

Minutes of the special meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on September 10, 2019 at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Corinne N. Bolduc
Dave Maughan
Doug Peterson
Jordan Savage

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

City Employees Present:
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Gailey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. Councilmember Bingham provided an invocation and Councilmember Maughan led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Joint Proclamation 19-01 declaring October 1 to be Breast Cancer Awareness Day in Syracuse City.

An administrative staff memo explained Mayor Gailey was contacted by a resident who proposed that Syracuse City declare a day in October as Breast Cancer Awareness Day; the entire month of October has been declared Breast Cancer Awareness Month and a campaign to bring awareness to the disease is managed by the American Cancer Society. Mayor Gailey felt it appropriate to designate October 1 as Breast Cancer Awareness Day in the City and asked for Council support of the Joint Proclamation.

Mayor Gailey summarized the memo.

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MOVED TO ADOPT JOINT PROCLAMATION 19-01 DECLARING OCTOBER 1 TO BE BREAST CANCER AWARENESS DAY IN SYRACUSE CITY. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3a. Recognition item: Recognizing the Syracuse Arts Council for their contribution to the community.

An administrative staff memo explained Mayor Gailey and Councilmember Maughan, liaison to the Syracuse Arts Council, have requested an opportunity to recognize the Syracuse Arts Academy for their contributions to the community. The Arts Council's summer musical production of Beauty and the Beast concluded at the end of July and the group has already begun planning their 2019-2020 calendar of events, which includes the following:

- October 11 - Dinner Dance fund raiser - October 11.
- October 21 - Choir Concert "Music from the Movies" free of charge at city hall.
- October 28 - Orchestra Concert "Folk Music from around the World" free of charge at Syracuse High School.
- November 21-23 - The junior theatre program will be presenting Frozen Jr. at Syracuse Arts Academy Auditorium. The cost is \$7 for adults, \$5 for children under 16.
- December 2 - Combined Syracuse Arts Christmas Concert featuring the Orchestra, Choir and Jazz band. FREE at Syracuse High School.
- February 24 - Orchestra concert "Give my regards to Broadway" free at Syracuse High School.
- March 23 - the choir and jazz band will combine for their spring fling concert at city hall. Free to the public.

- Still finalizing the date and location, but the City Orchestra is planning a late-April or early-May concert with the theme “Back to the 80’s”.
- June 8-27 - the Jr Theatre program will hold their annual summer camp. The registration for these camps fills very quickly and have been a great program for the youth of the city. They conclude with a performance at Syracuse Days on the 27th.
- July 16-20 - annual summer musical. The announcement of the musical is pending contract.

Councilmember Maughan summarized the memo and recognized Arts Council members in attendance.

3b. Recognition item: Recognizing Black Island Farms for their generous support of Syracuse City special events.

An administrative staff memo explained Mayor Gailey, on behalf of the City of Syracuse, would like to recognize Black Island Farms for their generous support of Syracuse City special events. Black Island Farms has donated pumpkins for the past several years for the City’s pumpkin walk. Additionally, they made a generous donation to the Syracuse Police Department’s 2018 Make a Wish fundraiser event. Brandon Law of Black Island Farms has been invited to the meeting to be formally recognized.

Councilmember Peterson summarized the memo and was joined by Parks and Recreation Director Robinson to present a certification of appreciation and plaque to Mr. Law and his family.

4a. Common consent: proposed Resolution R19-37 appointing Nicholas Weber to the Syracuse City Planning Commission.

An administrative staff memo explained there is currently a vacant alternate position on the City’s Planning Commission; the City has advertised the vacancies and solicited letters of interest from residents who meet the requirements of the positions. Mayor Gailey has vetted and interviewed the applicants and presented his recommended appointee to the City Council via email. The Mayor’s recommended appointee is Nicholas Weber; if appointed, he will finish the four-year term for the position, which was previously held by Gretchen Ruelan.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R19-37 APPOINTING NICHOLAS WEBER TO THE SYRACUSE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4b. Proposed Resolution R19-38 appointing Taylor Adams and Brandt Shaw as Advisors to the Youth Court.

An administrative staff memo explained there is a need to enlist the help of volunteers to support the Youth Court in an advisory role. The City has advertised the position and solicited letters of interest from residents who meet the requirements of the position. Mayor Gailey has vetted and interviewed the applicants and presented his recommended appointees to the City Council via email.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R19-38 APPOINTING TAYLOR ADAMS AND BRANDT SHAW AS ADVISORS TO THE YOUTH COURT. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4c. Proposed Resolution R19-39 appointing Sheila Worley to the Syracuse City Arts Council.

An administrative staff memo explained Arts Council leadership has requested that Sheila Worley be appointed to the Arts Council Board. Syracuse City Code Title Three provides a process for appointing members of the Arts Council as follows: 3.09.020(B) Terms of Office.

The terms of office for the five (5) Board members, who are not a member of the Recreation Department, shall be for five (5) years. These members’ terms shall be staggered so that no more than one (1) member’s term expires at the same time. The terms of office for at-large and ex-officio members shall be five (5) years from the date of appointment. The term of office for the Recreation Department staff designated as a member of the Board shall be as determined

by the Department Director. Appointments to the Board shall be made no later than the first City Council meeting in July of each year. In circumstances where appointments are not made prior to the first City Council meeting in July of each year, said appointments shall be made as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R19-39 APPOINTING SHEILA WORLEY TO THE SYRACUSE CITY ARTS COUNCIL. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5. Administer Oath of Office to Youth Court Members and Advisors.

An administrative staff memo explained Youth Court Advisor, Lori Smith, requested an item on the September 10, 2019 agenda to allow for the Oath of Office to be administered to the newest members and advisors of the Youth Court. Ms. Smith will be present and will introduce the new members, after which the City Recorder will administer the Oath of Office.

Councilmember Bingham reported on her experience as a liaison to the City's Youth Court; she has found the offerings of the Youth Court to be life changing for individuals who are members of the Court as well as those youth who appear before the Court for peer guidance and punishment. Other cities have looked to Syracuse as an example of a high-quality Youth Court. She then introduced Youth Court Advisor Smith and noted she provides a great amount of time and service to Syracuse in a volunteer capacity. The Court would not be as great as it is without Ms. Smith and her other Youth Court Advisor, Michelle Hicks. She concluded she is pleased that the Council was willing to appoint additional advisors to provide support to Ms. Smith and Ms. Hicks.

City Recorder Brown administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Youth Court Advisors as well as newly selected Youth Court Members.

Ms. Smith then thanked the Syracuse Police Officers who support the Youth Court, after which she reported on the evaluation of the Youth Court since she was initially appointed as an advisor. She noted that she has witnessed the work of wonderful students who are interested in serving their peers and stated that this is an organization that truly makes a difference in the lives of those that it serves.

6. Public comment.

Mayor Gailey asked City Attorney Roberts to expound upon rules governing public comment. Mr. Roberts read the following statement regarding the rules adopted by the City Council relative to the public comment portion of the meeting:

"Utah law directs Councils to adopt rules and regulations for the efficient administration and conduct of business during Council meetings. 10-3b-105(2)(a).

And a controlling federal appellate court has held that "orderly and efficient meetings" are a significant government interest. *Shero*, 510 F.3d 1196 (10th Cir. 2007).

Another court noted that while city council meetings are open to the public, they are still governmental meetings with a governmental purpose. *White*, 900 F.2d 1421 (9th Cir. 1990).

The Council, through the Mayor, who presides over the meetings, may appropriately limit certain activities that have an effect of disrupting the meeting or becoming redundant.

Rule 2 of the Council's Rules of Order and Procedure vests the Mayor with the unenviable duty to preside at the meeting, to maintain order at meetings, move the agenda along, hold down redundancy, and recognize speakers and councilmembers prior to receiving comments. Council Rule 2(B)

He is also charged with ensuring that people do not disrupt the meeting under Rule 4(K).

As noted in Robert's Rules of Order, participants and attendees of these meetings have an obligation to obey orders of the presiding officer in matters of decorum and order. § 61.

There is a time for ceremony, as in recognizing youth court members, and a time for taking comments on matters of public concern. As provided in Robert's Rules, the Mayor has specifically asked that during periods of public comment, individuals should:

- address their remarks to the presiding authority
- maintain a courteous tone

- avoid personal attacks or alluding to motives of members of the body.

Robert's Rules § 4.

Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length. Councilmembers and staff will not be answering questions. It is a time to receive comment.

We have reserved the front row to seat those who wish to make public comment. If you would like to make comment, please come forward and take one of those seats. If the seats are all taken, please wait until one becomes available, and come down and be seated. We hope that this will ensure that we can hear from all individuals who would like to be heard tonight, in a timely manner.

