

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on April 26, 2022 at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 875 1728 9962, in-person in the City Council Conference Room at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Dave Maughan
Jordan Savage (participated via electronic means)
W. Seth Teague
Paul Watson

Excused: Councilmember Paul Watson

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
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; discuss transportation grant applications; discuss culinary water rates and drought response; discuss Parks Maintenance Facility construction bid; discuss the following planning items:

1. Recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 10.30.080 pertaining to buffer yards.
2. Recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 8.15.010(B) pertaining to design standards (fire turnarounds).
3. Application for General Plan Map Amendment for property located at approximately 1700 S. Banbury Drive.
4. Application for zone change for property located at approximately 2000 W. State Road (SR) 193, Agriculture (A-1) to Mixed-Use (MXD-H).
5. Application for zone change for property located at approximately 300 S. 1550 W., General Commercial (GC) to Mixed-Use (MXD).
6. Application for zone change for property located at approximately 2150 W. 350 S., Agriculture (A-1) to General Commercial (GC). (10 min.)
7. Request for Development Agreement Amendment, Monterey West Mixed-Use Development, located at approximately 1300 S. 1550 W.
8. Recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 10.92, Mixed-Use Development (MXD) Zone.
9. Consideration of referral to Planning Commission – Syracuse City Code amendment pertaining to water conservation/waterwise landscaping.
10. Discussion regarding option of establishing process to provide for pre-application consultation with City Council prior to filing zone change application.

Continued discussion of Syracuse City Recruitment and Retention Policy; and general budget discussion.

Public comments

Mayor Maughan invited in-person public comments.

Josh Hughes stated that he is aware there was a City budget meeting held a few weeks ago and there was some confusion as to whether one of his projects in the City, referred to as the Holt project, received any tax increment financing (TIF) from the City. He stated he wanted to make it clear that he has received no TIF for any component of the project, residential and commercial. He then noted that the project is nearly completed, and nine of the 10 units are under contract and will be open in June. He then stated that since the 2021 election, there has been a great deal of discussion about how to signal to the business community that Syracuse is ‘open for business’. There was some concern that the election would have a

chilling effect on businesses, and he feels that matters such as that listed under agenda item f.10 on tonight's agenda would further that problem by sending a message to the development community that Syracuse is not business friendly. He stated there are plenty of cities that have pre-application processes and developers view that as an opportunity for a City to scrutinize a project and discourage a developer from proceeding. Often the process even leads to implementation of a moratorium for certain types of land use. The policy is essentially not friendly and will impact property rights. He then stated that he has three items on tonight's agenda, and he hopes to have an opportunity to speak during discussion of those matters.

Lurlen Knight addressed the agenda item related to adjusting Mr. Hughe's MXD project to move the hotel to a different location than previously approved. He is concerned about the loss of sales tax revenue in the City in recent years and he feels that the corner of State Road 193 and 2000 West is one of the most viable commercial properties in the City. He does not believe a hotel is the best commercial use of that ground and he would rather it be pressed for a large box store. He stated that Syracuse was formerly a destination City, but that is no longer the case with projects like SR 193 and the future extension of the West Davis Corridor through. These roads will make it easier for businesses to attract customers from all directions. He hopes the City does not pass up an opportunity to maximize the commercial potential of that property because he does not feel there is another property like it in the City. He encouraged the Council to look to the future and determine the best uses that will benefit all residents. He concluded that when Wal-Mart located in Syracuse, it was a great surprise because there were other Wal-Mart stores in Clinton and Layton; however, they indicated that they were attracted to the City because of the clientele here. He thinks other businesses, such as Costco, can be attracted to the City for the same reason.

Mayor Maughan then stated that tonight's meeting agenda provided instructions for residents to email their public comments to City Recorder Brown by 5:00 p.m. tonight in order for them to be read into the record of the meeting. He invited Ms. Brown to read any emailed public comments she received.

Ms. Brown read the following public comments submitted via email:

"On February 8th the Syracuse City Council amended Title 11 Traffic Code to expressly prohibit the use of assisted breaking devices like engine breaks, jake breaks, and exhaust breaks. The complete prohibition of assisted breaking devices is a threat to public safety on the roadway. While the amendment does state that they can be used to avoid immediate danger, the reality is in some heavy vehicles (class A diesel motorhomes for example) the engine break switch is not located in an easily accessible location for quick action. In addition, when turning on a dynamic breaking device, there is a lag of a few seconds before the break engages. Both of these combined mean that in a situation to avoid immediate danger, the driver of a heavy vehicle will have several seconds delay before the assisted breaking starts, causing the danger to have not been avoided. I would like each of the city council members to drive a heavy vehicle in heavy traffic both with a dynamic breaking device disabled then with it enabled then re-evaluate the new code. Driving without a dynamic breaking device during periods of non-heavy traffic (10:00pm-6:00am) should remain as other traffic is the main cause of "immediate danger" to these heavy vehicles.

Aaron Williford
Syracuse City resident"

"Please move the hotel to the other location. Charles Olson"

"My name is Noah House and I live in the Monterey Estates Subdivision. I've followed this project through the first application process, and now am following it through again with the current version.

Last fall, our neighborhood started getting social media posts about the proposed project. Upon attending one of the planning commission meetings, I heard the question asked to the developer, "how do the residents feel about this project?". I set out to find that answer by conducting a neighborhood survey.

I received 78 responses out of approximately 192 homes. 93% of respondents didn't like the project, 84% said the hotel was an issue for them.

I had an opportunity to meet with the developer about that survey. During that meeting some ideas were presented, and the possibility of the hotel relocating was a result. The first alternative location looked at was along SR193 between 2000 W and the mortuary. I don't believe it was until much later that the west side of 2000 W and SR193 was an option.

I have seen comment that the reapplication is just a bait and switch. That the developer knew all along they were going to move the hotel. I have seen comment that the council should just say no in hopes the project will fail since the hotel is, or never was, feasible in its current location. I urge caution to that line of thinking because what logical business sense does that make? Why spend time and money applying in the first place or opposing a referendum? Perhaps one of you knows the answers to these questions, and if so, please share in these meetings.

But maybe a better question is, does it really matter?

Is the city not getting a better product by relocating it to a major intersection unencumbered by current development? An area that is in the master plan as "commercial". An area that the hotel can become an anchor and be full of food, shopping, and entertainment. Not by a school. Not by a mortuary.

I emphasis better, not ideal. There is still plenty of opinion that it doesn't belong on the edge of the city.

