

1
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

3 **Wednesday, July 8, 2015**

4 **7:00 p.m.**

5
6 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville,
7 Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

10 Cheylynn Hayman

11 David Hirschi, Chair

12 Gina Hirst

13 William Ince

14 Logan Johnson

15 Kevin Merrill

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

18 Scott Kjar

19
20 **COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT**

21 Paul Cutler, Mayor

22 Ken Averett

23 Tamilyn Fillmore

24 Stephanie Ivie

25 John Higginson

26
27 **COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT**

28 Lawrence Wright

29
30 **STAFF PRESENT**

31 Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director

32 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

33 Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

34
35 **VISITORS**

36 Interested citizens

37
38 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

39
40 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Hayman

1 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

2
3 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held June 24, 2015 were reviewed and
4 amended. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion
5 was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (6-0).
6

7 **PUBLIC HEARING | TRUMP RESIDENTIAL LOT | 540 SOUTH 400 WEST -**
8 **Consider proposed Final Site Plan for an unplatted residential building lot on property**
9 **located at 540 South 400 West, for the purpose of constructing a new dwelling. Scott &**
10 **Susan Trump, Applicants.**
11

12 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported the Planning Commission
13 previously accepted the conceptual site plan for the proposed single family home. The applicant
14 has addressed the conditions of approval from the conceptual acceptance and is now ready for a
15 final site plan review. The applicant will still be required to pay all applicable fees, submit all
16 necessary utility provider sheets, and receive final approvals from the City Engineer. In addition,
17 a current title report will still need to be submitted to the City Attorney for review. Overall, the
18 final site plan is in harmony with the previously approved conceptual site plan. A building permit
19 is required prior to any construction taking place and will need to meet all applicable standards
20 found within the Zoning Ordinance.
21

22 Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to comment; he closed
23 the public hearing.
24

25 Commissioner Hirst questioned if all utilities are available to this site and if any
26 connections will need to be adjusted. Mr. Snyder said all utilities are available to the site and
27 staff will ensure all connections are appropriate during the building permit process. He said all
28 utility companies have been contacted; the applicant is awaiting responses.
29

30 Scott Trump, applicant, reviewed the site plan explaining its unique layout. The
31 hammerhead driveway will ensure fire safety access and turn-around. He also explained his
32 hopes to utilize this property for some small farming activities, including small animals.
33

34 Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the final site plan
35 for the Scott and Susan Trump Residential Lot, located at 540 South 400 West, with the
36 following conditions:
37

38 ***Conditions:***

- 39 1. All professional service fees, development fees and related impact fees shall be paid.
40 2. A bond for all public improvements must be posted prior to the issuance of a building
41 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. Applicant shall provide appropriate public utility easements and submit to the City. 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.

Reasons for Action (findings):

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)].

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Merrill and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (6-0).

WORK SESSION | SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN & PUBLIC COMMENTS REVIEW - The City Council and the Planning Commission will discuss the South Main Street Corridor Plan and review all the public comments received from various meetings.

The Planning Commission and City Council reviewed and discussed several aspects of the South Main Street Corridor Plan (SMSC), including the many public comments that have been made over the past several meetings. Mayor Cutler explained the City Council recently reviewed the proposed density cap as recommended by the Planning Commission and after a lengthy discussion the issue was ultimately tabled for further review and discussion. In addition to density caps the Commission and Council also discussed viability, mixed-uses, building heights and framing, and public spaces.

City staff reviewed conditional use permits and how this tool is used to allow additional development options if negative impacts are appropriately mitigated. Staff also reviewed the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) tool, which also provides an option for additional density but also ensures an overall better developed project. Staff explained there may be some ways to take a more conservative approach to density including a density cap. Several Council and Commission members agreed each tool can be useful but that each tool also presents its own challenges with respect to the SMSC. A majority of the members present agreed a density cap is an appropriate safeguard for the SMSC.