You are also asked to refrain from applauding, booing, or speaking during or after others' comments. Such disruptions interfere with the rights of other speakers who may have a different opinion, and who might be intimidated into keeping silent due to such behavior.

Individuals will disagree about many things. And many of the issues decided by the council affect individuals deeply and affect their personal lives. But one of the hallmarks of our society is the ability to treat each other with civility and respect. The Mayor's role is to keep us within the appropriate boundaries of that civility and to apply the rules."

Mayor Gailey then invited public comment.

Michael Shaffer commented on the proposed Shoreline project; he noted he is a millennial and he experienced some struggles early in his life related to housing. Housing is expensive and while agrees that the City should play a role in providing affordable and adequate housing for the booming population along the Wasatch Front, he does not believe that should be done on any open piece of ground. He believes there are other areas of the City that are more appropriate for this type of development. He is not opposed to any sort of high-density, but he is concerned about where it is placed. Areas along main thoroughfares are more appropriate. He stated the subject property is in his backyard; when he and his wife purchased their home, development in that area stopped for several different reasons and what resulted was a 'hodge-podge' development. However, they had the expectation that the area would eventually be developed in accordance with R-1 zoning standards. He concluded that the biggest point he would like to make is that the City should be developed from the center out; high density should be centrally located, and less dense developments should be located at the outer edges of the City.

Anna Garcia stated she is very opposed to the Shoreline project, which is planned for the property right behind her home; she is opposed for personal reasons, such as her view of the area, and she would be happy if nothing ever happened with the property. However, she understands that is not realistic. She noted that it would be a mistake to develop the proposed project on the property because the people that will live in the homes will not get along with the existing residents. The property is currently designated as agricultural and it should stay that way. She works in Salt Lake and commutes there every day; she uses the Layton Parkway freeway exit and the traffic down Gentile Road to Syracuse is bumper to bumper traveling at eight miles per hour. She asked how the City will address traffic issues when 1,000 more vehicles are added to the road and if Layton City will respond to the traffic issues on their roads. She stated she is a very patient person, but she hates traffic jams and the freeway is already a mess. She does not think the project will work and the current zoning should remain intact. If it stays agricultural, any person building on the property will get along with the current residents.

Barbara Nichols stated she is speaking in opposition to the Shoreline project; she has talked to a lot of people and none of them support high density housing in this community. She referred to comments on the Syracuse Citizens Facebook page to support her statement. If residents wanted high density, they would have bought property in Clearfield or Layton. The only people that are for high density seem to be City staff, certain members of the Planning Commission, City Councilmembers, and the Mayor. She suggested it might be time to replace these people with people who uphold the value of constituents and property owners rather than siding with greedy developers who take tiny parcels of land or larger parcels of land and make millions in their high-density property conversions. The developers walk away rich and the residents inherit the problems of crime, fires, burglaries, lack of water pressure, and on and on. The developers of the proposed Shoreline project have built huge developments in West Point just west of the Macy's Grocery Store; it is not that the developer cannot build large structures that would be an asset to the community, but he chooses not to in order to increase his bottom line. She noted blight will spread and she referenced Flint and Detroit, Michigan as examples of this. She concluded by reiterating the need for replacing leadership who approve high density housing and allowing it in a place where it should not be; it is more appropriate for the

business zones and near mass transportation. These leaders should be replaced with people who value the pursuance of quality of life as the majority of the citizens do.

Dan Rich referenced the Mayor's recent letter in the *Syracuse Connection* publication; this letter mentioned Gaston from *Beauty and the Beast* and he noted he is here tonight to put forth another analogy. He stated the sun rises and spreads across Syracuse much as it did over the pride lands in the kingdom of Mufasa; there are fields where we can run and play, places to get food, trails, and even a river and an island. We all play a part in making Syracuse a great place to live and what makes this kingdom great is the planning and foresight that went into the master plan for the community and the zoning that was there at the time. Growth in a way that promotes the great circle of life in Syracuse and keeps it so our resources, roads, water, fire, police, schools, parks, and stores are not overrun and so that the population and lifestyle wanted and bought into by the residents can be supported. In *The Lion King*, Scar rises to power and by bringing a few hyenas, he is able to overthrow the kingdom. Then he invites in more hyenas and the kingdom is eventually overrun based on a promise of endless meat. He stated he would like to raise a warning growl, much like Sarabi, Simba's mother, did and others have done, to those that support the high-density vote. A favorable vote will destroy the kingdom as surely as what Scar did; the roads, water, police, fire, schools, parks, stores, and other resources will become overrun and overtaxed. The great calm and friendly community will be replaced with distrust of neighbors, slower police response times, congested roads, increased gridlock, overcrowded schools, higher taxes to pay for emergency public service upgrades, lower water pressure, parks that can no longer be enjoyed, and the loss of a peaceful lifestyle. Although he doubts his analogy will change anyone's mind that is in favor of the project, he figured he would throw it out there.

Bonnie Bourgeois stated she wanted to make sure the Mayor and Council know that she appreciates their public service and their time and dedication to the City; this is what makes a republic great and this is a government for the people, by the people, and of the people. She addressed Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Steele and stated that he works for the City and not the developer and she would like for him to represent applicants with an unbiased opinion and not give a 'high-five' to the developer. She addressed the Mayor and stated that no resident wants a fight; rather, they want representation. The Vision 2050 Task Force was loaded with people from outside of the City and the development of the recommendation of that Task Force was not done with a vetted process. A new task force is needed, and it should be made up of Syracuse citizens. There are many good things in the proposed General Plan document, which is item 11 on the agenda for tonight, but there are many bad things and she urged the Council to oppose items nine and 11 on the agenda tonight because these things have not been publicly vetted. The biggest problem is the lack of citizen input and community involvement; this would unite the community and make it possible to reach consensus. The procedures and guidelines for adoption a new General Plan should be followed; an updated Plan is not due until 2021 and she wondered why the City is doing it now. No one is opposed to growth and no resident has asked for zero growth; rather, they want responsible growth, affordable housing, and adequate infrastructure. The Shoreline project is not affordable; 49 percent of the lots are 0.08 acres, or 12 homes per acre. The plat has five houses deep with no roads, only a shared driveway. There are only two tot-lots so if people have kids over the age of five, they are not welcome there because there is no where for them to play. The development will contribute \$1 million to a park that is over a half-mile away and that is the only park option for kids; the park is not even planned yet and is a long way out. The developer is counting pavement as open space and a 50-acre park as part of the open space. The actual green open space is less than three-acres, which does not count the drainage pond that will be a problem with phragmite. She addressed Councilmember Bingham and noted that in January when the developer first proposed the project, she had commented that she did not like the density of the project. She noted that Councilmember Peterson concurred with that sentiment so Greg Day indicated that he would go back to the developer to make changes and include one-acre lots in the project. The vote taken on January 8 provided conditional approval of the concept plan; the conditions included following-through with the changes that were requested. However, the developer has made no changes until in the last few days and that change is just reducing the number of units by two houses; now the project will include 549 homes rather than 551. There are no pickleball courts in the project and his commitment to include that amenity was a last-ditch effort in response to a presentation regarding pickleball courts that was made during the August 27 work session. She asked that the Council vote in opposition to the Shoreline project and the General Plan and that a new task force be organized to publicly vet these issues.

Don Nelson stated he does not live within the boundaries of the City, but he has three properties within the boundaries, and he feels he has a vested interest in this issue; he lives just west of the proposed Shoreline project. He is not in favor of

urban housing as he feels that a family needs a yard. He and his wife moved to Syracuse because of the openness; they initially purchased a home and property on 1700 South, and he was eventually squeezed out from both directions by developments and the State's road widening project. They moved to 2700 South, which was a rural area; they have enjoyed raising their family here and they like Syracuse, but the growth should be more planned growth and not urban development, which squeezes people together so that they are arguing and annoying each other. He does not feel the City has the infrastructure to support this project and within 10-years it will be a ghetto and draining the City's public safety resources. He received a letter from the City seeking to buy water rights from him and that indicates to him that the City does not have enough water to serve the area. He stated he does not support the proposed project.

Shawnee Fawcett stated this project would be in her backyard; she is a single-mom with a 16-year-old son with down syndrome and she is very emotional about this issue. The reasons she moved to her home was because of her backyard; it is open, and all her neighbors have dogs and horses and her son thrives in this environment. The street is not a through street and her son can ride up and down the road as much as he wants without encountering traffic and other dangers. She has two older kids who help her and all of her neighbors know him and welcome him to visit their animals. He is such a sweetheart and it breaks her heart to see all of these houses built, which may make it impossible for her to live there anymore. It is not that she cannot handle a lot of houses and she noted she is a real estate agent, but the land cannot accommodate that many homes and existing residents will not be able to keep horses anymore. This project will force all other residents to sell their property and relocate. She has never thought of Syracuse as an appropriate location for high density; it is 15 minutes from Interstate 15 and those that need a smaller home with a lower house payment need to be closer to the freeway to commute to their jobs. Syracuse is a more relaxed community, and this is not the right location for the proposed project; a development that compliments the surrounding developments would be more appropriate. She also would propose that the large space be used for a large horse arena that is open to other kids with down syndrome; they could live there in row homes and take care of horses. There are so many really good uses that could be put on the property that would not take away the openness and would still benefit the neighbors.