Doesn't the neighborhood stand to benefit? I think so. Maybe not with traffic, but in virtually every other objection to the current location. I'd argue traffic will be a problem no matter what. The proposed development to the west also has high density housing; it will also bring increased traffic. I think anything that ends up there will.

Let me be clear. Although I support the relocation of the hotel, I'm not advocating for more apartment buildings. I think after seeing the proposed hospital project that most anything would look nice there...a retail space or more small single-family homes. Apartments can work. Hotels do not.

If approved, I think the council will do a fine job negotiating what they'd like to see.

Some might object to the fact that the space along 1550 W could essentially become completely residential, with the accompanying commercial aspect almost a half mile away. I acknowledge this does not conform to the current mixed used ordinance. However, many, if not all, mixed use projects previously have been given broad latitude under the current ordinance. This project's first approval included.

I do appreciate the council and mayor's desire to get mixed used corrected in the future before any new projects are approved though. Increased expectations on what mixed used constitutes are vital going forward.

I quickly want to say, I am not pro high-density housing. When we moved to Syracuse three years ago, I never would have imagined apartments being built just down street. I fully understand, and share concern in, the lack of infrastructure and overburdened public services. I am shocked by the number of high-density, mixed used projects that have been approved in the past couple of years.

This project, however, is already approved. I have little confidence if the relocation is denied that the project will fail. I believe we will have a hotel built off 1550 W, which in my opinion, is worst case at this juncture.

I appreciate your time and service to city and look forward to your discussion on the matter."

"In reference to Agenda Item F.5: Proposed Rezone from GC to MXD located at approximately 300 S 1550 W
Members of the Syracuse City Council:

Like many, I am not surprised to hear the developer who previously proposed a hotel development at the above-referenced location is now requesting to change the land use code to allow apartment buildings at that site. While they might phrase it in such a manner, I don't believe the company is coming from a place of social responsibility. I believe they have come to the realization that apartments would be the more lucrative option for their business in that location.

I know I don't speak for all those involved in the referendum efforts a few months ago, but I don't want the community and people I spoke with to be misrepresented by the construction company. I knocked on over a hundred doors, and I can say with certainty that, while the hotel was certainly a hot button, most were more concerned with the adjacent high-density plans that went along with the proposed development. To allow them to add in more high-density housing is more a slap in the face to the community than it is a concession by the developers.

The argument for high-density is that we want our kids to be able to afford to live in Syracuse, but let's be honest. With overcrowded classrooms, inadequate roads, unkempt parks, and overburdened citizens, I don't know why my kids would even want to live here. We need to stop letting the developers treat this city like a money grab.

Please don't approve this change. Let it remain General Commercial, and let's put the burden on the developer to find a solution that makes sense and better serves the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Megan Meldrum"

"Dear City Council,

My name is Angela Stonebraker and I live on 1550 west in the Monterey Estates subdivision. To say I am disappointed in the progression of the Monterey West development is a horrific understatement; the thought of the project puts my stomach in knots, and I will once again highlight why in the following statements:

#1 Safety: 1550 west is either completely quiet, a drag racing strip, or a congested mess depending on the time of day you visit. I have lived on that street for almost five years and have almost been hit numerous times backing out of my driveway as people whip around the curve from 650 South. I have witnessed kids and adults alike almost get hit as they cross to the west side of 1550 West to get to their vehicle, as there is not even a school zone sign in that area, and we all know nobody goes the speed limit. With the addition of apartments, and therefore hundreds of vehicles taking a left from 300 south to access 193, you are looking at congesting and further endangering anyone driving on 1550 west. If one cannot take a left from the east side of 300 south (car wash side), they should not be able to take a left from the west side (mortuary side) either, yet that traffic pattern is absurd as most people will exit the apartment complex wanting to access 193 without driving around the block.

#2 Zoning- Considering the move of the hotel, I would love for someone to explain to me how a development consisting of only apartments and houses is considered MXD. The Syracuse City Zoning map was last updated March 2017, and still has the area to be developed zoned as Agriculture. The development of an apartment complex creates a development within itself, and restricts access of its amenities to paying tenants, therefor benefiting no

City Council Work Session
April 26, 2022

other part of Syracuse and the surrounding neighborhoods short of the tax revenue domino effect. We all know people work, shop and play within proximity, so those tax dollars will benefit surrounding cities too.

#3 Other reasons- are the apartments actually going to be affordable, or it that a whole other argument? Where is the inevitable influx of children going to attend school? With what water are people going to flush their toilets with while my lawn continues to die due to restricted watering and crappy water pressure? Are there future plans to integrate other road access for this development to either 2000 west or 193?

Build better Syracuse! We need more schools. Create more jobs with commercial development instead of cramming every square inch with people and cars.

Thanks for your time.

-Angela”

“There has been a lot of discussion in my neighborhood (Monterey Estates subdivision) about the Monterey West project. Most of my neighbors don’t love the idea of apartments there but are willing to let that go with all of the proposed improvements that have been made to the plans. Everyone is still concerned about the increased traffic. But I think some of the plan improvements should help decrease traffic.

But the second biggest concern is definitely the hotel. I don’t love the idea of a hotel being that close to my children’s elementary school. Sexual predators could stay at the hotel and watch the behavior of small children day after day before approaching them. The thought makes me sick to my stomach. There would also be a high school right around the corner. This could be a problem as students could easily sluff and meet up with an older boyfriend or girlfriend at the hotel. I have no problems with the apartments going in, single-family homes, or even restaurants or stores. But I don’t think the current location of the hotel is a great idea as it will be so close to two schools. Thank you for your time.

Allison Bockholt”

“Tuesday, April 26, 2022

Dear Syracuse City Council,

I am a resident of Monterey Estates and would ask for you to ultimately vote in favor of the zone change which would result in moving the hotel from the proposed Monterey West Development on 1550 S to the proposed location on 2000 W. I would also like to propose there be additional consideration and discussion as to what would be built in Monterey West in place of the hotel, should the hotel be voted to move.

Many residents of Monterey Estates and Syracuse City, (including the mayor, who headed the referendum), were concerned (among other things) about the perceived risks with a hotel being built so close to two schools and residential neighborhoods. Moving the hotel would help appease some of concerns regarding these perceived risks, and therefore it seems a better compromise between those for and against the hotel.

