

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on September 25, 2018 at 6:05 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson
Corinne N. Bolduc
Dave Maughan (via electronic means)
Doug Peterson
Jordan Savage

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

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

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; continue August 28, 2018 discussion regarding traffic control at 1950 S. Allison Way; discuss proposed ordinance amendments relating to cemetery maintenance; discuss proposed amendments to Title Four of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to excavations, lateral ownership, and tampering with street signs and lights; discuss proposed amendments to Chapter 10.82 of the Syracuse City Code relating to the Residential Planned Community (RPC) zone; consider a request to amend the City's General Plan Map from R-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD) for property located approximately 3500 S Bluff Road; review Syracuse City dog kennel ordinance; discuss request received during September 11, 2018 City Council meeting regarding use of City facilities for boy scouting events; discuss proposed restructuring of Community and Economic Development (CED) Department; discuss proposed Redevelopment Agency (RDA) budget amendment; discuss and review current Vision and Mission Statements for Syracuse City; discuss proposed timeline for considering updates to the Syracuse City General Plan; discuss linear park project; receive public comments; and discuss future agenda items/hear Council announcements.

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Traffic control at 1950 South Allison Way, continued from August 28, 2018.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained a citizen has raised concerns with a modification that was made to traffic control at the intersection of 1950 South Allison Way. A four-way stop controlled intersection was changed to a two-way stop control in July 2018. The resident is requesting the intersection be changed back to a four-way stop.

An evaluation of the traffic control devices along 1950 South (also known as Tivoli Way) was performed. It was determined by traffic volumes and accident data research that the intersection at 1950 South Allison Way no longer warrants the need for a four-way stop. The engineering criteria is established in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which is the national standard adopted by the Federal Highway Administration as well as the Utah Administrative Code. A technical memorandum report was compiled with data to support the decision. Recommendations included the following:

1. Install a four-way stop at the intersection of 1230 West Tivoli Way (Traffic control for the new subdivision).
2. Change the four-way stop at 1950 South Allison Way to a two way stop, allowing east/west traffic to free flow without stopping.
3. Install signs under the stop signs that will remain at the intersection of 1950 South Allison Way, that read: "Cross traffic does not stop". (MUTCD 2C.59)
4. Install a "Slow Children at Play" sign for westbound traffic approaching the 1525 West intersection.
5. During the first week after the changes, have a police presence to patrol both intersections to help drivers become aware of the changes.

All of the recommendations were carried out. The resident expressed his concern for safety of children that walk in that area. He was informed of the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program and filed a Citizen Action Request without submitting an application fee. The resident submitted a petition from 21 households in the neighborhood requesting the four-way stop be replaced. The resident was invited to city council work session to express concerns.

The memo summarized a few of the evaluation considerations: Keller Crossing received final approval on September 8, 2015. This approval made the final connection of 1475 West. The road was in construction during July 2016. Once the road was paved, it had concrete jersey barriers placed to prevent traffic from entering the construction area. The barriers remained in place through the winter and removed in the spring of 2017 to allow traffic. This road connection reduced traffic volumes at 1525 West.

The change to a two-way stop balanced the stop control distance along Tivoli Way between stop signs:

- 1200 feet from 1000 West to 1230 West;
- 1050 feet from 1230 West to 1475 West; and
- 1250 feet from 1475 West to 1675 West.

The two existing concrete waterways at 1525 West slow eastbound and westbound traffic down through that intersection. This should minimize the risk of vehicles speeding through the intersection.

The intersection at 1525 West is an intersection of two local roads. The roadway carrying the lowest volume of traffic should be controlled (MUTCD 2B.04). In this case, leaving the two stop signs at the northbound and southbound approaches to the intersection are necessary. A four-way stop at that intersection does not meet the criteria to warrant the need (MUTCD 2B.07). This is due to reduced traffic volumes because of the change in traffic patterns resulting from the connection of 1475 West through Keller Crossing, and connection of 1950 South through Tivoli Gardens.

- Option 1: Leave the traffic control set as it currently is now (2-way stop) at the intersection.
- Option 2: Collect more data with a more in-depth traffic study by a third-party engineering firm.
- Option 3: Deviate from the standard and create a different criterion for establishing traffic control.

Mayor Gailey invited input from Brad Phippen.

Mr. Phippen stated that he is present to support returning the stop sign to its former location; many of his neighbors have signed a petition supporting the same as they are concerned about the safety of their children walking to and from school.

