

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on July 12, 2022, at 6:00 p.m., held in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 857 6057 9445, in-person in the City Council Chambers at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

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

Mayor Dave Maughan
City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

Administrative Services Director Stephen Marshall
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Maughan 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 Watson led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

2. Request to be on the agenda: Introduce of new Fire Department employees and administration of the Oath of Office

Chief Byington introduced the Fire Department's newest full-time firefighters and have them sworn in by our City Recorder.

- Firefighter/Paramedic Joel Crawmer (Hired in May 2022)
 - Has been employed with Syracuse City as a part-time firefighter since June 2018. He brings over 20 years of experience from Gold Cross Ambulance and Layton Fire Department.
- Firefighter/AEMT Tyler Fullmer (May 2022)
 - Started his fire service career with Syracuse City when he was hired as a part-time firefighter in May 2021. He also brings experience from Weber Fire District.

City Recorder Brown administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Crawmer and Mr. Fullmer.

3. Public comment:

Mayor Maughan invited in-person public comments.

The following individuals addressed the Council to express their opposition to the land sale/trade with Ivory Homes and their desire for the City to uphold the commitments the City made to the seller of the property, Alma Thurgood, and her family, which was to extend Legacy Park onto the subject property. The agenda item referenced by those who spoke was listed as item 10 on the agenda: Brant Thurgood, Barbara Thurgood, Julie Alta Thurgood Johnson, Geri Thurgood Waite, Alan Thurgood, and Josh Beams.

Chris Frazier addressed the application to rezone property at 1700 S. Banbury Drive, item seven on the agenda. The same zoning designation was originally approved over five years ago for the 10 acres across the street, and he wondered why it has taken so long for that project to move forward. The current application has been considered and acted upon by the Planning Commission and now, tonight will be acted upon by the City Council, with very little consideration for the property that has sat idle for five years. Additionally, there has been no 'for sale' sign on the property that would indicate that it was for sale or lease for general commercial use; the property has been master planned for a general commercial use. The applicant wants to build a parking lot on the west side of Banbury and donate the parking lot to the City; the City does not need a parking lot to manage, and it will only be used for overflow for the PRD development on the east side of Banbury. If the City needs more parking for Founders Park, the City should enhance the driveway into the park and utilize the Park 100 percent of the time. Finally, he addressed the intersection of Banbury Drive and Antelope Drive; it is very dangerous, and someone will eventually die there. Adding more traffic to the road will only make the area more dangerous. He asked that the Council consider other opportunities for the property, including general commercial uses that are truly needed in the community.

Christy Frazier echoed her husband's comments and added information about the traffic issues during the school year and the times of day when there are more cars on the road. The schools in the area are already overcrowded and this project will only make that problem work. She asked the City to be proactive rather than follow the example of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), which only reacts when conditions have gotten too bad.

Larry Shingleton echoed the comments made by Mr. and Mrs. Frazier; he lives in the area of the subject property and is disappointed that the City Council has allowed growth that the citizens have been opposed to. The citizens want more families living near them to contribute to the joy of Syracuse, but the Council has allowed uses that the residents are not appreciative of.

Raymond Gumbrecht also spoke to the application to change the zoning of property on Banbury Drive; he lives in the area and deals with difficult traffic conditions on Banbury Drive. The traffic on the road drives at high rates of speed. There is also a great deal of noise near his home due to the new apartment complex nearby. He agreed that the schools are overcrowded, and it is difficult to get sidewalks clear on the roads during the winter months. Finally, he is concerned about the availability of water to serve continued growth; the Great Salt Lake is at historic lows and these conditions have the potential to impact all residents for years to come.

Alicia Gerney echoed the concerns that have been expressed about the application to rezone property on Banbury Drive. She shares concerns regarding traffic, school overcrowding, and the City's ability to provide public safety resources to the increased population of the community.

Robin Gumbrecht expressed her husband's comments regarding the current drought conditions and the impact that increased growth has on the availability of water.

Mary Carver spoke to the rapid growth in Syracuse City; there is insufficient water for existing residents, the streets are no longer quiet, and the small-town feeling has been lost. She has lived here her entire life and Syracuse is no longer the same as it once was.

Mayor Maughan then stated that tonight's meeting agenda provided instructions for residents to email their public comments to City Recorder Brown by 4:00 p.m. tonight in order for them to be read into the record of the meeting. Ms. Brown read the following public comments into the record:

"Dear City Council,

Below find my concerns about the property "being developed" on Antelope and Banbury.