1 Chair Hirschi said density and viability go hand in hand; the viability of commercial uses
2 depends on residential roof tops. He said if residential density is too restricted then commercial
3 uses will struggle. He said residential density should promote both commercial and retail uses.
4 He said commercial is important and should be encouraged along Main Street in addition to
5 appropriate residential uses. He said there have been many comments made that residential only
6 is the way to go. He is not sure this is best for Main Street. He said single-family uses are more
7 difficult to control. He questioned if the city really wants single-family homes with yards and
8 structures that cannot be specifically regulated along Main Street. He also questioned if people
9 would really be interested in raising a family on a busy Main Street. He believes the mixed-use
10 concept is still the best option for Main Street. He said he is also concerned with the idea of a
11 single-family PDO on Main Street. He said this could potentially put a fence along Main Street
12 with single-family homes facing interior. He does not believe a "wall" on Main Street is a good
13 idea. He is also concerned with "down zoning" Main Street from commercial to residential only.
14 He said this is unfair to current property owners who have been paying commercial taxes for
15 many years.

16
17 Councilwoman Fillmore said the SMSC uses form base standards to help unify
18 development along the frontage of Main Street, but does not address the rear parcels very well;
19 perhaps some clarification may be appropriate for rear residential uses. She believes the mixed-
20 use concept is still the best option for Main Street. She said economic viability is very important.
21 There needs to be enough return so a property owner is able to demolish an old building and
22 build a new high quality project. However, she is concerned comments made regarding viability
23 may be just that, comments. She believes viability needs to be studied more thoroughly to know
24 for sure if this is an issue. Councilwoman Fillmore stated that she had received today an email
25 from Jeff Cook, a business owner on Main Street, which said: "I have concerns about some of
26 the proposals for zoning ordinance changes in this corridor. The current ordinance which was
27 adopted only a few years ago is and will continue to be instrumental in retaining the small local
28 business atmosphere on Main Street, which is an important part of our history and our future."
29 Councilwoman Fillmore noted that a majority of the property/business owners on Main Street
30 are local Centerville residents, which allows them to live and work in Centerville. She said the
31 SMSC is appropriate because it provides flexibility. She said current property owners have
32 expressed a desire for flexibility so they can find the best redevelopment option for their
33 situation. Councilwoman Fillmore read again from what Jeff Cook had sent her, stating that he
34 has discussed this issue with several small business owners that want to express their concern as
35 citizens and property owners. This is a statement Jeff believes summarizes their feeling: "We
36 express our desire that the zoning in this area, which allows for mixed use development of
37 commercial and residential remain. The ordinances that are currently in place are the results of
38 more than a year of public input, study, professional consultation and compromise. A substantial
39 change would in fairness require that the same process be followed as when the current
40 ordinance was adopted. We believe that a moderate change such as a medium density cap would
41 be more fair and balanced." She said Main Street is intended to be primarily commercial. She

1 suggested keeping commercial as the primary use and residential or mixed-use as secondary, and
2 writing in language to that point. She is concerned a density cap could be detrimental for smaller
3 properties and may hinder their ability to redevelop. She believes a required commercial use or
4 mixed-use will help control density. She said the majority of the comments made in the past few
5 meetings have been concern over density, not necessarily negatives toward the SMSC plan. She
6 believes eliminating commercial on Main Street will intensify residential uses and density. She
7 supports a density cap as appropriate for larger parcels, but is worried that if set too low could
8 encourage blight because there is no incentive for redevelopment. She believes it is important to
9 maintain the synergy of the SMSC and encourage consistent redevelopment.

10
11 Commissioner Merrill said single-family lots are not as sought after with rising
12 generations. Research has shown that generations to come prefer smaller mixed-use homes with
13 little to no maintenance and services within walking distance.

14
15 Mayor Cutler said flexibility is important and questioned if there is a need to promote
16 townhomes or other forms of multi-family housing on Main Street. Commissioner Johnson said
17 he likes the flexibility of either residential, commercial, or mixed-use. Commissioner Hayman
18 agreed flexibility is best, but does not believe residential only is the best or viable option. She
19 said townhomes could be appropriate with a suitable density cap and green space requirement.
20 She questioned if a lower density cap could be set with incentivized increases? She too is
21 concerned with blight, but also wants to find a balance in keeping Centerville's unique small
22 town feel. Councilwoman Fillmore stated that multi-family housing is what she had heard the
23 most concern over, so promoting town homes would be opposite of the public's input.