Mayor Gailey stated that his number one responsibility is to ensure safety for the entire City and he facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the three options listed in the staff memo. Discussion centered on the Councilmembers' various philosophies relative to the standards relied upon that led to the removal of the stop sign and the group ultimately determined to support option two and asked staff to collect more data now that school is in session. They asked for the data to be presented once available in order for the Council to make a final decision. The Council also indicated they would like the opportunity to review the City's current traffic calming policy to determine appropriate updates to that policy.

Discuss proposed ordinance amendments relating to Cemetery Maintenance.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the Council's discussion on August 28 was limited, and this staff memo does not cover every change in the ordinance; rather, it notes the changes made since the August 28 meeting. Please refer to the packet on Aug 28 for an explanation of each change. The draft version is still redlined with all proposed changes to the existing ordinance.

Changes since the Council's last meeting:

1. 4.30.040 – Emphasizes that, like any other city park or facility, the public may not plant trees, shrubs, etc. on City land, with an expectation that they will not be removed. Even if a person obtains authorization to plant a tree or other vegetation, it does not guarantee that the city will retain that planting indefinitely.
2. 4.30.050 (C) – Clause “after providing the refund” clarifies the intent of the section – that the city may sell a position after providing a refund to a prior purchaser.
3. 4.30.130 – An additional 1 foot was added to the maximum height of decorations from that allowed in the previous draft. This will be measured from the ground. Those with the maximum height monument of 36” will be permitted to decorate with an additional 1 foot of items. Those with shorter monuments will have more vertical space in which to work.
4. 4.30.130 – Helium balloons – may exceed the height restrictions but may be removed by city officials after 48-hours, or on the day for maintenance/mowing.

5. 4.30.130 – Provides that a single shepherd’s hook may be installed on a position, but that it must be located either on the monument/marker or placed in a hole drilled into the mow strip. The hook and its decorations may not exceed 4’ in height (like all decorations).

As it relates to shepherd’s hooks, we need direction on whether they may be cemented into the mow strip. They can interfere with landscape maintenance. If not, then we will add a provision explaining this. If there are hooks that are already cemented, do we allow them to stay? Allow them to replace them when they break?

City Attorney Roberts reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council relative to the implications of the proposed amendments; he indicated he will use the feedback provided by the Council to adjust the proposed ordinance for consideration at the next business meeting. The Council offered their support for including the ordinance on the consent agenda for the October 9 meeting.

Proposed amendments to Title Four of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to excavations, lateral ownership, and tampering with street signs and lights.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director and City Attorney explained this proposal would include a violation for any excavations done in city rights-of-way without acquiring an excavation permit. It is commonly understood that all sewer and land drain laterals are owned by the property owner being served. This ordinance confirms ownership of laterals. This proposal would include prohibited acts of tampering with street lights and City signs. It also proposes prohibiting individuals from tampering with or turning off irrigation systems at City parks.

Public Works Director Whiteley reviewed the staff memo and further summarized the proposed amendments to Title Four of the Syracuse City Code. There was a focus on the responsibilities of property owners relative to snow removal and the regulation that snow should not be placed in the public right-of-way, after which the Council indicated their support for the proposed amendments and authorized placement of an action item on the next business meeting agenda.

Proposed amendments to Chapter 10.82 of the Syracuse City Code relating to the Residential Planned Community (RPC) zone.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following is a summary of the proposed changes to the RPC zone.

1. Allowing townhomes up to six units attached;
2. Increasing from 47 percent up to 55 percent of the total project units to be less than 3,500 square foot lots;
3. Reducing the two-car garage requirements from 100 percent of the units down to 75 percent of the units;
4. Allowing a fee to be given in lieu of constructed common space if within 1/2 mile of 'receiving' park;
5. Increasing parking requirements to have two car parking spaces in the driveway in front of the garage;
6. Increasing allowed density from 4 units per acre to 5.5 units per acre.

The Planning Commission has conducted a very detailed review of the proposed changes and is offering the following recommendations. The majority of the commission preferred maintaining the RPC zone as a single-family neighborhood zone within the current 4 units per acre maximum density. There was not majority support for changes one through four as listed above. However, item five, concerning requiring a larger driveway in front of each unit for parking was unanimously supported. To summarize the sentiment of the commission, the allowed 3,500 square foot lots within the zone are felt to be 'small enough' to provide housing options within the larger community. Also, there was concern about the location in which the RPC zone may be applied in the future as most 100 acre and larger parcels are located towards the perimeter of the city where it was felt townhomes would not be appropriate.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the six key changes the RPC zone as listed in the staff report. Throughout the discussion there was a focus on density and the potential to further amend the ordinance to provide a different set of criteria for RPC projects that include a townhome element. The Council ultimately determined to refer the proposed amendments to a smaller task force group that could further examine the details of the zone; Councilmembers Maughan and Savage were selected by the Council to serve on the task force with City staff. Their recommendation will be provided to the entire group.