Furthermore, the developer has proposed two new apartment buildings be built in place of the hotel if the hotel moves. As a resident of Monterey Estates, I would hope for more discussion and consideration as to what would be built in place of the hotel. For example, there are currently 11 small, single-family homes along 1550 W frontage as part of the Monterey West proposal. The inclusion of these single-family homes is appreciated, as it helps as a small buffer between single family Monterey Estates homes and the apartments. Although these small, single-family homes are not as lucrative for the developer as apartments are, it would be beneficial for Monterey Estates residents to have these single-family homes to continue either all along or extending further along 1550 W frontage, with only one additional apartment building being added if the hotel location moves. Monterey Estates would like to preserve as much of a single-family neighborhood feel as possible, a small ask in exchange for all the apartments from Monterey West which will be towering over us shortly, and also considering the large residential piece from Wasatch’s proposed high density development going in just to the west. Although this is not the item which will be voted on per se, it could potentially be affected by the vote and I would appreciate this being a part of the discussion. See attached diagrams to see the extension of single-family homes along 1550 W frontage, both partially extended and fully extended. Additionally (or alternatively), might there be a small commercial piece that could be built if the hotel moves that could benefit both the developer and current and future residents? The right commercial piece could help alleviate traffic patterns from the apartment residents. Traffic concerns at this area on 1550 W are already existing, particularly in conjunction with pickup and drop-off routines from Syracuse Arts Academy) and will only increase with the addition of two more apartment buildings. There has already been much discussion in previous city council meetings about the current and future traffic concerns here, especially with the addition of apartments. More single-family homes and/or small commercial could potentially alleviate some of the traffic concerns.

Thank you for your consideration, particularly with voting in favor of the zone change which will result in the hotel moving to 2000 W.

Thank you,
Emily Finau



“Good evening city council members and Mayor Maughan,
My name is Christy Ormsbee, a proud Syracuse citizen. I encourage you, most strongly, to approve the 2000 W 193 development request as the new location plot for the already approved hotel.
As you know, this will move the hotel away from Syracuse Arts Academy - an elementary school.
As the location for the hotel currently stands, it poses a marked threat for the safety of the students and parents of the school: both in regard to traffic as well as potential predator hotel clients.
We’ve worked hard to have this hotel moved. Please do not ignore the requests of your constituents, as well as your common sense. Please approve the 2000 W 193 lot area for this hotel relocation.
Sincerely,
Christy Ormsbee”

“My name is Jeanne La Rue and I attended the planning commission meeting on April 19, 2022/ As a resident of Syracuse it was very embarrassing to see the commission proclaim " why are going over the item again when our Collective Wisdom has already made the decision. Just to appease a small group of citizens who disagreed with the hotel? Syracuse Arts Academy is not even a public school. Lack of respect for other people's thoughts and the dangers they envision to their children are not to be taken lightly.
MXD-H is not a zoning code on the books for the city of Syracuse. Yet it was going to be proposed for 53.649 acres located at 2000 W .and SR 193 FROM A-1 to MXD. When you are a Planning Commission you plan you do not make it up as you go.
Suggestion for a Big Box Store for that corner on SR 193 and 2000 W has been suggested. If you owned a Big Box Store, would you want to come to a city that does not plan and just try to put any code that is made up to fit your situation. Then it may or may not get passed.
Regardless of the issue to be discussed, respect for the appointment you have given deserves to be shown, As well as the views and opinions of the citizens of Syracuse.”

“To Mayor Maughan and the Syracuse city council members:
My name is Ken Ormsbee and I live with my family near Syracuse High School and the north Syracuse Arts Academy campus. I'd like to voice my opinion about the proposed hotel that is to be built in the empty lot near those schools and near the mortuary. First, I'm a little surprised that it is legal to build a hotel that near any school property. That aside, I know there will be wonderful people who occupy the hotel. There will also be potential criminals, drug dealers and sexual predators. In the interest of child safety please consider the proposed new area for this location, the 2000 w 193 area.
Thank you for your time and consideration
-Ken Ormsbee”

“I feel that there still needs to be a commercial component to the mixed-use zone. There are a lot of housing units that are going in there and I think having some sort of commercial component that would serve the residents would be best. Additional housing units in place of a hotel could also have a greater impact on traffic issues in that area. This is something that should be considered.
 -Kristoffer Larsen”

“I am writing because I don’t want the hotel. I also do not want more apartments. I want townhouses or single-family homes. I vote to keep the hotel just so that the developer cannot build more apartments. He suggested the hotel and was approved make him keep it. I don’t think it’s fair to cancel a hotel and get more apartments. The traffic is already bad. The city water source is struggling. This isn’t good for our city. But I wish there was a way to stop the whole thing.
 Valerie and mine Doucette”

Discussion regarding transportation grant applications.

Mayor Maughan explained the City has discussed various grant opportunities for specific transportation projects in the City; he has learned recently that some grants that the Council has previously discussed are awarded by the same granting agency and it would not be best for the City to apply for two grants from the same agency in the same year. He is asking that the Council provide their support for Administration to pursue a grant for the project to continue 2500 Wes to State Road 193 in advance of applying for trails funding. He would like to apply for both grants, but not in the same year.

The Council briefly discussed the scope and timing of the two projects; Councilmember Teague indicated that if the timeline of the 2500 West project may be delayed based upon land acquisition matters, he would be concerned about delaying the trails grant application as a result. Mayor Maughan indicated there are pending property acquisition discussions, but it is his understanding those matters have been addressed and the City will be able to move on the project as hopes. The Council ultimately indicated their willingness to support the grant application timeline proposed by the Mayor.

Councilmember Savage added that he would like for the City to explore other grant programs that could offer funding for both the 2500 West and trails project; he has advocated for a sub-committee that would be assigned to research grant opportunities and he would like permission to proceed with that. Mayor Maughan stated that he would like to discuss those issues in greater detail in a future meeting.

Continued discussion of culinary water rates and drought response.

Administrative Services Director Marshall explained City Administration has performed a comparison of current water rates with those of seven surrounding cities; they also reviewed business water usage data from March 22 to determine the impact that the proposed adjustments could have on those customers. Potential adjustments to the rate schedule as identified by the Council are outlined as follows:

Flat rate billing	Current rate	Increase	Total New proposed rate
Tier 1	20.49	0.35	20.84
Tier 2	20.49 + 1.04	1.04+.35+.35	22.23
Tier 3	currently doesn't exist but covered by tier 2 rate	Current extra 1000-gallon rate of \$3.24 plus the tier 2 increase of 1.74 (tier 2 total)	25.47

	rate increase per 1000	total increase if you use all 3000 gallons at this level	total bill if you use all 3K in this tier
High volume use			
9001-12000	4.66	13.98	39.45
12001-15000	5.36	16.08	55.53
15001-18000	6.16	18.48	74.01

18001-21000	8.14	24.42	98.43
21004-24000	9.36	28.08	126.51
24001-27000	10.77	32.31	158.82
27001-30000	12.38	37.14	195.96
30000 and up	14.24	per 1000 gallons over	

The estimated impact of this change on residential customers is roughly \$200,000 per year. This discussion focuses on the **business water rates** in the City; staff performed a comparison of the seven surrounding cities business water rates.

