

ATTN: MARSHA

CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2015, AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER AND CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

Meetings of the City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Blaine Lutz, Centerville Finance Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. This agenda is also posted on the City's Website: www.centervilleut.net and on NovusAgenda at the following link: <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>

Tentative Time: (The times shown below are tentative and are subject to change during the meeting)

- 7:00 A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL
 B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
 C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT – Commissioner Cheylynn Hayman
 D. MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE – June 24, 2015
 E. COMMISSION BUSINESS
- 7:10 1. PUBLIC HEARING | TRUMP RESIDENTIAL LOT | 540 SOUTH 400 WEST
 Consider proposed Final Site Plan for an unplatted residential building lot on property located at 540 South 400 West, for the purpose of constructing a new dwelling. Scott & Susan Trump, Applicants
- 7:30 2. WORK SESSION | SMSC PLAN & PUBLIC COMMENTS REVIEW
 City Council and Planning Commission will discuss the South Main Street Corridor Plan and review all the public comments received from various meetings
- 8:30 3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT
 a. Upcoming Meetings
 • *PC Meeting July 22, 2015: Porter Lane Townhomes CUP and Final Site Plan, Youngblood Storage Conceptual Site Plan*
- 8:35 F. ADJOURNMENT

Posted July 2, 2015 by Community Development



PRELIMINARY DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cheylynn Hayman
David P. Hirschi, Chair
Gina Hirst
William Ince
Logan Johnson
Scott Kjar
Kevin Merrill, Vice Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director
Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

VISITORS

Patrick Scott, Brighton Development Utah, LLC
Taylor Spendlove, Brighton Development Utah, LLC
Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

OPENING COMMENT/PRAYER Commissioner Hirst

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the June 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Chair Hirschi and Commissioner Johnson requested changes. Commissioner Ince made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

PUBLIC HEARING – PORTER LANE TOWNHOMES, 564 WEST PORTER LANE

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, explained the application for Conceptual Site Plan for the Porter Lane Townhomes, on property located at 564 West Porter Lane (the Hafoka property), and clarified that Brighton Homes has withdrawn the application for rezone to Residential-High (R-H) and decided to proceed with the existing Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone. The previous rezone to R-M was considered by both the Planning Commission and the City Council based on whether R-M was appropriate for that property under the City's General Plan. Brighton Homes has chosen to move in a different direction from the initial assisted living center idea, and has submitted an application for a multi-family residential development. Mr. Snyder suggested that the proposed 48-unit townhome community, with one existing single-family dwelling, would be comparable visually to the Florentine Townhomes development south of Walmart. Two applications have been submitted – the Conceptual Site Plan, and a Conditional Use Permit to allow the density of 8 units per acre in the R-M Zone. Multi-family is a permitted use in the R-M zone.

1 Mr. Snyder pointed out concerns regarding parking and street width within the proposed
2 development as they relate to emergency vehicle access on the private road, and a concern
3 regarding how refuse collection would be accommodated. Mr. Snyder stated that, generally, it
4 is very likely that Brighton Homes will be able to meet the R-M standard for a multi-family
5 development, and said that, from a planning perspective, it would be feasible to move on to the
6 next step with the Conceptual Site Plan. However, Mr. Snyder said staff does not recommend
7 approval of the Conditional Use Permit until more details are provided. More information
8 regarding drainage of the property and traffic impact of the proposed development is needed.
9 He said the Frontage Road certainly has capacity for more traffic, but 400 West would tap out
10 quickly. Fire hydrant flow and location needs to be addressed, as well as additional parking and
11 circulation.

12
13 Mr. Snyder explained the concept of pocket parking. Commissioner Merrill pointed out
14 maintenance difficulties with pocket parking, and asked if the street width could be increased
15 from 24 feet to 29 feet to allow parking on one side. Commissioner Ince asked for clarification
16 regarding acreage and landscaping, and Mr. Snyder responded that the Conceptual Site Plan
17 appears to include enough landscaping that some of the space could be used for additional
18 parking. Commissioner Hirst asked if the wetland area would be usable by the community. Mr.
19 Snyder responded that the space is considered drainage easement to capture rainfall, not
20 wetland. Mr. Snyder explained that hydrants are in place along Porter Lane, the question is
21 whether the developer will choose a hydrant system on the private streets, or sprinkler systems
22 in the units. Commissioner Hayman asked what would be included in a traffic study, and who
23 would pay for the study. Mr. Snyder responded that City ordinances allow the Planning
24 Commission to require a traffic study at the developer's expense. A second opinion, if desired,
25 would be done at the cost of the City. A traffic study would determine flow and congestion
26 patterns, and recommend mitigation for unacceptable congestion levels. Commissioner
27 Hayman stated she would presume that traffic would be going east to the schools. Mr. Snyder
28 stated that the School District could be asked to weigh in regarding capacity and whether
29 students in the development would be bussed.

30
31 Patrick Scott with Brighton Homes explained that the existing home would remain a
32 single-family residence, with the addition of 48 townhome units on the property. No street
33 parking is planned, and Brighton has added 18 more parking stalls based on experience with
34 other developments. The Site Plan includes a total of 4.3 parking spaces per unit (2.3 guest
35 stalls per unit), which Mr. Scott said Brighton Homes has found more than sufficient, with the
36 exception of occasional large family gatherings, which do require more parking. Mr. Scott said
37 they have changed the Plan to include corner units with master suites on the main floor, which
38 will provide more resident diversity. The units all have 3-4 bedrooms, 2-car garages, and 1600-
39 2100 square feet, with no basements. The development includes 44% open space and 7.95
40 units per acre. Mr. Scott said the proposed development will be for-sale housing that he feels
41 will bring permanency to the neighborhood. There are no wetlands within the property. The
42 property includes an Army Corps of Engineers drainage easement that can be manicured, and
43 Mr. Scott said that, although the existing home may seem a little out of place, it is not
44 uncommon for development to occur around existing structures. He said he feels the
45 development design integrates the home into the community.

46
47 Mr. Scott stated several traffic engineers have indicated that a traffic study is not usually
48 needed if a development includes fewer than 50 units. He said he believes the roads have
49 capacity, considering that highest traffic counts occur during commuter hours, and he feels
50 commuter traffic is savvy at finding the quickest access. The Frontage Road provides access to
51 I-15 without going through the 400 West intersection. Mr. Scott suggested that the proposed
52 development would include more commuting professionals than families. Sidewalk is already in

1 place on Porter Lane between Frontage Road and 400 West, and fire access will be addressed
2 with the Final Site Plan. He said he does not feel emergency access should have bearing on
3 the Conditional Use application, since the Conditional Use Permit is density based. He said he
4 also feels that drainage is more of a Final Site Plan issue. Mr. Scott stated that, from a
5 developer standpoint, Conditional Use is an approved use unless substantial negative impact to
6 the community is found.

7
8 Commissioner Hayman pointed out that the additional 18 parking stalls are all on the
9 east side of the development. Mr. Scott responded that some additional spots are on the west
10 side. The overflow parking is intended to handle large-scale events. The two driveway stalls
11 per unit will provide short-term visitor parking for the units. Commissioner Johnson stated he
12 thinks the design for open space could be improved, and changing the design may help with the
13 location of additional parking. Mr. Scott said he feels it makes sense to have a majority of the
14 open space within the drainage area. The open space on the south side provides a buffer from
15 Porter Lane. Commissioner Hayman pointed out that the concern with the 24-foot street width
16 has to do with emergency vehicle access, not with parking. Mr. Snyder stated that no-parking
17 within an HOA on a private lane to ensure emergency vehicle access is enforced by the HOA,
18 often by contracting with a towing company. Mr. Scott pointed out that, because of driveway
19 placement, there would be very few places where vehicles could be parked on the street. A
20 clearance of 20 feet is needed for emergency access. Mr. Scott said he feels it would be a well
21 parked community with the 4.3 parking stalls per unit. Mr. Snyder confirmed that 4.3 is well
22 above the City standard, and parking for large-scale events will depend on management of the
23 neighborhood.

24
25 Commissioner Johnson asked Lisa Romney, City Attorney, if she agrees with Mr. Scott's
26 presentation of conditional use permits. Ms. Romney said she agrees with Mr. Scott's
27 description of the law. State statutes have changed to provide that a conditional use permit shall
28 be approved if reasonable conditions can be imposed to mitigate detrimental impacts. Ms.
29 Romney stated she supports staff's recommendation to table approval of the Conditional Use
30 Permit to receive more information.

31
32 Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing for the Porter Lane Townhomes Conceptual Site
33 Plan and Conditional Use Permit at 8:17 p.m.

34
35 Cami Layton, Centerville – Ms. Layton showed two building-block cities built by her
36 grandchildren (ages 2 and 4). She said her four-year-old grandson said that “people” make a
37 city busy. Ms. Layton said she does not want to live in a busy city. She stated that too many
38 people ruin the quality of experience. Centerville is referred to as “the City in between”. She
39 does not want to feel like a citizen squeezed in between. She stated that the citizens would like
40 to see the property zoned 1-4 units per acre. There are more than 600 units between Parrish
41 Lane and Pages Lane. She suggested the developer drive around and look at all the
42 townhomes and apartments all over. Single-family homes would be a change. Ms. Layton said
43 she feels many will want to move away if higher-density development occurs.

44
45 Dave Farnsworth, Centerville – Mr. Farnsworth expressed that he does not feel the
46 proposed amount of parking is sufficient. He asked if a traffic study has been done. He asked
47 how the towing policy would work, with no police enforcement of traffic and parking within the
48 property. He asked what makes the City Planner such a strong advocate of this development,
49 and asked if the “standards” referred to represent the thinking and view point of the community.
50 Mr. Farnsworth said he does not feel the proposed development reflects the feel of Centerville.

1 Stephanie Carter-Nielsen, Centerville – Ms. Carter-Nielsen mentioned several high-
2 density developments that have occurred since she bought her home. She stated that the traffic
3 on 400 West has become sensational. She said she knows that having renters in a
4 neighborhood reduces property values, and said she would be interested in finding out how
5 many existing units in the area are owner occupied. Ms. Carter-Nielsen expressed concern with
6 the lack of sidewalks within the proposed development for children to use to get to the common
7 area to play. She said she is concerned about the safety of children and concerned that the
8 units will not be owner occupied. She said it is not the right density for the property, and
9 proposed allowing five units per acre with 3-bedroom patio homes as an alternative.

10
11 Dale McIntyre, Centerville – Mr. McIntyre said he is concerned with the application being
12 called a project. He said he views it as two different projects, with two different types of use –
13 one project being used to justify the other high-density project.

14
15 Bruce Madsen, Centerville – Mr. Madsen said that when he moved to his home, 400
16 West was not a through road. He said he feels like the south end of the City is getting
17 everything that those on the north end do not want. He compared the proposed development to
18 the Shaela Park development across the street, which has 16 buildings. Mr. Madsen said he
19 believes the landscaping in the proposed development is configured to maximize profit. He
20 compared the situation to Foxboro in North Salt Lake, and stated that residents use their
21 garages for storage rather than parking. He added that most of the residents have three
22 vehicles, with the third vehicles utilizing the overflow parking. Mr. Madsen said that people will
23 park up and down the streets whether or not it is posted no-parking. Neighborhoods of seven or
24 more units per acre are the biggest areas for crime. He said that the viaduct near the Legacy
25 Parkway is better patrolled than 400 West through his neighborhood. The Frontage Road is not
26 used because it is not easily accessible. He added that he does not believe developers care
27 what happens to neighborhoods after development is completed.

28
29 Ms. Romney asked the public to direct all comments to the Planning Commission, and to
30 remember that the Planning Commission is considering applications for Conceptual Site Plan
31 and Conditional Use Permit.

32
33 Mr. Madsen concluded by pointing out that theory is different from what occurs in reality.

34
35 Janice Frost, Centerville – Ms. Frost stated she is not anti-development, but she does
36 not like what is being proposed. She said it looks to her like high-density, and agreed with Mr.
37 McIntyre's comments. She said she does not think it is realistic to include the existing home in
38 the development. She stated that she does not think the 48 units have really been thought out.
39 Ms. Frost said she feels the Planning Commission should consider the interests of the entire
40 community, and how the proposed development would impact the entire community. She said
41 the proposed parking is inadequate based on personal experience, and the traffic flow makes
42 no sense. She stated she thinks the proposed development would more closely resemble the
43 Country Cottages development than the Florentine Townhomes development. She feels 8 units
44 per acre on that property is too many.

45
46 Patricia Braithwaite, Centerville – Ms. Braithwaite read comments from Dean Williams,
47 who could not attend the meeting. The comments included concern that no-parking on the
48 streets would be unrealistic to enforce. Garages are used as storage units, with parking in the
49 driveways and streets. Concern was expressed regarding space for emergency vehicles to
50 maneuver, and it was stated that the City has a responsibility to not approve any development
51 that does not provide for the safety of the residents. A copy of Mr. Williams' comments is
52 attached.

1 Rick Dudley, Centerville – Mr. Dudley said he has spent hours at the park at Shaela
2 Park, and he appreciates that the sidewalk goes all the way around the development. He
3 pointed out that all the open space in the proposed development is along the boundaries, and
4 stated he feels it has gotten to the point that developers are asking themselves what can be
5 excluded from a community. Mr. Dudley said he already avoids the 400 West Porter Lane
6 intersection because of the wait time, and stated that a traffic study will not tell the Commission
7 how many citizens are avoiding the intersection.

8
9 Heather Strasser, Centerville – Ms. Strasser thanked the Planning Commission for all
10 they do. She said she has spent time reviewing the Site Plan and reading the City's ordinances.
11 She pointed out flaws in the Site Plan, including the lack of "ample access", insufficient parking,
12 and streets that are not wide enough. She stated that very few residents of Shaela Park are
13 able to park two vehicles in their 2-car garages. She commented that much of the green space
14 in the proposed development appears to be in the Army Corps of Engineers drainage area, and
15 there is no indication of sidewalks within the development and no indication of trash dumpsters.
16 She asked if the proposed development has sufficient drainage, and stated she feels the
17 existing home is a major concern with no buffer between the multi-family units and single-family
18 home. Ms. Strasser stated she feels a traffic study must be required, and the Site Plan must be
19 tabled. She said she feels 48-units and one home are too much for the property. A copy of Ms.
20 Strasser's concerns is attached.

21
22 Dave Bell, Centerville – Mr. Bell thanked the City Planners, and mentioned the impacts
23 of everyone commuting each day to work. He commented that the population will continue to
24 grow, and said he feels that a development that is done right would be a benefit. Mr. Bell stated
25 that the Shaela Park development was opposed by the neighboring residents, but the City made
26 sure it was done well. The population can either continue to spread out, or accept nice little
27 communities that can control the impact. He expressed confidence that the City will ensure
28 emergency services accessibility, and stated that he does not agree with most of the public
29 comments.

30
31 Marti Money, Centerville – Ms. Money stated she respects the work done by the
32 Planning Commission and Planning staff. She commented that Shaela Park is lovely, with 5.33
33 units per acre and green space. Ms. Strasser stated that the Conceptual Site Plan differs from
34 City ordinances in many ways, and asked the Planning Commission to table the Site Plan and
35 Conditional Use Permit. She asked Brighton Homes to try again, because the bare bones
36 concept is not good enough for Centerville. Ms. Money expressed disappointment that Brighton
37 Homes did not agree to meet with residents more than once before the Planning Commission
38 meeting.

39
40 Laura Dudley, Centerville – Ms. Dudley said she is concerned about the density of the
41 project, and said she believes it should be reduced to 30 units, allowing more green space,
42 wider roads, sidewalks, and a nicer feel. She stated if people wanted to live in a high-density
43 area they would move to Salt Lake City. She quoted requirements for wetlands, and added that
44 wetlands attract frogs and snakes, and is not an appropriate place for a playground. She asked
45 the Planning Commission to protect Centerville's wetlands and drainage areas by keeping the
46 zoning on the lower end and keeping the feel of Centerville.

47
48 Rita Johnson, Centerville – Ms. Johnson said she grew up in California. She said it is
49 appealing to her that Centerville is limited geographically, and highly encouraged five units per
50 acre on the subject property. Ms. Johnson said the community needs more children and more
51 families. She said she avoids making a left turn onto 400 West because of existing traffic

1 congestion, and stated that the 400 West Porter Lane intersection is not safe for pedestrians.
2 Ms. Johnson thanked the Planning Commission for their work.
3

4 Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 9:20 p.m.
5

6 Chair Hirschi asked the Brighton Homes representatives to explain the HOA plans and
7 what will happen when Brighton Homes leaves the development. Mr. Snyder commented that
8 HOA conditions would be part of the subdivision process. Mr. Scott responded that the
9 proposed development would be an HOA community. Brighton Homes typically turns a
10 community over to an HOA once all the units are sold. If HOA fees are not enough to pay all
11 maintenance bills, the developer must pay. Mr. Scott said it is in the developer's best interest to
12 ensure that a community is well managed. Mr. Snyder added that conditions can be imposed to
13 ensure the best possible outcome. Mr. Scott stated that medium density was allowed on the
14 property before it was owned by the Hafoka family. The assisted living facility concept was
15 deemed not feasible. He expressed a desire to make it the best development possible, but
16 added that it needs to be economically feasible. A single-family development would not be
17 feasible for Brighton Homes on that property at this time. Mr. Scott said they are willing to do a
18 traffic study, but they do not feel it is necessary. Regarding enforcement of parking restrictions,
19 Mr. Scott stated a towing company would be provided with the rules of the community and
20 would take over policing the area. Neighbors would not be required to rat on each other. He
21 stated that there seems to be consensus that a problem exists at the 400 West Porter Lane
22 intersection, and emphasized that Brighton Homes' scope will be identifying impact that would
23 be caused by their development. They do not feel their development would cause significant
24 impact above and beyond what already exists. Mr. Scott said it is common for private roads to
25 not have sidewalks, but they would be willing to discuss adding sidewalks. He commented that
26 Brighton wants to address the concerns, but a certain level of reasonableness need to be
27 maintained. Responding to a question from Mr. Scott, Mr. Snyder stated that a typical City
28 street is 29-31 feet wide gutter to gutter. Mr. Scott pointed out that public streets are narrower
29 than 24 feet if cars are parked on both sides. He stressed that Brighton Homes wants to make
30 sure the development is safe and well done.
31

32 Chair Hirschi asked about the width of the streets in Shaela Park, and was informed they
33 are 28 feet wide on the asphalt. Mr. Scott stated that sidewalks could be added to the proposed
34 development. Commissioner Hayman asked if adding sidewalks would reduce the small
35 amount of green space around the homes. Mr. Snyder explained that the calculations are
36 complex. Mr. Scott commented that 10-15 foot rear-yard setbacks are common in townhome
37 communities. He added that a large open space with a park feel is more usable than small
38 pockets of open space. Taylor Spendlove, also with Brighton Homes, emphasized that a tot lot
39 and a pergola are included in the landscape plan for community gatherings, and it is their hope
40 to include a dog park on the east side. Commissioner Kjar asked if Brighton will be able to re-
41 grade the drainage area. Mr. Spendlove responded that they cannot re-grade the drainage
42 area, but it will be landscaped and useable. Grading would require a permit from the Army
43 Corps of Engineers. Mr. Snyder confirmed that the wetlands restrictions posted near the
44 property apply to the regional detention off the property. He explained that Centerville
45 ordinances have a broad definition of open space that includes both passive and active open
46 space. Chair Hirschi asked what Brighton plans to do with the detention pond on the southwest
47 corner of the property. Mr. Scott responded that the detention pond is included as open space,
48 and will be a landscaped, manicured area. Mr. Snyder gave examples in town where detention
49 areas are included as open space.
50

51 Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Scott what design elements are included to make the
52 existing home fit well with community. Mr. Scott responded that enough open space will be

1 maintained around the home that it will not feel out of place. Referring to a comment made
2 during the public hearing, Mr. Snyder explained that the buffer requirement applies to single-
3 family development areas. A buffer is not required for a single-family home in the R-M Zone.
4 He also explained that the parks and recreation space requirements referred to during the public
5 hearing apply to the west side of the City. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the use of "should" and
6 "encourages" in the General Plan does not mean "mandatory". It is preferable to use a grid
7 street system wherever possible, but geographic difficulties are taken into account. No through
8 connections can be made on the property in question. Ms. Romney added that for a site plan
9 the Commission is looking to the criteria of the ordinances regarding open space.
10 Commissioner Ince said it seems to him that some questions ought to be looked at early on in
11 the process because it is difficult to backtrack after the ball gets rolling. Mr. Snyder explained
12 that if everything is required in a one-step process, there is significant friction between
13 expenditure and risk for the developers. Centerville's ordinances create a partnership between
14 the Planning Commission, the public, and developers. Developers contribute to building the
15 community with infrastructure – water, roads, and parks. Developers initially give the City a
16 conceptual sketch to compare to City ordinances, the public is given a chance to comment, and
17 developers can then determine whether or not to take the risk of the bigger expenditures moving
18 forward.

19
20 Commissioner Kjar stated he feels better about the open useable space in Shaela Park
21 than the open space in the proposed development. He added that the drainage area is a ditch,
22 and he would be more comfortable with more green space in the middle of the development that
23 could be seen from the road. Mr. Snyder commented that concerns need to be tied to impacts
24 that require mitigation. Commissioner Kjar stated that the open space needs to be more usable.
25 Mr. Snyder confirmed that an internal sidewalk could be required as a conditional use. Mr. Scott
26 stated that, if the Conditional Use Permit is tabled, it would be helpful if Brighton is provided with
27 specific issues to address.

28
29 Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to accept the Conceptual Site Plan for the Porter Lane
30 Townhomes Project, to be located on property at 564 West Porter Lane, with directives 1-3 and
31 reasons for the action a-c. Commissioner Merrill seconded the motion.

32
33 At 10:05 p.m. the Planning Commission took a brief recess, returning at 10:10 p.m.