Trent Cheney stated he lives on 3000 West; he and his wife moved here 28 years ago, but before that his wife was raising two small children in West Valley. The West Valley of his wife's youth was Grainger and it was a nice place to live, but that is no longer the case. As a step-father, he did not want to raise the kids in that environment, so they found a home in Syracuse. He has the smallest lot on 3000 West, but it is still one-acre in size; they have had horses and chickens and they currently have cows. When the property behind his home was built, the residents on that street were promised many things by the developers, including an equestrian trail or track and that never came to fruition. A lot of developers have made a lot of promises over the past and he recalled a Get Gephardt investigation into another promise made in this City stated that he moved to Syracuse to raise his kids and he asked that the City not take that opportunity away from future generations. He does not want Syracuse to turn into another West Valley; he is fine with development, but the type that is harmonious with the current environment in the City.

Stan Epps stated that his property would have 17 homes around it if the Shoreline project is approved; he finds that rather shocking. His job has required him to travel to or live in many different communities; in Colorado, he lived on 40 acres, but since leaving that area a very similar housing development was built there that allowed for high density with homes where the eaves nearly touch and there is no backyard for kids to play. This project was completed three years ago and since that time, five percent of the homes have gone back to the bank because no one is living in them. Thirty percent of the homes are for sale and the owners are having a hard time selling them as they are asking \$390,000. Developers can make these kinds of projects look great on paper, but these projects are usually managed by a homeowner's association (HOA) that has very strict rules and regulations that are off-putting to residents; many residents walk away from their homes because of this. The City will end up with a ghetto and he asked if the current elected leaders will take responsibility for that situation when it happens. He stated he has fought and bled for this country and he has watched his house burn down due to an inadequate Fire Department in the City; it took them 45 minutes to respond though his home is just a minute and 35 seconds from the Fire Station. He stated this is wrong and if the Council does not consider what is happening in reality, the future residents will be saddled with an albatross around their necks and they will be taken down.

Coleen Dahl Thurgood stated her family owns on Antelope Drive; it has been zoned for commercial use for 20 years and the property taxes have increased every year – last year they doubled. The property has been for sale for three years and

an offer has finally been made. She is supportive of creation of a mixed-use zoning designation. Antelope Drive is supposed to be the gateway to Antelope Island, but when driving down the road, a visitor sees weeds, dead trees, and old buildings; this is not very appealing, and she hopes that a mixed-use zone will be approved by the Council.

Val Dahl referenced the same property discussed by Ms. Thurgood; as he has been in meetings about City development over the past three years, he has developed a support for the creation of a mixed-use zone and some higher density housing in the City. He referenced the person who spoke earlier and referred to himself as a millennial and noted there are many millennials that would like access to a home that will give them the ability to start their own family before eventually moving to a larger home that they will live in for the long term; this product is not presently available in Syracuse and many people leave this community to find housing. Apartment units in a mixed-use zone would provide them the opportunity to stay in Syracuse. What has been proposed on the Dahl property is different than the Shoreline project; it is right on the beltway to Antelope Drive and there is easy access to public transit and shopping, and it would be a great place for young couples who are starting their lives together. He would hate to see too much of this type of development in the City because the buildings will be very large, but they are appropriate in the middle of Syracuse near the town center; it will be managed by an HOA so the appearance will remain nice. It is the perfect type of development for people needing affordable housing and he thinks the Dahl property is the right place for it.

Marilyn Suttlemire thanked the Council and Mayor for the time they dedicate to the City and she understands their job is hard; however, she is concerned that the Council is leaning towards supporting the developer because he has put two years of time into the Shoreline project. She stated she asked them to consider all the years the residents have lived in Syracuse that will be directly impacted by this project and noted it is much more than two years; this project will have a direct impact on their lives and she is most concerned about those whose properties will be fenced in by a number of small houses. She is not only concerned about their property value, but their quality of life and she does not think that has been considered enough. The City should think about how this project will impact those people and if it will be in an adverse nature. She then added she is concerned about the proposed changes to the General Plan under item 11; more input is needed from the citizens. She is not opposed to growth, but she is opposed to growth that will eliminate what she moved to Syracuse for just six years ago; that is open space and rights to keep animals. At that time, she understood the property was designated for R-1 development, which would require a minimum lot size of a third-acre for their home.

Jason Collins stated the proposed development would occur directly behind his home. He reiterated many of the concerns that have been expressed, specifically the need to reduce the density in the project and address the issues that current residents experience due to the high-water table. If the subject property is built up, the water will need to go somewhere and while some of it will be diverted to storm drains, it will not be possible to capture all of it. Quality control is also a great concern for him; he referenced housing developments that were built in other communities during the housing boom in the late 2000's. Many homes building during that time have fallen into disrepair because they were built so quickly and with little oversight. Additionally, after the first owner purchases one of these types of homes, they will likely be converted to rental properties and people who live in rental properties do not have the same investment in the City as homeowners do. He stated he is not opposed to development and recognizes that the Clark property will eventually be developed; however, the project that has been proposed will fundamentally change Syracuse. He moved to his home in November of 2018 to give his family different opportunities associated with the open space.

Brent Bourgeois stated a few years ago there were a number of hearings held by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) regarding the placement of the West Davis Corridor; there was much discussion about the projected population growth for the community in the years 2030, 2040, and 2050 and the need to support that population with the Corridor. He believes, however, that once the Corridor alignment was announced, the City went to work to populate the areas around the highway. The City is trying to achieve the population that was projected, but it is not being managed well enough and the densities that are being considered are too great. He then noted he has a degree in meteorology, and he has been studying this area for a long time; while he does not have documented evidence, he has observed changes with the weather patterns. The area where this project is proposed lines up with Weber Canyon and when the winds come out of that Canyon, they create a breeze through northern Syracuse and an eddy in southern Syracuse. The air wraps around in the area that is being considered so all of the new pollutants that will be introduced into the atmosphere will be an additional side effect felt by the City. It is not just this project, but one after another that has been approved for that area. He concluded he is a developer in that area; 20 years

ago, he decided to build his home on 3000 West, and he complied with the rules that were in place, which required him to have a one-acre lot. He did not ask for permission for a smaller lot or a smaller home; rather, he built in accordance with the City's rules. He asked that the City impose the rules on the developer of the Shoreline project rather than allow him to dictate a change in lifestyle for neighboring property owners.

Kathryn Bourgeois stated that she is Brent Bourgeois' daughter and he moved her and their entire family to Syracuse when she was a year old; she is now 23 years old and she has only moved out of the City for three years after getting married. She now has a child and she chose to move back to Syracuse so that he could grow up here just as she did. She does not want him to live in the middle of a development with too many homes and streets; she wants him to enjoy the same City she enjoyed as a child.

Faith Woodhouse stated that before she moved to Syracuse she lived in West Valley and West Jordan; she was aware there were planning meetings along the Wasatch Front to discuss high density housing and attempts to push cities to allow that type of development. She got politically involved in West Jordan to try to prevent high density housing developments in that city, but the Council did not listen, so she left the community. She is not opposed to growth, but she wants larger lots to provide adequate space between neighbors; this is not in her backyard, but she knows it will impact Syracuse citizens as well as traffic throughout the City. She drives an hour to work every day because she likes living in Syracuse; it is smaller and much nicer than West Jordan. She and her husband moved here to start their family and they want to raise their children in a tight knit community with neighbors she can trust. She asked that the Council take the residents' comments into consideration and think about the situation the Wasatch Front will be in just a decade from now if development patterns continue; the air quality will worsen due to increased traffic and continual construction.

Stan Hamblin stated he has lived in Syracuse his whole life, as has the Mayor, and he cannot believe Syracuse is considering a high-density subdivision. It makes no sense; the City does not need it and most residents do not want it. He asked the Mayor and City Councilmembers if they would trade their homes to move to the proposed Shoreline subdivision; he noted he doubted very much that they would and if that is true, the answer to the project should be no.