City	Base Fee	# of gallons in base	Additional Fee per 1000 gallons
Layton City	\$20.80	6,000	\$2.05 for commercial and \$2.28 for schools and churches
Clearfield City	\$22.56	-	\$1.14 for commercial
West Point City	\$23.75	6,000	\$1.40 per 1,000 up to 10,000, \$1.65 per 1,000 after 10k
Roy City	\$13.39	-	0.88/1,000 up to 9k, 1.58/1,000 next 6k, 1.81/1,000 next 5k, 2.08 / 1,000 after 20k
Kaysville	\$22.50	-	0.48/1,000 up to 3k, 0.69/1,000 next 3k, 1.00/1,000 next 3k, 2.25/ 1,000 after 9k
Clinton	\$21.50	10,000	\$2.15 for commercial
Farmington	\$19.40	5,000	\$2.30 for commercial
Average	\$20.56	3,857	
Syracuse City	\$20.49	10,000	2.00/1,000 from 10k to 20k, 2.40/ 1,000 from 20k to 40k, 3.00/1,000 above 40k

A couple of points to consider: first, the current structure is a base of 10k, level one is 10k to 30k, and level two is 30k to 40k, and level three is above 40k. Do you want to change this? Second, do you want to change the number of gallons in the base rate? Third, do you want to increase the rates of each level? If we changed our base to 5,000 gallons for commercial and increased all the tier levels by \$1.00, it would increase commercial water revenue by approximately \$33k per year.

The Council briefly discussed the potential impact that the culinary water rate adjustments could have on both residential and commercial customers; the Council communicated the intent of the adjustments are not to be punitive, but to encourage responsible water usage and conservation. They discussed the concept of reducing the base usage down to 4,000 gallons rather than 5,000 gallons but indicated they will wait to make a decision on that issue until the time they are voting on the matter. They directed staff to send a personal notification to all businesses in the City to communicate to them the matters that the Council will be considering relative to water rates; business owners are encouraged to provide their input regarding this matter. Mayor Maughan added that he would like to hold a public hearing on May 10, with the option of taking action on rate adjustments following that public hearing.

Discussion regarding Parks Maintenance Facility construction bid.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Director explained on February 11, 2022, requests for qualifications from qualified and licensed General Contractors to provide construction services for the new Syracuse City Parks Maintenance Facility were submitted by the following construction companies:

- Keller Construction
- North Ridge Construction
- VanCon, Inc

Following staff and JRCA Architects review of qualifications, all three (3) construction companies were asked to submit a construction bid for the Park Maintenance Facility. Bids were due on April 15th at 5:00 pm. Bids for the construction cost of the Parks Maintenance Facility were opened on April 18, 2022. Staff received bids from two (2) out of the three (3) construction companies.

- Keller Construction: Bid was not submitted
- North Ridge Construction: \$4,464,000.00
- Van Con, Inc: \$6,200,000.00

Council had previously approved a budget of 3.3 million, which included design and construction oversight. Possible funding sources for the project include capital funding and Park Impact Fee revenue. The following items outline the actions to be taken regarding this matter:

1. Discussion regarding the bids for the Park Maintenance Facility, and possible funding sources.
2. Staff is seeking direction from council on how to proceed.

Ms. Robinson and City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the reasons for the bid amount that exceeds the project estimate; the Council concluded it is necessary to proceed with the project as soon as possible to avoid additional cost overruns and that only minor adjustments to the design of the

building should be made as larger modifications would impact the usefulness of the facility. Mayor Maughan concluded the discussion by directing staff to solicit updated bid information for the project based on minor adjustments, and to schedule action to award the contract for the May 10 meeting.

Planning item: recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 10.30.080 pertaining to buffer yards.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the current version of our buffer ordinance does not require fencing for projects that are built adjacent to agricultural properties except for industrial projects. Most single-family homes will erect a 6' vinyl or wood privacy fence on their own merit. However, this fence is often incompatible with agriculture uses because of its fragile nature. Ditch burning, equipment kicking up small rocks, large animals leaning next to vinyl often damage the fence. Also at times, the resident doesn't install a fence or has a delayed install, this allows the new resident to trespass onto the farm where potentially dangerous situations exist. The buffer ordinance could be amended to require the developer to install a precast concrete fence or a metal chain link fence depending on the scenario which are both more durable options. The concrete fence is more appropriate with commercial, multifamily residential, or industrial projects. We have also seen a need to upgrade the fence requirement for when apartments are built next to single family homes which currently allows a vinyl privacy fence. See attached for the existing ordinance and a potential red line amendment that would correct the issue. On March 15, 2022, Planning Commission held a public hearing and voted to recommend to not amend the ordinance at this time because they felt that if a chain-link were required by the developer, the individual landowners would then build their own vinyl next to it, creating a place where debris would collect. They also felt that in the case a homeowner didn't build their own fence, the chain link was still scalable. Then finally, concerning the concrete fence installed between agriculture and new development, they felt that was excessive because the assumption that in most instances, the agriculture field would eventually develop, resulting in large concrete barriers between the same uses. There was one person from the public who commented and said that chain-link wasn't enough and thought the only way to buffer properly would be with a concrete fence. The lone dissenting vote wanted the concrete fence as well.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion of the Planning Commission's recommendation among the Council. Councilmember Carver stressed the importance of adequate fencing between residential and agricultural properties in order to safeguard children who may be curious about farm animals kept on agricultural property. The Council discussed this matter and debated whether fencing is needed and who should be responsible to erect a fence. They also discussed what type of fencing material is appropriate between residential and agricultural properties. Councilmember Carver asked for Council support to amend the ordinance to provide for the installation of chain link fencing between residential and agricultural properties. Councilmember Bingham agreed. Councilmembers Savage and Teague indicated they are comfortable with the Planning Commission's recommendation. Mayor Maughan stated the Council is split and he directed staff to include an action item on the May 10 agenda to allow for continued discussion and vote when the entire Council is present.

Planning item: Recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 8.15.010(B) pertaining to design standards (fire turnarounds).