34
35 Commissioner Kjar commented that Shaela Park has 6 units per acre, which looks good
36 to him because of the useable, accessible park and the 28-foot roads. He said he understands
37 the argument that people do not park in their garages, and stated he would prefer the proposed
38 development to include useable open space in the middle, and more parking. Commissioner
39 Kjar acknowledged that the developer needs to make money on the project, but said he would
40 prefer more open area visible from the road. Chair Hirschi suggested that the conditions could
41 be amended to include consideration of additional green space, interior sidewalks, and parking.
42 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to amend the motion to accept with the addition of
43 directive #4: the developer should to look at and address (1) rearrangement of green open
44 space to allow for better visibility from the street and more access to the community in general;
45 and (h) impact on the pedestrian situation in the community, specifically sidewalks and
46 interconnectivity. Commissioner Merrill pointed out that the Shaela Park usable space is not
47 visible from the street, and Commissioner Hirst added that they would not want children playing
48 out on Porter Lane. Commissioner Johnson struck "visibility from the street" from his
49 amendment. Commissioner Hirst pointed out that the tot lot is far away from most of the units.
50 Commissioner Ince seconded the motion to amend, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Commissioner Ince made a **motion** to amend the motion by adding that the developer should look at the ability to achieve the overall goals with fewer than 5 units per building. Chair Hirschi suggested that would be more of a conditional use issue. Commissioner Hayman said she would like to give the developer an opportunity to come up with a way to improve the green space situation. Commissioner Ince withdrew his motion to amend. Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to amend the motion by adding a fifth directive requiring a traffic study. Commissioner Merrill mentioned that the traffic study would be a conditional use issue. Commissioner Hayman withdrew her motion to amend. The Commission and staff discussed the appropriate order of directives and conditional use issues, as well as the possible scope of a traffic study. Commissioner Hirst stated she sees the existing home as a potential issue if it becomes abandoned, unsalable, and becomes an eye sore. Mr. Snyder explained the City's ability to mitigate structures deemed unsafe. Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to amend the motion to accept with an additional reason for action (d) regarding safety concerns. The motion to amend was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (7-0). The motion to accept the Conceptual Site Plan as amended, with directives 1-4 and findings a-d, passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Directives:

1. The applicant must submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in Section 12-21-110(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The final site plan submittal must also address the following:
 - a. The fire code regulation requiring a minimum 20-foot clear lane
 - b. How the fire requirements will be perpetually maintained, particularly with the visitor parking during family events, holidays, and other social activities
 - c. Details indicating the number of dumpsters to be provided
 - d. All dumpsters must be completely screened from view with an opaque six-foot wall or fence
 - e. The wall or fence must be compatible in material and color of the main buildings on the site
 - f. Provide a Landscaping Plan, prepared by a landscape architect, which must be submitted to address the standards of Chapter 12-51-Landscaping & Screening
3. A site signage package must be submitted for review by the Planning Commission and the Zoning Administrator in accordance with Chapter 12-54-Signs.
4. The developer should look at and address:
 - a. Rearrangement of green open space to allow for better access to the community in general.
 - b. Impact on the pedestrian situation in the community, specifically sidewalks and interconnectivity.

Reasons for the Action:

- a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [Section 12-21-110(d)(2)].
- b) The development appears to satisfy the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan [Section 12-480-3].
- c) The proposed conceptual site plan, with the directives given, appears to be capable of meeting applicable Development Standards for the R-M Zone, Off-Street Parking, and the Landscaping and Screening Standards of the Zoning Ordinance.
- d) Safety concerns must be addressed.

Commissioner Kjar made a **motion** to table the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application for the Porter Lane Townhomes Project, to be located on property at 564 West Porter Lane, with the following directive and reasons for the action:

Directive:

1. The conditional use application submittal shall also address the anticipated CUP issues and concerns, as outlined in the June 24, 2015 Planning Staff Report.

Reasons for the Action:

- a) A conditional use permit application to consider allowing multi-family density of up to 8 units per acre must address the standards found in Section 12-21-100(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- b) The anticipated list of issues to be addressed with the final site plan assists with the determining if there is sufficient evidence to support approval of the CUP.

Commissioner Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0). Mr. Scott asked if the Commission wants a traffic study to specifically address the project as a whole, or the impact of 5-8 units per acre. Chair Hirschi recommended Brighton Homes perform a traffic study that Brighton believes would be necessary for the Planning Commission to make a reasonable decision.

PUBLIC HEARING – RON SHULTZ SUBDIVISION/LOT SPLIT

Commissioner Merrill stated that the applicants are neighbors of his, and expressed a desire to recuse himself from this matter. Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner, explained the application for a lot division to create a new single-family lot. The application meets development standards for frontage, footage, and setbacks for both lots. A sidewalk will need to be included along 200 South as part of the development. The applicant has provided all necessary utility provider sheets and has shown necessary property easements. Mr. Toponce explained concerns expressed by a neighbor regarding drainage and building height, and stated that the concerns are all addressed during the building permit process. Staff recommends approval of the small subdivision. Ms. Romney presented a new standard set of conditions of approval regarding public improvement bonds to replace condition 2 in the staff report.

R. Ronald Schultz, property owner and applicant, said he is unsure how to proceed, and stated that he does not have any prospects for a buyer at this time. Commissioner Kjar suggested Mr. Shultz consult with staff regarding how to proceed.

At 10:54 p.m. Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing, and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Commissioner Kjar made a **motion** to approve the small subdivision waiver/lot split for the Schultz Subdivision located at 590 East 200 South, with the following conditions and reasons, eliminating condition #2 in the staff report and replacing it with the three conditions submitted by Ms. Romney. Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

Conditions:

1. The small subdivision waiver/lot split shall be for the property located at 590 East 200 South.
2. Developer may install public infrastructure and utilities *within the subdivision* prior to recording the final plat as allowed by *Utah Code Ann. 10-9a-604.5*, subject to

- entering into an Infrastructure Development Agreement (Prior to Recording Final Subdivision Plat) with the City. Pursuant to such agreement, the developer may install public infrastructure and utilities within the subdivision prior to recording the final plat and without posting a bond for such infrastructure and utilities within the subdivision.
3. Developer may install public infrastructure and utilities *outside the subdivision* and/or *within the public right-of-way* prior to recording the final plat, subject to developer entering into an Improvements Agreement with the City and posting a bond for such public infrastructure and utilities outside the subdivision or within the public right-of-way. Any work within the public right-of-way shall also require an Excavation Permit from the City.
4. When developer is *ready to record the final plat*, developer shall enter into an Improvements Agreement with the City and post a bond for all remaining or unfinished public infrastructure and utilities for the subdivision (whether inside or outside the subdivision) prior to recording the final plat.
5. The applicant shall record the lot split at the Davis County Recorder's Office prior to obtaining a building permit.
6. A 4-foot sidewalk shall be constructed along 200 South meeting the required Centerville City Engineering Standards.
7. All public utility easements shall be accepted by the Centerville City Council.
8. A building permit shall be issued prior to any construction on the property.

Reasons for the Action (Findings):

- a. The applicant has submitted a complete application for a small subdivision waiver/lot split [Section 15-2-107].
- b. The subdivision qualifies for the small subdivision waiver, in accordance with the criteria found in Section 15-2-107 of the Subdivision Ordinance.
- c. Two residential lots for single-family development is consistent with the goals of the Centerville City General Plan concerning development within Neighborhood 1, Southeast Centerville [12-480-2].
- d. The proposed subdivision meets the required development standards for the R-L Zone [Chapter 12-32].
- e. With the above conditions being met, the general requirements for all subdivisions have been addressed and fulfilled [Chapter 15-5].

PUBLIC HEARING – TRUMP RESIDENTIAL LOT, 540 SOUTH 400 WEST

Mr. Toponce explained the application for Conceptual Site Plan for an unplatted residential building on property located at 540 South 400 West, for the purpose of constructing a new dwelling within the Agricultural-Low (A-L) Zone. A single-family home is acceptable under the General Plan in A-L. He explained that the property is legally nonconforming by fronting both 400 West and Shaela Park. The plan is to construct a new home in the center of the lot. The final site plan would need to clearly mark streets and measurements. Staff recommends the Planning Commission accept the Conceptual Site Plan.

Scott Trump, applicant, stated that he has obtained all easements and legal descriptions, and he is ready with a full plan. Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 11:02 p.m. and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment.

Commissioner Kjar made a **motion** to accept the conceptual site plan for the Scott and Susan Trump Residential Lot, located at 540 South 400 West, with conditions 1-11 and reasons

for the action 1-4. Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. All fees shall be paid; including all related development fees.
2. The applicant shall submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in Section 12-21-110(e) of the Ordinance.
3. All utilities shall be indicated on the final site plan.
4. All utility provider sheets shall be submitted to City staff at the time of the final site plan application.
5. Surrounding properties and property owners shall be depicted on the final site plan.
6. The final site plan shall depict an accurate scale and legend along with accurate setbacks and measurements.
7. A grading and utility plan shall be depicted on the final site plan and reviewed by the City Engineer.
8. The final site plan shall depict the public right-of-way, including streets, curb and gutter and the sidewalk.
9. All necessary easements shall be provided; including one 10-foot easement along 400 West and two other sides of the proposed lot at 7 feet. The applicant shall provide the legal description of these easements to the City Engineer for review and approval.
10. A current title report shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review.
11. All related impact fees shall be paid, as per the City's Fee Schedule.

Reasons for the Action:

1. The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [Section 12-21-110(d)(2)].
2. The applicant has submitted a full application [Section 12-21-110(d)(1)].
3. Proposed utility easements are required on all developed lots [Section 12-21-110(e)(2)(iii)(d), 15-5-106-(8)].
4. A final site plan application shall be required for submittal [Section 12-21-110(e)].

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Planning Commission will meet next on Wednesday, July 8, 2015.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:05 p.m. Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

David P. Hirschi, Chair

Date Approved

Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

**CENTERVILLE CITY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
655 North 1250 West, Centerville, Utah 84014
(801) 292-8232**

**STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 1**

**PROPERTY OWNER/
APPLICANT:** SCOTT TRUMP
462 SOUTH 75 WEST
CENTERVILLE, UT 84014

EMAIL: SSTRUMPS@GMAIL.COM

PROPERTY: 540 SOUTH 400 WEST

ACREAGE: 1.44

ZONING: AGRICULTURAL-LOW (A-L)

APPLICATION: FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE THE FINAL SITE PLAN

BACKGROUND

On June 24, 2015, the Planning Commission accepted the conceptual site plan for Scott Trump who desires to construct a new home on property located at 540 South 400 West. As a reminder, Section 12-21-110(c)(2)(E), of the Zoning Ordinance, states the site plan approval process must be completed for any residential development outside a platted subdivision. This process consists of a conceptual review and the final approval process. Mr. Trump has addressed the previous conditions of approval for the conceptual acceptance and is now ready for a final site plan review.

PREVIOUS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All fees shall be paid; including all related development fees.
 - **Staff Response:** The applicant will still be responsible for paying any professional service fees and development fees that may be applicable.
2. The applicant shall submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in Section 12-21-110(e) of the Ordinance.
 - **Staff Response:** A final site plan application was submitted on June 26, 2015, meeting all the required submittal standards.
3. All utilities shall be indicated on the final site plan.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been completed.

4. All utility provider sheets shall be submitted to City staff at the time of the final site plan application.
 - **Staff Response:** Staff only has record of Rocky Mountain Power and Questar Gas stating service may be provided. Mr. Trump did send the provider sheets to all applicable utility companies letting them know of the new development. However, the lot is surrounded by development and will have access to all utilities.
5. Surrounding properties and property owners shall be depicted on the final site plan.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been indicated on the final site plan.
6. The final site plan shall depict an accurate scale and legend along with accurate setbacks and measurements.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been indicated on the final site plan.
7. A grading and utility plan shall be depicted on the final site plan and reviewed by the City Engineer.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been indicated on the final site plan, yet will still need to be reviewed by the City Engineer prior to receiving a building permit.
8. The final site plan shall depict the public right-of-way, including streets, curb and gutter and the sidewalk.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been indicated on the final site plan.
9. All necessary easements shall be provided; including one 10-foot easement along 400 West and two other sides of the proposed lot at 7 feet. The applicant shall provide the legal description of these easements to the City Engineer for review and approval.
 - **Staff Response:** This has been indicated on the final site plan, yet will still need to be reviewed by the City Engineer prior to receiving a building permit.
10. A current title report shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review.
 - **Staff Response:** The Title Report will need to be submitted to the City Attorney and reviewed prior to the issuance of a building permit.
11. All related impact fees shall be paid as per City's Fee Schedule.
 - **Staff Response:** This condition remains in effect.

FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW SECTION 12-12-110(e)

The final site plan is in harmony with the conceptual site plan that was accepted June 24, 2015. The lot is located within the A-L Zone, which allows single-family development. The proposed property was found to meet applicable Ordinance requirements concerning Development Standards found within Table 12-31-1 of the Zoning Ordinance. The requirements of double frontage and frontage requirements do not meet the current standards, yet are considered legally nonconforming. A building permit is required prior to any construction taking place and will need to meet all applicable standards found within the Zoning Ordinance. All utilities will need to be properly connected to the new home and inspected by the City Engineer.

After reviewing the final site plan, staff believes the applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed. They have also indicated how the criteria within the Zoning Ordinance for development within the A-L Zone will be fulfilled. Finally, any unpaid fees and public improvement bonds will need to be posted prior to a building permit being issued.


PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPOSED ACTION: I hereby make a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the final site plan for the Scott and Susan Trump Residential Lot, located at 540 South 400 West, with the following conditions:

1. All professional service fees, development fees and related impact fees shall be paid.
2. A bond for all public improvements must be posted prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. The submitted grading and utility plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to a building permit being issued.
4. All easements shall be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis County Recorder's Office.
5. A current title report shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

SUGGESTED REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

1. The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [Section 12-21-110(d)(2)].
2. The applicant has submitted a full final site plan application [Section 12-21-110(e)(2)].
3. Proposed utility easements are required on all developed lots [Section 12-21-110(e)(2)(iii)(d), 15-5-106(8)].



**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
7/8/2015**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Work Session - South Main Street Corridor Plan

Initiated By: Mayor and City Council

Scheduled Time: 7:30

SUBJECT

City Council and Planning Commission will discuss the SMSC Plan and review all the public comments received from various meetings

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ☐ June 2, 2015 City Council meeting minutes re SMSC
- ☐ June 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes re SMSC
- ☐ June 16, 2015 City Council meeting minutes re SMSC
- ☐ June 17, 2015 Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting minutes re SMSC
- ☐ Comments from southmain email
- ☐ Comments that came in after June 30 deadline

From: Paul Cutler [mailto:paulcutler@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 3:30 PM
To: southmain
Cc: Cory Snyder; Lisa Romney; Blaine Lutz
Subject: FW: Joint Planning Commission / City Council Meeting on SMSC

City Council / Planning Commission,

We have a lot of various topics and feedback on SMSC that we could discuss tonight. Here is a list of topics that I plan to use to try and guide our discussion tonight in a structured way. I'm hopeful that we can get through many of the items on the list and see if we can find consensus on how to move forward.

Cory,
Would you please add this list to the Novus staff report.

Thanks,
/Paul

Joint Planning Commission / City Council Meeting on SMSC
List of topics for Discussion:

1. Density caps / controls (per zone?)
2. Residential vs. Commercial
 - ? Commercial viability of Main Street
 - ? Mixed use viability/compatibility (Promote/Allow/Prohibit?)
 - ? Single Family vs Multifamily
 - ? How to "encourage/promote" Single Family on Main St (create new lot type in SMSC overlay?)
3. Do we want to "frame" Main St.?
 - ? Frame with buildings or a wall?
 - ? Wall on Main
 - ? Residential backyards on Main (front on side street)
4. Public Space
 - ? Public space plan (trees/street furniture)
 - ? Walkability/
 - ? Sidewalks (walk ability)
5. Height of Buildings (25' East/35' West)
6. Street width (allow private sub standard streets?)
7. Setbacks from Streets (commercial/residential)

--
Paul Cutler
Centerville City Mayor
801-390-3444
mayer@centervilleut.com



1 Final Subdivision Plat Approval for the Legacy Trail Subdivision located at the southwest corner
2 of Parrish Lane and 1250 West, to September 14, 2015. Councilman Higginson seconded the
3 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
4

5 PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR
6 PLAN/OVERLAY ZONE
7

8 Mayor Cutler opened the meeting to public comments regarding the South Main Street
9 Corridor (SMSC) and Overlay Zone at 7:37 p.m. He stated that the purpose of the comment
10 period is to receive comments regarding the principles and regulations of the SMSC Plan, and
11 suggested that citizens refrain from focusing comments on specific developers and projects.
12

13 Scott VanOrman – Mr. VanOrman said it is his understanding that there is no specific
14 density mentioned in the SMSC Plan, and requested the Council place a low-density stipulation,
15 limiting development to single-family residences as much as possible.
16

17 Robyn Mecham – Ms. Mecham said she believes there are only four buildings in the
18 SMSC that are not prime for redevelopment. She said she recently found some of the
19 comments she presented to the Council in 2008 during the SMSC Plan process. Ms. Mecham
20 commented that Farmington Station was financed by the California Teacher's Union, and asked
21 the Council what would stop a group from buying and redeveloping Centerville Main Street.
22 She said she feels there are big loopholes in the current zoning. Ms. Mecham read aloud
23 portions of the comments she made in 2008, and emphasized that the area of Main Street
24 under discussion is the most historic neighborhood in Centerville. She pointed out that
25 Centerville now exceeds the Federal requirements for affordable housing. Ms. Mecham
26 expressed concern for the safety of children in the neighborhood. She stated that more than a
27 majority of property owners on Main Street were against density in 2008, and she provided a
28 copy of a citizen survey taken at the time. She asked the Council members to drive down
29 Parrish Lane and look at what already exists in the business district, and see that it is not what
30 is wanted on Main Street. She asked the Council to please lower the density and lower the
31 height allowance, and asked if it would be possible to grant zoning amendments with the
32 stipulation that the original zoning would revert back if the proposed projects do not occur. Ms.
33 Mecham emphasized she feels it is important to ensure that new buildings fit in with the
34 character of the surrounding neighborhoods.
35

36 Travis Davis – Mr. Davis said he grew up in West Valley City, and watched the change
37 that took place in the community as density increased. He briefly explained restrictions being
38 implemented by West Valley City on the limited remaining developable residential properties.
39 He recommended the City consider a Residential-Low base zoning, not PDO, on Main Street.
40 Mr. Davis said he would like to see the City coming to the residents to explain why medium and
41 high densities are preferable, rather than the citizens trying to prove why the City should have
42 low-density.
43

44 Blane Roskelley – Mr. Roskelley referred to the high rise slums and high crime rate in
45 Detroit, and mentioned that Detroit was once a fine, growing city. He stated he would hate to
46 see Centerville become like that. He said he believes if traffic is increased with higher density
47 along Main Street, it will not be safe for children crossing to school. Mr. Roskelley said he
48 would like to see the integrity of the City remain where it is.
49

50 Cami Layton – Ms. Layton pointed out that this is Centerville's Centennial year, and
51 quoted from comments in the City's Sesquicentennial brochure regarding the goal to limit
52 growth and preserve a small town atmosphere. She stated that the City is small, and she would
53 not want Centerville to be known as "the city squeezed in between". She quoted from a Deseret

1 News article that states that Salt Lake City rents are among the cheapest in the region. Ms.
2 Layton said that cheap rent is available elsewhere, and does not need to be here. She does not
3 want the congestion and other issues that come with density. Contention is not healthy in the
4 community. She expressed confidence that the City can help developers and please citizens at
5 same time, but the City should be honest with developers that come to Centerville regarding the
6 desire for a small town atmosphere. She said she believes staff and the Council should have
7 the citizens' interests at heart. Ms. Layton said she does not want Wasatch Front Regional
8 Council (WFRM) or Envision Utah telling Centerville how the City should be built. She does not
9 want Main Street to be an active, busy section of town; Main Street is not the hub of the City
10 anymore. She is concerned about a possible rippling effect that could occur with properties on
11 Main Street. Ms. Layton stated she feels quality of life should be more important than getting
12 State funding. She also expressed concern for the aging population and stated the City should
13 have single-level residences where the elderly can live. She added that the City needs to think
14 about providing cemetery space, and said she hopes this Centennial year can be a good year.
15

16 Dale McIntyre – Mr. McIntyre asked the Council members if they are representing the
17 citizens who voted for them, or representing financial interests. He stated that the Landmarks
18 Commission is in the process of creating the Deuel Creek Historic District. Mr. McIntyre said
19 there is nothing historic about high-density housing in Centerville. Historically, children have
20 been able to walk to school safely, and he asked how safe they would be with high-density
21 housing. He asked the Council members to represent those who voted for them with the belief
22 that their desires would be represented.
23

24 Ryan Archibald – Mr. Archibald said that he grew up across the street from Centerville
25 Junior High and walked around the neighborhood safely, and he is concerned that children and
26 the crossing guard may not be safe crossing the street with high density.
27

28 Bret Milburn, Davis County Commissioner – Commissioner Milburn expressed
29 appreciation for the service given by the Council members, and said he knows that decisions
30 are not easy, and everything is not black and white. He said he is perplexed by the "not in my
31 backyard" type of commentary. He said he feels Main Street has a few businesses and many
32 run-down lots, and he would like to see change on Main Street in a manner conducive with the
33 desires of the citizens and the mindset of what Centerville wants to be known for in the future.
34 He said that change is inevitable, and he is not opposed to density in the right amounts. He
35 expressed the hope that citizens have taken the time to share their vision for the future through
36 the Envision Utah online survey. He commented that the arguments in favor of keeping a small-
37 town Centerville, and the desire for citizens' children to be able to afford to live in Centerville,
38 seem to be in conflict, and a balance needs to be reached. He said he does not feel it is just
39 about density, although density does have an impact on a variety of different things.
40 Commissioner Milburn asked if the City has spoken with other stakeholders, such as the school
41 district and emergency services, about possible impacts. He pointed out that the population is
42 expected to double along the Wasatch Front in the next 20-30 years. Other cities along the
43 Wasatch Front are facing the same issues and problems. Main Street will not be the same as it
44 was 80 years ago, and the City should be cautious and move into the future with a plan.
45 Commissioner Milburn suggested that UDOT may not be willing to lower the speed limit on Main
46 Street to residential speeds, and expressed curiosity regarding what is driving the sudden
47 interest by developers in ultra high-density development. He cautioned the citizens to be
48 reasonable, with reasons and solutions rather than only saying "no".
49

50 Neil Lish – Mr. Lish expressed the hope that the Mayor and City Council will adhere to
51 their campaign claims of valuing the small-town atmosphere in Centerville.