Blake Christensen stated he was born in Syracuse on a small street with large residential lots; a large development occurred around his home, so his family chose to move out of the City. He now finds himself back in Syracuse because it is still a great area with great developments, but the City is again in a similar situation. He thanked Ms. Bourgeois for clarifying something for him; he attended his first Council meeting last month and he thought that Mr. Steele was the developer's lawyer. He thanked Ms. Bourgeois for pointing out that Mr. Steele works for the City rather than the developer. He then stated that someone mentioned earlier in the meeting that the developer is motivated by greed and is not interested in doing what is best for the City; he was watching the developer and he looked up with a smirk on his face. Quite frankly, the developer is not from Syracuse and does not know what is best for Syracuse. The citizens, who are the constituents of elected leaders, know what is best for Syracuse. Nobody wants this project and the only reason it is being proposed is for financial gain. He addressed Councilmember Bingham; he was not planning to speak tonight because of his belief that the Council does not listen to residents and has already made up its mind, but Councilmember Bingham's Facebook post earlier today made him believe that the Council is listening. Her post started with the word 'enough', which means that she has heard so many people saying that they do not want this project. He thanked her for listening and noted he is excited to see how she votes tonight.

Christine Huntsman asked that each Councilmember individually think about this project and what it will do to the City. She has lived in Syracuse for 20 years and she cannot imagine how difficult it will be to pull out of her driveway and get on the road to travel east to the roundabout. She moved here for the open space and to be part of a farming community; she knows that growth will happen, but it can be done in different ways; this is too many houses to put on the property.

Kurt Jones stated the proposed Shoreline project abuts his backyard and he is opposed to the project because its density; he can envision safety issues associated with people who do not take care of their property, crime rates increasing, and increased traffic. He rides his bike through the City regularly and his concerns for his own safety have increased just due to the small amount of growth the City has experienced recently. He is not opposed to growth, but this is too much for the area; people will not be able to enjoy the area and the wildlife will be driven from the area as well.

Randall Hansen stated he has heard a lot of the arguments from those opposing the project, but he has not heard much support. He challenged the Council to evaluate and publish their findings regarding how this project will benefit the citizens enough to offset the associated costs.

Craig Johnson stated he feels enough has been said about the opposition to the project; it seems City residents are always in a position where they must fight the City about these types of issues. He was a member of the City Council in the past and he felt like he was constantly fighting with developers about their agenda for the City. These things happen because many of the Councilmembers are not standing up for what they believe in and he is disappointed in most of them for that reason. He stated he does not personally know Councilmember Bingham so he can not speak to what she stands for, but he does know the rest of them and he is disappointed about the things that have been happening in the City while they have been in office; this includes increased taxes and fees as well as things they have done to accommodate development requests that have been presented. He knows that being a member of the City Council is a hard job, but it has become easy for the current Council because they are rubber stamping things rather than fighting for what the residents want. He stated he will be surprised if the Council will actually listen to the residents that have spoken tonight; he does not believe they listen and take action in response. He does not want to be disappointed anymore because Syracuse is a great City, but so many negative things continue to happen. When he was a member of the Council, they fought against high density housing and stopped those types of project, but the current Council is doing the opposite and putting the developers above the citizens. He then referenced the agenda item to consider an interlocal agreement with UTOPIA to provide internet services for municipal operations and he classified this proposal as a socialist act whereby taxpayer money would be used for internet service. Many undue burdens are placed on residents due to the decisions made by the Council.

Pat Zaugg stated that the Clark family that owns the subject property does not live around Syracuse, so they have no stake in the City; they are only getting money by selling to the developer. The developer has some 'teeth' in this project as he will get the money from the development. She was taught long ago that residential homes cost the City money so she is not sure why the Council would want to put this many homes in that area. She stated the Council has heard the comments made, but she wondered if they will listen. She stated she was watching a PBR rodeo on Sunday and a man from Montana was interviewed; he said that he loves Montana for its beauty, and he invited people to visit. He noted they might eventually want to buy a piece of property, but they should not expect to be able to change the community and convert it to what they moved from. She stated that is what is happening in Syracuse; people came here for a way of life, and the City is changing it. She asked if they are listening. She asked what will happen to the housing development when the next recession occurs, and she noted her prediction is that it will become blighted. Everyone needs personal space; they cannot be packed into tight quarters without becoming irritated and angry. The children living in the community will not wander to the park that is a half-mile away; instead, they will be in the backyards, corrals, and pastures of the residents that live around them and this will cause problems. She noted her husband was a member of the Vision 2050 Task Force and he has asked that his name be removed as a contributor to that document because he does not agree with it. It does not reflect the recommendations made by the group; she has continued to ask the Council to do a poll of the citizens if the City truly wants to know what the citizens desire. The City refuses to accept the feedback provided on Facebook, thought it is valid. She encouraged them to show they are listening and not approve the Shoreline application tonight.

Lurlen Knight stated that he has a concern about the proposed Shoreline development, and he thinks it is poor planning; the planners are not planning for the future of the City. He recognizes that growth is needed and will occur and that there is a master plan in place, but residential growth does not pay for itself and the services needed by this growth will be paid for by the rest of the citizens of the City. He worries about Syracuse due to the loss of R.C. Willey and the tax revenue they generate. He noted the 7-Eleven convenience store has come in and that is not great planning. The area of the City for which the Shoreline project has been proposed is not the right area; he is not sure there is a place for high density housing in the City. That is why Syracuse is so attractive right now. He is concerned that the City is not planning wisely for the future; he agrees that it is necessary to listen to residents, to sometimes seek professional input, and to sometimes accept developer input, but the City does not need developers to do the planning for the entire City. He encouraged the Council to stand up for what is right. He then referenced the development of Jensen Nature Park several years ago; when the economy entered a recession, the Council sold 60-acres of the park; the City thought it could use that money to pay bills, but it was earmarked for park development. It is very disappointing to him that the land was lost by the City and it has now been developed for higher density housing developments. He is worried about the loss of open space; the people living near the proposed Shoreline project will bear the greatest burden. They have animals and will be forced to get rid of them because they will be surrounded by so many people. He had a friend whose agricultural property was surrounded by homes; people regularly come onto his property and let his

animal out. He got sued as a result and he lost his animals and a lot of money. He asked that the Council be mindful of what they are doing to the community and as the City develops, something must be done to attract economic improvements to offset property taxes. He stated he appreciates what the Council does, and he knows it is a hard job and the thanked them for their time.

Pam Cheney stated she does not have a lot of facts, but she wanted to speak from her heart. When she came to Syracuse, it was like a Utopia to her with the wide-open spaces and wildlife; she spent many hours wandering in the muddy marsh, and it filled her soul with happiness. She likes the open spaces and they mean a lot to her. Each month she looks forward to the *Syracuse Connection* and the monthly letter written by Mayor Gailey and she cannot believe that he would be supportive of this type of project. She thinks the project should not be high density but should be developed in a manner that allows families and children enjoy the open spaces, which are being eliminated throughout the world. She asked that the Council find it in their hearts to think about the residents rather than pocketbooks. When she first moved here, there was a plan to build a project called 'Horsey Acres' and it included a horse track and equestrian trails; this type of project would be suitable for the Clark property and she hopes the Council will think about something like that.

Cynthia Hansen stated this is the fourth time she has addressed the Council and she has heard many of the other residents also speak; she feels their opinions and concerns are falling on deaf ears and they have been called 'whiners'. She is originally from Canada and her uncle was a mayor of a large city; he used to say to her that for every email or letter he received, he weighed it as if 100 people were talking to him. She asked the Council to consider that each person that has spoke is representative of 100 people and concluded she hopes the Council represents them well.

Julie Giuliano stated she is opposed to the high-density housing project; while she is concerned about the infrastructure of the project, her greatest concern relates to the overcrowding of the schools. Her children attend Buffalo Point Elementary, which already has a student population over 1,000. The school is year-round. She added some of the children from this development would feed into Cook Elementary, which is over 800 students currently. The schools are already full and so many teachers have too many students; this means that students will not get the attention and education they need. She has children ranging from junior high to pre-k age; she is not against growth and has been blessed to live in high density housing in the past, but she is very concerned about building too many homes and the schools not being able to accommodate the kids that will live there.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard.

Councilmember Maughan called for a point of order; the Council has just heard 90 minutes of public comment and he suggested amending the agenda to move to the item for which so many of them have spoken about.

**COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO PROCEED TO ITEM NINE ON THE AGENDA.
COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.**

9. Proposed Ordinance 19-12 amending the Syracuse City Zoning Map from R-1 to RPC, for property located at 2600 West 3200 South, approving the submitted preliminary plat, and approving the execution of a development agreement to govern the property.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information about the proposed development:

Location: Approximately 2400 West Gordon Avenue (2700 South)
Current Zoning: R-1
Requested Zoning: RPC
General Plan: RPC
Date General Plan amended to RPC: January 8, 2019
Total Number of Lots: 549
Total Subdivision Area: ~115 Acres
Total Units per Acre: 4.8
Smallest Lot Size: 3,500 square feet

Largest Lot Size: 16, 267 square feet
Number of lots in 3500-5599 square feet: 273
Number of lots in 5600-6999 square feet: 200
Number of lots in > 7000 square feet: 78
Acres Open Space On Site: 19.5
Acres Open Space 'Off-Site': 9.25
Apartments proposed?: No
Townhomes Proposed?: No

The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone request to change approximately 115 acres from R-1 Residential to the Residential Planned Community Zone (RPC). They are also requesting approval of a 549-lot preliminary subdivision plat called Shoreline on the same property. The RPC Zone requires all rezone requests to be simultaneously with a preliminary plat with several detailed deliverables which are attached to this report.

