

Minutes of the City Council Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on July 28, 2026 at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 819 6555 5984, 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: Andrea Brown
Brett Cragun
Paul Watson
Julie Robertson
Abraham Pollard

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

City Employees Present:
Assistant City Manager Stephen Marshall
City Attorney Colin Winchester
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Police Chief Alex Davis
Kresta Robinson Parks and Recreation Director
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Communications Specialist Kara Finley

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; discuss street painting/street banners during homecoming week for Syracuse High School; pre-application consultation with the City Council, Brandon Wood of The Northwood Group regarding property located at approximately 3000 S. 2800 W.; review recommendation from the Planning Commission to amend Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) Section 8.30 and 10.20.140 pertaining to final plat approval; review recommendation from the Planning Commission to amend Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) Section 10.20.070 pertaining to zoning reversion; review and discussion of the priorities for the State Road (SR) 193 Economic Development Area (EDA) Three Year Plan; discussion regarding possible amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) 10.10.140 and 10.90 pertaining to drone operation within City limits; review request from Syracuse City Fire Chief to authorize the order of a new Ambulance to be delivered during Fiscal Year (FY) 2028; discussion/review of proposed ordinance requiring protective headgear when operating e-bikes and e-scooters on public property; and discussion regarding Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) for City-owned property located at 508 W. 2700 S.

Public comments

Deputy City Recorder Graham read the following written public comment for the record of the meeting:

“Dear Mayor Maughan and Members of the City Council, Thank you for your continued work on behalf of Syracuse. After reviewing this week's packet, my primary interest is the proposed Shoreline Subdivision on the former Davis School District property. I appreciate that the concept includes open space, trails, and amenities that appear to improve upon the previously approved layout. Preserving 26% of the property as open space and creating neighborhood connections are positive features. At the same time, increasing the development from 16 homes to 39 homes represents a significant change in density. Before any future rezoning or approval, I encourage the City to carefully evaluate traffic impacts, school capacity, emergency access, long-term maintenance of the open space, and overall compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. I also appreciate the City's efforts to maintain transparency in the sale of City-owned property by obtaining an appraisal, publicly marketing the home, and accepting competitive offers. That process demonstrates good stewardship of taxpayer assets. Thank you for continuing to involve residents in these discussions and for considering the long-term impacts of today's decisions on Syracuse's future. Eric Willison”

Request to be on the agenda: Syracuse High School representatives regarding street painting/street banners during homecoming week.

A staff memo from Administration explained that Syracuse High School faculty, administrators, and class officers have contacted Councilmember Brett Cragun regarding a Homecoming-season display. The request, as presently described, is to paint a street and/or place banners near the school. School representatives may attend the Council meeting to discuss the proposal. A similar street-painting request was declined in the past. The Mayor has asked that the matter be discussed publicly so the Council can consider both the school's goal of strengthening pride and culture and the City's responsibility to manage the public right-of-way safely, consistently, and fairly. The location, design, dimensions, materials, installation method,

July 28, 2026

duration, traffic-control plan, and removal plan have not yet been provided. Council direction at this stage would therefore establish a policy path, not approve a final installation.