Request to amend the City’s General Plan Map from R-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD) for property located approximately 3500 S Bluff Road.

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

- Location: 3500 S. Bluff Road
- Current Zoning: A-1
- Current General Plan: R-1
- Requested General Plan: PRD
- Property Area: 13.527 acres

The applicant is requesting that the General Plan Map be amended on three parcels to be changed from an R-1 General Plan designation to PRD. Proximity to Bluff Road (a Minor Arterial Road), the planned West Davis Corridor, and proximity to a similar housing product type has been cited by the applicant as reasoning to allow the PRD Zoning. Because the general plan is closed, the City Council chose to approve the opening of the General Plan for consideration of this application, which was done on June 12th. During their regular meeting on June 19, 2018 the Planning Commission moved to table this item because of concerns brought up by residents in the public hearing. Since that time, the developer worked with the Army Corps of Engineers to determine the location and intensity of wetlands. He has also met with the Trailside community who live west of the proposed project to discuss concerns raised during the meeting. Wetlands issues have since been addressed to an extent that the developer feels comfortable coming forward with the project again. Wetlands will need to be mitigated as part of this project.

During their regular meeting on August 21, 2018 the Planning Commission moved to table this item again because a majority decision could not be reached by the Planning Commission. The difficulty in reaching a required four-person vote was because of a recent resignation and an absence. Generally, three were in favor of approval with two against.

During the meeting on September 4, 2018 the Planning Commission discussed the proposed General Plan Map amendment at length. Commissioner Day recused himself leaving four Commissioners to vote which required unanimous agreement to approve a motion. A motion to approve failed with three in favor and one against. Another motion to deny failed for lack of a second. Recognizing a stale mate and also recognizing the need to move the project along, a third motion to forward the item to the City Council without a recommendation passed unanimously.

The applicant has drafted several layouts for the property. The allowed density in the zone is 6 units per gross acre but the applicant is finding that his draft designs will be at or below 5 units per acre. Concept plans are not required for a General Plan change and have not been included in this report. If this project moves forward with general plan and zoning, the details of subdivision design will be reviewed with the concept, preliminary, and final plat applications and will be cemented with a development agreement consummated at the preliminary plat stage. The developer is calling this project 'Edgewater'.

The following table compares the various allowed densities in different zones:

Acres	Zone	Max units/acre	Mas allowed lots	Proposed units	Proposed units/acre
13.45	A-1	.5	6	NA	NA
13.45	R-1	2.3	30	NA	NA
13.45	R-2	3	40	NA	NA
13.45	R-3	4	53	NA	NA
13.45	R-4	11	147	NA	NA
13.45	PRD	6	80	68	5.03
13.45	RPC	4	53	NA	NA

The memo noted that because of proximity to the proposed West Davis Corridor, trail access to Jensen Nature Park that would facilitate open space in a development on the property, and direct access to a Minor Arterial (Bluff Road), staff recommends that this General Plan amendment request be approved. The memo provided a list of pros and cons as follows:

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----|--|
| 1 | <u>Pros:</u> | 7 | Proposal less dense than alternatives |
| 2 | Amenities by trail | 8 | Next to Jensen Park, which promotes health |
| 3 | Meets housing needs | 9 | <u>Cons:</u> |
| 4 | Traffic impact low | 10 | Road crosses trail two times |
| 5 | Bluff ROW to City | 11 | Wetlands |
| 6 | Trail land to City | 12 | Neighbor opposition |

1 Different than General Plan 3 Not adjacent to commercial
2 West Davis Corridor road noise

4 CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the
5 implications of the proposed General Plan amendment. Throughout the discussion there was a focus on the wetland
6 delineation study for the subject property as well as wetland mitigation options; walkability of the area; impact of the
7 proposal on neighboring properties; and overall density of the proposed development.