1. Increase in traffic onto Banbury Dr. It is already hard enough to get out onto Antelope. Safety is a HUGE issue here!!!
2. The streets in the subdivision plan are very narrow and will not allow for any on street parking. Therefore, this will cause cars to be parked out on Banbury Dr. (Picture Heritage Days).
3. The donation of the smaller lot on the west side of Banbury to be a parking lot, will actually be an overflow parking area for the new subdivision, but because it is "donated" the city will be in charge of its upkeep, using our tax dollars to do this. There is plenty of parking in the park which only fills up after 8:00 pm the night of the fireworks. Several of us took note on this.
4. The apartments going in across the street on Antelope is in the boundaries for Syracuse Elementary, junior high and high school. Adding 112 townhomes into this will increase the student population.

Did I mention the traffic on Banbury?

I hope this helps. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE

Thanks! Louann Ottenstein"

"To whom it may concern:

I'm very concerned about the PRD proposal of town homes on Banbury this is way too many homes for only 6 acres of land! I was so excited to move to Syracuse a few years ago because I was extremely impressed with how well taken care of the yards were and that Syracuse did not allow second buildings of sheds, garages to be bigger and taller than the existing homes. Sad to look around after 12 years to see how quickly Syracuse is going downhill. Many homeowners have let their yards go and surrounding areas are not adding beauty and value to the community. This development off of Banbury causes many concerns.

- Parking issues this will add 180 cars to this area which is already quite congested and unsafe with school and park.
- To have the homeowners merging on to Banbury after a 4 way stop causes many issues not to mention the proposal of having two different outlets coming from the east and west to merge on to Banbury and then on Antelope is concerning and will cause many accidents.
- Not to mention with the development on antelope with the apartment complex right across the intersection to merge on to Antelope with no streetlight is going to be quite the traffic hazard which will result in many accidents. This will already increase our population with schools, traffic and water whether it be culinary or secondary is very concerning. We are already in an extreme drought.
- Syracuse City is already stretched to the limits with water concerns, lacking resources for Fire and Rescue, Police to facilitate all of this growth in the community.

I'm asking the City of Syracuse to really re-think the Landowner's proposal for the development. Come up with a different plan that brings affordable housing to the community and doesn't create traffic hazards and cause us to have permanent water restrictions. On 6 acres of land there should only be 20 to 25 homes in that area. Not 99 townhomes that will create many safety concerns as a community and not have adequate parking for the townhomes going into that subdivision.

Please really look at the concerns for our community before casting your vote on this proposal on Banbury.

Thanks for your service

Tiffany Davis

1617 W Ira Way"

"We are writing to publicly express our concern for the proposed rezoning of the frontage along Antelope Drive to PRD to allow increased density and number townhomes in the property at the corner of Antelope and Banbury Drive. We have several concerns with this proposed townhome development. First and foremost is safety. Traffic is already a problem along Banbury Drive and this high-density housing will only increase this problem. There are regularly accidents at that intersection. The apartments along that area of Antelope that are currently under construction will add to the traffic

concerns. Any additional townhome development in this area at this time appears unwise.

Another concern is the loss of desperately needed commercial space along Antelope drive. At a recent city council meeting, the developer was denied rezoning of the area on the West side of Banbury for additional townhomes, largely due to the viability of that space as commercial property. Now, the developer is proposing a parking lot in this area, with rezoning of the

property along antelope drive as PRD, with the associated high-density housing. The commercial area is so desperately needed in our area, far more than these additional high-density units as so many are already currently being built. It is also important to note that there is plenty of parking at the skate park the majority of the time. It only fills up on rare busy city events such as heritage days. Even on the night of the fireworks, there was still empty parking after 8pm.

Additional concerns include our limited water resources and public safety officers such as police officers, firemen, and other emergency services. The pace of the approval of new development has been so fast lately. Please slow this down and put a pause on this development. Please give a chance to see how much the developments that are currently being built affect traffic, water, and our other precious resources. Please give a chance for commercial real estate to be built, as was given for one of the reasons to build some of these other developments - to attract businesses. Please allow Syracuse to continue to be a wonderful place to live.

Sincerely,

Trisha Greer

1530 S 1525 W

Lorinda Anderson

1405 S 1525 W

David Anderson

1405 S 1525 W"

4. Approval of minutes.

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Work Session of May 24, 2022, Business Meeting of June 14, 2022, Special Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Meeting of June 14, 2022, and Special Municipal Building Authority (MBA) meeting of June 14, 2022.