New trails are proposed to be built along with this development. There will be a network of interior HOA walking paths, as well as an asphalt walking trail along 2400 West that will eventually extended south to the future regional park and larger city trail system. The bridal paths that border the Syracuse Meadows subdivision will be widened and extended to 3000 West and to the Equestrian Arena.

As a master planned community, several different lot sizes are included in this plan intermingled with HOA open space amenities such as walking and horse trails, tot lots, and a community pool. The northeastern corner of this development is just over 600 feet from the planned West Davis Corridor alignment and is where the majority of the smaller lot sizes are located, providing a feathered residential density from the corridor.

New trails are proposed to be built along with this development. There will be a network of interior HOA walking paths, as well as an asphalt walking trail along 2400 West that will eventually extended south to the future regional park and larger city trail system. The bridal paths that border the Syracuse Meadows subdivision will be widened and extended to 3000 West and to the Equestrian Arena.

Proposed amenities including a pool, horseshoe pits, tot lots, benches, trails, workout stations, pickleball courts, and turf areas will be included for the use of the residents. Per the RPC Code, if a development's on-site open space falls below the required percentage, a voluntary in-lieu fee can be provided for the development of adjacent parkland to mitigate for the missing on-site open space. This development is proposing to utilize the in-lieu fee option towards the planned regional park. The planned 2400 West extension south to Gentile will provide access from this development to the park.

Proposed architecture is similar to craftsman style and will feature cultured stone, and fiber-cement board. Muted greens, reds, blues, and browns will be used with a variety of exterior textures from shake to wainscot to cultured stone. The architectural theme plan states in which lot size designations each home will be located through the plan number. Plans beginning with 35 will be built on SFD 3,500-5,599 lots, plans beginning with 56 will be built on SFD 5,600-6,999 lots and plans beginning with 70 will be built on SDF >7,000 lots. Some of the 56 and 70 plans can be interchanged between the two larger lot size designations.

The memo referenced the attached staff reports for a list of outstanding comments that the developer is working to resolve. During their regular meeting on August 6, 2019 the Planning Commission made the following recommendations concerning this item:

- Preliminary Plat: Four in favor and one against with the conditions that lots abutting existing residential development be made larger and that the drainage plan submitted by the developer be included in the approval documentation.
- Rezone: Four in favor and one against with no conditions.

Mayor Gailey invited input from the applicant.

Brian Bayliss stated he has provided very similar presentations to the Council and Planning Commission as he has been discussing this project with the City for several months; many of the residents have heard the presentations multiple times and rather than making the same presentation, he is willing to answer questions or address concerns the Council has. First, he has a few brief comments to make in addition to the number of documents and reports included in the meeting packet. He stated he understands many people have very emotional responses to land use matters; land use is very important and that is why

C.W. Land has spent so much studying this property to try to get the project right. Shoreline should be approved tonight, and it will be a wonderful community; he can unequivocally say that with full confidence. Many of the concerns that have been raised are real and have happened in other communities; he lives in an area in West Kaysville that has experienced explosive growth. He was opposed to the densities there when they were first proposed and he was worried about schools, wetlands, open spaces, and many of the other concerns that residents have raised about this project. However, despite those concerns he has found it is a wonderful place for he and his family and for his kids to grow up. He stated that concerns are legitimate until the development is completed, and residents find it is a great place; the residents of the Shoreline project will add to Syracuse. Shoreline will be home to a significant number of great families that will learn to love Syracuse as everyone in this room tonight does; they will breath new life into Syracuse in many ways. They will become friends with existing residents, make the commercial establishments more successful, engage with others in churches and schools, and engage with local government. They will make this community home just as those who have lived here for a long term or their entire life. He stated it is frustrating to hear the claim that no changes have been made to the plan in response to residents' concerns; the applicant has been working on this project for two years and significant changes have been made. There are three significant changes that have been made to the plan for the project in just the last 72 hours; two pickleball courts will be built and maintained by the HOA and also open to the public. Because there is no equestrian trail or opportunity to buffer against the properties to the west, the lot sizes in that area have been increased to conform with R-1 standards. In addition to the six-foot privacy fence, all lots adjacent to the following property owners will be increased: Bourgeois', Cheney's, Booths, Epps, and Archers. This is included in the development agreement for the project. Finally, the outparcel owned by Toucan Investments, which is located between the Booths and Epps, has been removed from the project. With that, the road connection to 3000 West will be eliminated. The idea that the developer is just here for the money is offensive; C.W. Land has hired the best planners and engineers to come up with a plan that has cost them a lot of money to develop and build. But they are excited about the project because they feel it will be a great community for people to live in. It is true that they are in the business to make money; if any business does not make money, they can no longer operate. He assumed the comments that have been made about the Council, Mayor, and staff are also offensive as they have spent countless hours considering how to make this area of Syracuse a great community. C.W. Land has gone above and beyond the conditions of their concept plan approval in January; they are making a significant investment in the regional park that is planned for less than a half-mile from the subject property. They will be paying millions of dollars to the City in impact fees that will help to mitigate the impacts of the development on the City's water, sewer, roads, and parks infrastructure. The developer is asking for the Council to approve the Shoreline project tonight. He reiterated his willingness to answer any questions the Council has about the project.

Councilmember Peterson stated he has two pages of notes that he has jotted down over the past two months as this project has been discussed; first, as a Councilmember he has learned that no decision the Council has made makes everyone happy. He has always tried to make decisions void of emotion and he has tried to steel himself against negative comments made about him or the potential political implications of a vote he may be taking. For this development, he has acted no different; he wants to make his decision based on facts, opinion, and the way he feels. He stated that there has been opposition to this in public meetings and via email, but he has also had people talk to him face to face in support of the project. He addressed accusations that have been made by the public that the Council is somehow 'in the back pocket' of developers; in his experience, that is not how local government works. Some have said that Councilmembers have gone to lunch with the developers and in his 10 years as a Councilmember, that type of opportunity has been offered only twice and he has turned it down both times. He believes other Councilmembers have also turned down that opportunity because, even though it would be legal for them to participate, they do not want it to appear improper. He stated that what he has experienced with this Council and Mayor is that they try to be open minded, listen to issues, and to be fair and honest. He stated he has developed a list of pros and cons about the proposed Shoreline project, which is just his opinion. He does not agree that this project meets the definition of high-density; the project may be more dense than other residential projects, but when he thinks of high density, he thinks of projects that the City will certainly be considering in the future that may contain apartments. There are places in the City where that probably belongs, but he does not like using the term high density for Shoreline. He does not see Syracuse as a City that will ever have a great amount of high-density development. He then stated that he believes the developer has listened to the City Council, Planning Commission, and residents and has made efforts to change their plan; more changes could possibly be made, but several have been made already. He thinks the amenities, open space, trails, and the fact that it is

maintained by an HOA could make this a desirable community for years to come. There are some valid reasons for it to be located where it has been proposed, the major reason being its close proximity to a future major highway. It is also a unique piece of land in that the City does not regularly see this much contiguous acreage developed in one project. He understands the concerns about water supply, schools, and transportation, but he has seen the City, Davis School District, and the State of Utah planning for growth. He has taken the time to do research and he enjoyed the articles and podcasts sent to him by Ms. Bourgeois, even though he did not feel it necessarily all applied to Syracuse and the proposed development. As he has researched property values, he has no data or proof that this project would decrease property values; in fact, he has reason to believe that it could increase surrounding values. He has talked to the developer about the water drainage issues and he feels confident they will be addressed, and this project will likely improve ground and storm water issues in the surrounding area. He stated he does not want to be anti-growth; he grew up in Syracuse and at that time there were three subdivisions. He is cognizant of and grateful for the fact that 50 years ago, a former farmer made his land available for development and gave him a place to grow up. The same goes for 20 years ago when he bought a house to raise his family in; at some level he would feel like a hypocrite if he did not allow growth in Syracuse. He concluded that his head is telling him to support this project; however, he cannot get past the feelings he has had in his gut and his heart over the past weekend telling him to say no to the project; it is frustrating because he cannot pinpoint why he feels that way. It is possible that a small or even major 'tweak' to the plan is needed, that something has been missed, that now is not the right time, or the subject property is not the right place, but he does not know why he feels the way he feels. Until something makes him feel different, he will go with his gut. The developer has discussed some changes that have been made to the plan in the last 72 hours and he would love to look at those as an entire Council to see if that makes him feel differently; however, if this comes to a vote tonight, he will go with his gut.