8 Mayor Gailey invited input from the applicant for this project.

9 Paxton Guymon stated he is the real estate attorney for the proposed project. He stated he understands this is a
10 legislative matter and he recognizes the discretion the Council has when considering this type of application. He stated that
11 the applicant feels this type of development is appropriate for the area given the plans to construct a freeway very close to the
12 subject property. He added that the applicant is willing to enter into a development agreement for the project that would cap
13 the density at no more than five units per acre; the developer wants the input of the Council and he wants to provide
14 amenities that would benefit the community. The applicant has also heard from the community about their preference for an
15 age-restricted senior community that would only allow residents over the age of 55 and he is willing to develop and build that
16 type of project. He concluded that he has worked with the applicant for several years and he has completed many successful
17 projects; he feels this project would be no different and would be something the community could be proud of. He noted that
18 he believes the decisions that have been made relative to the future alignment of the West Davis Corridor through Syracuse
19 are good triggering events for the Council to consider amendments to the General Plan. He stated he and the applicant look
20 forward to a more robust discussion about his proposed project during the October 9 meeting.

21 22 **Review of Syracuse City dog kennel ordinance.**

23 A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that during the public
24 comment period on September 11, 2018, a citizen requested the City Council review the Dog Kennel Ordinance. City
25 council decided to look at it more closely in the work meeting. Please find our adopted ordinance below, and the adopted
26 county code. Questions may be directed to CED director Noah Steele. County code allows three dogs, as long as one is a
27 shelter dog. Syracuse ordinance allows two dogs. Those who want more than that need a kennel license in both jurisdictions.
28 The county kennel provisions do not match, because it suggests that you need a kennel license if you have three or more dogs
29 (without reference to whether one is a shelter dog).

30 CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and offered a comparison of the City's dog kennel ordinance with the
31 Davis County ordinance. The Council discussed the issue that was raised by the resident that spoke during the September 11
32 meeting and ultimately concluded to bring the ordinance in line with the Davis County ordinance, but not require that one of
33 the three dogs be a shelter dog. The City's nuisance laws will also be relied upon for dealing with other animal issues. City
34 Attorney Roberts reported that the animal regulation is included in the City's land use code and, therefore, the Planning
35 Commission will need to consider the proposed amendment and provide the Council with a formal recommendation.

36 37 **Discuss request received during September 11, 2018** 38 **City Council meeting regarding use of City facilities for** 39 **boy scouting events.**

40 This item was not discussed as Councilmember Maughan was not physically present at the meeting and facilitating
41 the discussion as requested would be difficult given his remote status.

42 43 **Proposed restructuring of Community and Economic** 44 **Development (CED) Department; and** 45 **Proposed Redevelopment Agency (RDA) budget** 46 **amendment.**

47 A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that now that a
48 director has been hired, the department needs to back-fill the position that Noah is vacating for the department to be fully
49 staffed. It is proposed that instead of re-hiring a Development Services Manager, a new Planning Technician Position is
50 created. This new position will increase the department's ability to process increased volume of applications, and shift job
51 duties to better match the team's strengths and the observed increase in front counter land use applications. Planner 1 is
52 proposed to move to Planner 2 as duties are shifted, there will be more advanced duties warranting the higher title. Please see
53 the following organization chart and budget implications of the proposed re-structuring. In addition to this re-structuring, it is

1 proposed to hire a consulting firm to assist the city with economic development activities. This would not be paid for out of
2 the general fund, but out of the RDA fund. Procurement policy requires an RFP (Request For Proposal) process where the
3 city will define the scope of duties and choose the consultant best suited for the City.

4 An additional staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained it is
5 proposed to hire a consulting firm to assist the city with economic development activities. The services would include a team
6 of professionals that specialize in attracting businesses to the city, assisting in formulating TIF incentives/loans/projects,
7 assembling graphics and information for use in RFI packages, providing guidance, and sharing established relationships in
8 the economic development world. The CED director and city manager would continue their efforts in economic development
9 in conjunction with the envisioned help of the consultants. It is not envisioned that the consultant would have a desk
10 workspace at city hall but would meet frequently with staff and remain in close contact as opportunities arise. This service
11 would not be paid for out of the general fund, but out of the RDA fund. The goal is to increase the amount of economic
12 development that the city could otherwise accomplish with just one director with time split between many job duties and
13 responsibilities. The consultants will increase the city's professionalism, improving the chances to land major retail, office,
14 and commercial users looking to locate in the city. This in turn, makes the city more resilient in increasing sales and property
15 tax revenue, providing employment opportunities for our residents, and additional shopping options as well. Procurement
16 policy requires an RFP (Request For Proposal) process where the city will define the scope of duties and choose the
17 consultant best suited for the city. Terms for the consultant would be limited, usually around one year. Contracts can be
18 extended or terminated based upon performance and re-evaluation to the needs of the city. Please find attached the annual
19 budget for the RDA. \$60,000 dollars has been added to the budget, which is estimated to be sufficient to attract the
20 aforementioned and desired services.