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

5a. Common consent: Proposed Resolution R22-28 authorizing the Mayor to execute an Interlocal Agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and West Point City for corridor preservation.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained State Road 193 extension between State Street and 2000 West was built in 2014. The extension between 2000 West and 3000 West was completed in 2018. UDOT owns and maintains the facility including controlling all access roads and driveways feeding onto the facility. The current allowed access points that UDOT has approved are located 1/2 mile at signalized full movement intersections. UDOT is protective of the access points because the facility's designed speeds and projected traffic volumes could create a dangerous traffic condition when cars pull out and accelerate into traffic or brake to pull out of traffic flow. To facilitate development, West Point and Syracuse have jointly approached UDOT to ask for more access onto the facility for economic development and improved circulation. UDOT has agreed to granting additional access by allowing additional right in right out (RIRO) intersections with center medians at the 1/4-mile marks. The RIRO intersection according to UDOT is safer since it doesn't allow a left-hand turn movement which has

been proven to be the more dangerous traffic movement since you are crossing multiple lanes of oncoming traffic resulting in 'T-bone' or head on collisions.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R22-28 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) AND WEST POINT CITY FOR CORRIDOR PRESERVATION. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5b. Common consent - Appointments:

- i. Proposed Resolution R22-29 appointing Scott Shea and Dennis Johnson to the Syracuse City Planning Commission; and
- ii. Proposed Resolution R22-30 appointing Aaron Johnson to the Architectural Review Board; and
- iii. Proposed Resolution R22-31 re-appointing Dan Merkling to the Disaster Preparedness Committee in an At-Large Seat and re-appointing Brigham Young to the Disaster Preparedness Committee in a District Service Seat.

A memo from Mayor Maughan summarized the background and experience of the individuals that he has recommended for appointment to various committees in the City.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R22-29 APPOINTING SCOTT SHEA AND DENNIS JOHNSON TO THE SYRACUSE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R22-30 APPOINTING AARON JOHNSON TO THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R22-31 RE-APPOINTING DAN MERKLING TO THE DISASTER PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE IN AN AT-LARGE SEAT AND RE-APPOINTING BRIGHAM YOUNG TO THE DISASTER PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE IN A DISTRICT SERVICE SEAT. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

6. Consideration and possible vote to add third At-Large Seat to the Disaster Preparedness Committee.

Mayor Maughan provided a brief explanation of the purpose of expanding the membership of the Disaster Preparedness Committee. There was high-level discussion among the Council and Mayor regarding the current membership of the Disaster Preparedness Committee and the purpose of increasing the number of members, after which the Council concluded to consider a necessary ordinance amendment in a future meeting to allow for a third At-Large Seat on the Committee.

7. Proposed Ordinance 2022-15 amending the Syracuse City Zoning Map for property located at approximately 1700 S. Banbury Drive, Agriculture A-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD) and General Commercial (GC).

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Erik Craythorn has applied to amend approximately 2.5 acres of the City's zoning map from Agricultural (A1) to Planned Residential Development (PRD) and General Commercial (GC). The applicant intends to build a 95-unit townhome project and to sell the corner land for commercial development. The proposed townhome development is approximately 9.45 acres, and the commercial pad is approximately .5 acres. The applicant already has PRD zoning for approximately 7 acres of the project. The project is located at approximately 1700 S Banbury Drive. Density for the project is approximately 10 units per acre. The change is consistent with the General Plan which is slated as 'High Density Residential'. There is only one place in the entire city where the high-density residential designation is planned for. The process as described in city ordinance for an amendment to the zoning map includes holding a public hearing and receiving a recommendation from Planning Commission. The hearing and recommendation results are then reported to City Council who makes the final decision. The PRD ordinance requires that along with the zoning application, a preliminary plat, architectural plans, and landscape plan. There is also a requirement for a development agreement (DA). The DA, Zoning, and Preliminary Plat are considered concurrently for a PRD development. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on June 21, 2022, and voted to recommend denial of the requested rezone. The vote was 6-1. The public hearing was well attended where the neighbors to the north expressed opposition to the project and to its perceived impacts to traffic, schools, police, and infrastructure among other concerns expressed.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a review of the preliminary plat and the types of commercial uses that could be located on the site. The Council discussed the viability of mid-block commercial development, and several Councilmembers expressed concern regarding giving up general commercial options on the subject property in order to allow

additional residential development. This led to philosophical discussion and debate regarding the most appropriate use for the subject property.