1 Dale Engberson – Mr. Engberson spoke very complimentary about Brighton Homes as
2 developers. He stated that the City cannot change the rules midstream just because someone
3 doesn't like the project. He suggested that many citizens could take advantage of the
4 accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance that the City is working on.

5
6 Paula Tinnabe – Ms. Tinnabe stated she has a long family history in Centerville, and is a
7 long-time employee of the Centerville Post Office. She said that people love Centerville
8 because of what Centerville is. People did not move here to have Centerville become what they
9 left; they moved here because of what Centerville was. She said she does not want a lot of
10 high-density apartments in the neighborhoods, and expressed the hope that we can keep it a
11 nice town.

12
13 Carol Bake – Ms. Bake said she liked the mixed-use idea when it was originally put in
14 the SMSC Plan. She said her only concern is that it will not be implemented. She stated she
15 loves her neighborhood dearly, and when she reads the Plan she feels she is reading
16 something different than many of her neighbors. She expressed concern that her home
17 appraised for less than expected because the neighborhood is considered a "declining
18 neighborhood" with empty lots, and rundown or empty buildings. Ms. Bake said she does not
19 see the concerns that have been voiced being a problem with the SMSC Plan. Centerville is not
20 Detroit or West Valley City. Centerville is not an affordable place to live, and she would like to
21 see places along the SMSC where some young families or older residents could afford to live.
22 She said she would hate to see all the young families living on the west side because that is the
23 only place they can afford. A lack of younger families in the neighborhood would contribute to a
24 declining neighborhood. She expressed a desire for a family friendly Centerville for now and
25 future generations. She read portions of the Plan aloud and said she does not see cause for
26 alarm. She does not see high-rise development occurring with the current Plan. Ms. Bake said
27 she has heard from citizens that they don't trust the City Council, and she expressed confidence
28 that Centerville will not become like Detroit or West Valley City unless the Council throws out
29 their Plan that was drafted by the Planning Commission. Some tweaks here and there may be
30 needed. She said she loves Centerville and would like to see the Corridor become what it can
31 be, not perpetuate what it is now.

32
33 Stephanie Richardson – Ms. Richardson stated that citizens are not saying the City can't
34 have any multi-family dwellings; they are trying to avoid higher density than the City already
35 has. The City should create guidelines for developers to prevent really high density. She said
36 she lives within the historic district, which has a lot of small homes that are rentals, and many
37 young families renting that can't find medium-sized homes. There is a need for medium-sized
38 single-family homes to balance out the apartments across the freeway.

39
40 Cami Layton – Ms. Layton stated the General Plan needs to be amended with stronger
41 words that protect quality of life and the values of the citizens. The Plan has too many
42 inconsistencies and loopholes for developers. She said she feels that density, not building
43 design, is the issue. She referred to the Walmart development and developments to the south
44 of Walmart up to Porter Lane, and said that those projects were well-done and look nice
45 because citizens got involved. Ms. Layton stated that Brighton Homes sounds like a good
46 company. She said she does not believe Centerville should be an entitlement city. The
47 Wasatch Front is expensive. If children can't afford to live here, too bad. She referred again to
48 the affordable housing in Salt Lake.

49
50 Rolf Sorensen – Mr. Sorensen said he lives across the street from one of the proposed
51 projects. He and his wife realize that things change. He does not want to leave, but he does
52 not want to see happen here what he moved away from in California. He expressed concern
53 about the traffic that would come with high density. He agreed with the need to look at things

1 cautiously, and said he moved here for the Centerville, Utah feeling. Mr. Sorensen expressed
2 confidence in the natural real estate process.

3
4 Pamela Sorensen – Ms. Sorensen stated that the change that occurs needs to be the
5 right change. She expressed concern about the density because of traffic that already exists in
6 her neighborhood without high density. She does not want to be forced to leave Centerville.
7 She appealed to the Council members as members of families, and said she hopes the issue
8 will be thought out seriously, with families in mind.

9
10 Rick Bingham – Mr. Bingham stated that residential real estate in Centerville is in high
11 demand. He does not know of many areas that are declining in value, and commented that
12 there is affordable housing in the Centerville. The City cannot be all things to all people, and he
13 does not think the City should try to provide houses for all income levels. He asked for
14 clarification of the definition of mixed-use development. Mr. Bingham said he would not want to
15 lower the value of the community with high density, and he feels a master plan is needed for the
16 area to guide the future. He stated that, even if the population along the Wasatch Front
17 doubles, the population of Centerville does not need to double. He added that he would like the
18 zoning to be changed to reflect residential on Main Street, not commercial.

19
20 Tim Hawkes, Utah House of Representatives – Representative Hawkes said he thinks
21 people will like the revised plan for Walton Village. If they like it, it will be in spite of the overlay,
22 not because of the overlay. He said he feels the City should be careful what is incentivized.
23 The demand for commercial does not seem to be there. Without density restrictions,
24 developers will economically follow high density. Representative Hawkes said the City should
25 make sure that the Centerville being incentivized is the Centerville we know and love.

26
27 At 9:14 p.m. Mayor Cutler closed the public comment period, and pointed out that public
28 comments will be welcome on June 10th at the Planning Commission meeting, and at the
29 Council meeting on June 16th. Property owners will be specifically invited to a public meeting
30 with the Council on June 17th.

31
32 The Mayor explained that a zoning change can be initiated by three parties: property
33 owners, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. Responding to some of the questions
34 asked during the public comment period, Mayor Cutler stated that the City encourages positive
35 development, but has no financial or other interest in encouraging more dense development.
36 The City does not select specific developers, but responds to those who ask questions. The
37 height restrictions on Main Street are currently lower than height restrictions in residential
38 zones. Mr. Snyder responded to the question regarding changed zoning reverting back if
39 intended projects do not occur, stating that he feels "contract zoning" would be against existing
40 law. Property is zoned based on all possibilities within a zone being acceptable, and a lot of
41 legal problems would be raised by going back and forth depending on the project. Supporting
42 reasons are needed to change zoning. Ms. Romney added that City ordinances are not set up
43 to require development plan or site plan with a rezone request. However, a site plan can be
44 required in an overlay. Mixed-use traditionally involves something like retail on the bottom floor,
45 and something like an office or dwelling on the second floor. The SMSC Plan allows for vertical,
46 horizontal or side-by-side mixed-use. Funding for "ideal" mixed-use is difficult. Mayor Cutler
47 recognized the suggestion made during the comment period to change the Commercial zoning
48 on Main Street to Residential-Low.

49
50 The Council took a break at 9:26 p.m. and returned at 9:36 p.m.

1 Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend approval to
2 the City Council of a reduction in the minimum parcel size in a PDO, as follows:

3
4 ***Amend the text of the Planned Development Overlay Zone to reduce the minimum***
5 ***parcel size to three (3) acres.***

6
7 ***Reasons for Action (Findings):***

- 8 a. The Planning Commission finds there are no specific General Plan policies related to
9 expectation to minimums or maximums for Planned Overlay Developments.
10 b. The Planning Commission finds that the concept of setting a minimum is related to
11 providing enough land area for allowing flexible development patterns to establish
12 open areas and amenities to improve the design and layout of parcels.
13 c. The Planning Commission finds that when parcels become too small, it is much more
14 difficult to create needed buffers to surrounding properties or to internally create the
15 desired common spaces and related amenities to improve a development beyond the
16 traditional zoning regulations.

17
18 The motion was seconded by Commissioner Merrill and passed by roll-call vote (6-1).
19 Commissioner Ince opposed.

20
21 **PUBLIC COMMENT | SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR (SMSC) PLAN**
22 **OVERLAY ZONE - Receive public comments about the South Main Street Corridor**
23 **(SMSC) Plan and related Zoning Ordinance (Overlay Zone)**

24
25 Chair Hirschi opened the floor for public comment regarding the South Main Street
26 Corridor (SMSC) Plan.

27
28 Patty Kennington requested the City consider expanding the density cap to the southern
29 and east ends of the SMSC. She said the old Dicks Market site (Pages Lane between Main Street
30 and 400 East) is surrounded by residential uses and a residential density cap of 8 units per acre
31 would be consistent and compatible with the area. In addition, Pages Lane is not a high traffic
32 road and could not accommodate high density.

33
34 Dale McIntyre said the J.A. Taylor Elementary and old Dicks Market areas are not suited
35 for high density. This is a residential neighborhood area. He said all the residents that have been
36 coming to these meetings are against high density. He will be deeply disappointed if the City
37 does not cap the density as it is clearly the community's desire.

38
39 Ryan Archibald said he is against high density in Centerville. He only supports low
40 density. He said high density will bring too much traffic which will negatively impact schools
41 and endanger students crossing the street.
42

1 Lisa Malmstrom said she is a crossing guard on Main Street and said current traffic is too
2 intense and dangerous for students. She said adding additional high density to the area will only
3 compound the situation.

4
5 Jennifer Turnbloom said she too is against high density and agreed that more density will
6 negatively impact the area. She said most of the housing for sale in Centerville are townhomes
7 and apartments with a wide range of prices. She said there are already plenty of housing options
8 in Centerville, additional high density options are not necessary.

9
10 Tim Hawkes urged the Commission to listen to the public and advocate for their desires
11 for low density. He said it is clear citizens do not want high density.

12 Kenny Mecham said he is against high density. He said high density brings higher crime.

13
14 Carol Bake said it sounded as though the lowering of the Planned Development Overlay
15 (PDO) minimum acreage would allow the Commission and City Council more control and
16 discretion of those types of developments. She said this is an advantage for the City. She also
17 agreed low density is the best option for the old Dick's Market area. She said high density will
18 bring too much traffic and negatively impact schools.

19
20 Bruce Roberts said he is concerned with density. He agreed traffic is already an issue in
21 the city and more density will not help this problem. He said it takes him longer to navigate
22 Centerville's roads than it does to drive to another city and back. He said the old Dick's Market
23 site is large and could bring a large development. He said low density is a better option. He said
24 high density will bring additional traffic problems and safety concerns for children.

25
26 Stephanie Ivie, City Councilwoman, said she avoids driving Main Street because traffic is
27 already too intense. She said the best long-range benefit for Centerville would be to keep the
28 SMSC at Residential-Low. She is also not convinced that high density will stimulate
29 redevelopment.

30
31 Nancy Smith said the best solution may be to throw out the SMSC Plan and revert Main
32 Street back to commercial only. She said if the City is going to keep SMSC Plan then a few
33 amendments to the plan may be needed such as clarifying the half block designation, and
34 clarifying the form base regulations or reverting back to zone based regulations. She believes the
35 zone base format is simpler and doesn't create expectations. She said most of the cities that she
36 has researched allow the mixed-use option but under the zone base format, not form based. She
37 said R-L should be the only allowance at the half block distance and beyond. She agreed traffic
38 is an issue and said the off-set intersections on Main Street only compound the problem. She said
39 high density will only intensify these problems. She said the traffic issues may even hinder the
40 amount of patrons that could access commercial uses on Main thus sending patrons to other
41 cities. She said perhaps the SMSC Plan is not the best concept for Main Street as originally
42 thought.

1 Melissa Thomas said there is a not a high density shortage in Centerville. There is already
2 a great deal of apartments and townhomes, there is no need for more. She said there are very few
3 single-family homes for sale and there are many people that want to live in Centerville in a
4 single-family home. She said R-L is a great option for Centerville, particularly within the SMSC.
5 She explained she recently purchased a home in Centerville but faced many challenges securing
6 a loan because there are too many rentals and not enough single-family owned homes. She said
7 single-family will stabilize the community and increase property values. She said high density
8 will only continue the decline of the area.

9
10 Alan Arbuckle said he has heard a lot of pleading for lower density. He said he is curious
11 how passionate property owners and developers really are for high density. He questioned who is
12 really pushing for high density, is it the City or property owners because it is clear it is not the
13 residents.

14
15 Seeing no one else wishing to comment; Chair Hirschi closed the public comment and
16 thanked the public for their time and comments.

17
18 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, said the City Council will hold another
19 public hearing for public comment re the SMSC Plan on June 16, 2015 and will hold a joint City
20 Council and Planning Commission meeting for the property owners and businesses to give them
21 the opportunity to comment on the SMSC Plan on June 17, 2015. The public is welcome and
22 encouraged to attend both meetings.

23
24 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- 25
26 1. The next Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday, June 24, 2015.
27 2. Upcoming Agenda Items
28 • Conceptual Site Plan & Conditional Use Permit, Porter Lane Townhomes
29

30
31 The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

32
33
34
35 _____
36 David Hirschi, Chair

37
38 _____
39 Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Centerville City Council
Minutes of Meeting of June 16, 2015

Page 2

PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN/OVERLAY ZONE

Mayor Cutler opened a public comment period regarding the South Main Street Corridor Plan/Overlay Zone at 7:24 p.m. He acknowledged that the City received a petition with a significant number of citizen signatures in support of a single-family proposal on the property between 300 South and Porter Lane on Main Street, and commented that suggestions of specific changes that could be made to the SMSC Plan would be helpful to the Council.

Jim Hanni – Mr. Hanni stated he is President of Centerville Commons HOA. He said he felt the petition mentioned by the Mayor was presented as a thank-you note for Brighton Homes. He said the letter was ambiguous, and he feels people were signing something they did not understand. He thanked Councilwoman Fillmore for answering many of his questions on her own time, and said it is his understanding that high density would not be involved on the Walton property or on Pages Lane. Mr. Hanni said he is anxious to see the Pages Lane area redeveloped. He would not be concerned about the mixed-density proposal that he has seen. Mr. Hanni said there is nothing that distinguishes Main Street in Centerville as a main street. He expressed concern that UDOT will make Main Street more of the thoroughfare than it is now if the City does nothing. Mr. Hanni mentioned what has been done in Santa Clara, Utah, and said he really feels the City needs to do something.

Sherri Lyn Lindstrom – Ms. Lindstrom commented that Main Street in Centerville has historically been dotted with commercial entities from Parrish Lane to Porter Lane. She said she would be disappointed to see the property between 300 South and Porter Lane be turned into single-family houses. She stated she understands the need for an interface with the homes east of the property, but she would hate to see the type of corridor across from Centerville Junior High duplicated between 300 South and Porter Lane. Ms. Lindstrom said she does not know anyone who would sell their homes to move to a house on Main Street. She said she would like to see a mixed-use component in that area. She suggested the Council find out the kind of density and number of floors being approved in surrounding communities, and keep density in perspective. She would like to see an appropriate, reasonable approach to help Brighton Homes build a nice project.

Dale McIntyre – Mr. McIntyre said one of the most compelling arguments he has heard in favor of higher density is that our grown up children will not have place to live. He said when he was a young adult he wanted to be independent and not live too close to his parents. He feels Centerville is attractive and desirable because it is a small town, and the small town atmosphere is what gives value to the properties. Mr. McIntyre said he believes that mixed-use with Residential-Low is appropriate for Centerville.

Nancy Smith – Ms. Smith stated she feels the current SMSC Plan gives unrealistic incentives to develop in ways that negatively affect neighboring land uses. She said levels of high density will ultimately create blight in the established neighborhoods, and added that mixed-use is not a good fit for Centerville. She stated she believes the current Plan inflates property values. Other commercial areas in the City might be weakened if an attempt is made to relocate commercial to the SMSC. She expressed concern for traffic, and the effect tall buildings would have on nearby residences. Ms. Smith suggested that a PDO would weaken the SMSC Plan, and asked that the City get rid of the Overlay if it is not going to be used. Established requirements become negotiable with a PDO, and she said she is uncomfortable with this type of zoning next to established neighborhoods. She asked the Council to leave the

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Centerville City Council
Minutes of Meeting of June 16, 2015

Page 3

1 TZRO in effect until a public space plan is in place for South Main Street. Ms. Smith stated she
2 intends to send a copy of her comments to the Council.
3

4 Brooke Larsen – Ms. Larsen stated she is a college student who would love to come
5 back to live in Centerville. She said she is in favor of a highly developed community center with
6 walkable sidewalks. Ms. Larsen stated she does not believe a wall that would close off a
7 residential development from Main Street would be an asset. Ms. Larsen said she would
8 support the SMSC Plan as it currently is.
9

10 Cami Layton – Ms. Layton stated that the citizens are the heart of Centerville, not the
11 SMSC Plan. She said she feels the plan for single-family homes between 300 South and Porter
12 Lane blends in beautifully with the city. She does not feel the wall would be a problem. Ms.
13 Layton said that no one is happy with the current compromise for the property. She pointed out
14 that the changes promised when the SMSC Plan was adopted have not occurred. Ms. Layton
15 read the letter she circulated for signatures in her neighborhood, and read some of the
16 responses. She said she is in favor of a single-family home development on the Walton
17 property. Ms. Layton thanked Councilman Wright for his service on the Council.
18

19 Ryan Archibald – Mr. Archibald expressed gratitude for the Council's willingness to
20 listen. He pointed out that Main Street across from Centerville Junior High is lined with fences.
21

22 Jennifer Turnblom – Ms. Turnblom suggested the half-block designation be defined as a
23 foot measurement, and gave examples of a possible minimum and maximum properties. She
24 said she does not know why there would be a problem with a fence around homes on Main
25 Street. Ms. Turnblom said she believes there is interest and desire for homes on Main Street.
26

27 Robyn Mecham – Ms. Mecham explained possible densities for the Pages Lane area as
28 she understands them. She said it is her understanding that UDOT and the Transportation
29 Board do not intend to widen Main Street to a four-lane highway. She said the Council needs to
30 remember they are talking about the City's historic district, and asked if it is fair to put something
31 in the long-time residents' neighborhood that they don't want. Ms. Mecham showed a map she
32 put together, and stated that high density concentrated in one area would eventually create
33 blight. She said she would like to see the area zoned R-1, with an intention for the City to work
34 with individual developers. Ms. Mecham said she believes people will want to live on Main
35 Street.
36

37 Ruth Ann Fisher – Ms. Fisher lives on Main Street near Parrish Lane. She said she
38 would love to be able to put a 6-8 foot wall in front of her property for noise abatement and
39 privacy, but she agrees with the idea that Main Street should not be an auto corridor through
40 town. She said she finds it frustrating that she could have a fence on her property along Main
41 Street if she could turn her house around to face a different direction. Ms. Fisher added that
42 she likes the idea of mixed-use on Main Street south of Parrish Lane.
43

44 Richard Ryan – Mr. Ryan stated he is concerned about the talk of high density in the
45 Pages Lane area. He said he believes if high density is allowed, it will become a transient area,
46 and will cause problems for schools and traffic. Mr. Ryan stated the City needs to look at
47 keeping low density in the Pages Lane area, and put the high density on the other side of the
48 freeway.
49

50 Karl Kennington – Mr. Kennington thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak. He
51 said the success rate of small businesses is not great, and he feels the most successful

1 arrangement for the Pages Lane area would be residential. He would like Centerville to retain
2 the desired atmosphere. Mr. Kennington referred to the nice condominium developments that
3 line Pages Lane on the north, and stated there are other, more appropriate places for taller
4 apartment buildings. He said he would not want to mimic Salt Lake City and invite what
5 happens with higher density. Mr. Kennington stated the area does not need buildings with
6 more than two stories.

7
8 Heather McKenzie Campbell – Ms. Campbell said the best time to go for a walk in her
9 neighborhood is on Sunday, with reduced traffic. She feels the speed is way too fast on Main
10 Street. She said it is too bad that Dick's Market moved away from Pages Lane. She stated that
11 people do not stay in the small high-density apartments for long - they move to homes. If the
12 Pages Lane area cannot be commercial, she said she believes it would be a nice area to build
13 single-family homes. She expressed concern for traffic if high density is allowed, and said she
14 hopes whatever is allowed will not congest the area and bring a transient population. She
15 believes Centerville should stay a family-friendly city.

16
17 Fred Davies – Mr. Davies said his concern is that the Council maintain the integrity of
18 the City of Centerville. He said he hopes as the Council makes decisions they will have the best
19 interests of Centerville at heart. He stated that trying to plan for a city the size of Centerville is
20 difficult. He expressed appreciation for the time spent by the Council for the benefit of the City.

21
22 Lisa Baker Heaton – Ms. Heaton stated she is in support of a plan that preserves
23 commercial on Main Street and does not build a wall along a block of the street. She said she
24 would like to see it continue to be a vibrant area of the city. Ms. Heaton said she hopes a
25 development plan can be found that fits with the SMSC Plan as it currently is.

26
27 At 8:25 p.m. Mayor Cutler closed the public comment period, and the Council took a
28 break, returning at 8:31 p.m.

29
30 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

31
32 The minutes of the June 2, 2015 Council work session and regular meeting, and the
33 June 9, 2015 Special meeting were reviewed. Councilman Wright made a **motion** to approve
34 all three sets of minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Ivie and passed by
35 unanimous vote (4-0).

36
37 **SUMMARY ACTION CALENDAR**

- 38
39 a. Terminate Warranty for Chitose Johnson Subdivision
40 b. Municipal Code Amendments – Title 16 – Stormwater – Consider Municipal Code
41 Amendments to Various Sections of Title 16 regarding Stormwater Management and
42 Pollution Control – Ordinance No. 2015-11

43
44 Councilman Wright made a **motion** to approve both items on the Summary Action
45 Calendar, including Ordinance No. 2015-11. Councilman Averett seconded the motion.
46 Councilwoman Ivie asked for clarification of item (b) regarding stormwater. Lisa Romney, City
47 Attorney, explained that the minor amendments eliminate any ambiguity regarding pollutants.
48 The motion passed by unanimous vote (4-0).