Policy Considerations

1. Traffic safety and regulatory compliance. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) treats decorative pavement art as an aesthetic surface treatment rather than an official traffic-control device. It is not categorically prohibited, but it may not interfere with, detract from, obscure, or be confused with official markings. Location, color, contrast, visibility, driver behavior, pedestrian movement, and accessible navigation require engineering judgment. Staff have expressed safety concerns and Utah law also prohibits unauthorized markings that resemble or interfere with traffic-control devices.
2. Road ownership and jurisdiction. The City may act only on streets under its control. A state route would require Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) involvement, and a display on school property would require Davis School District approval. Any proposal should first identify the exact limits and ownership of the site. The City cannot consider alterations to 2000 W or the intersection with 700 S, except for streetlights or other items under the City's jurisdiction.
3. Design and placement. A mascot, wordmark, or large color field can affect how drivers perceive lanes, stop lines, crosswalks, and intersections. The design should avoid official traffic-control colors and symbols and should be evaluated in relation to nearby crosswalks, school-zone devices, intersections, bicycle facilities, curb ramps, and sight distance needs.
4. Materials, durability, and pavement condition. Any product should be reviewed for wet-weather skid resistance, reflectivity or glare, compatibility with asphalt and existing striping, environmental effects, winter maintenance, and the possibility of leaving a visible "ghost" after removal. A temporary or washable product reduces permanence but does not eliminate safety, cleanup, runoff, or maintenance concerns.
5. Installation and traffic control. Work on the roadway could require a temporary traffic control plan, lane or road closure, qualified supervision, notice to affected residents, coordination with Police and Fire, protection of pedestrians, and compliance with work zone requirements. Homecoming timing may also affect traffic near the school.
6. Cost and continuing maintenance. The Council should decide who pays for design review, materials, installation, traffic control, inspection, repair, removal, restriping, pavement restoration, and staff time. If allowed, the agreement could require the applicant to bear all direct costs and provide a restoration deposit or other financial assurance.
7. Risk allocation. The City should obtain legal and risk-management review of insurance, indemnification, supervision, and restoration terms. Those provisions can allocate responsibilities, but they do not replace the City's obligation to exercise reasonable care over its streets.
8. Fairness, expression, and precedent. An ad hoc approval may create expectations from other schools, civic groups, nonprofits, businesses, or advocacy organizations. The legal analysis may differ depending on whether the City selects and controls a limited civic display or creates a permit process open to private speakers. If any program is open to outside applicants, eligibility, locations, content limits, duration, frequency, costs, and approval criteria should be adopted in advance and applied consistently with City Attorney review.
9. Neighborhood and community impacts. The Council may weigh the community value of supporting school pride against possible traffic disruption, visual clutter, resident concerns, and demands on staff. Seasonality, scale, frequency, and the number of eligible locations are policy choices.

Options for Council Direction

1. Retain the prior approach—no decorative painting on public streets. The Council could confirm that non-traffic pavement graphics will not be allowed and direct staff to work with the school on alternatives.
2. Request a complete proposal and return for site-specific review. The Council could express willingness to consider the concept without approving it now. The school would submit the exact site, design, dimensions, materials, schedule, installation and removal plans, responsible parties, and proposed funding. Public Works, Police, Fire, Legal, Risk Management, and the School District would review the proposal before it returns to the Council.
3. Consider a one-time pilot. After the reviews described above, the Council could authorize a narrowly defined temporary pilot on a low-speed City street, subject to written conditions, monitoring, applicant-funded installation and restoration, and an express sunset date. A pilot should include objective success and removal criteria and should not proceed until the City confirms compliance and acceptable risk.
4. Develop a citywide decorative-display policy before approving any request. The Council could direct staff to prepare standards for pavement art, banners, utility-box wraps, or similar displays. This approach would provide consistent criteria but may not be completed in time for the upcoming Homecoming season.

Alternatives that May Present Fewer Roadway Concerns

- Banners on approved poles or structures: subject to pole ownership, structural and wind-load limits, attachment hardware, clearances, installation/removal dates, and a consistent banner policy.
- Utility-cabinet wraps: with written approval from the cabinet owner and standards preserving access, ventilation, labels, visibility, and maintenance.
- Displays on school property: including designated parking areas, campus walkways, courtyards, fences, or buildings, subject to School District approval.
- Temporary signs, flags, or washable sidewalk displays: at approved locations and subject to applicable sign, right-of-way, accessibility, cleanup, and safety requirements.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained that the City has addressed a similar request in the past, but the request was for street painting on a state-owned road, and the City didn't have the authority to authorize that request. The Mayor reviewed the potential options for the high school and indicated that the school could purchase utility wraps, put up displays on school property, and banners could be purchased by the school and hung throughout the City. The Mayor then invited Emily Skidmore, Senior Class President from Syracuse High School, to join the discussion and explain the school's request. Ms. Skidmore explained the students at Syracuse high school are proposing to have a temporary street painting display for homecoming week on 700 S. She explained this is the 20th anniversary of Syracuse High School, and their goal is to create unity between the community and the high school.

City Manager Bovero recommended the school submit a design prior to approval so staff can review it. Mr. Bovero stated some designs may be confusing to drivers and the City would be liable for any accidents on City roads.

The Mayor and Council showed support for this request and recommend the school submit a design and place of location to the City for approval.

Planning item D1: Application for pre-application consultation with the City Council, Brandon Wood of The Northwood Group regarding property located at approximately 3000 S. 2800 W.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained that the City has received a request for a 'Pre-Application Consultation' from Brandon Wood of the Northwood Group. The property in question is parcel 15-102-0424 owned by Davis School District. Property is located approximately 3000 S 2800 W.

10.20.065 Pre-application City Council consultation.

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 nonvesting. The pre-application consultation will occur during a public, nonvoting meeting and individual Council Members will provide their input to the applicant. [Ord. 22-13 § 1 (Exh. A).