24
25 City staff discussed possible density caps (i.e., 4, 6, and 8). Staff believes there are pros
26 and cons to each density cap option. Staff is willing to research possible incentive options and
27 tools. Staff also discussed the General Plan for Main Street explaining some changes to the
28 SMSC may also require a change to the General Plan. Staff explained it may be possible to cap
29 residential densities and/or size of parcel with some type of tiered density system. Staff
30 explained that a density cap will affect viability and the City needs to be careful not to negatively
31 impact property owners. Staff agreed the higher the density cap the more likely it will not
32 negatively affect smaller parcels.

33
34 Councilman Higginson agreed commercial uses should be encouraged along Main Street.
35 He said commercial uses should front Main Street with residential uses behind. He is not
36 concerned with catering to every demographic. He said Centerville is different and unique. He
37 said walkability is often discussed but is rarely a reality. He said there are walkable
38 developments but most people drive to them, then walk around. He said Main Street will not
39 likely ever become a true walkable area. He said he is in favor of a density cap and is also in
40 favor of keeping commercial uses on Main Street.

1 Councilman Averett questioned if the City is planning for the past or planning for the
2 future. He said retail is not viable on Main Street mostly due, he believes, to online sales. He said
3 current research shows that 1 in 5 Americans work from home at least once a week and trends
4 show that number will only increase in the future. He agrees live/work concepts are important
5 and should be encouraged. He agreed future generations want to live in smaller PDO type
6 developments with no maintenance. He said it seems the future is leaning toward mixed-use
7 options.

8
9 The Planning Commission and City Council discussed density with regard to the Pages
10 Lane area which is set at a much higher density. Members present were not as concerned with
11 this area as it is different from the Core District and will bring a different type of redevelopment.
12 A majority of the members present agreed the Pages Lane area may still require a density cap but
13 at a much higher option in order to maintain flexible redevelopment options. The Planning
14 Commission agreed to research and discuss the Pages Lane area and provide a recommendation
15 for density to the City Council in the near future.

16 Councilwoman Ivie said she is not comfortable with any density over four (4) units per
17 acre along Main Street including the Pages Lane area. She said Centerville already has over 600
18 units within this small SMSC area, which is too dense. She said any additional density will only
19 negatively impact the area.

20
21 City staff discussed public open space options along Main Street, including sidewalk,
22 trees, street furniture, parking and lighting. Staff explained how UDOT is involved with these
23 decisions as Main Street is a State owned road. The City intends to complete a public space plan
24 for Main Street in the future. The public right-of-way is narrow and options are limited. Any
25 public space plan will require feasibility studies and coordination with UDOT. The Commission
26 and Council discussed requiring aesthetic public space improvements as part of redevelopment
27 plans thus placing the burden on property owners. Staff reminded those present that these types
28 of burdens are generally balanced with density increases. Chair Hirschi suggested creating a
29 PDO option for Main Street with bonus density provisions for public space improvements. This
30 possible PDO option could also maintain the SMSC building structure/framing and commercial
31 use requirements. The Planning Commission agreed to research and discuss possible public
32 space options in the near future.

33
34 The Commission and Council discussed building heights for Main Street. The building
35 height for all residential homes across the city is 35 feet. A majority of the members present
36 agreed a maximum building height of 35 feet is appropriate for Main Street and will help
37 encourage redevelopment. It was also mentioned that building height can be mitigated with
38 setbacks. City staff discussed the "framing" concept. If buildings are brought forward then
39 parking is pushed behind providing less vehicular accesses on Main Street and a buffer between
40 the commercial fronts and residential uses behind. It was mentioned that "framing" should

1 provide more commercial viability because the cost from UDOT to install an access on Main
2 Street is excessive.

3
4 The Commission and Council discussed street width. Concerns were raised regarding the
5 challenges that sub-standard street widths can produce (i.e., maintenance, fire access, density,
6 parking, etc.). City staff debated the challenges that can come when full-width streets are
7 required in private developments (i.e., parking lots, car ports, decreased circulation, speed, etc.)
8 Staff agreed to research possible options to increase street widths where possible.

9
10 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- 11
12 1. The next Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday, July 22, 2015.
13 2. Upcoming Agenda Items
14 • Porter Lane Townhomes, Conditional Use Permit & Final Site Plan
15 • Youngblood Storage, Conceptual Site Plan
16

17 The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

18
19
20 
21 David Hirschi, Chair

22
23
24 9-9-15
25 Date Approved

23
24 
25 Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