Discussion then shifted to parking planned for the property and opportunities for shared parking on adjacent properties, including City owned properties. Mayor Maughan stated it is his understanding that the parking lot would be built by the developer, and he will maintain access to it for use as needed by residents of his project. The City would maintain the property for the benefit of Founders Park use.

The Council then heard from Public Works Director Whiteley regarding the impact this type of project will have on the City's water resources; Mr. Whiteley noted that there will be individual water service for each unit in the project area, which will increase the demand for water. He then addressed concerns expressed regarding traffic, reading from Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) historic traffic data logs; for 2019 the annual average daily traffic on Antelope Drive was 27,184 vehicles. The 2024 forecast is for a slight decrease to around 26,000 and this may be due to the anticipated completion of the West Davis Corridor project in Syracuse City.

Council debate of the project then continued; Councilmember Savage stated he does not believe mid-block development can support general commercial uses. He added he wished the Council had not approved the PRD zoning designation for the property across the street five years ago. He also noted that he believes that this type of project places a lower demand on water resources than a typical single-family residential subdivision. Finally, he indicated that he feels there will be some traffic reduction due to the West Davis Corridor project.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2022-15 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY ZONING MAP FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1700 S. BANBURY DRIVE, AGRICULTURE A-1 TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD) AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC). COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER WATSON, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

8. Proposed Ordinance 2022-16 amending the Syracuse City Zoning Map for property located at approximately 1100 S. 1675 W. from R-2 Residential to R-3 Residential.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Lance Cheshire has requested to rezone his property at 1100 S 1675 W from R-2 to R-3. He desires to construct a stairway and entrance into his basement. Our current practice for measuring setbacks associated with a building permit is to measure from the foundation to the property line. Since his concrete retaining wall stairs tie into the concrete foundation of the home, for purposes of setback measurement, the stairways addition places the home closer to the rear property line. The R-2 rear setback requirement is 30 feet and the R-3 setback requirement is only 20 feet. As measured, the new stairway would encroach into the 30-foot setback. For this reason, he is applying to the R-2 zone for an additional 10 feet of rear yard for his desired stairs down to his basement. The homes along his rear yard boundary are already R-3 so this rezone doesn't create an island. The rezone is also still consistent with the General Plan designation of 'low density residential'. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item on June 21, 2022. No comments were received from the public. The Commission voted to recommend approval 6-1. The dissenting vote felt that the item should have been a variance and not a rezone.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo. The Council indicated they are comfortable acting on the application but asked that staff work to develop an ordinance that result in a land use ordinance text amendment to prevent this type of issue from occurring in the future.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2022-16 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY ZONING MAP FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1100 S. 1675 W. FROM R-2 RESIDENTIAL TO R-3 RESIDENTIAL. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

9. Proposed Ordinance 2022-17 amending Section 10.30.020(F)(1) of the Syracuse Municipal Code related to accessory building encroachment into front yards of cul-de-sac properties.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Jared Stoker has requested to amend the ordinance to allow him to place an accessory structure closer to the street than currently allowed. Currently ordinance requires that accessory structures not be placed in the front yard setback. They may be placed in the rear or side yards and setbacks are determined by the height of the accessory structure. The applicant's house is in an R-1 zone which has a front setback of 25 feet. The applicant's house is also located in a cul-de-sac. The applicant argues that the unique context of this situation would have minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood since there is low traffic on his street. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on June 21, 2022. No public comments were received. The Planning Commission voted to recommend denial of this amendment. They all felt that rather than amend the ordinance, instead the item would be a better candidate for a variance through the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo. The Council discussed potential unintended consequence of the proposed ordinance amendments, ultimately concluding that they are comfortable with the amendment to reduce the setback in cul-de-sacs only.

COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2022-17 AMENDING SECTION 10.30.020(F)(1) OF THE SYRACUSE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATED TO ACCESSORY BUILDING ENCROACHMENT INTO FRONT YARDS OF CUL-DE-SAC PROPERTIES. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