49

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Minutes of the joint meeting of the Centerville **City Council and Planning Commission** held Tuesday, June 17, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor	Paul A. Cutler
Council Members	Ken S. Averett Tamilyn Fillmore Stephanie Ivie Lawrence Wright

<u>MEMBER ABSENT</u>	John T. Higginson
-----------------------------	-------------------

<u>PLANNING COMMISSION PRESENT</u>	David Hirschi, Chair Gina Hirst William Ince Logan Johnson Scott Kjar
---	---

<u>COMMISSIONERS ABSENT</u>	Kevin Merrill, Vice Chair Cheylynn Hayman
------------------------------------	--

<u>STAFF PRESENT</u>	Steve Thacker, City Manager Lisa Romney, City Attorney Cory Snyder, Community Development Director Katie Rust, Recording Secretary
-----------------------------	---

<u>STAFF ABSENT</u>	Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager
----------------------------	--

<u>VISITORS</u>	Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)
------------------------	--

SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN/OVERLAY ZONE

At 7:12 p.m. Mayor Cutler opened a public comment period to receive comments from business and property owners regarding the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Plan/Overlay Zone. Responding to a request from the audience, Mayor Cutler explained that the SMSC Plan was created to provide design standards to improve the commercial viability of Main Street. The Plan encourages developers to put buildings close to the street with parking lots behind. Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, read the main goals of the SMSC Plan aloud, and described the separate zones designated within the SMSC. Mayor Cutler stated that the Council has received feedback centered overwhelmingly on density. The Plan does not have a maximum density cap, and could, in theory, be exploited to have more density than intended. David Hirschi, Planning Commission Chair, explained the Planning Commission's recommendation for a maximum density of four units per acre, with up to eight units per acre on a conditional use permit basis, for residential in a commercial zone.

Ed Schirner – Mr. Schirner owns a home on Porter Lane just east of Main Street. He said his main concern is potential development of the Walton property. Mr. Schirner commented that he has seen in Clearfield what happens in schools when high density is allowed. He stated that location contributes to the success of a business, and he feels that small business would probably not survive on the Walton property. He suggested that about 15 homes would be appropriate on that block, and added that it would be beautiful if the homes

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Joint Centerville City Council/Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting of June 17, 2015

Page 2

1 faced Main Street. Mr. Schirner said building homes and putting a fence around them would be
2 the worst thing that could be done. He said he moved to Centerville for the small town feel, and
3 he would like to see drawings of a desired street view. The City needs to plan for 20 years
4 down the road.

5
6 Ann Fadel – Ms. Fadel owns a business on Main Street. She stated she thinks three-
7 story buildings at the sidewalk would be a mistake. South Main Street is not the commercial
8 heart or gateway of Centerville anymore. She said she loves having the parking in front of her
9 business, and she feels the setback is customer friendly. Ms. Fadel commented that the new
10 building on Main Street next to her business is too large and ostentatious, and is not vibrant.
11 She said she feels vibrant local business includes guardianship, camaraderie, and
12 watchfulness.

13
14 Andy Bavelas – Mr. Bavelas said that Main Street is a beautiful place, and he values a
15 small town feeling. He believes memories play an important part in the lives of people of all
16 ages - more important than shopping. A small town feeling means security, serenity, peace and
17 beauty. Mr. Bavelas said that people come to his farm and compliment Centerville.

18
19 Gary O'Brien – Mr. O'Brien owns O'Brien Glass Products on 55 East 400 South. He is
20 monetarily impacted by the discussions and decisions that will be made. He said he was told by
21 the previous administration that the City wants the SMSC improved. He purchased the corner
22 lot on Main Street and Porter Lane and has paid commercial property tax for a few years with
23 that assumption. Mr. O'Brien said he does not know what people want done. He stated he has
24 acted in good faith based on the stated goals for the Corridor. He said he feels that it would not
25 be fair or right to build a house on the property after he has paid commercial rates for so many
26 years.

27
28 Marv Blossch – Mr. Blossch stated he represents the former Dick's Market properties on
29 Pages Lane. He pointed out that the former Dick's Market building has sat vacant for three or
30 four years, and traffic and shopping trends have moved closer to freeway exits. Mr. Blossch
31 asked that the City not limit what can be done on Pages Lane in terms of flexibility and providing
32 for the future. He said he can see potential in a higher-density residential development, and he
33 would hope the City would be sensitive and not make arbitrary restrictions. He stated that
34 parking behind is good, and mixed-use is good, and he would want to keep the commercial
35 zoning alive. He said he will continue to try to bring another grocery store to the area, but he
36 does not feel it is very likely. Mr. Blossch said that four houses per acre would not work
37 financially on that property. He suggested Riley Court, an independent senior living
38 development in Bountiful, as a positive example of what could be done. He mentioned that an
39 RDA is probably out of the question on Pages Lane. The area needs innovative concepts for
40 fresh, new growth to carry it through the next 20 years. Mr. Blossch emphasized that flexibility in
41 zoning is the key issue.

42
43 Jennifer Turnblom – Ms. Turnblom stated it needs to be clarified that the Planning
44 Commission's recommendation is not for the whole Main Street Corridor. She has both a
45 residence and a family business on Main Street, and she has been involved with both
46 successful and unsuccessful business on Main Street. Ms. Turnblom said she was under the
47 impression that new businesses on Main Street would have an appearance similar to Cutler's
48 Cookies. She would not want to take commercial away completely, but she would not want the
49 commercial overshadowing everything else. She said she would love to eventually be able to
50 put some nice houses on her property that would blend with the neighborhood. She does not
51 think high-density is what is needed on the Walton property.

1
2 Michael Randall – Mr. Randall expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak, and
3 stated that he has a home and a business on the Main Street Corridor. Mr. Randall said he
4 does not think there was enough public input at the time the SMSC Plan was put together. The
5 economy was strong at that point, and it may have seemed more appropriate to plan the
6 Corridor the way it was at that time. He said he is not against development, but the City needs
7 to do things that make sense on Main Street. Centerville still has a hometown feel. Mr. Randall
8 expressed sympathy for Mr. O'Brien, but stated that there is risk involved in buying property. He
9 likes that his customers are able to park at the front of his store. He said he agrees with lower
10 density, and does not have a problem with changing zoning to allow single-family homes. Mr.
11 Randall said he enjoys being able to live next door to his business.
12

13 Sharman Smoot – Mr. Smoot stated he is involved in management and ownership of
14 three properties in the Parrish Lane/Main Street area. He suggested it would be valuable to
15 look at what is feasible and what would really happen, and said that some of the properties will
16 continue to be eye sores unless vision is part of the planning process. He said he has been
17 involved in many projects along the Wasatch front, and he feels it is good to recall what works
18 and what doesn't work in terms of planning. There are pockets where commercial will continue
19 to struggle. He said he does not believe Pages Lane will grow commercially because it is not
20 near the freeway or big box stores. He would love to see a nice, quality development along
21 Pages Lane, but the City would be dooming the property if it is limited to 4 units per acre. Mr.
22 Smoot stated that infrastructure concerns can be mitigated, and it would not hurt the City to add
23 a little higher density. He said he does not think 25 units per acre is very high density because
24 those numbers are necessary for really quality projects. The Pages Lane area needs flexibility.
25 Mr. Smoot agreed that buildings close to the street with parking behind adds to a nice feeling.
26 Some restrictions negatively affect what a project will look like.
27

28 Councilman Averett asked for Mr. Smoot's opinion of the viability of commercial mixed-
29 use on the O'Brien property. Mr. Smoot said he suspects there is not a lot of demand, and
30 commercial space would frequently be vacant. He suggested some nice looking, high-end town
31 homes.
32

33 Responding to a previous comment, Mayor Cutler clarified that the SMSC Plan allows
34 for different types of mixed-use.
35

36 Marv Blosch – Mr. Blosch pointed out that Bountiful did not want apartments along Main
37 Street until it realized that residents are necessary to make commercial viable. The small
38 businesses will not be viable without residents.
39

40 Andy Bavelas – Mr. Bavelas stated the City needs to consider the residents on the south
41 end that will be affected by what is done. He said it is always a concern that Centerville will feel
42 as though it is separated into a north side and a south side. The rights of the residents need to
43 be considered.
44

45 Mayor Cutler closed the public comment period at 8:25 p.m. He showed on the City
46 website where minutes and agendas can be found, and stated that recordings can be obtained
47 from the City Recorder.
48

49 Councilwoman Fillmore pointed out that the Council has invited public comments
50 regarding the SMSC Plan through June 30th, and stated she would be reluctant to engage in
51 Council and Planning Commission discussion until after the public comment period has ended.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Joint Centerville City Council/Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting of June 17, 2015

Page 4

1 Chair Hirschi agreed, and said he has been pleased with the comments received so far. He
2 clarified that the Planning Commission recommendation regarding density restrictions applies to
3 the City Center and Traditional areas. Councilman Wright also agreed with Councilwoman
4 Fillmore, and encouraged citizens to resubmit emails if their emails were originally submitted
5 when the email address was not working correctly.

6 Commissioner Ince asked for clarification regarding comments made at the June 16th
7 meeting regarding a wall along Main Street on the Walton property. Mayor Cutler responded
8 that the wall refers to a specific proposal shown by Brighton Homes to residents. The City has
9 not received an official application for that proposal. The Mayor explained the TZRO currently in
10 place, and the Council's desire to expedite the planning process to be able to lift the TZRO as
11 soon as possible. Councilman Averett expressed a desire for the Council to meet with the
12 Planning Commission for joint discussion and goal setting after the public comment period is
13 over to speed up the process. Chair Hirschi agreed, and encouraged citizens and members of
14 the Council and Planning Commission to read through the SMSC Plan again to provide a
15 foundation for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

16
17
18
19 Mayor Cutler adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.
20
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder
27
28
29
30
31

Date Approved

Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

Marsha Morrow

From: Dean Williams <battalion71@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 9:16 AM
To: southmain; Dean Williams; Lynne Shaffer; John Higginson; Ken Averett; Larry Wright; Mayor; Stephanie Ivie; Tami Fillmore; Debra Randall; Gina Hurst; Wm Scott Kjar; Bill Ince; Zonecentervilleright; Cheryl Williams
Subject: Development of the South Main Street Corridor

Centerville City Council
Centerville City Planning Commission

I would like to thank you for your service, and your willingness to devote so much time and energy in making Centerville a most cherished place to live. I am a lifelong resident of Centerville and grew up on the Williams Dairy Farm on the corner of Main Street and Porter Lane. I wouldn't change my childhood and my experiences in Centerville for anything. I attended Centerville Elementary until we opened J.A. Taylor for my 4-6 grades. We were then bussed to Kaysville Jr. High until we opened Centerville Jr. High for my 8-9 grades. I was in the fourth graduating class at Viewmont High School. The LDS stake I grew up in included all of Centerville and Farmington. I have seen tremendous growth in the city, and realize that this growth was inevitable, including subdividing my family's farm, which is where I now reside.

Although growth is expected, I believe we have a tremendous responsibility to plan that growth in such a way that we don't lose the Centerville that we all love. I believe the growth has been well planned, including the commercial corridor that so many were against on Parrish Lane. We needed that for a tax base for the city, and it has worked out well.

The two sections that I feel we need to take our time with and make sure they fit in with the plan of the city are the sections on the northeast corner of Main Street and Porter Lane, and the section west of 400 West on Porter Lane. There have been plans on developing these into high density housing, which I believe have been tabled for medium housing. My preference is to put in more single family homes to fit in with the neighborhoods around these parcels.

My concerns are listed as the following items. I am not going to go into great detail, I believe you already know this, and others have voiced their concerns, and will continue to voice them because of their concern of a changing lifestyle that we will have to live with long after the developers have gone.

- 1- Increased traffic. Main Street and 400 West have now become treacherous in their flow, as they are the main artery for the entire south end of Davis County entering Centerville's Commercial District on Parrish Lane.
- 2- Increased pressure on the school system. Centerville Elementary, J. A. Taylor Elementary, Centerville Jr. High, and Viewmont High all have portable classrooms. This isn't only costly, but takes away green space and recreation space.
- 3- Decrease in recreation areas. The parents of the soccer teams at Viewmont fought long and hard to keep their teams in the Centerville area. The area behind Centerville Jr. High was secured as not only fields for Viewmont, but also several club teams that bring in tournaments, including the Mayor's Cup. There isn't any place left in the south end of Centerville for any more fields.

4- Increase in church attendance. There isn't any room left for the construction of any more chapels, of any faith.

5- Decrease in recreation space. The south end of Centerville lost their only baseball fields to the Parrish Lane development. There is a

great development on the frontage road, but it is in the north end of Centerville. The south end can't afford to lose any more

recreation area for our children, especially the area behind Centerville Jr. High. The middle of Centerville isn't Center Street.

6- An increase in multi-family units. The south end of Centerville cannot support any more multi-family developments. When you look

at what we are supporting now, including what Bountiful City put on our border with them, all the multi-family developments are in

the south end of the city. Because of all the reasons listed above, if we must have more of these types of developments, spread them

out throughout the city where the impact isn't so great.

7- An increased load on Police and Fire. If we increase the population, it will obviously increase the load on Police and Fire. We can't

only look at the call volume, but the thousands of hours each year that are dedicated to community policing and fire prevention,

which are far more valuable than response. I retired from West Valley City Fire Dept. and every fire station that ran an engine and

ambulance was never staffed with less than five personnel, which is more than what we are running now. Increased staffing causes

increased taxes.

Once again I would like to thank you for your time. Please let me finish with one last thought. My in-laws moved to Hurricane City about 20 years ago. They moved because of the congestion in Woods Cross. After they had been there a couple years, my father-in-law was so excited about development that was about to occur. The road was widened, which forced him to move, and commercial development occurred. I could never understand why he was so enthused about having development move in when the reason he moved there was to get away from it. I had the opportunity to talk to several residents of Hurricane last week, and they say the town is a mess. Why do we want to change Centerville into something that is completely contrary to why people live here, and want to move here? If people want to live in that kind of environment, there are plenty of opportunities to do so surrounding us. There is a reason that we love Centerville. Because of this it puts a great responsibility on all of us to look at what little space there is left, and to plan for it accordingly. If we want to have a Main Street like Bountiful, move to Bountiful. If we want to have a Main Street like the one that drew and keeps us all here, be wise with the growth. Property owners do want to maximize their investment, but they also have to appreciate what is happening and has happened around them, and it isn't all about the money. If it was about the money, my grandfather and his children wouldn't have put my area into single family homes.

Thank you for your time. Please take your time in these decisions. I am available anytime if you have any questions or comments.

Dean Williams
130 West 550 South
Centerville
801-719-8345

battalion71@hotmail.com

Marsha Morrow

From: Ryan Archibald <ryan.archie22@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2015 9:34 PM
Subject: Dear Centerville City Council and Mayor

Dear Centerville City Council and Mayor,

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen of Centerville. I only support the development of low density single family homes whether its on Main Street, Parrish Square on Parrish Lane, and also across the street from JA Taylor Elementary where the old Dicks Market and Rogers Memorial Theatre sits. It will endanger the kids and the crossing guards of the city by increased traffic.

If you believe that higher density is a good idea I ask you, "Are you willing to be the crossing guard on our streets?"

Brighton Homes has released a plan for single family homes between 300 south and 400 south on Main Street. I expect you will give full consideration to this plan. I support this plan for single family homes and believe these homes will sell very quickly- I meet renters living in smaller homes who want to stay but cannot find a home to buy.

Another suggestion for these areas up for redevelopment - A bigger fire station with tennis courts. Bountiful city has this, my family and I often use these courts and its fun to see the fire trucks out and about.

Thank you for reading my email.

Sincerely,
Ryan Archibald

--

Thanks,

Ryan Archibald

- www.linkedin.com/in/ryanarchibald1/

Marsha Morrow

From: Ronald G. Russell <rrussell@parrbrown.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 9:28 AM
To: southmain
Subject: Let's Not Turn Our Backs to Main Street

City Council and Planning Commission:

I understand that the City Council and the Planning Commission are considering public comment regarding the South Main Street Corridor Plan and related zoning ordinance. I believe that this discussion results from a recent development proposal submitted by Brighton Homes.

As the former Mayor of Centerville, I was heavily involved in the lengthy process that resulted in the South Main Street corridor plan and zoning ordinance. The process that we followed before implementing the current plan and zoning, involved well over a year of meetings, public hearings and open houses that involved all stakeholders. I would strongly recommend an equally robust process before any changes are made to this carefully thought-out plan for the heart of our community.

The primary goals of the Main Street Plan are just as valid today as they were when the plan was adopted in 2008. The Main Street Plan:

1. Moves the buildings to the street, which matches the older buildings to create a small town look that frames the corridor.
2. Frames the corridor with buildings closer to the street to protect from the potential of future widening to accommodate more traffic lanes or rail transit.
3. Limits the height of buildings to what was allowed before the Main Street plan was approved.
4. Moves the buildings away from adjacent residential, which improves the buffer and minimizes the impact of commercial buildings (including shadows) on adjacent residential.
5. Gives more options to property owners to make economic uses of their property.
6. Eliminates commercial uses that we found to be undesirable on Main Street. Gives us tools to make commercial more compatible with adjacent uses.

As I understand it, Brighton Homes has come up with a plan to try to address concerns raised by neighbors who would prefer a development with only single-family residences. The single-family plan I have seen would have a row of houses with the back yards against Main Street and a wall, creating a "boulevard" appearance. I implore you not to make changes to the plan and zoning that would "turn our backs" to Main Street. That would be a planning disaster that could never be reversed and would run counter to all of the policies and design principles that are embraced by the Main Street Plan. All development in the South Main Street corridor needs to face the street.

I understand concerns expressed by neighbors regarding increased residential density and I would not be opposed to zoning changes that would accommodate single-family homes behind a row on buildings facing Main Street. Ideally, the buildings facing Main Street should have compatible commercial uses on the main level with residential above. If there is compelling evidence that commercial uses on the Main level would not be viable, then it might make sense to consider a row of "brownstones" or similar residential uses along Main Street with single-family homes behind.

Please don't be shortsighted by throwing out what we have accomplished with other new buildings on Main Street. We shouldn't waffle or do flip flops in how we plan, but offer consistency and fairness to property owners on Main Street who need viable options to accomplish the policy of having buildings that frame the street and preserve the corridor.

Ron Russell

801-560-8692

Ronald G. Russell | Attorney | Parr Brown Gee & Loveless | A Professional Corporation
101 South 200 East, Suite 700 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
D: 801.257.7942 | T: 801.532.7840 | F: 801.532.7750 | russell@parrbrown.com | www.parrbrown.com

Information in this message (including any attachments) is confidential, may be legally privileged, and is intended solely for the use of the person(s) identified above. The sender did not intend to waive any privilege by sending this message. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete the original and any copies of the message. Any duplication, dissemination or distribution of this message by unintended recipients is prohibited.

Marsha Morrow

From: David <drkhgill@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 10:53 AM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street

Email resent.

From: drkhgill@msn.com
To: southmain@centervilleut.com
Subject: South Main Street
Date: Mon, 15 Jun 2015 20:37:09 -0600

Dear City Council member. Thank you for your service.

Concerned Centerville Citizens have worked out a plan with Brighton Homes that is a great improvement over the original proposal. With just one more step the plan can fit the intent of the South Main Street Corridor Plan. Please take that step.

To **preserve** the South Main Street Corridor Plan and related zoning ordinances would be in the best interest of *all* the Citizens of Centerville. The beautification and design standards will gradually transform this area into an ambiance to take note of.

Preserving the Plan will also support the opportunity to create a Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and offer assistance to property owners and developers making the transition to mixed use.

Preserving the Plan is preferable to allowing exceptions which would reduce the viability of the entire overlay area.

Preserving the Plan in place will allow current commercial property owners to retain their property values through mixed use.

Please take the long view in favor of the future of Centerville and **preserve the Plan** in place. You and all of Centerville will be happy with the long-term results.

Dave Gill

Marsha Morrow

From: Joanne and Brady McGarry <joanneandbrady@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 12:14 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Fw: Brighton building proposals

On Tuesday, June 16, 2015 12:26 AM, Joanne and Brady McGarry <joanneandbrady@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Centerville City Council,

Thank you for all of the time, effort and energy you put into the work you do for Centerville city.

I'm writing concerning the Walton Village proposals. I support the single family housing proposal much more than the higher density proposal (I think there is sufficient high density living options in Centerville already).

My only concern regarding the single family homes, as proposed, is the fencing off a block of main street- which goes against the Main Street Plan. I think the long term vision of that plan is valuable

I also wonder if there are other possibilities besides just fencing off an "all single family homes" development. If not, I would like to see a hybrid plan proposed that provides single family homes, and also protects an open and walkable Main. I lean away from supporting town homes on main-- as I think they would be difficult to sell. I mostly like the option of offices lining the street if that is viable.

Thank you for your time and service.

Sincerely,

Joanne McGarry

Marsha Morrow

From: Alice Roberts <alligator321@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 4:14 PM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor

I sent a couple of emails Monday and yesterday, but have heard that they perhaps didn't go through. I'm writing to share my thoughts on the development being planned for walton lane. I think the original plan had a density that was too high for the area and it would have been out of place. I appreciate Brighton Homes being willing to make changes for the good of the community. My concern now is that the changes, while better for the residential neighbors in theory, are not what is actually best for the long term health of our main street.

This development will set a precedence for all the future development along main street, and as another citizen pointed out during the planning commission meeting I attended, there are a lot of properties along main street that are likely to be redeveloped in the not too distant future.