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained the subject property is currently included in a development agreement with the City so any changes would be altering the current development agreement.

CED Director Steele explained that this Shoreline development had a portion of the property that was set aside for a school to be built and a school is no longer going to be built. The development agreement allows 400 units and currently 384 units are entitled.

Brandon Wood from the Northwood Group, a representative of Davis School District explained that the school district purchased this property in 2019 with the intent to build a school and have decided they will no longer be building a school on this property. He explained that the 16 lots that are entitled by the development agreement aren't profitable for the school district and is proposing 39 total lots. Mr. Wood explained that he is looking for feedback on what the City Council would be interested in approving at this property as there is room for adjusting the overall design.

Mayor Maughan expressed concern regarding another amendment to this existing development agreement; this would be the 4th amendment to this development agreement. Mr. Wood spoke to the Mayor's concerns and stated before the School District entered into a contract with a developer they would come meet with the City and make sure what was being proposed was something the City would be interested in approving.

Councilmember Pollard asked if the green space would be maintained by a homeowner's association (HOA) and if the other homes in this development have an HOA established. The Mayor stated that there is already an established HOA and he would prefer these homes to be added to the existing HOA rather than creating a separate one. City Manager Bovero stated all the homes in this development would benefit from the green space and would also prefer one HOA for the community.

The Mayor stated the City has never allowed two different categories of lot sizes within the same street before and expressed concern about opening that up as a possibility for all future developers. He recommended adjusting the proposal to allow for 7,000 sq lots or higher and 20% green space. The Council discussed the Mayor's proposed changes and agreed they would prefer the 7,000 square foot lot size.

The Mayor concluded that he sensed a general agreement from the Council pertaining to adjusting the lot size to 7,000 square feet and 20% green space. Brandon Wood thanked the Mayor and Council for their time and input on this matter.

Planning item D2: Recommendation from the Planning Commission to amend Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) Section 8.30 and 10.20.140 pertaining to final plat approval.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained that a developer recently brought it to the City's attention that our subdivision process does not comply with a recent amendment of state code 10-20-805 (9)(b) that went into effect 11/6/2025. The provision of the state code says:

(9) A municipality shall review and approve or deny a final subdivision plat application in accordance with the provisions of this section and municipal ordinances, which:

(a) may permit concurrent processing of the final subdivision plat application with the preliminary subdivision plat application;

(b) may not require planning commission or city council approval.

The proposed amendment will remove the responsibilities of approving a final plat from Planning Commission and place them with the Development Review Committee (DRC). The DRC consists of the City Engineer, City Fire Marshal, and City Planner. The Planning Commission discussed the item and held a public hearing on 7/21/26. They are forwarding a recommendation for approval. The goal of this discussion is to review their recommendations and decide if this item should be placed on the next business meeting for approval, placed on next meeting for approval with modifications, tabled for more discussion on the next work meeting, or discontinue discussion on the item.

CED Director Steele briefly reviewed the proposed amendments and explained that the State of Utah passed a law pertaining to subdivision final plat approval. Mr. Steele stated a development review committee (DRC) will now review the final plat instead of the Planning Commission.

Mayor Maughan expressed concerns about there being significant changes between the preliminary plat approval and the final plat approval processes. He stated if there were significant changes from preliminary to final plat approval, he would expect the process to start over for the applicant. Mr. Steele stated very little typically changes between preliminary plat approval and final plat approval.

The Council felt comfortable with the proposed amendments and the Mayor concluded that this item would move forward to the August consent agenda for a vote.

Planning item D3: Recommendation from the Planning Commission to amend Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) Section 10.20.070 pertaining to zoning reversion.

A staff memo from Administration explained that the Mayor has requested that the city consider placing an expiration on rezones if a project has not begun construction within a specific time period. Once expired, the zoning would revert back to the previous zone before the change. Ordinance 10.20.070 details the procedures and approval standards required for a zone change. The Planning Commission discussed the item and held a public hearing on 7/21/26. They are forwarding a recommendation for approval. The goal of this discussion is to review their recommendation and decide if this item should be placed on the next business meeting for approval, placed on the next business meeting for approval with modifications, tabled for more discussion on the next work meeting, or discontinue discussion on the item.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and explained this amendment would allow a zone to revert to its previous zone if no development action has been taken within two years of the requested zone change. Mr. Steele stated the Council would then hold a public hearing at a business meeting to change the zone back.

The Mayor explained he talked to other Mayors in Davis County and a lot of those cities have ordinances that change the zoning back if no action is taken within 18 months to two years; this type of practice is common practice.