21 CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to summarize his
22 proposal for restructuring his Department. The Council also engaged in discussion regarding the components of the proposed
23 restructuring, with a focus on the creation of the Planning Technician position; the Council determine it appropriate to open
24 the position to the public rather than reclassifying an existing employee and moving that person into the new position. The
25 Council authorized Administration to proceed with hiring a second Permit Technician, given that position is already included
26 in the City's wage scale and a job description/wage has been developed for the position.

27 The Council then addressed questions to Mr. Steele regarding the manner in which the performance of an Economic
28 Development Consultant would be measured to determine whether the \$60,000 expenditure was warranted. This led to high
29 level philosophical discussion regarding the commercial development potential for the City. Mr. Steele indicated that while it
30 would not be appropriate to tie a consultant's success to the recruitment of one specific business, it is possible to include
31 performance indicators that are measurable. The Council engaged in discussion and debate regarding the proposal to hire an
32 economic development consultant, with a focus on the correlation between the City's General Plan and the work that would
33 be performed by a consultant. Councilmember Maughan expressed concern about allocation Redevelopment Agency (RDA)
34 funding to pay a consultant with no guarantee for the return on investment; he indicated he would prefer to spend that money
35 on a property improvement that could benefit a business in the City's Town Center. Councilmember Savage echoed the
36 concern and added it is also troubling that most consultants work for multiple cities and it would be difficult for the City to
37 ensure that the chosen consultant is providing adequate representation to Syracuse. Continued philosophical discussion and
38 debate regarding the proposal to hire a consultant continued, after which City Manager Bovero noted that the Council is not
39 being asked to make a decision tonight; rather, City Administration is looking for feedback from the body that would inform
40 the development of a request for proposals and subsequent contract if the Council is comfortable proceeding with the
41 proposal. Mr. Steele added that he does not want the Council to mistake this proposal as an affirmation that he is unable to
42 perform the economic development functions of his position; he indicated he can continue to do what the City has always
43 done and yield the same results, but he is making this proposal to improve the level of service in the City and improve the
44 City's economic development opportunities and viability. The Council ultimately concluded to direct staff to research
45 economic development consultant agreements in place in other cities to develop a draft request for proposal for Council
46 review at a future meeting.

Discussion/review of current Vision and Mission Statements for Syracuse City.

47
48
49 A staff memo from the City Manager explained this discussion item is a precursor to the special meeting that will be
50 held at a later date. At the September 25 work session meeting, we will determine if any of the statements need to be
51 modified based on the Council's vision. At the future special meeting, the Mayor and Administration will provide more
52

1 specific goals that will attempt to achieve the Council’s vision. The Council will then be able to discuss, clarify, and
2 ultimately adopt these goals.

3 Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding appropriate updates or
4 amendments to the City’s Vision and Mission Statements. The Council recommended edits to the 10-year City-wide vision
5 statements to reference future growth of the City rather than just the West Davis corridor project specifically. Relative to the
6 Fire/EMS vision statement, subitem four dealing with debt, was removed. In the Public Works/Utilities section, subitem one
7 was adjusted to communicate that utilities will be affordable, but will also cover the cost of providing utility service. In the
8 Parks and Recreation section of the document, language was added to communicate that the Community Center will be
9 equipped for multiple purpose and to host a variety of activities. Additionally, relative to Parks and Recreation, a statement
10 was added to reference the park improvement and maintenance plan. Mr. Bovero then indicated he will use the feedback
11 provided by the Council to make edits to the document, which will be presented to the Council in a future business meeting
12 for action.

13
14 **Discuss proposed timeline for considering updates to**
15 **the Syracuse City General Plan.**

16 Mayor Gailey stated he will be communicating to the Council in an email his plans to assemble a General Plan task
17 force consisting of 25 to 30 individuals; he would like for the group to begin meeting in January of 2019 and meet twice a
18 month through the end of March to develop proposals relative to the planning of the community through 2050. The group
19 will meet in work shop settings in order to maximize their time and efforts. He stated he will be sending a list of individuals
20 that he would like to include on the task force and he requested that the Council let him know if they have concerns about any
21 of the recommended individuals.