I think we need to make sure that the ordinance for that area preserves the vision that we want for the area. Personally, I think a good compromise would be a row of mixed use with single family homes behind. That preserves the open, safe, walkable community that doesn't have a big fence blocking the street from the community, and it also keeps the density lower. The single row of mixed use also provides a better buffer from the noise of main street than a fence would. If the feasibility study shows the area can't support commercial, there are still options for a row of higher density condos or town homes that face main street (with extra sound proofing perhaps) but have the driveways in the back.

I run through our community regularly, and can feel a difference in terms of how safe I feel in different areas. Areas that have a street fenced off from the homes do not feel as safe as areas where there are people in yards or walking on the sidewalk around me. I also have children who do or will walk home from the junior high, and I would prefer the area to be open so people in those buildings can see the children on the street- more eyes on our kids keeps them safer.

The current ordinance was put in place because of a vision of what our main street could be in the future. I'm afraid if we let go of that future, we'll end up with something we didn't want. We have walmart because citizens were concerned about traffic and density of the planned mixed use development. I know the single family homes are not walmart, but I think reacting to one thing in that case ended up with something that was not in the best interest of our community. I love the feel that the main street plan has, and hope that we can find a compromise that works for the surrounding residential area AND works for preserving the vision of the main street plan.

Alice Fisher Roberts

Marsha Morrow

From: Brooke Larsen <brookinselise@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 7:43 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Main Street Corridor Plan

City Council and Planning Commission,

I love Centerville. As a college student thinking toward the future, I would love to have the opportunity to raise my own family in Centerville someday. An option for higher density housing would make that a more reasonable option for me and many other young families someday. I also love the idea that this higher density housing could bring more diversity to our community which would be very valuable. But whether the higher density housing happens or not, I fully support the Main Street Plan as it currently is. I love the idea of making Main Street an attractive community center with a pedestrian friendly feel. Because of this, I cannot support the current proposition for the Brighton Homes development on Main Street (Proposal #2) as it would be an overreaction to the citizen requests.

I am opposed the idea of a big fence or wall which would be unappealing to the eye and close off Main Street from the housing area. It would defeat the purpose of the Main Street plan which states that the goals are to, "Promote the South Main Street Corridor as the cultural, civic, and community heart of Centerville by providing a careful balance of land uses, which serve residents, businesses, and visitors" and to "Enhance and promote the South Main Street Corridor as the setting for attractive, convenient, active, safe, and enjoyable destination and place of residence." This wall would make the area feel less friendly and safe, as well as look less attractive. I also worry that the wall would make drivers feel as if they could speed along faster on Main Street than they already do. The buildings closer to the street along with trees and pedestrian areas would make drivers more alert and careful. We have a small amount of Main Street with which to make these goals happen, and the area under consideration would have a great deal of influence on the overall goals. Putting this wall up would hinder the whole plan that the Planning Commission and City Council have been working on for years.

I would support Brighton Homes in building multi-family housing, single family housing, a commercial/housing combination, or a commercial area, however, I would like to fulfil the goals of the current Main Street plan to make the area a gathering and cultural center of our community by removing the wall along Main Street in the currently proposed plan. Because of this, I support Proposal #3, which would be a compromise between the high density housing and the fenced off neighborhood. This plan would be an opportunity to appease the citizens of Centerville but also to keep the integrity and viability of the Main Street plan which would have long-term benefits for our community that I hope to be able to enjoy for years in the future.

Brooke Larsen

Former Centerville City Youth Mayor

348 Tobe Drive

Centerville

Marsha Morrow

From: Ryan Archibald <ryan.archie22@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 9:57 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Think of it like a business

Dear Centerville City Council and Mayor,

I've been thinking a lot about this Walton property and I believe a good way to look at it is like a business. All of you are the executive team and the employees are the residents.

Now as the executive team you want employees (residents) who come, stay, and build up this great company (city). You don't want an environment that only attracts temporary/seasonal employees (renters living in apartments) because those employees will leave when you were so excited they joined your company. Your turnover will be so high that no one will want to help you build up your company because they won't stay long enough.

Having an environment where people want to stay (low density single family homes) is the best plan to bring the most success to this company you all are working hard to build.

In other words- I FULLY support the single family development plan proposed by Brighton Homes. I FULLY Support the wall on main street providing privacy to the new homes on the Walton Property.

If the wall is so big of an issue - I live across from Centerville Junior High where our "wall" is made up of chain link, wood, and plastic (vinyl?) fencing; I would love to see a nice uniform wall to improve the appeal of my neighborhood- give us the wall!

--

Thanks,

Ryan Archibald

- www.linkedin.com/in/ryanarchibald1/

Marsha Morrow

From: MATTHEW AND MELISSA LARSEN <yeateslarsen@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2015 1:41 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Proposed Walton Village Development

June 15, 2015

Paul Cutler, Centerville Mayor
Ken Averett, Centerville City Council
Tami Fillmore, Centerville City Council
Stephanie Ivie, Centerville City Council
John Higginson, Centerville City Council
Larry Wright, Centerville City Council

Re: Walton Village Development

Dear Mayor Cutler and Members of the City Council:

Similar to many Centerville citizens, I was alarmed when I heard the news of the high-density housing proposal on Main Street. I am relieved to know that Brighton Homes has since decided to hold off on that project and that they are considering other options based on the input of the citizens of Centerville. I am supportive of a single-family home development, but I do not feel that the newest proposal is the right choice for Main Street and for Centerville.

I have read the South Main Street Corridor Plan and fully support its intent. I realize that a great deal of work went in to getting the plan approved and in place. I feel that the goals in that plan are very viable and would help our Main Street improve and become the "city center" that our city deserves. It is my opinion that the plan should be kept and honored as is, and not be changed.

A single family development that faces away from Main Street surrounded by a wall is not a desirable plan. It would create a highway-like atmosphere that would encourage speeding, making that block of Main Street less safe and less desirable for walking, biking, and gathering. A single-family development that faced the Main Street would be a good compromise, as would a row of commercial development with single-family housing behind it.

I am writing to make it clear that all Centerville citizens do not feel that the most recent proposal by Brighton Homes is a home run. I appreciate their compromise to avoid high-density housing on Main Street. I believe, however, that there is still room for compromise so that the development does not diminish or change the South Main Street Corridor Plan.

Sincerely,
Melissa Larsen
348 Tobe Drive,
Centerville, UT 84014

Marsha Morrow

From: Dean Williams <battalion71@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2015 7:32 PM
To: Cheryl Williams; John Higginson; Ken Averett; Larry Wright; Mayor; Stephanie Ivie; Tami Fillmore; Debra Randall; Gina Hurst; Wm Scott Kjar; Bill Ince; Zonecentervilleright; Dean Williams
Subject: Development in South Centerville
Attachments: Centerville Development June 21.docx

Please take the time to read the attachment about a couple current developments in South Centerville.

Thank you for your time.

Dean Williams
130 West 550 South
Centerville
801-719-8345
battalion71@hotmail.com

South Centerville Development

I understand there is a Planning Commission meeting this week discussing a couple properties in South Centerville. I unfortunately will be out of town, and would have liked to be there to continue dialog about these properties and the zoning.

I know all of you are busy, so I am asking for just a few moments to give my thoughts on the development that is occurring in South Centerville. As I stated before, I have a vested interest in Centerville, and always have. My great great grandfather was Osmyn Deuel, one of the first settlers. My great grandfather was Joseph Williams, the second mayor of Centerville. My family has been here from the beginning, and we plan on staying until the end. I have a concern with developers who's interest is in changing Centerville to accomplish their goal of taking the money and running. I don't believe we as residents, or you as elected and appointed officials, have an obligation to developers or landowners to ensure that they are able to develop their property in a way that they become financially secure. Our obligation is to ensure that the developments reinforce a lifestyle that is safe and comfortable for those residents who have decided to make Centerville their home, for those who want to move here because of what Centerville is.

A concern mentioned by Brighton Builders was that they have only a slight margin on their investment. My take on the issue is that Brighton was never planning on putting in high density housing. They brought that to the table knowing that if it was approved, they would receive a windfall. I believe they always planned on medium density knowing the neighborhoods would fight high density, Brighton would back off, and the residents would feel that they accomplished a victory. I have a hard time believing that Brighton has not done a significant amount of research and planning, and have come up with a low density plan as an alternate, knowing that if they backed off to that they would still make money – not as much, but enough to make it worthwhile. If they don't plan for these events, they will go broke.

As I mentioned, I don't believe we owe Brighton anything but a pat on the back for putting in a development that fits in with the lifestyle and goals of Centerville. I don't know why some feel that every piece of land that is left in South Centerville must be developed into high density housing. I don't want it to be like the Salt Lake Valley (where I worked for 32 years as a Firefighter), where people feel the only way they can avoid the congestion is to move to Tooele, Eagle Mountain, or Kamas.

I appreciate you giving me some more time on this important, but lasting issue. I look forward to continued dialog to ensure that we all feel that what is built is within the best interest of Centerville, and all of us, including the property owners and developers, can have continued pride in saying that we are part of Centerville City.

Thank you again for your time and service. Please feel free to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

Dean Williams

130 West 550 South

Centerville

801-719-8345

Battalion71@hotmail.com

Marsha Morrow

From: PaulandStephanie Archibald <psarchibald@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 1:18 PM
To: southmain
Subject: main street corridor

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to voice my **full support** of the new proposed **single family residence** plan for the porter walton property. What a great idea to put homes in that area!! We really think the homes are a better solution than the high density housing that was originally proposed. More apartments would bring a lot more headaches and problems to this area of town. There already so much traffic congestion on main street that adding 85 apartment units with 2 cars each would only make that problem worse. I wonder if the people who live in the north part of Centerville even know this is being proposed. They should also be concerned as many of them have to drive their kids to Centerville Jr. High and the traffic on main street is horrendous as they well know.

I hope the council members will consider this and know that the people who live in this are want more single family homes. Young families are always looking for a home to purchase in this are for the great location close to so many great schools and there is a real shortage. They dont see an apartment and a place to raise their families long term. People are looking for lots to build a home in Centerville to raise their family, not a temporary place to live while they build there home somewhere else. Is that the kind of place you want Centerville to become, a temporary living place?

Of course I would prefer a lower density or 4 or 5 homes per acre. But, I will take what I can get for now.

Thank you

Stephanie and Paul Archibald

Marsha Morrow

From: Joanne and Brady McGarry <joanneandbrady@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 2:50 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Fw: Brighton building proposals

On Tuesday, June 16, 2015 12:26 AM, Joanne and Brady McGarry <joanneandbrady@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Centerville City Council,

Thank you for all of the time, effort and energy you put into the work you do for Centerville city.

I'm writing concerning the Walton Village proposals. I support the single family housing proposal much more than the higher density proposal (I think there is sufficient high density living options in Centerville already).

My only concern regarding the single family homes, as proposed, is the fencing off a block of main street- which goes against the Main Street Plan. I think the long term vision of that plan is valuable

I also wonder if there are other possibilities besides just fencing off an "all single family homes" development. If not, I would like to see a hybrid plan proposed that provides single family homes, and also protects an open and walkable Main. I lean away from supporting town homes on main-- as I think they would be difficult to sell. I mostly like the option of offices lining the street if that is viable.

Thank you for your time and service.

Sincerely,

Joanne McGarry

Marsha Morrow

From: Heather Strasser <lebonheur76@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 11:20 AM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor Plan

Dear Mayor Cutler and City Council,

As you consider the South Main Street Corridor Plan, I would like to express some concerns about the current plan. I look forward to the recommendations that come from this deeper look at the plan.

More higher density housing is not needed or desired in this area of our city. Looking at an aerial view of the city, the density in South Centerville is already high enough.

Main Street is not the current cultural center of our town. Our library is not on Main Street, the City Hall's access faces east, not west on Main Street, and the commercial district is certainly not Main Street. Now is a good opportunity to update the intent of the South Main Street corridor to what works.

There is much discussion about the proposed Walton Village development. Single family smaller homes is a great idea. We don't have much of this option in Centerville. It seems to be either town home developments or larger, more expensive homes. I hope that we don't limit our options for this Walton Village development based on an outdated SMSC plan that no longer fits.

Thanks for all you do for our city.

Sincerely,

Heather Strasser

434 South 600 West - Centerville

Marsha Morrow

From: Travis Davis <travis@hughesgc.com>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 6:21 PM
To: southmain
Cc: Travis Davis
Subject: SMSC Density Cap at R-L
Attachments: Centerville SMSC Zoning 6-29-15.pdf; Centerville South Area Map.pdf

Centerville City Officials,

Regarding the South Main Street Corridor Zoning Overlay: From a developer's perspective, every project has its obstacles and many projects have their NIMBY's (not in my backyard), but it seems that in reality the SMSC puts developers in a position of unreasonable risk and complication. Looking back on the Walton Village process is quite telling. It started out with the developer meeting the zoning requirements, not necessarily by preference, but only to make a project of the underdeveloped piece of real estate. Developer and zoning were aligned, but then the citizens spoke up and now the citizens and the developer are aligned with zoning on the outs. The market has spoken that commercial use doesn't work there, density doesn't work there, single-family works great, but it is ridiculous to have some new beautiful homes face Main Street when the rest of the homes in the development face a quiet street and smiling neighbors. How does a developer accept the risk to make that marketable? The current Brighton Homes plan of 31 single family residences with an attractive fence and 5' landscape buffer on Main Street seems to strike a perfect balance of landowner's rights, developer's rights, and the citizen's desires.

The SMSC plan was designed in anticipation of increased commercial use and higher density housing. Commercial development is not a reliable investment and the citizens will not tolerate medium or high density housing. Further complicating the SMSC plan is the fact that it only contemplates the Main Street frontage. It in effect holds the rest of site hostage with unreasonable risk. Rather than benefit Centerville, the SMSC plan seems to actually cause harm to current landowners, deter reliable development, and frustrate citizens (please see the attached files).

The SMSC plan also describes Main Street as being a civic, cultural, and commercial center, which seems out of date for the following reasons:

1. The civic center is somewhat on Main Street with City Hall (although never accessed from Main Street, do the doors even open?). The well designed library is on 400 west, and public works is on the west side of the freeway.
2. The cultural center is the beautiful Centerpoint Theater (a great asset to the community). There are also the new movie theaters on the west side of town.
3. The commercial center flanks Parrish Lane with low-rise office buildings, bustling retail centers, and many service centers.


If the SMSC plan were being fulfilled all of the above mentioned uses (most of which have been constructed since the SMSC was put in place) would be along Main Street. The reality is that natural development and citizen preference has avoided Main Street with the uses under the current zoning. Commercial/retail won't sell on Main Street, but I bet (and current market data support) that Brighton homes could sell single family homes of varying sizes on every developable parcel of land along Main Street as fast as they could build them. Some folks may be concerned about a wall on Main Street, or "turning their backs on Main Street", but there are many simple means of creating beautiful transitions from Main Street to single family homes.

There is also a rumor of UDOT coming to widen Main Street in the future. UDOT certainly has master plans, but in my experience UDOT is reactionary to development and accident rates along established roads. A sure fire way to get UDOT to add traffic lights and widen roads is to increase housing density.

Please consider repealing the SMSC plan or re-working it to allow current land owners better use of their property and support the voice of the citizens.

Thank you for your diligent service.


Travis Davis
111 Canyon Breeze
801-860-1553



NOTE: THE ABOVE SOUTH CENTERVILLE MAP DEPICTS THE LOCATION OF THE CIVIC, CULTURAL, RETAIL, AND COMMERCIAL ELEMENTS OF CENTERVILLE THAT THE SMSC PLAN DESCRIBES TO BE LOCATED ON MAIN STREET. THOSE USES ARE ALREADY ESTABLISHED AND GROWING IN AREAS OTHER THAN MAIN STREET (WITH EXCEPTION TO CITY HALL). THE ONLY THING LEFT IN THE SMSC PLAN FOR MAIN STREET IS HIGH/MEDIUM DENSITY HOUSING, WHICH IS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE CITIZENS, NOR CONDUCTIVE TO THE CURRENT ZONING INTENT.

Title 12 – Zoning
Article 4 – Special Purpose and Overlay District Zones
Chapter 12-48 – South Main Street Corridor Zone

SMSC OVERLAY DISTRICT Sub-District Illustration Map 12-48-1



Title 12 – Zoning
Article 4 – Special Purpose and Overlay District Zones
Chapter 12-48 – South Main Street Corridor Zone

TABLE 12-48-1 Lot Types Allowed by Sub-District						
TABLE 12-48-1	South Main Street Corridor Districts					
Lot Type	North Gateway/ Mixed-Use	Civic/Cultural	Traditional Main Street	City Center Main Street	Residential Boulevard	Pages Lane/ Mixed Use
Traditional Main Street	X	X	X	---	---	X
City Center Main Street	X	---	---	X	---	X
Corner Gateway	X ¹	---	---	---	---	X
Civic/Cultural	---	X	X	---	X	---
Traditional House	X	X	X	---	X	---
TND/Mixed Use	X	---	---	---	---	X
Brownstone/Live Work	X	---	X	---	---	X
<i>Note 1: Corner Gateway Lot Type must be used for any corner lot development at the Parrish Lane and Main Street Intersection; The TOD lot is not allowed on lots fronting Main Street</i>						

TABLE 12-48-2, Off-Street Parking Modifications		
Land Use Type	SMSC Districts	
	City Center	All others
Residential Uses	60% of Requirement	75% of Requirement
Public/Civic Uses	50% of Requirement	60% of Requirement
Commercial Uses	40% of Requirement	60% of Requirement

SMALL RETAIL SHOPS THAT FRONT MAIN STREET WOULD BE GREAT, BUT THE DECLINING COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE MARKET ON MAIN DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS USE. FURTHERMORE, WHAT CAN BE DONE ON THE REST OF THE SITE?

Traditional Main Street Lot

Building Envelope Specifications:

East Side: 1 1/2 to 2 stories 25' maximum
West Side: 1 1/2 to 3 stories 35' maximum w/ CUP
Height: 10' clear height (minimum 50% of floor)
Upper Floor: 8' clear height
Front of Lot: Required Build-To Range (RBR) 5' to 10'
Sides of Lot: No setback required
Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
Lot Width: 25' to 260'
Building Frontage: Minimum 75% of lot width
Street Facade: Minimum 75% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:


Solid to Void Ratio: 60% openings (voids) are required for the street level on all street facing facades. Upper levels shall have 30 to 60% openings on all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not a lower in lengths that exceed 20 feet on any side.
Uses: Ground floor uses shall be nonresidential, such as office or retail, on the street-side portion of the building. Residential uses may occupy the rear portion (up to 50% of the ground floor). Upper floor uses may be residential, office, retail,



Character Examples

Lot Width
(25' Min to 260' Max)

Building Height
(35' from Grade of Main Street)




Percent open (voids)

Main Street

Building Frontage %
(75 to 100% of Lot Width)

% of Building within RBR
(75 to 100%)

Required Build-To Range
(5' to 10' From Back of Sidewalk)



Main Street

THESE ARE BEAUTIFUL EXAMPLES, BUT THERE IS ALREADY A CITY HALL ON MAIN STREET AND CENTERPOINT THEATER IS ON 400 WEST, IT IS NOT LIKELY TO SEE ANOTHER THEATER ON MAIN STREET.

Civic/Cultural Lot

Building Envelope Specifications:


Height: 2 or 3 stories, 40' maximum
First Floor: 12' clear height (minimum 50% of floor)
Upper Floor: 9' clear height
Front of Lot: Required Build-To Range (RBR) 15' to 25'
Sides of Lot: 5' min
Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
Lot Width: 50' to no max
Building Frontage: Minimum 60% of lot width
Street Facade: Minimum 75% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Solid to Void Ratio: 60% openings (voids) are required for the street level on all street facing facades. Upper levels shall have a minimum of 30% openings on all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not allowed in lengths that exceed 20 feet on any side.
Uses: Civic uses shall occupy a minimum of 50% of the ground floor space. Office or community service related uses may occupy the remainder of the ground floor and upper floors.




Character Examples




Required Build-To Range (15' to 25' From Back of Sidewalk)



Building Frontage % (60 to 80% of Lot Width)



% of Building within RBR (75 to 100%)



THESE ARE CHARMING HOMES THAT ARE SHOWN TO FACE MAIN STREET. IT IS A BIG RISK FOR A DEVELOPER TO BUILD HOMES THAT FACE MAIN STREET. IT IS FAR BETTER FOR HOMES TO FACE QUIET INTERIOR STREETS AND FRIENDLY NEIGHBORS - THEIR BACK IS NOT "TURNED ON MAIN STREET", THEIR ACCESS IS CONVENIENT FROM MAIN STREET - THEIR HOME STILL HAS A CENTERVILLE FEEL LIKE MOST RESIDENTIAL SPACES CURRENTLY ALONG MAIN STREET.

Traditional House Lot

Building Envelope Specifications:

Height: 1 or 2 stories, 28' maximum
First Floor: 9' clear height (minimum 75% of floor)
Upper Floor(s): 8' clear height
Front of Lot: Required Build-To Range (RBR) 15' to 25'
Sides of Lot: 5' min
Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
Lot Width: 25' to 120'
Building Frontage: 40' to 70% of lot width
Street Facade: Minimum 75% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Solid to Void Ratio: 30 to 60% openings (voids) are required on all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not allowed in lengths that exceed 20 feet on any side.
Uses: The ground level may be used for a small office or business as associated with a home business.
Access: A rear drive or alley is allowed for access to garages and/or accessory dwelling units at the rear of the lot.
Fencing: Fencing, not to exceed 36 inches in height, is allowed on either street facing facade.



Character Examples

Lot Width
(25' Min to 120' Max)

Building Height
(28' from Grade of Main Street)






Main Street

Required Build-To Range
(15' to 25' From Back of Sidewalk)

Building Frontage %
(40 to 70% of Lot Width)

% of Building within RBR
(75 to 100%)



Main Street

THESE ARE GREAT EXAMPLES, BUT NOBODY CAN FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE A LIVE/WORK CONFIGURATION FUNCTION. DEVELOPERS ARE NOT CONFIDENT IN THE CONCEPT AS DISPLAYED IN THE WALTON VILLAGE PROCESS. THIS ORDINANCE THAT WAS ORIGINALLY INTENDED TO DEAL WITH MAIN STREET FRONTAGE FORCES THE ENTIRE PARCEL TO BE HIGH DENSITY.