The Mayor and Council discussed what length of time would be appropriate as well as making sure the language in the ordinance would not be challenged. City Attorney Winchester explained he believes citing 'substantial progress' as a measure for whether a zone revision could occur is appropriate for a City wide ordinance; requiring more objective criteria and target dates is easier with each specific development. The Council felt comfortable with an 18-month initial timeframe with the opportunity for a one-year extension if requested.

The Council expressed general agreement with the proposed amendments. The Mayor indicated this item will proceed to the next business meeting in August for the Council to take action on.

Planning item D4: Review and discussion of the priorities for the State Road (SR) 193 Economic Development Area (EDA) Three-Year Plan.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained that the SR 193 Economic Development Area (EDA) was created in 2012 and expires in 2028 after 15 years. The project area funds have been used mostly to reimburse the master developer Ninigret. Payments to Ninigret will come to an end this next year as our obligations to them

have been satisfied. While the current balance in the area's account is at zero, it is projected to accrue about 1 million dollars per year over the next three years. There are many ways that the money could be spent. The purpose of the project area is to attract jobs and industry. The project funds can be used to directly help the businesses build buildings, fit out tenant spaces, incentivize a specific user, or be used on the infrastructure required to serve the businesses including roads, utilities, and sidewalks.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained that this EDA is set to expire in 2028 and the EDA will still accrue money until its expiration, so the Council is not limited to just one idea. The Mayor and City Manager stated they are looking for feedback regarding the Council's top 3 projects they are interested in.

The Mayor facilitated a high-level discussion regarding the proposed options for the EDA funds. The options discussed were adding a trail through the power corridor and this would provide a pedestrian walkway between the residential area and the industrial employment area. Building a roundabout for traffic safety near the High School. US Cold storage is planning a final phase adjacent to 1000 W. The eastern facade is planned to be a large blank white wall. There is opportunity for façade enhancements including murals, masonry, public art or other architectural features. A flex industrial project has just been completed. It consists of three block buildings and one tilt-up building. The funds could be used to assist businesses in locating and fitting out their tenant finishes. Additional amphitheater parking could be added to Syracuse Arts Academy, the contribution could strengthen alliances, allowing city access to the performing arts facility. The last option would be road resurfacing.

The Mayor concluded that he sensed a general consensus for the top three options being the roundabout, amphitheater parking, and the road resurfacing. The Mayor stated that staff will continue with the planning process on this EDA.

Planning item D5: Discussion regarding possible amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code (SMC) 10.10.140 and 10.90 pertaining to drone operation within City limits.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained that the City has been approached by Wing Drone Delivery who is proposing to establish a drone delivery business at Syracuse Walmart. The business would deliver Walmart's goods via Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) drones. The drivers of these drones are primarily at remote locations. The proposed setup would be contained within a fenced off portion of the Walmart parking lot. They call this a 'nest'. Inside the fence, there are drone landing pads, a battery generator, and a storage shed. The city does not have a regulatory framework for this land use as it is a relatively new technology. The word 'drone' appears one time in city ordinance. It appears in the noise ordinance chapter listed as a prohibited noise during specific hours between 10 pm and 7 am during the week and 11 pm to 7 am on weekends. The words airport or helipad are not mentioned as permitted uses in any zone. The city does not have an airport, but there is a helipad located at the Syracuse Emergency Center on 2000 W and SR 193. Also, in adjacent unincorporated Davis County, there is a model airplane flying club and a mosquito abatement airstrip. Drone ports and airports are not the same in land use planning. While both fall under aviation, traditional airports are major infrastructure planned through regional authorities and governed strictly by the FAA. Drone ports in contrast, are compact and usually evaluated for site-level impacts like traffic, privacy, and localized noise. Because commercial drone delivery and operations have surged, many cities are actively updating their municipal codes to separate drone infrastructure from standard airport zoning.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained that the City was contacted by Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) and they are proposing to deliver Walmart products via drone delivery service. The Mayor explained that currently the City does not have an ordinance that pertains to drones and the City would need to create and adopt an ordinance. Mayor Maughan explained in an emergency the drones would find a safe place to land until the owners of the drones can come and pick them up. He explained there would be a see through fence in the parking lot of Walmart and the drones would be housed in a shed within the fenced area.

The Council briefly discussed this item and felt comfortable with the proposed amendments to the Syracuse Municipal Code. The Mayor concluded that this item will move forward to the Planning Commission and then be placed on a future business meeting agenda for a vote.

