex roads as long as they are contiguous to property already in the City. Ms. Brass mentioned that the annexation plan has not been updated since 2002 and should be updated; she added the Planning Commission would review the changes and wanted to know if the Council wanted to review the changes in another meeting. There was a consensus that if there were any changes outside of what the Council recommended that they would review it in another work session.

#### **Discussion regarding communication to the State Legislature relative to housing and land use authority**

A staff memo from the Mayor explained that Mayor Maughan received an update at the October COG meeting regarding potential legislation designed to address the statewide housing issue and land use authority between the state and cities. The Davis COG is requesting cities to consider writing letters to the legislature that outline the measures they have already taken to improve the housing situation.

Mayor Maughan facilitated discuss with the Council and Mr. Bovero reviewed some of the items that can be listed in the letter such as the affordable housing plan, stats on the number of units that have been approved and the number of units under construction. The Council ultimately decided to write a letter to the State Legislature.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

Dave Maughan  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: December 12, 2023