Councilmember Bolduc stated that much has been said and the Council has definitely listened. She reiterated Councilmember Peterson's comments that this project does not meet the definition of high-density; there are no apartments or townhomes in the project. Some people have tried to say that the open space does not count, but the proposal does provide open space. The project will be 500-feet from West Davis Corridor. The developer has made several concessions, and those made in the last 72 hours are significant; especially the concession to create R-1 lots along the properties of the residents that have spoken in opposition. It has been said that the development is too large, but in June of 2018 the developer was very clear about his intentions to develop the entire parcel using the R-1 cluster or RPC zoning designation. The Council knew about his plans from the very beginning and approved the annexation of this property with that knowledge. If the Council was not comfortable with a 115-acre development, they should have told him such or given him direction to reduce the overall project size. She believes the water drainage issues have been addressed and this project will fix something that was done improperly by a previous developer. There has been a lot of claims about malfeasance and she can guarantee that no member of the Council nor the Mayor has taken anything from the developer, including lunches. City officials do meet with developers to find out what they are planning, and that is totally appropriate. There have been questions about traffic and schools; the Davis School District has indicated they will build a new school according to their policy, but the City has no influence over their decisions. Roads do need to be expanded and that is done according to national standards. She stated the overall density of the development is 4.7 units per acre and this follows the original intentions expressed by the developer, of which the Council was aware of from the very beginning.

Councilmember Maughan stated he thinks this issue is very simple; in his time as a Councilmember, there have never been this many people attend and speak during Council meetings. They have spoken with one voice and have all said the same thing. If the Council is truly representative of the people, it should be obvious to them that the people are not for this project right now. He feels the Council owes the developer a decision tonight and they owe it to them to vote it down; if the matter is allowed to linger, that will only continue the dissonance in the community. The community has gotten very involved and has expressed their feelings and resolution will be reached if a decision is made tonight. He stated that the claim that changes have been made in the last 72 hours is concerning to him; he has not seen anything different from what was published in the packet at the end of last week and he is not sure if the City staff knew of the changes. An hour before he left for this meeting, he was notified of an email that was time stamped at 3:12 this afternoon that summarized the changes; if these changes were important enough, he wondered why the Council did not know about it before then. During the August 27, 2019 work session meeting, the Council indicated they would be voting on this project tonight and that they were not completely on board with the project and would like to see some changes. If changes were not made until the last minute, that is not helpful, and he is not forgiving

of that. When he considers Syracuse as it is laid out today, there is one last area where farms touch farms and the several farmers living on the same road work together as a community; there are still other farms in the community, but many have been sold and developed. When he grew up, he worked on his grandfather's cattle ranch and he witnessed that farmers depend on each other and work together; if a development is allowed to put dividers between the farms, that will destroy the way of life of that area of the community. He is still concerned about the drainage issue, but even without that concern, he has already decided there are enough reasons to vote against this. However, the City has heard over and over that experts can solve the drainage issues in the City; the drainage of Rock Creek Park has been addressed several times, but it is still not resolved. He is not sure he can believe that this project will address the drainage issues in this area of the City. He then concluded that the RPC zone was created with one purpose; it was created with the idea that if a block of land, which is continuous, could be developed guaranteeing a diversity of product while allowing some diversity in density for the greater good of the community, then it would be positive. He stated he does not feel that standard has been met by the proposed project. If there was some promise that the rest of the City would benefit, he would consider the project. He reiterated that it is simple; he wants to represent the voice of the people and when it comes time for a motion, he will make a motion to deny the application.

Councilmember Bingham disagreed that this is a simple issue and noted she appreciates the viewpoints expressed on both sides of this matter. The Council must consider the project from a 360-degree view point. Some people have been given false or bad information – intentionally or not – and that does not make them informed. Also, when she said 'enough' in her Facebook post, she was speaking about the character assassinations and lies, not about hearing from the citizens. She stated way too many things have been said about far too many people who are good and who have integrity; having a disagreement does not mean someone is corrupt. She does not consider anyone who disagrees with her to corrupt; rather, she considers that they have reasons for their thoughts and decisions. The Planning Commission voted to forward a positive recommendation to the Council on a four to one vote; Commissioner Day recused himself from all discussions about this development, yet it has been said over and over on social media that he was involved and was influencing the votes that were taken. At this point in time, she feels there are so many reasons to discuss affordable housing because this is not the Syracuse of 20 or 10 years ago and is not the Syracuse that she grew up in. The State is in crisis and so many people and young families cannot afford home. People have said that a \$300,000 home is not affordable, and they are right; it is a shame that young families are forced to take out what is considered a jumbo loan in order to have a home and property on which to raise their families. She was hoping the bubble would burst and that her kids would be able to outlast inflation; she has been informed it is not a bubble and in 10 years, the State of Utah will be paying California prices for homes. This is due to several factors; the Utah culture is very family centric, and generations of families try to find a way to stay here and be with their families. This tends to make the housing market very strong; children that have moved from Syracuse eventually come back to be in their home and the community they grew up in. Additionally, the inland port will be coming to Salt Lake and this will encroach on Davis and Weber Counties and because of this there are many people moving to the State and consuming homes in the market; this is pricing the younger generation of Syracuse residents out of homes. This is greatly concerning to her and to simply say that this is not happening would be incorrect. Also, the State of Utah is drafting legislation that will include punitive options for forcing cities to comply with affordable housing rules; the City will be paying fines and fees if it does not comply and she would rather decide where to put 4.7 homes on an acre than being told that the City is being forced to build high-rise apartments on an acre. She acknowledged there are things that do need to be addressed with the Shoreline project; many have said they are not opposed to development and growth, but most of the comment relate to those two things. This is not something that the City can deny because people want to move to Syracuse. What the Council can do is provide opportunities to build homes that will accommodate a market demographic; people that are choosing to live near the West Davis Corridor are likely not envisioning their dream home; rather, they are willing to settle in a smaller and less expensive home and property. The West Davis Corridor has definitely impacted the land use surrounding it. She then noted that she was not present when this project was initially proposed; however, she has been quoted as saying she was either opposed to or supportive of smaller lots. What it comes down to is the knowledge about the future of the State of Utah and she wants to be someone who facilitates opportunities for families to invest in a home in this community and stay here with their family. She stated there are pros and cons to every project and she has never suggested otherwise. She would love for the City to be how it was when she grew up, but that is not possible, and it does the City no good to suggest that this should not be addressed at this time. She stated that each Councilmember has listened to everything that has been said and to suggest otherwise is disingenuous; the Council has no desire to ruin the City

they love so much. She would not continue to sit in her seat listening to battery after battery from people who do not like what she has to say or how she thinks if she did not want what is best for the City; she knows it is necessary to consider the future of the City and its posterity and she is so grateful that someone was willing to let her live here though she did not have the means to live on an acre-lot, operate a farm, or keep animals. For these reasons, as long as many others, she would support the project and all of its amenities that will bless the entire City and not just the residents in that area.

Councilmember Savage stated that with the introduction of the West Davis Corridor, the Council is trying to work out transportation issues throughout the City as Councilmember Bolduc addressed; the Council is trying to plan for all the various items that the City is responsible for. One of the fundamental roles the Council plays in planning the community; they must taken into consideration many different factors. Many people want certain businesses to locate in Syracuse, but they will not do that if there are not a certain number of residences to support them. He used Costco as an example; this business requires a 250,000-person bubble and cannot overlap a bubble for a nearby store. If residents truly want these businesses, housing development is necessary. The Council has heard many say they are not opposed to development and the City has recognized that farmers have the right to sell or develop their land, just as others have property rights that should be honored and respected. He addressed the water issues in the area of the subject property and stated that he feels those could be mitigated through development in the area. He agreed that the development needs to be contiguous and the fact that so many neighboring property owners will be impacted is not fair. His aunt has a dairy farm in Idaho and as people have moved in around her, they have complained about the farm that has been there for generations. While he understands many of the concerns that have been raised, the biggest in his mind is the impact on the immediately adjacent residents. This is the biggest public response he has seen in his three years as a Councilmember and he feels he owes something to them, and he wishes to send the message that he represents them. However, his goal is to fairly represent everyone; not just these residents, but also their neighbors, people across town, developers, and landowners. Tonight, he feels it necessary to go with the majority of those that have spoken; while he thinks the Shoreline project is a great development, he would like modification to protect certain areas and locate the highest density closest to the West Davis Corridor. He would like more time to review the changes that have been made in the last 72 hours, but he is not sure they would be enough; the areas directly abutting existing residents should be adjusted so that the lots are similar to their surroundings.