Request from Syracuse City Fire Chief to authorize the order of a new Ambulance to be delivered during Fiscal Year (FY) 2028.

A staff memo from the Fire Chief Byington explained that due to the emergency nature and the need to have reliable emergency equipment, the Syracuse City fleet assessment has planned to replace fire department ambulances on a 10-year rotation. During a Syracuse ambulance's lifetime, it spends 5 years as a first-out response vehicle and 5 years as a backup vehicle. Syracuse Fire currently has a 2015 Ford ambulance that reached its 10-year birthday in 2025. This ambulance is currently in our fleet assessment plan for replacement in Fiscal Year (FY) 2028. Due to factors beyond our control, current lead times for ambulance purchases are up to 18 months, requiring us to begin the ordering process now for delivery in the FY 2028 budget. The purchase price of the chassis and ambulance box will be locked in upon contract, and payment will not be required until delivery in FY 2028. The ambulance will be ordered following the Syracuse City Purchasing Policy and the purchase

price of the ambulance and related equipment is \$460,000. Once the new ambulance is in service in FY28, with Council approval, we will surplus the 2015 Ford ambulance and return money to the general fund.

Fire Chief Byington reviewed his staff memo and explained that it is time to replace an ambulance and currently the timeframe for receiving the ambulance once ordered is around 18 months for delivery. He explained that this ambulance would be ordered now, with payment occurring as part of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 budget.

The Council felt comfortable with this request and the Mayor concluded this item would move forward to the August 11 business meeting for a vote.

Discussion/review of proposed ordinance requiring protective headgear when operating e-bikes and e-scooters on public property.

A staff memo from the City Attorney Winchester explained that a recent change to Utah law requires persons under age 21 on a highway to wear protective headgear while operating or riding on or in any all-terrain vehicle, electric assisted bicycle, high power electric device, motorcycle, auticycle, moped or motor assisted scooter. Utah law allows local governments to enact ordinances requiring the wearing of protective headgear while operating or riding on or in such devices in other areas. Staff recommend that the City Council adopt an ordinance requiring persons under age 21 on public property (in addition to highways) to wear protective headgear while operating or riding on or in any all-terrain vehicle, electric assisted bicycle, high power electric device, motorcycle, auticycle, moped or motor assisted scooter.

Police Chief Davis reviewed his staff memo and explained that the proposed ordinance would allow for enforcement of the recently passed state law requiring headgear of a person who is under 21 when operating e-bikes and e-scooters on public property.

Councilmember Watson questioned why the City would need to adopt an ordinance if there was already state law requiring headgear. City Attorney Winchester explained that the state law only applies to sidewalks and roads. This ordinance would apply to the gap in the state law and apply to trails and all City property.

Councilmember Robertson asked if the police department see opportunities to enforce this ordinance. Police Chief Davis explained this will allow officers to be able to enforce this ordinance on City property and ensure the e-bikes and e-scooters are legal as well as allowing for education for headgear.

The Council showed support for the proposed ordinance and the Mayor concluded that this item will move forward to the consent agenda at the August 11 business meeting.

Review/discussion of Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) for City-owned property located at 508 W. 2700 S.

A staff memo from Assistant City Manager Marshall explained that the City purchased the 508 West home in 2019 to widen 500 West. At the time the property was purchased for \$271,000. The city appraised the property on 04/15/2026 and the appraised value is \$344,000.



The home was placed on the market on June 19, 2026 for a period of 30 days as requested by the city council. The City received a total of 12 offers. The highest and best offer net of realtor fees, concessions, and title and escrow fees was \$353,734.

City Council Work Session

July 28, 2026

The offer is from Michelle & Talon Labaron with the following details:

- Offer Price: \$376,000
- Buyer and Seller Commission: **-\$18,800**
- Concessions: **-\$500**
- Title, Escrow, and Closing: **-\$2,966**
- Net proceeds to city: \$353,734

Per UCA 10-2-2(1) and our surplus property policy:

- Council must determine that the sale is in the public interest and complies with applicable laws and ordinances.
- Council must disclose the proposed purchaser and the purchase price.
- Council approves the sale of the home

Assistant City Manager Marshall explained that this property was listed for 30 days as requested by the Council and the City is accepting an offer of \$376,000 and after the realtor fees, concessions, and title and escrow fees the total is \$353,734.

The Mayor explained this offer is from an individual and is not being sold to a corporation in response to emails he has received from concerned citizens.

The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Dave Maughan
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: August 11, 2026