22
23 **Discussion regarding linear park project.**

24 A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City is contractually obligated to complete the linear park along
25 with the 2000 West project. The task force has been working on the concept plan and received direction from the Council at
26 the May 22, 2018 Council meeting. Since this property will be highly visible, the task force felt that it would be important to
27 create something that aesthetically pleasing and unique. Some of the primary goals were:

- 28 • Create a visual buffer between the road and the back of the homes.
- 29 • Establish a pattern of street trees for pedestrian shade and to create a boulevard feel.
- 30 • Provide a location for public art or entry signage.
- 31 • Make an ‘off road’ route for kids walking or riding their bikes to school that is more adventurous and
32 interesting than the sidewalk.

33 The memo concluded Councilmembers Maughan and Savage have asked to discuss this project at the Council
34 meeting.

35 Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and briefly reviewed the draft site plan for the project and oriented the Council
36 to the components included in the linear park. The Council revisited past discussions regarding the project and engaged in
37 debate regarding whether the design of the park provides safety to pedestrians, which will namely be students walking to and
38 from school in the area. The Council ultimately conclude they would like for City Administration to solicit bids for the
39 project that will provide a detailed breakdown of the cost of each component in order for the Council to determine whether
40 the current design and scope is appropriate. Councilmember Anderson added that she would like to receive feedback from the
41 Community Council’s from the schools in the area to determine whether they support the project.

42
43 **Public comments**

44 Nancy Ashby discussed the proposed development near the Trailside Subdivision; she feels that she and her
45 neighbors have been classified as a ‘bunch of complainers’, but she would like the Council to understand that they are
46 concerned about the potential impact of high-density development near her neighborhood and the entire community. She
47 asked the Council to consider an increase in traffic associated with the development, as well as other impacts. She stated that
48 she and her neighbors are not opposed to change, but they want it to be well thought out and something that will be beneficial
49 to the City. She provided the City Recorder with a written statement that has been signed by several residents of the Trailside
50 Subdivision.

51 Councilmember Savage asked Ms. Ashby what she would like to see as far as development of the raw ground near
52 the Trailside Subdivision. Ms. Ashby stated that she is very sad about the potential to lose the wetlands and the mature trees

1 in the area; however, with the knowledge that the property owner has the authority to develop their land, she would prefer a
2 55-and-older community with smaller homes and a fair amount of open space.

3 Gary Osterson stated he lives next door to Ms. Ashby and he echoed her comments; he emphasized the
4 neighborhood is interested in responsible development. He then stated he is seeking clarification regarding the potential
5 density of the development of the property and Mayor Gailey recommended that Mr. Osterson visit with Mr. Steele regarding
6 that issue.

7 Louis Hepworth stated that he also lives in the Trailside Subdivision and his greatest concern about the proposed
8 development is the increased traffic with the lack of adequate ingress/egress points for the project, which will lead the
9 residents to use 3000 South and that will result in the road functioning like a freeway through a homeowner's association
10 (HOA).

11 Ralph Vaughan thanked the Council for supporting Mayor Gailey's appointment of him to the Planning
12 Commission. He then referenced the agenda item related to the proposal to hire an economic development consultant and
13 stated that he supports the proposal because of the expertise that can be offered by a consultant. This will benefit the City by
14 way of recruitment of big-box retailers and job centers. The Council will also need to consider concessions packages that can
15 be offered to large businesses interested in locating in Syracuse. He used the Smith's Marketplace project in West Point City
16 and stated that West Point gave approximately \$3 million in tax increment financing and that city will not realize a return on
17 that investment for many years to come. He then addressed the item dealing with the vision and mission statements and asked
18 that the Council consider the vision statement to be their directive to City staff while the mission statement is something that
19 they should consider their charge for how to carry out their duties as Councilmembers.

20
21 **Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements**

22 The Council asked that a discussion item be added to a future meeting agenda to consider opportunities for various
23 entities to use City facilities and potentially receive a fee waiver for their activity.

24 Councilmember Savage announced that the deadline for the fundraising efforts for the sponsor wall at the Syracuse
25 Island project is October 31. The Council engaged in high level discussion regarding the various fundraising opportunities
26 for the Syracuse Island project and other park projects in the City as well as the effort needed to market vital projects to the
27 community.

28 Councilmember Peterson reported the Parks Advisory Committee met in their first meeting and committed to meet
29 twice a month for the remainder of the year to develop a draft Master Plan for City parks.

30
31
32 The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.
33
34
35

36 _____
37 Mike Gailey
38 Mayor

39 _____
Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: November 13, 2018