Mayor Gailey stated he would entertain a motion.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO DENY ORDINANCE 19-12 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY ZONING MAP FROM R-1 TO RPC, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2600 WEST 3200 SOUTH, APPROVING THE SUBMITTED PRELIMINARY PLAT, AND APPROVING THE EXECUTION OF A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO GOVERN THE PROPERTY. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Councilmember Peterson inquired as to the applicant's options if the motion to deny is approved. CED Director Steele stated the applicant will not be able to make application for this zoning designation for one-year. Councilmember Maughan stated that they could apply for something different, however; they could apply for an R-1 zoning designation, which matches the General Plan for the property, and the Council would hear that application.

Councilmember Savage asked if the applicant could apply for another RPC project with modifications. Mr. Steele answered no; however, if the Council tables the ordinance, adjustments could be made. Councilmember Peterson stated he would support tabling.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO CALL THE MOTION TO QUESTION. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTING 'AYE': COUNCILMEMBERS MAUGHAN AND SAVAGE. VOTING 'NAY': COUNCILMEMBERS BINGHAM, BOLDUC, AND PETERSON.

Councilmember Peterson stated he voted in opposition to the motion to call to question because he wondered if there is any reason to discuss the matter further to see if concerns can be alleviated. Councilmember Maughan stated that in the past similar developments have been proposed and the process of considering those developments drag on and on; they were tabled and removed from the agenda and this did a disservice to the public. The residents living in the Trailside community came out for months and months of meetings and the Council waiting for a moment that they were not present to vote on a development adjacent to tehri subdivision. Councilmember Savage stated that is not what he recalls occurring; after months and months of negotiating, the Trailside residents actually came in support of the project. Councilmember Maughan stated that endorsement

came with changes that the Council was not able to accommodate. They specifically asked for a road to go through that would avoid their subdivision and the Council could not accommodate that.

Councilmember Bolduc stated that C.W. Land, as the applicant, has made some changes to their plan and the Council needs to investigate them more fully and that is reason to table. Councilmember Maughan disagreed based on past similar experiences, which create a disservice to the public. He stated he feels the Council owes it to the developer to reach a resolution at this point because the only other outcome is that a member of the Council will eventually flip their vote to allow the project to go forward. Councilmember Bolduc stated that waiting two more weeks will not hurt. Councilmember Maughan stated there is no voting meeting in two weeks. Councilmember Bolduc stated one way or another, the Council needs to know more about what concessions have been made; that would be fair to the landowners and the developer.

Councilmember Maughan asked that the Mayor call for a vote on the motion on the table.

Mayor Gailey stated there has been a motion and second to deny proposed Ordinance 19-12 and he called for a vote; VOTING 'AYE': COUNCILMEMBERS MAUGHAN, PETERSON, AND SAVAGE. VOTING 'NAY': COUNCILMEMBERS BINGHAM AND BOLDUC.

Mayor Gailey asked that a roll all vote be conducted. Councilmember Peterson asked for clarification on what they are voting on. Mayor Gailey stated this is a vote on the original motion to deny the ordinance, preliminary plat, and execution of a development agreement.

Councilmember Peterson asked if a substitute motion can be offered to table the ordinance. Mayor Gailey answered yes. Councilmember Peterson stated he feels that the Council owes it to everyone to hear more about the concessions that have been made and there is time to allow for that process. He stated that if the Council must vote tonight to approve or deny, he will vote to deny, but he is willing to support a vote to table.

Councilmember Maughan stated that the vote on the original motion was called; a revote is fine, but he asked the Mayor if he is asking people to change votes. A vote was called and recorded. Mayor Gailey stated he was confused by what he heard in the voice vote, so he called for a roll call vote on the original motion. He then conducted a roll call vote. VOTING IN FAVOR OF DENIAL OF THE ORDINANCE, PRELIMINARY PLAT, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WERE COUNCILMEMBERS MAUGHAN, PETERSON, AND SAVAGE. VOTING IN OPPOSITION WERE COUNCILMEMBERS BINGHAM AND BOLDUC. Mayor Gailey declared the motion to denial as having carried.

7. Approval of minutes.

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Truth in Taxation meeting of August 13, 2019 and Special Meeting of August 13, 2019.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES LISTED ON THE AGENDA AS AMENDED. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE.

8. Final Plat Approval, The Fields Subdivision, phases one and two, located at approximately 2700 W. Gentile Street.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information about the proposed development:

Location: Approximately 2700 West Gentile Street

General Plan: R-1

Current Zoning: R-1 (Cluster Conditional Use Permit)

Acreage: 7.68 in Phase 1 and 10.10 in Phase 2

Number of Lots: 33 in Phase 1 and 45 in Phase 2. 78 Total

The applicant has requested approval of two final subdivision plats in the same development. These lots will accommodate single-family detached housing. The cluster zone requires 50% open space in exchange for 7,000 sf lots and more flexible lot dimensions. The project will be dedicating approximately 20 acres of land to the city as agreed to in the development agreement approved with the preliminary plat. The Cluster subdivision was approved as a conditional use permit in the R-1 zone prior to the amendment that changed the Cluster to a stand along zone.

During their regular meeting on August 20, 2019 the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of both final plats with the following condition:

1. All staff comments must be met before the plats go before the City Council for consideration.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo.

Councilmember Maughan stated that vesting has occurred for this application and the Council does not have the ability to deny it given that it complies with the guidelines for the zoning designation that has been assigned to the property.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO GRANT FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE FIELDS SUBDIVISION, PHASES ONE AND TWO, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2700 WEST GENTILE STREET. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

10. Proposed Ordinance 2019-13 amending Section 10.35.040 of the Syracuse City Municipal Code pertaining to home occupation parking standards.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City Council directed Planning Commission to review two separate requests to amend the parking standards in relation to home occupations. The first issue in question was to determine if the ordinance should be amended to allow additional truck parking associated with home businesses, specifically food trucks. The second was whether or not additional employees should be allowed to park at the residence where a home occupation resides. On the topic of food truck parking at home businesses, the Planning Commission was not in favor of loosening the rules, however the council decided to be more lenient by increasing the number of permitted trucks from 1 up to 3, so long as certain qualifiers are met. Concerning employees parking at home occupations, the Planning Commission voted to allow up to 2 employees to park on site so long as they don't park in front of or on the neighbor's property. The attached draft ordinance language reflects the most recent input received by both bodies.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo.

There was a brief discussion about the implications of the ordinance and Councilmember Maughan clarified that the changes do not restrict the number of employees allowed at a home occupation; rather, it restricts the number of business vehicles allowed. City Attorney Roberts stated he can slightly modify the language to be certain that the ordinance communicates that only the number of cars is limited. The language would read that "the home occupation license shall limit the number of vehicles parked by employees onsite to two.". Councilmember Maughan supported the language edit.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2019-13 AMENDING SECTION 10.35.040 OF THE SYRACUSE CITY MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO HOME OCCUPATION PARKING STANDARDS, WITH THE ADJUSTMENTS NOTED BY CITY ATTORNEY ROBERTS ABOVE. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTIN; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

11. Proposed Ordinance 19-15 adopting the proposed General Plan and General Plan Map for Syracuse City, Utah.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the General Plan and the included General Plan Map is an advisory document that provides general guidance on the preferred growth strategies of the City. If an application is received in the future that petitions to change the current zoning map to something shown on the general plan map, the city is not obligated to approve the change, and can make legislative decisions independently. Planning Commission voted on June 18, 2019 to recommend approval of the attached document. The vote was four to one. This document encapsulates the majority opinions and findings of a visioning committee that met six times from January 24 to March 14 and of the Planning Commission that worked on the document from April 2 to June 18. The City Council reviewed the item on June 25, July 9, July 23, and Aug 27, 2019. Staff has implemented the comments received into a revised document that is attached.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo.

Councilmember Bingham stated that much time and effort has been dedicated to the development of this document; there seems to be misinformation in the City that the General Plan Map is not often opened or amended, but it is actually true

that it is adjusted every two years. With the announcement of the West Davis Corridor, changes throughout the City were needed to ensure that proper land use is determined around the road and its interchanges. She summarized the timeline and work done by the Vision 2050 Task Force and stated she is supportive of adopting this plan for the future of the City.

Councilmember Savage reiterated it is important to update the Plan to recognize the West Davis Corridor; it is not an option to simply leave the old General Plan unchanged. He has overlaid the two plans and finds that they are nearly identical with the exception of a few changes around West Davis Corridor interchanges and assignment of the PRD or RPC zoning designations on properties in the City. The Plan is not perfect, but it is an attempt to protect residents from diminished home values associated with their proximity to the West Davis Corridor. He is supportive of the proposed document.