10. Potential land trade/sale to Ivory Land Corporation for property located at approximately 2325 S. 1230 W.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City is entertaining a transaction to trade land with Ivory Homes. See attached for the draft trade agreement. City policy requires a public hearing and recommendation from Planning Commission prior to selling/trading land. The City Council will have the final vote for the transaction. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on 06/07/22. They are forwarding a recommendation to not trade the property following a well-attended public hearing voicing opposition to the transaction. There is an optional opportunity to trade/sell approximately 2.72 acres of City land for approximately 1.08 acres of land owned by Ivory Homes. The 1.08 acres of Ivory property is located directly west of the existing Legacy Park. The intent is to expand Legacy Park on the newly acquired land and potentially build a new fire station there as well. The resulting more rectangular park shape would be more useable space for soccer and other field sports and have the needed frontage to develop a fire station. Since the value and acreage of the City property is larger than that of the Ivory property, Ivory will pay the cost difference resulting in approximately \$363,591.77 payment to the City that could be used to develop the park expansion. Also, adjacent to the future park/fire station area, there will need to be road improvements including curb, gutter, and sidewalk installed. Those improvement costs would be deducted from the cash payment. The original intent when the City purchased the 2.72 acres in 2004 was to expand Legacy Park as it is adjacent and to the south of the existing park. Council minutes indicate that the intent of the purchase was to expand the park. However, there is no deed restriction or contract in place that requires the City to only utilize the land as parkland. The land was not donated to the City and the City paid fair market value at the time. The City hired a landscape architect to envision what the "L" shaped park would look like. It included a linear water feature and parking. For unknown reasons, the City never developed the park as planned. Possible reasons include a recession in 2007 which put a hold on City projects because of reduced revenue and also there was a change in City manager leadership at the time. If the trade is executed, Ivory intends to build approximately 8 lots and a road on the land that would connect to the end of Grant's Lane. This portion would be developed along with Ivory's adjacent Legacy View Estates subdivision. Grant's Lane is currently a cul-de-sac, dead end road. Originally, Grant's Lane was a private drive that serviced only the duplexes adjacent to 1000 W. Later, 4 homes were desired to be built west of there and the private drive was extended to service the homes. At some point between 2005 and 2006, the dead-end road was improved with sidewalk and a cul-de-sac. It is assumed that this was the point when it was dedicated to the City as a public ROW and the City made the improvements. The narrowest portion of the paved surface is approximately 30 feet. The standard low volume road design calls for 25' asphalt with curb pans, so 29' drivable surface. The minimum that fire code requires is 26 feet. The road does meet fire code. Also, if the trade is completed, and once Ivory builds their proposed Legacy View subdivision, Grant's lane would be one of seven entrances into the new project and is not anticipated to carry heavy traffic. The City commissioned an independent appraisal from Wall Appraisal Company LLC. Date of the report was March 14, 2022. The appraisal came back at \$658,000 for the 2.72 acres of City land. The City purchased the land in 2004 for \$125,440 which at the time was fair market value. The offer from Ivory for the City land is \$805,720.60. The value of the Ivory property is agreed to be \$345,308.83. The value of the road improvements Ivory will complete for the City is \$98,820. The sum of the Ivory Property Value, the Cash Payment, and the cost of the Road Improvements is deemed equal to the City Property Value. Although this has proven to be a contentious item, the City's responsibility lies in weighing the pros and cons of all opportunities that could benefit the greater good of the residents of the City as a whole, including improving fire and police response and exploring cost conscious ways to add park space.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and Mayor Maughan facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the matters that have been raised by residents and the recommendation from the Planning Commission that the Council not approve the land sale/trade with Ivory Homes. The Council indicated they understand the perceived benefits of approving the transaction with Ivory Homes, but also understand and agree with the concerns expressed by the residents regarding the change in planning for the property. Councilmember Savage stated he understands all concerns that have been expressed on all sides of this issue, but he is concerned about executing the park extension plans as reflected on the concept plan presented by the Thurgood family; there are connectivity issues and insufficient parking for the conceptual park. He agrees that the existing park should be maintained and landscaping could be augmented, but he would support the land trade as proposed as it would provide a better and more accessible park that can serve more families and provide for better traffic flow through the City.

Councilmember Carver stated that her concerns regarding this issue relates to the nature of the communications that she has received from many residents; she stated this was her first experience with public bullying and if she experiences the same in the future, she will make public the names of those who are participating in the inappropriate behavior. She then

concluded that she has thought long and hard about this issue and based upon her own morals and values, she will not support the land trade as proposed.

COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE LAND TRADE/SALE TO IVORY LAND CORPORATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2325 S. 1230 W. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

11. Continued Discussion on Good Landlord Program/Crime Free Housing Program

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained this discussion follows up on the preliminary discussion we had in June about the Good Landlord Program. The council seemed favorable to the idea and asked for additional information. Much of the information is tentative. It is impossible to ascertain the disproportionate rental fee, for instance, because that fee may only be established after the study for disproportionate costs is established. When it comes to administrative support necessary, we have used FTE's rather than dollar amounts. As you know, the amount paid to an FTE varies and we would only hire and maintain a full-time administrator if the workload justified it. If the Good Landlord Program was established, it would need to be preceded by a requirement that rental units within the City obtain a business license, which will require a heavy lift on the front end to identify rental units, make contact with property owners, register those responsible owners who respond, follow-up on those who do not, and take enforcement action against recalcitrant or non-responsive property owners. The City will be populating a database from scratch. Staff have compiled a chart of comparison between the Good Landlord Program and Crime-Free Multi-Housing program.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the benefits of both the Good Landlord Program and Crime-Free Housing Program; the Council concluded that the Crime Free Housing Program would have a lesser burden on staff in the long-term but may not provide the same awareness of rental properties as a Good Landlord Program would. The concluded to continue to investigate the Good Landlord Program rather than the Crime Free Housing Program and ask that staff provide additional information regarding the Program in a future work session meeting.

12. Continued discussion regarding updates to General Plan moderate income housing elements in compliance with Utah House Bill (HB) 462.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Utah's Land Use, Development, and Management Act (LUDMA) requires that every city have a general plan. In 2022, various changes to LUDMA's 10-9a-403 of Utah Code were made that will require us to update our plan. The items in our General Plan that are out of compliance are:

- Select three or more moderate income housing strategies from new list. These are the leading strategies from the list recommended by staff:
 - A. rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing;
 - B. demonstrate investment in the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that facilitates the construction of moderate-income housing;
 - F. zone or rezone for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers;
 - H. amend land use regulations to eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on the resident's own vehicle, such as residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities;
 - R. eliminate impact fees for any accessory dwelling unit that is not an internal accessory dwelling unit as defined in Section 10-9a-530;
 - W. create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, multifamily residential dwellings compatible in scale and form with detached single-family residential dwellings and located in walkable communities within residential or mixed-use zones; and
- Include an implementation plan and timeline for each strategy
- Add a water use and preservation element

The purpose of this discussion item is to provide high level input to the Planning Commission who will work on the changes over the next month or so to bring our General Plan into compliance with state law. After a recommendation from Planning Commission is completed, the proposed General Plan amendments will be forwarded back to City Council for approval/adoption.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the three items they prefer; the Council concluded to support menu items A, B, and F and refer the matter to the Planning Commission for a formal recommendation.

13. General budget discussion and preparation for Truth in Taxation process; discussion regarding adjustment to salaries for elected officials.

An Administrative staff memo explained this discussion item is meant to allow any item related to the upcoming FY23 budget amendment pursuant to the August 9, 2022 Truth in Taxation hearing. The Council is welcome to address any items that they feel necessary to discuss related to the budget. In addition to the budget hearing on August 9, a presentation will be given to explain to the public the consideration of the potential property tax increase. The presentation can address the following points:

- An overview of the City's revenue sources
- A brief explanation of how property tax rates are calculated in Utah
- The impact inflation has on default property tax revenue
- A breakdown of the average property tax bill
- Explanation of where the additional revenue is planned to go, if the tax rate is held or raised.
- A comparison of tax rates of neighboring cities in Davis County

If there are any other major points to consider in the presentation, the Council can provide that direction to staff at the meeting.

The Council engaged in philosophical discussion regarding the most appropriate method of determining elected official salaries; they supported the concept of following the City's recruitment and retention policy to ensure that elected official salaries are determined in the same manner as for general employees. Councilmembers clarified that they are not concerned about the proposed compensation for the Mayor and City Council, but they were concerned that the process and the final compensation amounts were not fully transparent, and they simply wanted to have a discussion in an open meeting regarding those issues.

Mr. Bovero then reviewed the staff memo regarding the efforts of City Administration to prepare public information regarding the City's proposed final budget and the purpose of the property tax increase being considered by the Council.

14. Public comments.

Julie Thurgood stated she wished to publicly thank the Council for their decision on agenda item 10, the proposed land sale/trade with Ivory Homes.

16. Mayor/Council announcements.

The Council and Mayor provided announcements about upcoming community events and other opportunities for public involvement.

15. 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 (if necessary).

COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MOVED TO ADJOURN 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 PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL VOTED AYE.

The meeting recessed at 8:25 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:52 p.m.

At 8:52 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Dave Maughan
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: _____