Brownstone/Live-Work Lot

Building Envelope Specifications:

Height: 2 or 3 stories, 35' maximum
First Floor: 10' clear height (minimum 75% of floor)
Upper Floor(s): 8' clear height
Front of Lot: Required Build-To Range (RBR) 5' to 10'
Sides of Lot: 0' min
Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
Lot Width: 32' to 50'
Building Frontage: Minimum 75% of lot width
Street Facade: Minimum 66% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Solid to Void Ratio: 30 to 60% openings (voids) are required on all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not allowed in lengths that exceed 20 feet on any side.
Uses: The ground level may be used for a small office or business as associated with a live-work unit.
Units: A minimum of two units shall be constructed adjacent to one another. This may take place on the same lot or on adjoining lots.
Fencing: Fencing, not to exceed 36 inches in height, is allowed on either street facing facade.



Character Examples

Lot Width
(32' Min to 50' Max)

Building Height
(35' from Grade of Main Street)




Main Street

% of Building within RBR
(66 to 100%)

Building Frontage %
(75 to 100% of Lot Width)

Required Build-To Range
(5' to 10' From Back of Sidewalk)



Main Street

Interville Zoning Ordinance
e 12, Chapter 48, Page 12 of 20


Building Envelope Specifications:

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Required Build-To Range
(5' to 10' From Back of Sidewalk)

Building Frontage %
80 to 100% of Lot Width)

% of Building within RBR
(75 to 100%)



THE CITIZENS DO NOT WANT HIGH/MEDIUM DENSITY. FURTHERMORE, THESE CONFIGURATIONS DO NOT ACCOUNT FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE MAIN STREET FRONTAGE. WHAT WILL HAPPEN ON THE REST OF THE SITE? ANOTHER ISSUE IS THAT COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IS NOT A VIABLE OPTION, SO THAT GROUND FLOOR USE ON THE MAIN STREET FRONTAGE IS HOLDING DEVELOPMENT ON THE REST OF THE SITE HOSTAGE.

City Center Main Street Lot

Building Envelope Specifications:

- East Side: 1.8/2 stories 26' maximum
- West Side: 1.8/3 stories 36' maximum w/ CUP
- Height: 12' clear height (minimum 50% of floor)
- First Floor: 8' clear height
- Upper Floor: 8' clear height
- Front of Lot: Required Back-To-Range (RBR) 2' to 5'
- Sides of Lot: 0' to 10' max
- Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
- Lot Width: 18' to 120'
- Building Frontage: Minimum 80% of lot width
- Street Facade: Minimum 75% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Solid to Void Ratio: 60% openings (voids) are required for the street level on all street facing facades. Upper levels shall have 30 to 70% openings in all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not allowed in heights that exceed 20 feet on any side.

Uses: Ground floor uses shall be nonresidential, such as office or retail, on the street side portion of the building. Residential uses may occupy the rear portion (up to 50% of the ground floor. Upper floor uses may be residential, office, retail.

Arcade: An arcade or gallery may project into the sidewalk easement if constructed as part of a contiguous street frontage of at least 200 feet in length.




Character Examples

Lot Width
(18' Min to 120' Max)

Building Height

(35' from Grade of Main Street)




Height 35' from
Main Street

Main Street

Required Build-To Range
(2' to 5' From Back of Sidewalk)

Building Frontage %
(80 to 100% of Lot Width)

% of Building within RBR
(75 to 100%)



Main Street

THE CITIZENS DO NOT WANT HIGH/MEDIUM DENSITY. FURTHERMORE, THESE CONFIGURATIONS DO NOT ACCOUNT FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE MAIN STREET FRONTAGE. WHAT WILL HAPPEN ON THE REST OF THE SITE? ANOTHER ISSUE IS THAT COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IS NOT A VIABLE OPTION, SO THAT GROUND FLOOR USE ON THE MAIN STREET FRONTAGE IS HOLDING DEVELOPMENT ON THE REST OF THE SITE HOSTAGE.

Corner Gateway Lot


Building Envelope Specifications:

Height: 1.5 or 2 stories; 28' maximum
First Floor: 10' clear height (minimum 50% of floor)
Upper Floor: 8' clear height
Front of Lot: Required Build-To Range (RBR) 5' to 10'
Sides of Lot: No setback required
Rear of Lot: 15' setback to building
Lot Width: 25' to 190'
Building Frontage: Minimum 75% of lot width
Street Facade: Minimum 75% in the RBR

Building Use & Element Specifications:

Solid to Void Ratio: 60% openings (voids) are required for the street level on all street facing facades. Upper levels shall have a minimum of 30% openings on all street facing facades. Blank walls with no openings are not allowed in lengths that exceed 20 feet on any side.


Uses: Ground floor uses shall be non-residential, such as office or retail, on the street-side portion of the building. Residential uses may occupy the rear portion (up to 50%) of the ground floor. Upper floor uses may be residential, office, or retail.



Character Examples

Lot Width
(25' Min to 190' Max)

Building Height
(28' from Grade of Main Street)





Main Street

Required Build-To Range
(5' to 10' From Back of Sidewalk)

Building Frontage %
(75 to 100% of Lot Width)

% of Building within RBR
(75 to 100%)



Main Street

Title 12 – Zoning
Article 4 – Special Purpose and Overlay District Zones
Chapter 12-48 – South Main Street Corridor Zone

TABLE 12-48-3 – Landscaping Modifications

Land Use Type	SMSC Districts	
	City Center	All others
Non-Single Family Projects	15% On-Site Requirement	20% On-Site Requirement
Non-Residential Projects	7% On-Site Requirement	9% On-Site Requirement
Mixed Use Projects	7% On-Site Requirement	9% On-Site Requirement
Public Street Landscaping	10 Feet to Parking Areas	15 Feet to Parking Areas
Buffer Landscaping For Mixed Use Projects Only (all others per 12-51)	8 Feet for "M" Zones 15 Feet for "H"	8 feet for "M" Zones 15 Feet for "H"

Title 12 – Zoning
Article 4 – Special Purpose and Overlay District Zones
Chapter 12-48 – South Main Street Corridor Zone

TABLE 12-48-4 - Lot Size and Dimension Requirements

<u>Lot Types</u>	<u>Height</u>			<u>Setbacks</u>			<u>Siting</u>	
	Total (min/max)	First Floor (min)	Upper Floors (min)	Front	Side	Rear	Lot Width (min/max)	% of building at RBL Building % of lot frontage
1. Corner Gateway Lot	28	1.5/2	10	8	5 to 10	0	15	25/185 75 75
2. TND/Mixed-Use Lot	35	2/3	12	8	5 to 10	0/10 max	15	25/no max 75 80 to 100
3. City Center Main Street Lot a. East Side b. West Side	25' 35'	1.5/2 1.5/3 ^a	12 12	8 8	2 to 5 2 to 5	0/10 max 0/10 max	15 15	18/120 18/120 75 75 80 to 100 80 to 100
4. Traditional Main Street Lot a. East Side b. West Side	25' 35'	1.5/2 1.5/3 ^a	10 10	8 8	5 to 10 5 to 10	0 0	15 15	25/240 25/240 75 75 75 75
5. Civic/Cultural Lot	40	2/3	12	9	15 to 25	5	15	50/no max 75 60
6. Traditional House Lot	28	1/2	9	8	15 to 25	5	10	25/120 75 40 to 70
7. Vehicle Storage Lot					15	5	5	56/150
8. Brownstone/Live-Work Lot	35'	2/3 ^b	10	8	5 to 10	0	15	32/50 66 75

- a. Note: For Traditional Main Street & City Center Main Street Lot Types a third story height shall be subject to Condition Use Permit approval and limited to West Side Only.
- b. Note: If lot type is used in the Traditional Main Street District building heights shall comply with the east/west allowances of Table 12-48-4(4).

Marsha Morrow

From: Eric Eddings <egeddings@gmail.com> on behalf of Eric G. Eddings
<eric.eddings@utah.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 4:55 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Citizen comments regarding Walton Village development

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

We wanted to send a brief note regarding the planned Walton Village development in Centerville. We live at 152 East Canyon Breeze Dr., which is approximately one block away from the development site.

We have watched the evolution of the various plans for that site, and want to voice our support for the recently-proposed, single-family plan provided by Brighton Homes. We appreciate their willingness to evolve their plans for that property, based on feedback from both the surrounding residents as well as the city, and appreciate what they have put together with this new single-family home development.

While this plan represents higher density housing than traditional single-family homes (most often on 0.18-0.25 acre or larger lots), this new plan provides a reasonable compromise with the developer. We saw a similar type of development come into the area with Centerville Commons (Pages Lane and Main), and our experience was quite positive with those homes and their occupants as neighbors.

The earlier plans provided for a mixed-use option, which may have had some alignment with the South Main Street Corridor plan, but the amount of commercial space available in those earlier versions was so small that it would not have provided any truly significant commercial development, in our view. We do not feel that the amount of additional commercial activity that would come into the city via any sort of mixed-use housing at that site, would have enough economic impact to warrant the negative impact it would have on the surrounding neighborhoods. We watched for many years while developers struggled to fill the first-floor commercial space in the "Village on Main Street" development at the old J.C. Penney site, and would not want to see a repeat of that in the Walton Village development.

Please consider this new plan as a viable option for addressing the needs of both the developer and the surrounding citizenry. While it does not include a commercial component, we feel that the development would have a positive impact for the South end of Main Street in Centerville.

Regards,
Eric & Julie Eddings
152 East Canyon Breeze Dr.
Centerville, Utah 84014
(801) 299-1821

Marsha Morrow

From: JUSTIN <flynrock@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 9:06 PM
To: southmain
Subject: SMSC

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

My name is Justin Cozad and I live at 192 E 400 So.
I also own the property at 110 E 400 So,
And the property at 92 E 300 So.

I want you to know that I oppose high density!

Commercial property isn't working on the SMSC, and it won't!

I support single family homes on nice lots!

Thank You for your time and service.

Justin Cozad

Marsha Morrow

From: JEFF THOMAS <jeffrey.thomas@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 11:58 PM
To: southmain
Subject: P

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

My name is Jeff Thomas and I live at 225 East 800 South.

I want to comment on issues surrounding the SMSC. I have several concerns regarding our corridor!

- The SMSC seems to encourage high density development, which I oppose. I don't understand or cities love affair with high density in south Centerville! I live right next door to the Riviera Townhouses. I love the people that live there, however, it certainly doesn't foster a stable community. These people with growing families can't stay...they lack room!
- I support residential density caps in ALL the overlay zones in the SMSC. Why must we make the same mistakes other cities are currently making? How about residential lots no smaller than 1/4 acre lots?
- I'm trying to support Brighton Homes' proposed Walton Village development of single family homes on Main Street. Are the developers running our city, or are you? Why settle for projects all around our city that doesn't lead to a greater, family friendly community! We really are becoming the "City in between". People only sleep here, and work and shop somewhere else!
- High density attracts UDOT to make drastic changes on Main Street. Because every high density neighborhood deserves lightrail, and higher crime! Why has anyone in our city management given this any consideration as a good idea?
- My hope for each of you, especially on the North end.....is that a high density neighborhood is built next door to you! Then you too can enjoy your neighbors for a year or two, and then they'll move away! It is awesome!

Sincerely yours,

Jeff Thomas

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Marsha Morrow

From: Lauri Wootton <wootter11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:36 AM
To: Mayor
Subject: Mainstreet Concerns

My name is Lauri Walton Wootton, daughter of Franklin E. Walton Jr. and Edna May Walton (deceased). Centerville has been my home for most of 68 years. My parents and extended family instilled a great love for this town in me at an early age. I have watched it grow and change (sadly, not always for the better) and tried to come to grips with the idea that change is good...we must consider any and all ideas and be respectful of all even if their beliefs don't align with yours. I have been mostly on the fringe of many of the decisions concerning this town but this issue has to be addressed.

I have difficulty believing our City Planner has a "vision" for Centerville while he resides in Syracuse. He needs to really listen to what the majority of the citizens of this wonderful city want! I have been to many meetings on this mainstreet debate and I have heard 95% percent of those who spoke support the ideas of low density and no commercial on the Walton Village project. Why is this even an issue? The majority of us support this plan!!!! I have been told that Centerville has the highest density housing in the state. Can that really be true? If it is, I am certainly not proud of it...none of us should be.

Please consider what the people are asking for and respect their views and values.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lauri Walton Wootton
120 E. 300 S.
Centerville

Marsha Morrow

From: Michelle Morris <mmorrisgau@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:31 AM
To: southmain
Subject: Concerns about Proposed Main Street Development

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I want to share with you my comments and concerns with the South Main Street Corridor and proposed single family development called the Walton Villages on Main Street between Porter Lane and 300 South.

My concerns are that we continue to keep Main Street as it has been which is a small town road, a road that connects to the neighborhood walk-able streets and has the continuity of its surroundings. A place where people want to move to and stay, as I plan to until I die. As a life long resident of this beautiful city I share the concerns of many others and support keeping single family development a priority for this area and development.

While I understand the differing point of views, I do feel that we have other areas that currently support and offer more space for high density housing with the surrounding amenities that most people who live in such a place need. I believe that you have more options of encouraging new business in these areas to fit the needs of a community. The mixed used model has not worked on Main Street but has shifted to Parrish Lane where the growth continues to be happening, where the roads and infrastructure have the capacity to support the increase of housing and cars on the roads.

I do not support a mass transit on Main Street but feel that we should continue to look for ways to support the current transit available with the possibility of a Front Runner Station stop and more walk-able trails down by the Legacy Theaters, where there is the space, current high density housing and construction for more.

Please cap the density in the SMSC to Residential Low.

Lastly, I would like to thank you for your time and effort in listening to the concerns of the residents of Centerville. It is a beautiful, family friendly place to live.

Sincerely,

Chris and Michelle Morris
83 West 850 South

Marsha Morrow

From: annieferrin@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 8:45 AM
To: southmain

Please don't fence off main street!

Sent from my HTC on T-Mobile 4G LTE

Marsha Morrow

From: Cami Layton <camilayton59@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 12:26 AM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor comments

Sent from my iPad. Dear City council, I think I have emailed all of you regarding my feelings on the Walton property, but want to share it with you again. I am going to be blunt because I don't believe in beating around the bush. I am terrible with writing all this down and wish I could speak to all of you and just get it all out. So excuse my writing and grammar etc. I don't have the time it takes to care about this sort of thing. Sorry.

GET RID of the conditional use and PDO. They have been in direct conflict with the beauty of the SMSC plan. Why have a plan when this other just defeats it. They just give the developer and property owners the right basically to do anything they want. If we had every parcel of land developed with the conditional use and PDOs in our area, we would have a nightmare. It already is so saturated with every type of multiple housing unit. How on earth did we get into this mess??? I can tell you that it was 1 development at a time!!! Now we have over 600. Why oh why has our city councils the past 30 years let this happen? Because our city councils have not had the foresight to protect us from the beginning. City councils have listened to the citizens in my area for years over concerns, but they DON'T HEAR!! We have a few like Larry and Stephanie that can't seem to get the rest of you to really hear what the citizens are saying and feeling. It's been like this for years and years. I am OPPOSED to anymore apartments, town homes condos in our area period. We have our share and are dealing with all the concerns that go along with them in our wards and stake. One of my friends said a few years ago that her husband regularly helped people move in and out every Friday and Saturday. There are plenty more issues than that, but I'm not going to list all of them. Traffic is HORRIBLE! Do we get punished because we live in the South?? I am opposed to any multiple housing on Main period! It is OUT OF CHARACTER for our rural town atmosphere feel. More density on Main could in the future supply the evidence for light rail that citizens have OPPOSED!! NO density on Main!! I am for the 31 single family home Brighton development only because it has the less density of the two proposals and I am against town homes as I said before. The fence issues can be worked out. It is absolutely ridiculous what a fuss people are making over a fence/wall. They are nit picking because they think the single family homes are going to jeopardize "The Plan". No single family home is going to wreck our Main Street. It would only add to the small town atmosphere citizens desire. If our General Plan or Main Street Corridor Plan is not making citizens happy- CHANGE IT!!!!!! What is more important? A "Plan" should never be more important than its citizens. Look what it's done already to South Centerville. It's made it a dumping ground for density. It's too bad our past councils did not have

the vision to preserve and protect us and put responsible density caps in place so we wouldn't be arguing about this all the time.

I'd liked to see density caps in our city as a whole and especially in the south and in our SMSC. Please consider amending the plan quickly to reflect a R1 cap for us. We deserve that in our area with all the other we have had to put up with. Yes, you can do it. Be the city council to come to the rescue of South Centerville? Step up and make the difference. As far as The SCMC plan goes, I feel like mom and pop stores aren't going to make it. Not against them if they want to try, but most likely they won't succeed. The new MATT'S place is nice on Main. Those type of business are perfect for our Main Street and most likely are the ones that will do well. Mixed use is not going to work and again OUT OF CHARACTER. I am opposed to this. Please amend it from the SMSC plan. It encourages high density and I am opposed to this as well as many citizens!!!!!!!!!!!!!! It also conflicts with the vision of Main Street.

A single family development should be allowed on Main regardless of any plan period. It can only enhance what we desire on Main. If the SMSC plan does not limit density or what we value then amend it so it reflects those values we do!! Get rid of the PDOs because they encourage higher densities that citizens are opposed to. And we don't want anything that entices light rail!

The biggest concern of citizens in the South is DENSITY. Please amend all plans to rectify this.

I hope I didn't forget anything. And if I did , you know what I meant to say . Please listen to the citizens and hear what we have been trying to say all these years. We have enough density- please protect us from any more. Single family homes-not a thing wrong with them!!

Density caps please!! Of course R1 Preferred.

SMSC -amend the plan to get rid of mixed use- density issue.

Work with Brighton on this proposal, but be tough with them on complying to every good thing we can get.

Last but not least- citizens that live around these developments should weigh in more with their concerns because they live around them and are impacted by them the most. Citizens who have paid taxes and lived here ought to be heard before those that haven't moved in yet.

Centerville is not an entitlement city. And we do not need to be the problem solver for the potential growth we hear coming. We have so much land in America and Utah. One of these days we need to realize we can spread out again.

We do not have to build up and so tight we feel squeezed in . If we have a density cap, we won't get that growth. Our quality of life is worth protecting now and the small town atmosphere we all desire. We are not the only wonderful city. My kids love their neighborhoods and cities and none of them live in Centerville. They bloomed where planted. And so can others. That is all . Thanks for all your time. Hope we can get all this density figured out soon. One last idea.

Maybe Tami Filmore could paint her vision of Centerville on the Fence/Wall and then she could finally be happy. No offense to Tami but I think she just wants to make her mark on the city and this might be the thing that would do it for her. I'm tired and want to go to bed and I'm not going to correct all these sentences. Good luck reading all this.

Appreciate you all!! If I didn't address all the issues or concerns you know what I meant . Please amend , fix, adjust and keep our Centerville what the citizens desire- which is NOT density squeezed in by multi-housing. Keep our growth at R1. Thanks, Cami Layton

Thanks Larry and Stephanie for representing the citizens! I have been reading some of the city council minutes and noticed you both truly vote for our happiness and quality of life. Way to go!

I support density caps in the SMSC and from Pages to Parrish and the rest of Centerville . Let's work on this to make this happen. Let's not get an eyesore on the old Dicks Market property.

You probably need to get some fresh air after reading this and take a deep breath - I don't blame you. Take a break and go do it. This was not meant to offend. It's just how I feel and want to get my point made about density. We're tired if it !! Thanks so much for all you do for Centerville. I know you spend many late hours in meetings. The things you vote on affect us for years. I know you do many good things for centerville too, but this density issue is not healthy for our community. We need to address it, and find ways to strengthen the bond between the citizens. It's not what it used to be and I'm afraid the citizens are pulling apart from each other. South Centerville citizens are feeling like they are not cared about from their neighbors in the North. What can the city council do to help with that problem?? Good luck with all this. Please hear us. Thanks, Cami Layton

Marsha Morrow

From: Scott Van Orman <scottvanorman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 12:37 AM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor - please specify residential low density and allow single family along main

Hello,

Thank you for accepting input on the main street corridor. I feel the existing plan is the vision of a minority of individuals that do not represent the majority of the Centerville citizens that is in conflict with a low density, small town community that has made Centerville a great place to live. I also think the existing plan for commercial development is unrealistic, outdated and misplaced. The gateway to Centerville is Parrish Lane.

In my opinion, the main reason the existing plan was so difficult to put in place was because it does not reflect the true values and will of the majority of Centerville residents. I was in attendance at several planning commission and city council meetings with many other fellow citizens several years ago when the corridor was being discussed and finalized.

Despite concern from many citizens on high density and three-story mixed use storefronts, I remember a member of the planning commission telling the citizens that people on the planning commission were highly educated and understood how to plan for the future and that if we knew what they knew then we would see things differently, or, in other words, "We know better than you, let us tell you what you really want." I remember another person on the planning commission state, "Let the city council deal with it." The existing plan was "approved" by the planning commission despite the presence of standing-room-only numbers of concerned citizens in town hall. As a concerned citizen I was amazed and frustrated at the approval of the plan.

There is a high demand for single-family homes in Centerville while existing commercial space on main street sits vacant or turns over frequently as businesses come and go. I and many other citizens I know want to continue low-density development along main street and in as many other parts of the city as possible.

So far the SMSC has failed to deliver on its promises.

- Commercial isn't working on Main Street, so why would mixed-use commercial work on Main Street? It isn't even working well in cities with established Main Streets like Bountiful.
- The SMSC seems to encourage high density development, which I oppose.
- I support residential density caps in ALL the overlay zones in the SMSC.
- I opposed use of PDOs on smaller parcels.
- I support Brighton Homes' proposed Walton Village development of single family homes on Main Street.
- High density attracts UDOT to make drastic changes on Main Street.