Councilmember Peterson stated that it will never be possible to get everyone to agree on the plan for the entire City; however, this has been the most inclusive public process that he has witnessed. Compromises have been made and he feels the outcome is a document that provides what is best for the future of the City.

Councilmember Bolduc agreed with the comments about the need to update the General Plan to recognize the West Davis Corridor. She also agreed the public process was very inclusive and the Planning Commission has worked hard to develop a document that has taken into consideration the input that was received.

Councilmember Maughan stated there are certainly a few things in the Plan that he does not agree with, but he did concede that the majority should rule, and the Plan reflects that. He stated it is somewhat odd that the City is defending the need to revise the plan every three to five years, yet the Plan is given the title of Vision 2050, which is 30 years down the road. He asked if that is intended to communicate that the Plan will not be changed regularly. He added that he was also contacted by Mr. Zaugg requesting to have his name removed; he wondered if it would be appropriate to remove the entire page that recognizes those that participated on the Task Force. He concluded that he does not agree that the 'City got this right', but he reiterated that the majority rules.

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 19-15 ADOPTING THE GENERAL PLAN AND GENERAL PLAN MAP FOR SYRACUSE CITY, UTAH, WITH THE EDIT TO REMOVE RAY ZAUGG'S NAME FROM THE DOCUMENT. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

12. Authorize Administration to enter into interlocal agreement with Utopia for Internet Services for Syracuse City municipal operations.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City currently has internet service provided by Comcast which costs approximately \$4,000 per month for City-wide dedicated fiber. This network provides the following connection speeds:

- City Hall, Police, Community Center = 50 Mbps
- Fire Dept = 20 Mbps
- Public Works = 6 Mbps
- Museum = 6 Mbps
- Jensen Building = 6 Mbps

The City had a five-year contract that ended in March 2019. We are now paying month to month for our internet service. The current speed is not adequate for our City services.

Cost Proposals from other providers:

We reached out to CenturyLink, UTOPIA, and a bid renewal from Comcast for services. We asked for quotes of 1 Gbps and 10 Gbps over a term of 4 or 5 years. Here is what we received:

- **UTOPIA** – Approximately 70k for dedicated FIBER to be ran to Police, City Hall, Community Center and Fire. This cost spread over a 4-year contract would be ~\$1,460 per month for the term of the contract. UTOPIA would give us FREE internet service for 10 Gbps over those 4 years while we pay back the FIBER costs. After that term, the 10 Gbps would be \$1,400 per month ongoing.
- **COMCAST** – They gave us an updated quote of ~ \$4,500 per month for 1 Gbps or ~\$15,000 per month for 10 Gbps over a 4-year contract.
- **CENTURY LINK** – After repeated calls and emails to the company we have not received any response back from their FIBER team. The DSL team told us that they only have a maximum capacity of 140 Mbps.

UTOPIA Services – This would only be service provided to the city government for our municipal operations. This would provide opportunity for other businesses, schools, and the county to hook into the network if they provided the appropriate fee to pay for it. This would **NOT** be for residential services and residents would not be able to participate under this current contract or fiber installation. The City would be the consumer. The city would not provide wholesale services to residents.

The memo concluded that by switching to UTOPIA, the City would save ~\$2,500 per month on internet service and increase our internet speed by 200 times our current speed. We would like to move quickly on this agreement to be able to recognize the savings. Also, we would need to use some of these savings to install an air fiber (wireless point to point) from the Community Center to the Public Works building. This would cost approximately 5k – 10k to install (one-time cost) and would provide up to 1 Gbps to public works. This is far cheaper than running a dedicated FIBER line to public works at a cost of \$170,000. Also, by moving quickly on this approval, we will have time to install the necessary antennas and air fiber between the community center and public works buildings before wintertime.

The following actions need to be taken. the Council needs to decide whether to authorize the Mayor to enter into an interlocal agreement with UTOPIA for Internet Services for Syracuse City municipal operations.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

Councilmember Bolduc stated she appreciated the clarification that UTOPIA is only being pursued for City operations and not as a City utility for all residents. Councilmember Maughan agreed but noted that this could be a step in that direction; however, given that UTOPIA's bid was lower than the other bidders, authorizing this agreement is a 'no-brainer'. Councilmember Bingham agreed and this provides the City the ability to cut costs where possible. Councilmembers Savage and Peterson agreed; both noted this will result in taxpayer dollars savings.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO AUTHORIZE ADMINISTRATION TO ENTER INTO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH UTOPIA FOR INTERNET SERVICES FOR SYRACUSE CITY MUNICIPAL OPERATIONS. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

13. Public hearing: Proposed Ordinance 2019-14 amending culinary water disconnection procedures.

A staff memo from the City Administrative Services Director explained the goals of tonight's discussion are to review and consider updates to the Title IV code pertaining to shutoff procedures. The Council and staff discussed the City's shutoff procedures at work sessions in July and August. Staff has made proposed edits to the shutoff procedures based upon those discussions. The key changes include:

- Reference changes to Utility Billing Supervisor instead of Clerk.
- Notice of shut-off method of delivery. Through the mail instead of in person.
- Reference changes of second notice to a door hanger. Also change wording to state that if payment is made within 3 days the city shall shutoff instead of may be shutoff. Once the doorhangers are delivered, no more payment arrangements will be made.
- Once the resident is shutoff, we will not accept a check payment to restore services.
- There will be a \$5 nonrefundable fee charged once doorhangers are placed at the residence.

Staff recommends the Council determine whether to approve ordinance 19-14 amending Title IV of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to culinary water shutoff procedures.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

Councilmember Maughan noted that fees charged by the City are intended to cover the cost associated with providing a service. He expressed some concern that the \$5 non-refundable fee will not cover the costs of placing a doorhanger at a residence and he wondered if this issue should be reconsidered or discussed further. Councilmembers Bingham and Savage indicated they were comfortable proceeding with the proposal, with Councilmembers Bolduc and Peterson indicating they would like to hear if there are any concerns expressed in the public hearing regarding this item.

Mayor Gailey opened the public hearing at 8:43 p.m.

Bonnie Bourgeois stated that her sister-in-law rents a home that she owns in Syracuse; she had a renter years ago that had their water shut off and it was very difficult to evict them; her sister did not even know the water had been shut off and she wondered if attempts are made to notify an owner of a rental property that the water has been disconnected.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed at 8:45 p.m.

Mayor Gailey addressed Mr. Bovero and asked if the monthly bill for City services is sent directly to the property owner regardless of whether the property is a rental or owner-occupied. Mr. Bovero stated that the monthly bill may be sent to the occupant of the home, but in a rental situation, the property owner will also receive notice of a delinquency. Councilmember Maughan noted the City cannot be expected to manage problems between a property owner and a tenant. Mayor Gailey agreed, but noted that the landowner is notified of a delinquency. Mr. Roberts agreed and stated the City's ordinance complies with State law.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2019-14 AMENDING CULINARY WATER DISCONNECTION PROCEDURES. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

14. Public comments.

Bonnie Bourgeois stated she is very confused about the actions taken earlier tonight; the Council voted to deny the Shoreline project, but to approve the General Plan. The General Plan map identifies the property as having been assigned the RPC property, but the action to deny would leave the R-1 zoning intact.

Mr. Roberts stated the General Plan map does indicate that the future land use for the property could be RPC, but the zoning map indicates the current zoning is R-1; the zoning map dictates what is done on the land, so the adoption of the General Plan does not necessarily indicate that the property owner is entitled to RPC zoning at this time.

Pat Zaugg stated that as someone who typically watches Council meetings via the City's YouTube channel, she has a few suggestions regarding formatting of the screen view; the current format allows for the majority of the screen to be consumed by the agenda title and packet materials, while the camera view of the actual Councilmembers is much smaller. She suggested that the picture of the Council dias should be enlarged and the agenda title be smaller across the bottom of the screen.

15. Mayor/Council announcements.

The Council and Mayor provided announcements about upcoming community events and other opportunities for public involvement. They also discussed request for future agenda items.

Mayor Gailey also invited City Manager Bovero to make any necessary announcements.

Mayor Gailey then recessed the meeting at 8:57 p.m. to allow for the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Special meeting to convene and, afterwards, for the Council convene in a work session meeting. The business meeting reconvened at 9:23 p.m.

16. Consideration of adjourning into Closed Executive Session pursuant to the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Open and Public Meetings Law for the purpose of discussing the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; or the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO CONVEIN IN A CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 52-4-205 OF THE OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OR REAL PROPERTY AND PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The closed session began at 9:23 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:08 p.m.

City Council Regular Meeting
September 10, 2019

At 10:08 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: October 8, 2019