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City's current ordinance dictates how to measure distances on dead end roads before a fire truck turnaround is required. Ordinance says to measure from the centerline of the road, but standard practice is to measure from front of curb or edge of pavement if there is no curb and gutter. See attached for the proposed amendment. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendment on April 5, 2022. They also held a public hearing, during which there were no comments. They are unanimously recommending approval.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo, after which the Council indicated they are comfortable proceeding to action on this item. Mayor Maughan directed staff to include an item on the consent calendar of the May 10 meeting to allow for action.

Planning item: Application for General Plan Map Amendment for property located at approximately 1700 S. Banbury Drive.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Erik Craythorn of Q-2 LLC has applied to amend approximately .91 acres of the General Plan Map from Commercial to High Density Residential designation. This would be contiguous with the already-general-planned high-density area to the east. It would also preserve approximately .62 acres of Q-2 LLC owned land on the corner for future commercial development. The High-Density Residential designation anticipates a future zoning of PRD among others. The applicant desires to build townhomes using

City Council Work Session
April 26, 2022

the PRD zoning on this site that would be part of the larger proposed PRD townhome development. See attached concept plan. The total acreage of the entire project is proposed to be approximately 9.45 acres. Given the location of the site on a state highway, within the town center overlay, and being within 1/4 mile to a bus stop, the site would qualify for 12 units per acre under the PRD zoning should the zoning be granted. The proposed plan is at about 10 units per acre with a proposed 102 townhome units. All of the proposed townhomes are 2 stories except for 16 three story units in three buildings. The three-story units are proposed to be located near Antelope and none are located adjacent to single family homes. The process for a General Plan map amendment is for Planning Commission to provide a recommendation to City Council and to hold a public hearing. Then City Council will make the final vote to approve or deny the request. If the applicant is successful with the General Plan, next steps would be to request the PRD zoning which requires a development agreement that sets the architecture and preliminary plans. On April 5, 2022, Planning Commission held a public hearing and voted to recommend approval of this item with a split four-three vote. There were many residents that expressed opposition to this and all of the other projects under construction. Concerns included traffic, growth, water, school capacity, etc. Planning Commission found that because the proposed General Plan amendment area did not have direct access or visibility from Antelope Drive, the commercial viability of the site was not good and therefore a two-story residential use would be the right fit.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Mayor, Council, and the applicant regarding the history of other applications for this property. They discussed the commercial viability of the property and pondered whether it may be wise to delay a zone change on the property to evaluate whether the highest and best use of the property may shift as surrounding properties are developed and population in the area increases.

Mayor Maughan indicated that the item can be included on the May 10 agenda for continued discussion and action.

Planning item: Application for zone change for property located at approximately 2000 W. State Road (SR) 193, Agriculture (A-1) to Mixed-Use (MXD-H).

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City has received an application from HCA/Mountainstar Healthcare to rezone 53 acres to the MXD-H zone which does not currently exist in the city ordinances. The original application was received on 11-04-21 petitioning the normal MXD zoning, which was prior to the resolution by city council requesting to not accept new MXD applications while amending the ordinance. The proposal includes basically three components. About 50% of the site is proposed to be dedicated to the hospital campus and medical uses. About 12% would be dedicated to commercial retail shops and restaurants, and the remaining approximately 38% of the site would be multi-family residential. The project would be built in phases over the next several years with the first phase most likely to be the commercial and multi-family components. The medical side consists of a free-standing emergency department, five story hospital with approximately 120 beds, two four-story medical office buildings of approximately 80,000 sf each. The residential side is proposed to have 120 rental units in five three-story stacked flat buildings with 24 units per building, 180 units rental townhomes in 30 2-story townhomes with 6 units per building. The residential side comes to about 15 units per acre. The residential side is also proposed to have a clubhouse, pool, playground, and other amenities. The commercial component is proposed to have five buildings, three of which with drive through windows. The combined approximate commercial square footage is 17,340 square feet.

The developer is proposing to create a new zone custom for this project called the MXD-H zone created through a development agreement. This zone essentially removes many of the architectural and site planning requirements from the project that were problematic for the hospital due to their requested large setbacks, parking lots, and buildings since the MXD zone was designed to build a historic looking vertical mixed-use development. The new zone would also relieve the residential side from many of the requirements deemed undesirable by the apartment developers. The development agreement associated with the zone asks for the city to pay for 450 S. Staff has reviewed the provided plans for compliance with the existing MXD ordinance and has found several items of non-compliance. See included staff review. Planning Commission and City Council need to decide the proper regulatory course to entitle the project as many of the staff comments are applicable only to the existing ordinances. The Planning Commission reviewed and debated this item at length during their meeting on April 19, 2022. A public hearing was held during which no public comment was received. The Commission voted to recommend approval of the rezone/zone creation with a vote of 6-1. The dissenting vote expressed concern over creating a new zone just for this project and preferred the use of existing more established zones. The majority vote expressed support for the project and the positive economic impact it will have for the city. Since this item will be presented during the City Council Work Meeting, no voting will occur. The goal of this discussion is to decide if the item is ready to be placed on the May 10 meeting for a vote or if it should be placed on the next work meeting for additional discussion on May 24.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo.

Council discussion of the application centered on concerns about the creation of a new zone (MXD-H), particularly since it is only applicable to one project rather than being fluid for other properties throughout the City. They debated the concept of creating a new zone versus utilizing a project specific development agreement to accomplish some of the same deliverables of a zone.

A representative of HCA/Mountainstar Healthcare approached the Council to summarize the reason behind their application for the creation of a new zone; this came from the process of meeting with City staff regarding options for accomplishing the desired project. He stated he does not believe that it is a new zone; rather, it is a 'sub-zone' of the MXD zone and HCA would still enter into a development agreement to govern the project. It was easier to try to develop new standards for the hospital use in the project rather than try to fit into the current MXD zone. Mayor Maughan argued that the hospital use could fit under the commercial component of the MXD zone. Councilmember Savage stated that he feels the commercial regulations are too limiting to allow some of the types of businesses that the community desires. He stated that the Council is currently updating the MXD zoning ordinance, and it is possible that this project may fit within the MXD once those updates are approved. This led to general discussion regarding the timeline for consideration of MXD ordinance amendments and whether that timeline would be problematic for this applicant. Mayor Maughan stated he feels the project, as proposed, would be approved by the Council with an appropriate development agreement accompanying it. He asked if the applicant has any issues with the manner in which the Council decides to administer this project, whether it be via adjustments to the existing MXD ordinance and a development agreement for the project or creation of a new sub-zone of the MXD zone. The applicant's representative indicated that his only concern is timing; he is seeking approvals in order to allow the project to move forward as soon as possible. He added he understands that the City is revamping the existing MXD zone and that he is the only applicant whose application should be considered under the existing zoning ordinance. Mr. Steele summarized the options before the Council and applicant: approving a new sub-zone (MXD-H) or using a development agreement along with the existing MXD zoning ordinance to approve the project. Mayor Maughan stated he supports the option that provides the most transparency and opportunity for public input.

Council discussion then shifted to the draft development agreement for the project; Councilmember Savage referred to Section 6.4 of the development agreement which reads: "the Regional Public Road is considered a System Improvement and the City shall reimburse Developer for the value of the land and the cost of the Regional Public Road by providing Developer with impact fee credits pursuant to Section 13.55.140(A)(4) of the City Code." He stated he has never seen a provision like this in a development agreement and he asked why it is appropriate for this project. Councilmember Teague stated it is his understanding that the road is needed for City purposes and the developer would not be building it to serve their project if the City were not requiring it. Councilmember Savage stated that the road will service the project, and, at most, the City should participate in the cost of the project rather than fully fund it. Mr. Steele stated that if the City is asking for an upgrade to a road above and beyond what is called for in the City's transportation plan, the City would pay for the difference in cost. However, the applicant is asking the City to pay for the land and the improvement of the land to a road. This led to discussion and debate among the Council regarding opportunities for negotiating with the applicant regarding the construction of the road and possible land trade to build a new Fire Station near the hospital. Mayor Maughan indicated those discussions can continue outside of this meeting and additional information will be presented to the Council during their May 10 meeting, during which a vote can be taken on this application.

Planning item(s): Application for zone change for property located at approximately 300 S. 1550 W., General Commercial (GC) to Mixed-Use (MXD); and Application for zone change for property located at approximately 2150 W. 350 S., Agriculture (A-1) to General Commercial (GC); and Request for Development Agreement Amendment, Monterey West Mixed-Use Development, located at approximately 1300 S. 1550 W.

Staff memos from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided summary information regarding each of the three applications; for the first application, Josh Hughes of Twenty-Five Eight Development LLC has applied to amend the zoning map from GC to MXD on approximately 1.5 acres. The applicant has recently purchased the property from Ninigret Construction Company North LLC. The MXD/GC zoning was granted as part of the 'Monterey West MXD' project approved on 11/09/21. During the public hearings for the original project's zoning amendment, there was some discussion about relocating the hotel offsite to create more distance between the school and the hotel. The original location discussed was to move the hotel about 600 feet or about 1/8 mile to the west also on 300 S. The proposed site for the hotel has since shifted to a new site further west located on the southwest corner of 2000 W and 193. The new location is approximately 2,400 ft away or about a half mile and separated by 2000 W. The new site is owned by Wright Development Group. Relocating the commercial aspect of an MXD project is anticipated in the ordinance language but with some conditions. Ordinance 10.92.040 says the partner site must be within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. It also says 'City Council, with recommendation from Planning Commission, must find a direct benefit between the proposed residential units and the commercial project to exercise this option. The intent of the MXD ordinance is to create a neighborhood where residents can 'work, play, shop, and live that are strategically designed to create a symbiotic relationship'. It also says that the agreed-to enhancements to the partner site in this option must be completed before the first residential unit receives final occupancy. Then finally, it says that the details of the partnership obligations are to be included in the development agreement. The development agreement does anticipate the hotel relocation and the agreement has been included in this

report. Assuming the new hotel site is approved by the city, the applicant is proposing to place two more 24-unit buildings on the land previously occupied by the hotel. Since the land is zoned GC and apartment buildings are not a permitted use in the GC zone, an amendment to the zoning map would be necessary to permit the proposed change. See attached for the approved layout with the hotel and also the proposed alternate layout with the apartment buildings instead of the hotel. The Planning Commission reviewed this item and conducted a public hearing on April 19, 2022; the neighbors participated and showed support for the relocation. After much debate and consideration, the Commission voted to forward a recommendation for approval with a split vote of for to three.

For the second application, Josh Hughes of Twenty-Five Eight Development LLC has applied to amend the zoning map from A1 to GC on approximately 2.97 acres. The property is currently owned by Wright Development Group. The MXD/GC zoning for the associated 'Monterey West MXD' project was approved on 11/09/21. During the public hearings for the original project's zoning amendment, there was some discussion about relocating the hotel offsite to create more distance between the school and the hotel. The original location discussed was to move the hotel about 600 feet or about 1/8 mile to the west also on 300 S. The proposed site for the hotel has since shifted to a new site further west located on the southwest corner of 2000 W and 193. The new location is approximately 2,400 ft away or about a half mile and separated by 2000 W. Relocating the commercial aspect of an MXD project is anticipated in the ordinance language but with some conditions. Ordinance 10.92.040 says the partner site must be within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. It also says ' City Council, with recommendation from Planning Commission, must find a direct benefit between the proposed residential units and the commercial project to exercise this option. The intent of the MXD ordinance is to create a neighborhood where residents can 'work, play, shop, and live that are strategically designed to create a symbiotic relationship'. It also says that the agreed-to enhancements to the partner site in this option must be completed before the first residential unit receives final occupancy. Then finally, it says that the details of the partnership obligations are to be included in the development agreement. The development agreement does anticipate the hotel relocation and the agreement has been included in this report. The hotel component of the 'Monterey MXD' is proposed to move to this site. See attached a rough site plan for how the hotel would be situated on the site. Also see attached for additional maps and information. The Planning Commission reviewed this item and held a public hearing on April 19, 2022. One gentleman expressed concern over the new hotel location at a prime retail corner. After much debate and consideration, the Commission voted to forward a recommendation for approval with a split vote of four to three.

For the third application, Josh Hughes of Twenty-Five Eight Development LLC has requested to amend the development agreement for the Monterey West MXD project located approximately 1300 S 1550 W. The project and associated development agreement (DA) was approved by City Council on 11/09/21. The reason for amending the DA is to relocate the proposed hotel off-site and place two more apartment buildings in the vacated spot. See attached for the proposed amendment language. In summary these are the main points of the applicant's proposed amendment:

1. Changes the developer's name on the project to a new joint partnership of 'WDG 25-8 Monterey West, LLC' which appears to be a partnership between WDG (Wright Development Group) and 25-8 (Josh Hughes)
2. Adds the new proposed hotel site to the project acreage
3. Increases the permitted development units from 153 to 201. 48 apartment unit increase in two buildings.
4. Relieves themselves of having to bring in a hotel of at least 30,000 and instead to bring a hotel with the site to be determined by a market study.
5. With the currently approved hotel plan there were 397 stalls. With the new apartment plan there are 378 proposed stalls. MXD code requires 2 per unit so 400 required stalls. This is short 22 stalls. The proposed language says that this would be acceptable.
6. Let's them build a hotel brand's prototype design without having to meet city architectural standards. Which usually means lesser quality, more stucco, bright branding colors.
7. Changes the requirement for when the hotel has to be built from the 6th residential building to the 8th (last building). MXD ordinance says that the developer has to build the off-site commercial items before the residential, which the proposed amendment would allow the hotel to be built only before the last residential building.
8. Deletes the original agreement's language about the anticipated alternative hotel site. The talks at the time were referencing a site within 1/4 mile that is part of the proposed Hospital MXD. Apparently, this site didn't work out or they wouldn't sell etc. Now the proposed amendment would authorize a new location 1/2 mile away. However, the MXD ordinance says that when moving the hotel off-site, it has to be within 1/4 mile.
9. Delete's the hotel architectural theme exhibit. This would make it so they could build any style of hotel they wanted. It would also make it so the city doesn't know what kinds of amenities the hotel would be providing. The original plan the developer provided included an indoor swimming pool, patio, fitness center, community eating area, lobby, and business center. These amenities would not be guaranteed with these changes.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item on April 19, 2022 and also held a public hearing. There was one public comment asking not to move the hotel because it may limit future big box commercial. The Commission voted to forward a recommendation for conditional approval with the vote of 6-1. The conditions were that they were not ok with number 5 above concerning parking, and neither were they ok with the part of number 9 above concerning the amenities.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Mayor, Council, and Mr. Hughes regarding the options before the Council tonight. Mr. Hughes stated that in his mind there are just three options. Option one would be to make no changes to the project and allow it to proceed as approved in the fall of 2021; option two is to move the hotel to the west across 2000 West, which would require the purchase of three additional acres and the applicant is seeking to include apartments in the project to help him recoup the cost of purchasing that additional land; option three is to remove the hotel from the project. Mr. Hughes stated that he is not supportive of options three through seven that were included in the staff report. He concluded that he is disappointed that these applications are being referred to as a 'bait and switch' given that he is only pursuing the adjustments to try to appease the neighbors who have expressed a great deal of concern, specifically those that sponsored a referendum against the project last year.

Council discussion and debate centered on the proposed location of the hotel; the size and number of rooms in the hotel; traffic associated with both the hotel and apartment units requested by the applicant; other potential hotel options for the City to consider; the potential for additional commercial uses to be included in the project or on surrounding properties. The Council concluded they are comfortable moving the hotel to a new site. They also hesitantly offered support the request for apartments. Finally, regarding the request to amend the development agreement, the Council indicated that the 30,000 square foot requirement for the hotel should remain in place. Commercial standards will be upheld until the City has a specific design request for the hotel. And that construction of residential and commercial uses in the project will be tied to one another in a way that allows the developer to secure financing for the project.

Mayor Maughan indicated that additional discussion can take place during the May 10 meeting, after which a vote can be taken on all three applications.

Planning item: Recommendation from Planning Commission to amend Syracuse City Code Section 10.92, Mixed-Use Development (MXD) Zone.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the Council has expressed a desire to amend various elements deemed problematic with the MXD zone. Also, the City received an application by the Hospital MXD developer to amend the ordinance, albeit in a narrower scope. Although, the applicant has since requested that the hospital related amendments to be rolled into a new zone altogether, called the MXD -H zone. That decision will be related to the rezone request for the Hospital MXD, and the proposed changes remain regardless of what occurs with the separate Hospital MXD item. Council and Planning Commission has been discussing both the requested changes and the more encompassing changes for a few months now. Ordinance amendments are legislative matters that only the City Council can approve. However, the Planning Commission plays an important role in reviewing land use related ordinances and providing recommendations to Council. Planning Commission also holds public hearings to receive input from the public. Once a recommendation from Planning Commission is forwarded to Council, the item is voted on and approved or denied by ordinance.

The memo summarized the history of the matter:

- On February 22, 2022 City Council inconclusively discussed the following potential amendments: remove the picture from the ordinance, adjusting the commercial to residential ratio, removing the partner site option, restricting the zone to be located along state highways, tightening the distance for in-lieu open space fee receiving sites, increasing the buffer landscaping requirements, ensuring proper long-term maintenance, and adding water wise landscaping requirements.
- On March 22, 2022 City Council again discussed the zone amendment. They would like to increase the required ratio of commercial to residential. They would also like to look at adjusting the requirements for the partner site.
- On April 5, 2022, the Planning Commission discussed some specific changes to the ordinance and directed staff to place the changes on the next meeting for a recommending vote.
- On April 19, 2022, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the text amendment. No public commented on the item.

The current version of proposed MXD ordinance amendments includes the adjustments requested by the Council over the past several months.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a review of the proposed ordinance amendments; the Council suggested additional adjustments, some of which varied from the recommendations from the Planning Commission. Mr. Steele stated the feedback from the Council will be incorporated into the final version of the document, which can be presented to the Council for action during the May 10 meeting.

Planning item: Consideration of referral to Planning Commission – Syracuse City Code amendment pertaining to water conservation/waterwise landscaping.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that with a goal of qualifying our residents for a waterwise landscaping conversion incentive program sponsored by the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, and to of course be good stewards of our limited water supply, we have conducted a review of our existing landscaping requirements. These amendments would:

- Prohibit lawn in park strips.
- Limit lawn in yards by percentage. 35% max in SF. 15% in Commercial.
- Prohibits lawn in buffer areas.
- Require drip irrigation in areas less than 8 feet wide.
- Require smart irrigation controllers.
- Prevents HOA's from conflicting with our landscape ordinances.

The text amendments would reduce water use for existing and new development and address some if not most of the items the district has recommended. The goal of this discussion is to decide if these potential text amendments are palatable and decide to either to send them to Planning Commission for recommendation or send to another work session for more discussion.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and engaged in discussion with the Council regarding implications of the proposed ordinance amendments; there was a focus on whether to require any plants/grasses on residential lots, the difficulty in legislating ‘beauty’ in landscaping, and the importance of only including regulations in the ordinance that are enforceable. He indicated he will utilize the feedback provided by the Council to adjust the ordinance amendments in preparation for a vote on May 10.

Planning item: Discussion regarding option of establishing process to provide for pre-application consultation with City Council prior to filing zone change application

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained design is a lengthy and expensive process. And those proposing land uses in the City might be reluctant to put forward land use ordinance amendments such as a zone map change without first taking the Council’s temperature. This is particularly true of zoning designations that require substantial detail with their initial land use application, such as the RPC, MXD and PRD zones. A common practice in Utah involves meeting with individual or non-quorum groups of councilmembers to solicit input. This opens up the councilmembers to accusations from the public, or sometimes miscommunication or contradictory statements by parties. It is proposed that the council provide an avenue for a developer who is considering a project for which it will be seeking legislative approval of a zone change. Potential ordinance language is attached. The application for consultation with the council would be provided as a matter of right to the applicant. The process would be informal, staff review, and involvement would be minimal, and the councilmembers’ input would be non-vesting. The benefits of providing this avenue for those who wish to take it include: the applicant presenting the same information to all councilmembers; the emphasis of important points of development early in the process, which allows the applicant to save expenses of re-engineering or re-design; early input for non-desirable projects may dissuade controversial projects from being officially proposed; and some protection by councilmembers from accusations of improper behavior or of stating things about a project off-the-record. The proposed ordinance contemplates putting the applicant on a work session agenda, where the council can discuss the possible development and provide some initial, non-binding direction to the applicant. It would be a new section of the Zoning Code and would need to be run through the planning commission before final adoption. Additional considerations for this ordinance include:

- Does the City assess a fee for this consultation, and if so, how much?
- What level of detail is acceptable? We need not establish any specific requirements, which would provide flexibility. It would permit an individual to approach the council with a simple concept and no drawings. And some applicants might prefer to know what is important to the council, as far as we can predict it.
- Should the City require this process for those zones that require up-front development agreements and substantial pre-application design (RPC, PRD, MXD, Cluster)?
- Should this process be limited to only those zones that require the development agreement and pre-application design work?
- Does the Council want to put parameters in place for the review – such as a requirement that it be put on an agenda within a certain number of days or the amount of time that will be allotted to the application in council meeting?

The memo concluded the purpose of this agenda item is to discuss whether the additional process would be valuable and, if so, to determine whether to direct staff to make any changes to the zone text in preparation for a voting meeting.

City Attorney Roberts reviewed the staff memo and engaged in discussion with the Council regarding the purpose for format of this conceptual process; the Mayor stressed that the process is voluntary and not a requirement for developers, but if developers are interested in learning the feelings of the Governing Body before spending money to file a formal application or proceed with design work, it would be beneficial to them. Councilmembers Bingham and Teague expressed concern that the purpose of this process is to stop developers from having conversations with individual Councilmembers. Councilmember Bingham stated she will only support the process if it is clear that pre-application consultation is an optional and voluntary process. Councilmember Teague agreed and noted that of greatest concern to him was the language in the staff memo that indicated that this process would eliminate accusations from the public about improper actions being taken by Councilmembers. He stated he wants to be clear that accusations are a result of votes taken and decisions made by the Council rather than any individual conversation that any Councilmember has had with an applicant. He stated that approval of the process will not dissuade him from having a conversation with a developer because he has never talked about something that he would not be comfortable discussing in a public setting.

Councilmember Savage asked if the Mayor would allow. Mr. Hughes to expound on why he feels that this policy would be viewed as being unfriendly to business or developers. Mayor Maughan declined to provide Mr. Hughes the opportunity to provide input. He stated that the policy will not stop any Councilmember from having conversations with anyone and that was not the intent; however, it will preclude the City from arranging meetings between two Councilmembers and a developer to discuss a project. Councilmember Bingham stated that the City may not set up such a meeting, but two Councilmembers will still have the ability to meet with any person they choose. Mayor Maughan stated he feels that would be a display of poor integrity. Councilmember Bingham stated that was her assumption of the intent of the policy; the intention was for this process to replace personal conversations and to communicate to the public that any two members of the Council that choose to meet with a developer outside of a public meeting have poor integrity. Councilmember Carver stated that while she would not choose to meet with a developer or business outside of a public meeting, she does not believe that someone who would has low integrity or poor moral character. Councilmember Savage agreed and indicated that it is the job of an elected official to talk with someone who is proposing a project that may impact the future of the City and he does not want to legislate that responsibility away. He reiterated he is comfortable with the policy so long as it is voluntary and optional.

Recruitment and retention policy, continued discussion.

A memo from the City Manager summarized changes to the policy document since the Council's last review and discussion:

- **Level of Compensation:** The new draft sets the compensation level for beginning positions at the same level of all others, which is the average of the top three. The previous draft had those positions as equal to the top paying city.
- **Reference for Pro-Rated Merit Increases:** Annual merit increases would be pro-rated for employees hired within the year, consistent with the current policy. This change just references the employee policy manual.

Mr. Bovero reviewed the memo.

Councilmember Carver wondered if there is the potential to create compression or larger wage gaps associated with the City's policy regarding merit increases. The Council discussed the formula for determining an individual employee's annual merit increase, indicating they are not concerned with the current policy, and they provided Mr. Bovero with direction to include an action item on the consent calendar of the May 10 agenda to consider adopting the updated policy.

General budget discussion.

Mayor Maughan indicated that City Administration is still finalizing information to be included in the tentative budget for the next FY; he asked if any Councilmember had questions regarding any outstanding budget item. There was brief discussion about costs associated with staffing adjustments throughout the City; namely, City Manager Bovero referenced the creation of a new part-time passport agent position that was discussed during the budget retreat. He asked that the Council authorize the City to advertise the position once the operating budget is approved given that the funding for the position is not related to the proposed tax increase. The Council offered their support for this proposal. Mr. Bovero then noted that the other staffing issue relates to reducing the current seasonal budget for parks maintenance workers in order to hire full-time employees; this is also a budget neutral issue and he asked that the Council authorize the City to advertise those positions immediately. The Council also offered support for this proposal. Mr. Bovero noted an additional issue relates to a third Police Officer position, only if two others are funded; this will require funding from the proposed tax increase. However, this means the third Police Officer would not be hired until after the Police Academy session concludes in August and would not be able to enter the Academy until January; this would put at risk the City's participation with metro-swat in FY2023. He has asked the Police Chief to investigate options for addressing the issue and this led to high level discussion among the Council regarding options for addressing the problematic nature of the staffing scenario. Mr. Bovero asked that the Council be prepared to continue the discussion about this issue in the coming meetings.

City Council Work Session
April 26, 2022

The meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Dave Maughan
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: June 14, 2022