Please listen to our input to allow for residential, single-family development along main street and continue the development in a manner that has made and will continue to make Centerville the great place it is to live. Thank you.

Scott Van Orman
55 Canyon Breeze Dr
Centerville, UT 84014
801-910-3810 cell

Marsha Morrow

From: Jennifer Turnblom <thatsustwo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 11:40 AM
To: southmain; Ken Averett; Stephanie Ivie; John Higginson; Tami Fillmore; Larry Wright; Mayor
Subject: PLEASE LISTEN TO THE CITIZENS!

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Please be KNOWN for the City Council that LISTENS TO THE CITIZENS WHO VOTED FOR THEM.

The focus of my concerns is the 2 sections of Main Street that go from Porter Lane(400 South) to 100 North. Named the City Center Main Street District and Traditional Main Street District on the Main Street Plan.

During many of the meetings in June I heard the phrase that city plans were for the future not for now. I would hope that the city council would have the foresight NOW to make a plan that would leave options for the FUTURE. I would like to see a plan now that requires residential LOW density PER ACRE and buildings that are 2 stories or less and under 25 feet in height. This would allow for future citizens to implement plans for more density and more stories IF the need should arise. This would eliminate the shadow effect on the historical residential communities on east and west sides of Main Street. People move into our community because they enjoy the "small" town feel. Many start out in condos/apartments and then hope to find single family homes, but find it difficult. This is because there are plenty of condos/apartments available and not homes. I also feel that low density single family dwellings would help the senior citizens of our community be able to stay, because most of the high density developments do not allow for single level living. Which is a necessity for seniors. A very good neighbor had to move out of our community to find a single level home.

While I don't object to businesses on Main Street, the commercial element on Main Street has struggled for many years. In the last 8 years that struggle has become more prominent as businesses have closed and buildings have sat empty permanently or for very long periods of time. I would like to see commercial buildings that are single story and reflect the historic feel of our community.

Judging by the number of times the fire trucks, ambulance and paramedics drive past our house with the sirens on, they are already stretching their resources to help people. Higher density would just aggravate this situation

I would like to point out one more glaring discrepancy in the Main Street Plan

The city regulations for front yards is; open fencing no higher than 4 feet, therefore the fencing on Main street should not have to be under 3 feet, it should align with the 4 foot regulation for the rest of the city. To have this discrepancy on main street does not accommodate the private residences on Main street it causes confusion. I also object to phasing out privacy fencing on side yards along Main Street. Owners placed those to protect their families the city should not take away that protection and privacy. I am EXTREMELY AGAINST City incentive programs for something like this. My tax money should not be used to pay for another person's landscaping.

(3.B. Develop and implement Corridor-wide standards for fencing to protect the pedestrian environment while still accommodating the needs of private residences. Fencing regulations should be consistent with front-yard fencing, allowing only for low, open fencing under 3' in height or low stone walls (2' height). New privacy

fencing ought not to be allowed adjacent to the sidewalk and existing privacy fencing could possibly be phased out using a City incentive program)

Thank you for the time and effort you put in to serving our community

Jennifer Turnblom

249 S Main Centerville

Marsha Morrow

From: Eileen Turnblom <thatsusalso@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 11:54 AM
To: southmain; Ken Averett; Stephanie Ivie; John Higginson; Tami Fillmore; Larry Wright; Mayor
Subject: I'm writing in regards to the South main street corridor plan:

I've lived on main street for the better part of 70 years. My father, like so many people since then, bought the property in Centerville because it was such a lovely, peaceful community.

When I was a child, there were no less than 17 single-dwelling homes on main street between Porter Lane and Parrish Lane. There were also the Lumber Yard building/pioneer ZCMI (the tallest building on Main St.), a grocery store, 3 gas stations, a coffee shop, and a dry cleaning business. I believe that it is possible for homes and businesses to share the same street.

Since I have lived with the winter shadow effect for the past 30-35 years, I am totally against buildings taller than 25 feet built adjacent to the sidewalk. There are some people in Centerville who would like to see our Main Street resemble Bountiful Main Street. Most of the businesses in Bountiful for many years were built adjacent to the sidewalks. Bountiful also has wider streets, room for street-side parking, wider "mow strips" and wider sidewalks. Although the new 3 story buildings in Bountiful are nice, they are claustrophobic. We would rather drive on 1st West in Bountiful past single dwelling residences and lovely large trees to avoid Main St.

I was quite pleased when the city wanted to create an Historic District in Centerville. I believe high density multi-dwelling buildings would detract from the atmosphere of this endeavor.

One more thing I would like you to consider. What is the first thing you notice as you drive down Farmington or Brigham City main streets? I'm quite sure you would agree with me that it would be the beautiful trees gracing each side of the road. The residential areas of main street north of Parrish Lane and south of Porter Lane are lovely. Between the two streets---all you notice are the multi-story stark business buildings. The smaller business buildings are more attractive and welcoming.

Eileen P. Turnblom
249 S Main

Marsha Morrow

From: CONNIE DAVIES <kevinconniedavies@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 12:55 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Mainstreet plans

Dear city council,

Thank you for all your work to help Centerville a wonderful place to live! I love living here, I enjoy walking to the grocery store, library, and fun movies at the park.

I recently heard of the newest plan for development of the section of mainstreet that used to house a plant nursery and dry cleaning business. I have heard there is an idea for residential housing that would require a large long fence along mainstreet.

As you make development plans, can you please keep in mind those of us love the vision of a beautiful walkable mainstreet and how a long fence would affect that feel? Is there a way to have small business and residential housing? I understand many compromises have been made for this area and I appreciate the efforts that have been put forth.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Connie Davies

Marsha Morrow

From: Dan S <dansonntag@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 1:00 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Centerville mainstreet corridor plan

Dear Centerville City.

I am a new resident of Centerville and missed the public comment meetings. I have read through the Mainstreet plan that was completed in 2008 and would like to say the plan is good and implementation of the plans will only benefit Centerville and it's residents.

Mainstreet in Centerville as it currently stands is unremarkable at best. It is unattractive, not comfortable to walk (narrow sidewalks right on the curb in many areas), not friendly to bicycle traffic except it is a very wide street. there is no visual unity or sense of place and no consistency with lighting, park strips or street trees, paving, setbacks, or intersection treatment. It is my opinion the 2008 plan addresses all these problems and should continue to be the goal.

Thanks

--

Dan

Marsha Morrow

From: Keith <kljutah@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 1:30 PM
To: southmain
Subject: The Fence :(

Dear City Council,

Please understand that walls, the backs of buildings, and fences are the things that line alleys, not Main Streets. Our Main Street tells who we are. Put up a fence and it says we are hiding something. If you want to make our city vibrant, then make it pedestrian friendly. Alleys aren't pedestrian friendly and yet we'll send hundreds of kids walking down our Main Street during the school year. This isn't just my opinion. This concern is supported by all kinds of urban design studies and you as our elected representatives, who are making these types of decisions, should be implementing smart design choices that will make and keep Centerville a vibrant, people on the street community. Please say no to the fence! Please find the better solution!

Cheers,
Keith Johnson
801-558-8580
kljutah@aol.com
67 E 400 N
Centerville, Utah

Marsha Morrow

From: Robin Carbaugh <rcarbaugh@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 1:46 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Walton Village and the SMSC

To my Mayor and City Council,

I have not been involved in any way in the political process in the community. I now realize that this is a mistake that I intend to rectify. I am making this comment so that I can thank you for your service to our community and so that I may pledge my support of those of you who are championing the same values espoused by my husband and myself.

So we are clear, I own the home at 115 E Porter Lane. The western edge of my lot shares a property line with the eastern edge of Gary O'Brien's property. I am very vested in the outcome of the plans for the Walton Village.

However, I am MORE concerned about the density and height issues that need to be addressed regarding the SMSC plan - for the entire length of this corridor, not just the property in proximity to my home.

First, the vast MAJORITY of the comments at the meetings I have attended have resolutely been against high density housing. I hope you were paying attention to this during the Month of Listening (a good idea, if you sincerely wish to represent us.)

Excessive building heights on Main Street are just going to ruin the feeling of this lovely little town.

Mixed used commercial on Main Street is not a viable option. The last thing I want to see in empty storefronts. As unattractive as O'Briens Glass is, I prefer it to empty shops. The breakeven point - even with tax incentives - for small business, would almost ensure that most of these new business would fail or leave the area.

Thank you for your time,

Robin Carbaugh
Former President/CEO Phillips-Wasatch Credit Union

Marsha Morrow

From: Timothy Hawkes <timothy.d.hawkes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 2:17 PM
To: southmain
Cc: Becky Hawkes
Subject: Comments on the SMSC Plan

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

We would like to comment on the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) overlay zone, proposed revisions to that zone, as well as on Brighton Homes' proposed development at Walton Village and how it relates to the SMSC.

First, we question the effectiveness of the SMSC. To date, it has failed to have any appreciable effect on the look or feel of the South Main Street corridor. It hasn't reduced speeds or increased pedestrian traffic or improved the overall streetscape. What it has threatened to do--particularly in the case of the initial proposals for the Walton Village development--is to encourage high density residential developments--the one thing the public has consistently opposed over the last decade and beyond.

Most residents moved to Centerville and choose to remain here because, despite its proximity to downtown, it offers a small town feel, and quiet, walkable neighborhoods. That's Centerville's best and most enduring asset, and the SMSC and other zoning ordinances the City enacts must promote those values--even as we grow--so that we continue to attract people who want to move here, stay, and invest in our community.

We question whether mixed use commercial represents a viable engine for redevelopment on Main Street. Mixed use developments elsewhere often struggle unless they are right on transit hubs or built out on much bigger scale. More importantly, it hasn't worked here, though it's been in place for several years. The Bamberger Offices aren't mixed use, but pure commercial. Similarly, Brighton Homes really struggled to come up with a mixed use product that could work on Main, ultimately concluding that they could do so only combined with extremely high residential densities and/or roof heights beyond what the SMSC currently allows.

That leaves high density residential housing as the most obvious--and likely--driver of redevelopment on Main, and threatens to dramatically increase densities beyond where they already are, which in this zone will only increase congestion, fuel calls for additional mass transit, burden our already strained infrastructure, threaten surrounding property values, and erode the small town feel of our community. In short, the SMSC seems to encourage exactly the opposite of what most residents would like to see happen.

Second, for all the reasons stated above, we strongly support proposals to cap densities in the SMSC corridor at Residential Low, with conditional uses permitting only modestly higher densities (e.g., 4-6 units per acre) and we support those caps for all overlay zones in south Centerville.

Third, we oppose making Planned Development Overlays (PDOs) a more widely used or available tool as such overlays tend to undermine existing zoning and result in less predictability for developers and residents. They also incent higher densities, which--again--remains the single greatest concern for residents in the south part of town.

Fourth, the latest iteration of Brighton Homes' proposed Walton Village development envisions a medium density development consisting only of single family homes. While single family homes are a permitted use in this zone, some aspects of the plan may not fit the requirements of the SMSC. If so, the TRZO should be suspended for that parcel, boundaries shifted, and/or the SMSC modified to a permit

that development, which fits well with surrounding neighborhoods of single family homes to the south and east. While many of us would like to see this either remain commercial or see a development of single family homes at lower (Residential Low) densities, the current, medium density represents a reasonable compromise under the circumstances and one we and many of our neighbors would like to see happen.

We appreciate the City Council's willingness to revisit the SMSC and consider whether, as drafted, it reflects the values and serves the interests of those who live here. The question is not whether the City "turns its back on Main Street" so much as whether it "turns its backs on the community." At the end of the day, the SMSC exists to serve that community. The community does not exist to serve the needs of the SMSC.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our community.

Sincerely yours,

Tim & Becky Hawkes*
443 South 225 East
Centerville, UT 84014
(801) 294-4494

**Writing in a personal rather than official capacity as concerned citizens who love Centerville and want to preserve what makes it great.*

Marsha Morrow

From: Nance Brad K <Brad.K.Nance@irs.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 2:48 PM
To: southmain
Subject: SMSC Density & zoning

Centerville City Officials,

I am writing in regards to the South Main Street Corridor Zoning (SMSC) between Porter Lane on the South and 1st South on the North. I have attended and spoken at several of your open meetings with Brighton Homes on this issue. The overwhelming concern of the residents is HIGH DENSITY. As a CPA, I believe the present zoning configuration of mixed use commercial near Main Street and residential behind, places a large economic risk on any developer. The risk is that the envisioned commercial use portion will not sale and must be retained for lease. Since this corridor has proven not to be a viable retail commercial location, this forces the developer to increase the density of any remaining residential property to cover for the "wasted" commercial frontage which at best could be rented out on an inconsistent basis.

With Density being the main concern of your residents, it is very troubling that past councils have adopted zoning which does not address Density. And further, this zoning actually encourages High Density as explained above. I support a Density zoning restriction of around 8 units per acre and elimination of the mixed use requirement. I find that the most recent development submitted by Brighton Homes, with 31 single family homes on this 3.8 acre plot, is economically feasible and would actually increase the values of properties in this area. This development would attract more permanent residents who would contribute to the community and reduce the infrastructure needs of a denser development. I find that a nice wall as illustrated by Brighton Homes along Main Street, set 5' back from the sidewalk with landscaping would provide the most aesthetically pleasing frontage available for this property.

We are fortunate to have a developer like Brighton Homes willing to take on this project in a manner consistent with the desires of the local residents. I encourage Centerville City to change the current zoning to allow for their 31 single family home development with no commercial component. I would support raising the current height restriction by a few feet to allow for more pleasing rooflines on single family homes. I also encourage the City to limit the density on other properties outside of SMSC, specifically on West Porter Lane to 8-10 units per acre.

Thank you for your diligent service and consideration of my comments.

Brad Nance

58 Canyon Breeze

801-864-3651

Marsha Morrow

From: Margaret Murphy <genwebber0@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 3:19 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Widening South Main street

Our home is in the Centerville Commons area and our backyard butts up against Main Street. It is my sincere hope that the street will be widened on the east side of the street so as not to take away my backyard. There are only six yards of grass in my backyard. I and my neighbors would not have a backyard if the street is widened on the west side of the street.

Sincerely,

Margaret Murphy

Also, I do not think that Centerville should try to support more business because of the close proximity of it to Bountiful and Farmington. We would end up with a string of business failures and empty buildings like Bountiful has. We should keep what is left of the east side of the freeway in Centerville as low density. Then we will not have a daily traffic snarl as well.

Marsha Morrow

From: Timothy Hawkes <timothy.d.hawkes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 4:49 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Letter of Support for a Single Family Home Development at Walton Village

While this was submitted to members of the City Council previously, we wanted to make sure it was submitted formally during the comment period for the SMSC plan, as it calls for "any necessary zone text amendments or other code changes that will allow a development of single family homes on this property to move forward as quickly as possible." There are 78 signatories to this letter, including a few added since this was originally submitted.

15 June 2015

By Email

Paul Cutler, Centerville Mayor
Ken Averett, Centerville City Council
Tami Fillmore, Centerville City Council
Stephanie Ivie, Centerville City Council
John Higginson, Centerville City Council
Larry Wright, Centerville City Council

Re: Walton Village Development

Dear Mayor Cutler and Members of the City Council:

Brighton Homes Utah LLC ("Brighton Homes") proposes a development of new single family homes called "Walton Village" on property extending from 400 South north to 300 South and from Main Street east roughly a full city block. (See the attached draft site plan.)

Local residents strongly opposed earlier versions of the Walton Village Plan that involved high density and mixed-used condominiums and townhomes based on concerns about what the development would mean for local property values and the character of the community. We strongly support this revised plan, however, as it envisions only single family homes, a type of development that is consistent with the character of

surrounding neighborhoods and a proposed historic district and meets a pressing need for new and moderately priced single family homes in the area.

In addition, we, the undersigned:[1]

(1) Applaud Brighton Homes for their willingness to listen to the concerns of local residents, to modify their proposed plans to address those concerns, and ultimately to propose a single family development that many local residents welcome as one that will contribute to the character of the community;

(2) Commend the owners of the property in question for their contributions to our community and for their willingness to work with Brighton Homes and the surrounding neighbors and neighborhoods;

(3) Thank Mayor Cutler and members of the City Council who helped to facilitate a dialog as well as the many local residents who devoted time and resources to this effort;

(4) Pledge to support publicly any necessary zone text amendments or other code changes that will allow a development of single family homes on this property to move forward as quickly as possible.

Although we are not in a position to weigh in on the specifics of the proposal (set backs, road widths, parking, building size, green space, etc.),[2] we pledge our enthusiastic support to a development of quality single family homes on this property and thank everyone who helped make it possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Hawkes
Rebecca Hawkes
Travis Davis
Danelle Davis
Bud Hollingshead
Charlie Bradley
Kimi Bradley
Brandt Sharp
Kelly Sharp

Shauna Stevens Maxwell
Ricci Nightingale
Mary Bailey
J. Michael Bailey
Shonn Tanner
Crystal Tanner
Heidi Holbrook
Tusi Naea
Josette Naea

JoAnna Matthes
Ulrich Matthes
Lauralee Horrocks
Dave Peterson
Holly Peterson
Rebecca Sperry
Chuck Madsen
Connie Madsen
Jaymie Reynolds
Clay Newton
Cathy Newton
Darren Hedin
Lori Hedin
Kadin Mercer
Jennie Pope Mercer
Candace Harris-Peterson
Marti Money
Brent Money
Dean Williams
Cheryl Williams
Kevin Elder
Jeannee Elder
Joel Moriyama
Carolyn Moriyama
Kevin Smith
Shauna Smith
Melissa Keeler West
Chris Morris
Michelle Morris

Christina Wilcox
Callie Eddings Nieman
Jon Nieman
Tim Carr
Jenn Carr
Lamar Hansen
Elaine Hansen
Barbara Finn
Bret Hayman
Eric Eddings
Julie Eddings
Sarah Sharp
Laura Zemp
Ryan Patin
Kade Patin
Kristin Fink Schill
Paul Archibald
Stephanie Archibald
Scott VanOrman
Kerri VanOrman
Brad Nance
Teri Nance
Lori Woodbury
Jon Woodbury
Todd Sweeten
Doug Williams
Karen Williams
Michelle Millburn
Bret Milburn

[1] All signatories to this letter sign in an individual and private capacity rather than a public or representational one. Nothing in this document should be construed as representing the official position of any institution, public or private, nor that of any elected official.

[2] Please note: we support the site plan as reflected in the attached document and the concept of a single family development, but reserve the right to change our position should the City or Brighton Homes make significant, material changes to the site plan prior to construction, particularly if those changes result in an increase in overall density.

Marsha Morrow

From: Marti Money <martimoney@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 5:12 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Concerns About SMSC Plan

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Please accept this message as my comments regarding the South Main Street Corridor Plan. Thank you for all you do to understand and determine solutions for our city. There are many voices, and I thank you, most kindly, for your attention to mine.

I understand the SMSC plan to be a tool that is outdated and unable to accommodate the overwhelming consensus that Centerville remain a lower density area where families are comfortable living, investing and remaining for a long time. I see the SMSC plan incentivizing higher density building plans. I see it alarming residents in nearby neighborhoods as it encroaches on the traditional and successful single-family home lifestyle they treasure. The Walton Village concept of single family homes stands alone among the possibilities that would work within the framework, and even that plan had to go through so much to become an option within the Corridor that is it regrettable.

My concerns are also with the deplorable walkability on Porter Lane, lack of south side street improvements, and lack of access to the other side of Main Street. Main Street does not have painted crosswalks east/west at this location. Funneling school children toward crossing guards is something Mayor Cutler mentioned as a reason behind this. However, Main Street is a barrier for a jogger, a UTA bus rider, a mom trying stroller her way to the Cemetery memorial park, Island View Park or to a person trying to get a bite to eat. We must connect our community. This must be improved immediately, regardless of what additional plans or SMSC issues are determined at this stage. On the topic of sidewalks, please improve ordinances that do not require a developer to include sidewalks or appropriate street widths and usable greenspace on its site plans in the SMSC and elsewhere throughout the city.

Density caps are a good idea--residential low is a good idea, conditional uses, as we've seen in the Hafoka property, are a slippery slope. Please keep CUP densities low--4-6 acres like Shaela Park.

In addition, the PDO concept seems like a helpful tool, but because higher densities results, it is not a good tool for Centerville. It make existing, investing residents nervous. Please do not apply PDOs in the SMSC.

Thank you,

Marti Money
486 S. 675 W.

Marsha Morrow

From: Dick Cawley <rrcawley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 5:46 PM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Development

As a long time resident of Centerville, I add my voice AGAINST the proposed development of density housing in Centerville.

Thank you

Richard Cawley
983 South 700 East
Centerville, UT

Sent from my iPad

Marsha Morrow

From: Jan Hagen <janhgn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 5:52 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Mainstreet Development

Please consider the impact of a walled main street, which would turn that corridor into something like an alleyway, instead of an inviting street.

Keeping some green space, and open space will go a long way to adding to the appeal of this town.

Jan Hagen
582 N. 220 E.
Centerville, UT 84014

Marsha Morrow

From: Jake Layton <jakelayton26@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 5:53 PM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

My name is Jacob Layton and I live at 525 S. 300 E. We have lived here in our current home for just under two years and I personally have lived in Centerville for most of my life. My wife and I decided to buy a house in Centerville because we liked the small town feel.

I would like to comment on the South Main Street Corridor plan. Below are my thoughts.

1. We moved here after school for the small town feel and it seems to me that the SMSC plan takes away from that small town feel (even though it is supposed to keep it). I am opposed to high density in our neighborhood and think it would be a good idea to use density caps in this area and remove the overlay zones that promote high density.

2. I prefer to have residential single family housing on the Walton Village development and am opposed to mixed-use commercial buildings. Centerville has a great business district down on Parrish Lane and I feel that is a great place to have most of the commercial businesses. Mixed-use commercial buildings will feel out of place in our neighborhood.

3. I have seen Brighton Homes proposed Walton Village Development with single family homes and I am in favor this plan. I feel it is a good way to get some younger families in the neighborhood while avoiding the high density.

I love living in Centerville and I hope that we can continue to keep the small town feel that I have grown to love over my lifetime.

Sincerely,

Jacob Layton

Marsha Morrow

From: John Hollingshead <jhollingshead@livinternational.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 6:10 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Comments on South Main Street Plan

Dear Mayor Cutler, City Council, Planning Commission and City Administrators,

As a resident of over four decades I have learned, as was probably the case with most of you, people move to Centerville because it is a unique little city that is quiet and peaceful, yet close to the airport and downtown Salt Lake City. The majority of us moved here, even though the housing is more expensive than other areas of the valley, to distance ourselves from noise, dense and degrading neighborhoods and crime, and to raise our families in a safe and lovely place.

Most of us live in single family residences in quiet neighborhoods with nice yards and gardens, in quiet neighborhoods. We know and enjoy our neighbors and most know us. Our families are safe and our children benefit from the association of peers who are typically upstanding, friendly and good students.

It has been disheartening to see the emphasis the past few years by some of our city leaders and elected officials who, ironically in most cases benefit from the advantages of residing in a lovely single family located home in a safe and quiet neighborhood, advocating an increase in density and the creation of mixed use developments. It is especially sad to see a lack of respect for the preservation of old historic downtown Centerville. What are they thinking? Why would anyone who enjoys and benefits from all that we have here encourage the creation of a more dense environment and invite developers to build medium to high density apartment complexes that will add transient individuals, less stable circumstances, more traffic, noise and crime to our little city.

Regarding the South Main Street Corridor, I do not believe that it is practical or that it is possible for the tenants it promotes to ever be realized. I have consulted with a number of Centerville residents who are wise and experienced city planners and administrators elsewhere in the valley who have seen mixed use developments such as the main street plan promotes fail. They mention the obvious, the Centerville commercial district is Parish Lane, there is not enough, nor will there ever be enough commerce and foot traffic to financially support mixed use developments along old Main Street.

I happen to serve in an ecclesiastical position that represents approximately 25% of Centerville's population, all of whom are located in the south end of town. I hear almost daily from these individuals and of their concerns for the direction the city seems to taking to promote density and developments that will invite transient residents and more noise, traffic and other negatives. Their voice is simply, "if the city leaders insist on high density and the traffic, noise and the other negatives it brings, at least be thoughtful and respectful of old historic Centerville and locate it on the west side of the freeway where the traffic and noise will be confined and those temporary residents will have easy access to the freeway".

South Centerville already suffers from more than its share of medium and high density developments. There are an immense amount of high density apartments already available just a few blocks to the South in Bountiful and five minutes north in sprawling Farmington. Let's invite those who enjoy that environment to live there.

Thank you for your dedicated service to our community. May I respectfully encourage you to carefully consider, not just the immediate impact, but the long term impact of the decisions you will be making regarding Main Street and the other vital areas of the city for which you have responsibility.

Sincerely,

Bud Hollingshead
780 East Center
Centerville, Utah 84014
801-859-2377

Marsha Morrow

From: PEGGY and DEBORAH <debpeg@q.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 6:37 PM
To: southmain
Subject: opposed to high density housing

To Whom It May Concern: I am opposed to high density housing on the east side of Main Street. Single family dwellings would be preferable. Thank you. Deborah Davidson 543 S. 300 E. Centerville

Marsha Morrow

From: Bret Millburn <pbmillburn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 6:39 PM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street Corridor

Dear Mayor and Member of the City Council:

Thank you for the service you render to the citizens of Centerville. I, like you have a vested interest in how our great city faces the challenges and opportunities of the future while not forgetting the ideals and principles that have shaped us in the past.

I write today in regards to the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) overlay zone, proposed revisions to the overlay zone, and a proposed single family development called Walton Villages on the block that lies on the east side of Main between Porter Lane and 300 South. Any development on this property has a direct impact on my family as we live at 283 East 300 South.

As I've stated in public meetings before regarding this project area, I am not naïve to think, nor do I want these parcels to be left in their current condition. I welcome development, but it needs to be the right development for the area.

I'm aware that in the past, a fair amount of effort and resource went into the development of the SMSC. Unfortunately, it appears that the SMSC has been woefully unsuccessful in delivering on what it promised. Let's be honest, commercial enterprises struggle at best on Main Street. Why would mixed-use be any different? Don't get me wrong. I'm a strong proponent of mixed-use, but it needs to be placed in the right area and meet certain criteria in order to be successful. The commercial corridor in Centerville is on Parrish Lane, not Main Street. A State owned road with a 40mph speed limit is not conducive to this kind of venture.

So if mixed-use is not viable option, a developer is left to maximizing density with residential units to make the project work financially. I submit that high density is not cohesive with the surrounding area. High density in this area will have a dramatic negative impact to an existing congestion problem, which also has an impact to the safety of the residents in the area. In addition, I strongly believe that it would have a negative effect on the property values in the immediate area and most of all, runs contrary to quiet, hometown feeling that Centerville is known for.

Kudos to Brighton Homes for their willingness to go back to the drawing board and come up with a proposal of medium density single family homes for this project area. Does the proposal from Brighton give all interested parties exactly what they want? No, but it represents a reasonable compromise that me and many of my neighbors can support.

I appreciate the willingness of the City Council to revisit the SMSC and urge you to ask yourself, as currently drafted, does the SMSC really reflect the values and fulfill the desires of Centerville residents.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Bret Millburn

283 East 300 South

Marsha Morrow

From: Florence Farnsworth <pdsfarnsworth@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:10 PM
To: southmain
Subject: comment on SMSC and Walton Village

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

My name is Florence Farnsworth and I live at 610 E Center St. I want to first thank you for the many hours you spend researching and debating many issues that come up with Centerville. I want to share a few thoughts about some zoning issues along Main street. I definitely prefer low density, even along Main Street. I know there have been suggestions that we build high density units, or units that have a business below and renters above, however, though that model works in other cities, I don't think it is a natural fit for Centerville, especially with how many businesses there are along Parrish Lane. We have watched businesses along main street open and close, for example, where the 7-11 was, then the Chinese restaurant. I would encourage you to cap density in the South Main Street Corridor with residential low, with conditional uses permitting only modestly higher densities (e.g., 4-6 units per acre). Also, I support Brighton Homes' proposed Walton Village development of single family homes on Main Street. I, of course, would like to see less homes per acre, but realize for the cost of the land, there must be compromise.

Thank you for the excellent 100 year Centerville celebration! Thank you for getting some outstanding people to chair the celebration.

Yours,

Florence Farnsworth

Marsha Morrow

From: Tim Carr <timcarr1975@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:22 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Walton Village

> Centerville City,

>

> Centerville is a great community! We love that it is close to downtown Salt Lake and Layton while maintaining a smaller town feel. The South Main Street Corridor zoning overlay seems to add the very elements of other cities that are avoiding by living in Centerville. We love that our children can grow up with other families that truly care about the community and want to stay here for as long as possible.

>

> I hope that the zoning plan can be changed to preserve the Centerville that we love by promoting single-family homes.

>

> We appreciate you listening to our opinion and thank you for serving our wonderful community.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Jen Carr

>

>

Marsha Morrow

From: Tim Carr <timcarr1975@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:23 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Walton Village

Centerville City,

- >
- > As a long time resident my family of eight has enjoyed living in Centerville just a few houses east of Main Street. I am very concerned about the South Main Street Corridor zoning overlay and the potential it has to create anything other than single-family housing. While we are not opposed to commercial buildings on Main Street, it seems that with few exceptions existing commercial establishments get more run-down over the years, while new single-family infill homes built in the area are getting nicer - several old homes in our neighborhood have even been torn down and replaced with beautiful homes.
- >
- > There is also plenty of multi-family housing in south Centerville that appears to be more transient in nature and not a good match for the historic homes of the area.
- >
- > There is very little turn-over on our street. When a house does come up for sell it goes quickly. The homes that border Main Street have been there for decades and everyone seems to enjoy them, why not continue that same model on new development on Main Street? Beautiful homes make beautiful neighborhoods.
- >
- > Please re-visit the zoning to eliminate more multi-family housing and allow single-family in place of mixed use or an option to commercial buildings.
- >
- > Thank you for your consideration.
- >
- > Tim Carr
- >
- >

Marsha Morrow

From: BLAINE HOLBROOK <bholbro1467@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:36 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Main Street Plan

I am torn as what to do about the old Dick's Market site. I would prefer a shopping center like we had before. I definitely would not like to see a 3 or 4 story building there. It is nice to see commercial spots on the main level of the old J. C. Penney's site below the apartments. Less height to buildings would be preferable.
Thank you for your concern and for bringing it to the public's attention.

Catherine Holbrook

Marsha Morrow

From: Andrea Richman <andrea@mstar.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:51 PM
To: southmain
Subject: single family development

I believe that we need to keep main street commercial where appropriate and single family dwellings in the rear. We do not need higher density mixed use projects to crowd our streets more. I believe more single family dwellings will enhance our community and strengthen our family friendly environment. We have plenty of density in south west centerville. I also think that a care center for seniors would be a great use of the walton property. Thanks, Andrea Richman

Marsha Morrow

From: Brent Hintze <brhintze@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 10:39 PM
To: southmain
Subject: South Main Street

To whom it may concern,

I just wanted to add my thoughts too many that have perhaps already been submitted. I appreciate the visit of the South Main Street Plan. Much has happened in the intervening years since the plan was first adopted. I hope we have all learned some things and this opportunity to tweak some of the aspects of the plan is very much welcome.

One of the things that we have learned is that commercial on Centerville South Main Street is really not viable. The only exception seems to be dental offices. We have learned with the latest interaction with Brighton Homes, a Utah developer, they do not want to be involved in a commercial enterprise on Main Street. I think that is very telling. This city made the decision many years ago to move the commercial to Parrish Lane and west. We must continue to promote commercial in that area.

Hence, I strongly endorse returning Centerville's South Main Street to a more residential environment. We should begin with vigorously embracing the Walton Village proposal of single-family homes. Any new zoning should be void of commercial requirements in most of this corridor.

Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to share our thoughts and concerns.

Brent Hintze

Marsha Morrow

From: Nancy Smith <nancy_cobblestone@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 11:10 PM
To: southmain
Subject: SMSC
Attachments: Main Street Petition Business (30 Jun 15) (1).pdf; Main Street Aerial.pub

Dear City Council,

We appreciate the time and concern that has been shown to citizens as well as the businesses and a willingness to re-look at the SMSC overlay. Several business owners had to leave the night of their special meeting and were not able to comment. As a result, two of us took a partial day and visited as many property owners as we had time for. As a starting point for discussion, we used the same matrix that had previously been submitted to the City Council in October 2010. We simply added another column for them to initial and indicate if they had the same sentiments of concern and opposition to the SMSC or if they had changed in their position. Of course we did start with those that were against it in 2010. The original 2010 document with individual letters and full detailed comments can be re-submitted if you have not seen it and would like to have a copy. All property owners we reached on Main Street still have concerns with the plan, specifically height, density and the mixed-use concept. They were happy to initial their continued opposition and they also signed as property owners in support of the single family development being proposed by Brighton Homes.

Of those that we were able to contact, 100% signed in opposition to the SMSC and in favor of single family homes. Some of the comments made were:

1. We don't want the mountain view taken away as we look across the street to tall buildings.
2. It doesn't work, Park Station and West Bountiful have a draw, Centerville does not have the demographics to bring in that much more commercial.
3. The concept increases property values, but it isn't who we are and not what we want.
4. Most who signed were grateful for the opportunity to do so as they didn't know they could make a written comment.
5. They expressed concerns with traffic and also that they liked being able to park in front of their building.

I realize this is a very informal approach and in no way is intended to imply all things are bad with the SMSC plan. It is, however, a reflection from the property owners by their signature that they do have concerns with this Corridor plan and in general are opposed to it and have not embraced the concepts it supports, specifically the mixed-use.

Attached is an aerial view showing those that wished to express concerns with the requirements of the SMSC plan. The second attachment reflects their continued opposition by initial and a separate signature page.

Again, thank you for all you are doing to address these concerns for our community.
Nancy Smith

This report was prepared by ~~Bruce Pitt~~ trying to correctly and objectively represent the concerns of the owners and businesses on Main Street as well as other public feelings. The other letters included bring diversity of words to the same concerns.

6-2015

BUSINESSES ON MAIN STREET	OPPOSED	FOR	COULD NOT CONTACT	Feel same ABOUT SMSC
- 819 S. Main Evensen Creative Ornamental Iron	x			X JB
- 815 S. Main Eavy Evensen	x			X HE
- 707 S. Main			x	X PM
- 495 S. Main Lawrence	x			X DB
472 S. Main			x	
- 454 S. Main Thomas Williams	x			X JW
- 428 S. Main			x	X LHM
- 415 S. Main		x		X RSN
380 S. Main Cook Building			x	
360 S. Main			x	
- 346 S. Main Main Street Garage	x			X GMR
326 S. Main OBrian Glass		x		
Pinea	x			
- 326 S. Main Abandoned House	x		x	X ML
310 S. Main Hepworth Floral		x		
304 S. Main Golden Corral	x			
302 S. Main		x		
281 S. Main Dental Building				
Arbuckle	x			
owners Knowles	x			
Pitt	x			X DB
- 260 S. Main Cutlers	x			
- 249 S. Main Syl's Woodcraft				X AT
And Hobby	x			
- 221 S. Main Bill Porter	x			X AN
- 224 S. Main Ann Fadel	x			X X
- 181 S. Main Jade Hill	x			X DB
149 S. Main Dental Lab	x			
- 44 E 100 S. Aspen Dental Canyon Creek	x			X BDR
Brian Rigby	x			X BDR
- 124 S. Main Family Dental	x			
104 S. Main Pizza Perfect	x			
- 80 S. Main Kim Samuelson	x			X KBS
Dentist				
190s. Main St. Bomberger Office Bld.				X L
- 134 S. MAIN HOFFAKER DENTAL	x			X TH
55 S. MAIN DON'S MEAT (REX & LOTS SESSIONS OWNER)				X YLS

6-2015
Feel the SAME
ABOUT SMSC

28 S. Main	University of Utah Health Care		x
25 S. Main			x
12 N. Main	Leon Neilson	x	
	Daniels Design		x
	Nu Trends	x	
45 N. Main	Taco Time	x	
82 N. Main	Investment Auto Group		x
94 N. Main	Maverik Country Store	x	
129 N. Main	Old House		x
142 N. Main	Duplex		x
	Car Care Center	x	
278 N. Main	Ron's Service	x	
305 N. Main	House		

Andy Banelas prop. x

X Ron

Centerville City Council
250 N. Main
Centerville, Utah

Brighton Homes Utah LLC
215 N. Redwood Road #8
North Salt Lake, UT 84054

Dear Brighton Homes, et al:

We the undersigned want it to be known that we support your single-family dwelling proposal on the Walton property. We wholeheartedly support this type of development knowing that single family housing enhances the stability of our community and strengthens the family friendly environment that we desire. We applaud your efforts regarding single-family development.

NAME	^{Business or} CENTERVILLE RESIDENT	DATE
<i>Lynne Davidson</i>	✓	6-24-15
<i>Mary Crowder</i>	MAIN ST. BUSINESS ✓	6-23-15
<i>Larry Smith</i>	✓	6/12/15
<i>Kris Christensen</i>	MAIN ST BUSINESS ✓	6/15/15
<i>Amanda Smith</i>	✓	6/15/15
<i>Xim & Samuelson</i>	MAIN ST. BUSINESS ✓	6-24-15
<i>Ann Fader INS Agency</i>	224 S MAIN BUSINESS ✓	6-24-15
<i>Dorothy Barber</i>	MAIN ST BUSINESS ✓	6-24-15
<i>Jeanette Williams</i>	MAIN ST. HOME ✓	6-24-15
<i>MICHAEL RANDALL</i>	346 S. MAIN BUSINESS + HOME ✓	6-24-15
<i>Ernest Ellerton</i>	630 S 800 E Resident ✓	6-24-15
<i>T. Huffman</i>	MAIN ST. BUSINESS ✓ 134 S Main	6-25-15
<i>Joe Q</i>	MAIN STREET BUSINESS + HOME ✓ 249 S MAIN ST.	6/25/15
<i>Ron Randaer</i>	MAIN ST. BUSINESS ✓	6-25-15
<i>Karen George</i>	MAIN ST. BUSINESS ✓ 600 N. MAIN	6-25-15

12

Dear Brighton Homes, et al:

We the undersigned want it to be known that we support your single-family dwelling proposal on the Walton property. We wholeheartedly support this type of development knowing that single family housing enhances the stability of our community and strengthens the family friendly environment that we desire. We applaud your efforts regarding single-family development.

Marsha Morrow

From: Timothy Hawkes <timothy.d.hawkes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 11:35 PM
To: southmain
Subject: Citizens in Support of a Walton Village Plan Consisting Solely of Single Family Homes
Attachments: Main Street Petition Signatures - 17 Pages (30 Jun 15).pdf; Main Street Petition Signatures 22 Pages (30 Jun 15).pdf

Dear Mayor Cutler and Members of the City Council:

The attached documents contains the signatures of 504 Centerville residents who support Brighton Homes' proposal to build a medium density neighborhood consisting solely of single family homes on the block currently occupied by O'Brien Glass and adjacent properties.

While the petitions deal solely with that development and not with the SMSC generally--and for that reason likely aren't subject to the June 30 deadline for comments--putting that site plan into effect would require adjustments to the SMSC (for that parcel if nothing else). Furthermore, the signatures underscore the widespread view among local residents in favor of lower densities and more single family home options in south Centerville, a sentiment that also has implications for the SMSC.

I did not collect these signatures; rather, they were collected by a number of concerned citizens who took the time to walk their neighborhoods and invite friends and neighbors to add their signature to the list and express public support for a development of single family homes.

When added to the separate list and petition I submitted earlier this evening, the total signatures collected thus far from residents who support a single family option total 582.

We may present these formally later, but wanted to submit them electronically before the public comment period closes, just to err on the side of caution.

Thank you for your time and attention in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Tim

Timothy Hawkes
443 South 225 East
Centerville, UT 84014
(801) 294-4494

on behalf of 504 residents who willingly signed this petition

Marsha Morrow

From: Hannah Porter <hannahbelnap@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 12:08 AM
To: southmain
Subject: On preserving the Main Street plan

Hello,

I just wanted to add my voice to the melee.

I feel that a design with a fence along Main Street does not support the Main Street development plan that our City Council and planning commission have been working on for years. Let's not throw the baby out with the bath water, and lose all the positive aspects of the plan.

My personal feelings are it is not only an eyesore to line Main with more fence, but it feels less safe. Especially at night. When I go on runs at night, I always head to main in Bountiful. Lighted, pedestrian friendly.

Plus, I'm worried that a SFH-front plan will just worsen the fact that main is becoming a major highway corridor rather than a small town Main Street.

Finally, for what it's worth, I'm not scared of multi family housing. I welcome a little diversity, even (maybe especially) from those who will only be here for a few years. They can still make a positive impact while they're here and contribute things that people in a different stage of life may not be able to. Diversity is what enriches a community.

Thank you for all that you do.

Hannah Porter

Marsha Morrow

From: Alan Arbuckle <awarbuckle@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 10:57 AM
To: southmain
Subject: Police searching for armed robbers at Herriman apartments

<http://www.ksl.com/?nid=148&sid=35314947#viWvOLU33WjIU57S.14>

Here is an article on what too many apartment building can bring in to a community.

Interesting to read some of the comments of what is happening in other cities.

I am not against more people moving in to Centerville just how high of density. There is a real need for homes like Patio homes similar to Pineae gardens. The single family houses with small yards.

It is not the cities responsibility to make a project economically feasible, that is for the developers to decide.

Alan Arbuckle
Pages lane

Marsha Morrow

From: Mike Hepworth <mikeandkaren62@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 11:13 AM
To: southmain
Subject: Zone changing

My name is Karen Murri Hepworth, I live at 234 West Cara Vella Lane, Centerville.

Comment #1. In the early 1970's I transcribed the minutes of the Centerville City Council. Up for discussion was the rezoning west of the freeway. The request was for a zone change for Syro Steel manufacturing. Many residents and business people wanted the area to be more like the west side of Salt Lake with large business complexes. The comments were like : " But we are not Salt Lake, we are just little Centerville, we will never get big projects out here." Well, the change was made. I am sure there are varying opinions even to this day as to whether this was a good decision for Centerville and whether Syro has been a "Good Neighbor"
My point: Once we make a change in zoning, we are left with how that change plays out. Everything always sound so good when it is new and clean, but what happens down the road when the City is left with the change and its consequences.

Comment #2 Cedar Springs. The concept of Cedar Springs and the use of that property sounded so good and was so appealing when presented. It is still a lovely place for many people who live there and take care of their property, but it is also one of the worst places in our City for crime and drugs. Many of the units in Cedar Springs were purchased as condos and now are being used as rental properties. The owners are not present. The Bamberger Condos on Bamberger Way are seem to be a great way to use space, with ALMOST single family atmosphere, yet give an increased density.

I do not favor the zone change for High Density or even Medium Density housing. People who live in apartment style units, are temporary. Just a transition to moving to their own home. When the project on the JCPenny site was built. They were to be condominiums. But they did not sell. Now they are rentals. Once the zone change is made, it is difficult if not impossible to control how the future plays out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Murri Hepworth

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
7/8/2015**

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Community Development Director's Report 070815

Initiated By: Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director

Scheduled Time: 8:30

SUBJECT

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on July 22, 2015. Items scheduled are as follows:

1. Porter Lane Townhomes CUP and Final Site Plan
2. Youngblood Storage Conceptual Site Plan

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND