

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, AUGUST 10, 2016, 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 Becki Wright
D. MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE – July 27, 2016
E. COMMISSION BUSINESS
- 7:10 1. PUBLIC HEARING | LEGACY CROSSING STORAGE | 150 NORTH 1250 WEST**
[Applicant requested to postpone to August 24, 2016 meeting]
Consider the proposed Final Site plan and a Conditional Use Permit for a self-storage facility (Legacy Crossing Storage) on property located at approximately 150 North 1250 West
- 7:15 2. PUBLIC HEARING | MARTHA'S PLACE | 347 NORTH 400 EAST**
Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Martha's Place (formerly 347 Subdivision), on property located at 347 North 400 East, for the purpose of a multi-family development; consisting of 1 tri-plex and 1 single-family dwelling
Chad Morris, Applicant
- 7:35 3. PUBLIC HEARING | CODE TEXT AMENDMENT | ALLOW CLIMATE**
CONTROLLED STORAGE IN VARIOUS ZONES
Consider the proposed Code Text Amendment regarding Section 12-12-040-Definitions, by adding "Climate Controlled Storage" and Chapter 12-36-Tables of Uses Allowed, by allowing "Climate Controlled Storage" in various zones; including C-H (Commercial-High) Zoning District. Steve Tate, Applicant
- 8:00 4. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
• PC Meeting on August 24, 2016
Zone Map Amendment for I-VH Zone in West Centerville Neighborhood,
Youngblood Storage Conceptual Site Plan, Legacy Crossing Storage
CUP & Final Site Plan, Bartile Storage Sheds Final Site Plan
- 8:05 F. ADJOURNMENT**

Posted August 5, 2016 by Community Development



CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON AUGUST 10, 2016 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 Planning Commission 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 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: and at <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>.

Tentative - The times shown below are tentative and are subject to change during the meeting.

Time:

7:00 PM A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Commissioner Becki Wright

D. MINUTES REVIEW and ACCEPTANCE

Planning Commission Meeting July 27, 2016

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7:10 1. Public Hearing - Legacy Crossing Storage, 150 North 1250 West

[Applicant requested to postpone to August 24, 2016 meeting]

Consider the proposed Final Site Plan and a Conditional Use Permit for a self-storage facility (Legacy Crossing Storage) on property located at approximately 150 North 1250 West

7:15 2. Public Hearing - Martha's Place, 347 North 400 East

Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Martha's Place (formerly 347 Subdivision), on property located at 347 North 400 East, for the purpose of a multi-family development; consisting of 1 tri-plex and 1 single-family dwelling

7:35 3. Public Hearing - Code Text Amendment, Allow Climate Controlled Storage in Various Zones

Consider the proposed Code Text Amendment regarding Section 12-12-040-

Definitions, by adding "Climate Controlled Storage" and Chapter 12-36-Table of Uses Allowed, by allowing "Climate Controlled Storage" in various zones; including C-H (Commercial-High) Zoning District

8:00

4. Community Development Director's Report 081016

The next regularly scheduled meeting is August 24, 2016. Items to be considered are as follows:

- Zone Map Amendment for I-VH Zone, West Centerville Neighborhood
- Youngblood Storage Conceptual Site Plan
- Legacy Crossing Storage CUP and Final Site Plan
- Bartile Storage Sheds Final Site Plan

F. ADJOURNMENT

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
8/10/2016**

Item No.

Short Title: Planning Commission Meeting July 27, 2016

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▢ 07-27-2016 PC Preliminary Draft Minutes

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, July 27, 2016

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

Kevin Daly
Becki Wright
Logan Johnson, Vice Chair
Cheylynn Hayman
Scott Kjar

MEMBERS ABSENT

David Hirschi, Chair
Gina Hirst

STAFF PRESENT

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

VISITORS

Interested Citizens

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/PRAYER

Kevin Daly

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held July 13, 2016 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Daly made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (5-0).

PUBLIC HEARING | GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE WEST CENTERVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN - Consider the General Plan Amendment regarding Section 12-480-6, West Centerville Neighborhood Plan, Goal 1, Objective 1.I., reconsidering whether the I-VH (Industrial-Very High) Zoning District should continue in the future for this neighborhood. Centerville City, Applicant.

1 Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner, reported the Planning Commission and City
2 Council have been concerned that the intensity of uses allowed within the Industrial-Very High
3 (I-VH) Zone are no longer in harmony with the future of the West Centerville Neighborhood. At
4 a previous work session (March 23, 2016) the Commission and Council discussed the idea of
5 eliminating the I-VH Zone. During the work session concerns were raised that the I-VH uses
6 conflict with future desires and that a continued mixture of office space, residential,
7 entertainment, and business space may be best for West Centerville. Mr. Toponce reviewed the
8 current policies for the West Centerville Neighborhood and the definition for the I-VH Zone. He
9 also reviewed current existing uses and businesses within the I-VH Zone and how they may be
10 affected by a change to the ordinance. He also reviewed possible impacts to the current
11 surrounding mixed-uses if I-VH is maintained. Given the recent development of commercial and
12 residential in West Centerville, staff agrees the I-VH Zone may no longer be feasible. The
13 elimination of the I-VH Zone may help enhance the perceived value of the West Centerville and
14 West Bountiful neighborhoods. It will also encourage future development that is more
15 compatible with existing and desired future development. Mr. Toponce reviewed the proposed
16 amendment to the General Plan eliminating the I-VH Zone from the southeast area of the
17 Centerville Business Park District.

18
19 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, said this is only step one of the process.
20 He explained the General Plan is a policy not an ordinance. Eliminating the I-VH Zone from the
21 General Plan simply shows a desire for future planning; it does not set a zoning map regulation.
22 To ultimately eliminate the I-VH Zone from West Centerville a Zone Map Amendment will need
23 to be completed. At this time, the City has not researched all the pros and cons of an amendment
24 to the Zoning Map and does not have a specific goal in mind. This is a process that requires
25 extensive study and planning. He said it could be argued that a General Plan amendment at this
26 time is premature because there is not a set Zoning Map plan as of yet. However, if the I-VH is
27 eliminated from the General Plan at this time then it would help discourage any future heavy
28 industrial uses from locating in West Centerville until a full zone map planning process is
29 completed or a better vision is foreseen as driven by the market. If the I-VH is eliminated the
30 default zone would fall to Industrial-High (I-H). Mr. Snyder discussed current uses within the I-
31 VH Zone. He explained there are a few businesses located in the I-VH Zone but that only one
32 (Syro Steele), to this knowledge, is conducting business in a manor consistent with the Heavy
33 Industry definition. The other businesses are less intense and their uses could possibly fall under
34 the I-H Zone. In this one instance (Syro Steele), eliminating the I-VH Zone would create a non-
35 conforming use after a Zone Map Amendment is completed. However, all the businesses within
36 the I-VH Zone have the right to use their property according to I-VH definition at this time.

37
38 Vice Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

39
40 Mark Green said he has owned a business in the I-VH Zone in West Centerville since
41 1978. He said this is the fifth time the City has asked him to leave. He said his company has

1 supplied all the water pipes and road materials for the city over the years and he does not
2 appreciate being pushed out. He said I-VH should not be eliminated. He said the City talks about
3 negative impacts of the I-VH Zone, but he said it is him that has been negatively impacted by
4 current development. This is unfair. He said it won't matter if the I-VH Zone is stricken from the
5 books because it is clear that industrial uses are not wanted and there is no industrial business
6 that would relocate to Centerville given recent developments, i.e., residential and commercial
7 uses. He said the City has put him in a position where he cannot get a reasonable return on his
8 property. It will take significant money to make his relocation possible and the City is limiting
9 his options. He agreed that his business no longer fits in West Centerville but he does not
10 appreciate being forced out of the City, nor does he appreciate that his property value is being
11 diminished. He said if Centerville wants him to go, then the City will need to think big and
12 encourage big money to move in.

13
14 Richard Rowe said his small business also resides in the I-VH Zone. He said his business
15 has served him well and he had hoped it would also provide him retirement once sold or
16 redeveloped, but if the I-VH Zone is eliminated then so is his retirement. He agreed that it
17 doesn't matter what the zoning designation is because Centerville has already made it clear to
18 industrial companies that they are not wanted. This makes it difficult to turn over a business. He
19 agreed it will take big incentives and big money to make any redevelopment worthwhile. He
20 asked the Commission to consider the negative affects this type of decision makes on those that
21 have been here for many years, who have put their blood, sweat, and tears into Centerville, and
22 not just those that might come in the future.

23
24 Bob Mason questioned what types of zones could replace the I-VH if eliminated. He said
25 the City claims there is not a plan for the West Centerville Zoning Map and yet it is listed as an
26 agenda item for the Planning Commission to discuss in a couple weeks. He said if there is not a
27 plan then the General Plan should not be amended at this time and if a zone map amendment
28 truly takes time to study then it should not already be listed on a future agenda.

29
30 Vice Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

31
32 Mr. Snyder said a possible Zone Map Amendment discussion is already listed on a future
33 Commission agenda in order to meet noticing requirements. This was simply in anticipation that
34 the Council may direct the Commission to discuss this issue further after tonight's General Plan
35 decision moves forward to the City Council for final approval. The agenda item may or may not
36 move forward but the posting of the future agenda item will allow the beginning of the zone map
37 amendment process if needed. He reminded the Commission and the public that a Zone Map
38 Amendment will include additional public hearings and encouraged additional public comments
39 at those times.

40

1 Vice Chair Johnson clarified that tonight's decision is regarding the General Plan, a
2 future visionary policy. He said eliminating the I-VH from the General Plan simply shows that
3 Centerville no longer envisions I-VH in the future for this area. Mr. Snyder agreed. He said the
4 assumption is that the I-H Zone would replace the I-VH Zone until a map amendment process
5 can be completed. The City has yet to know what the best vision and subsequent zoning for this
6 area of the City would be. After research and discussions, it may be found that I-H is also not the
7 best vision for this area, this is the beauty of the process.

8
9 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, clarified that Syro Steele is a conforming use in the I-VH
10 Zone. If the I-VH Zone is eliminated from the General Plan and a subsequent Zone Map
11 amendment approved, then Syro Steele will become a non-conforming use. She reminded the
12 Commission that zoning designations run with the land. If the I-VH Zone remains and Syro
13 Steele chooses to leave, then another heavy industry use can move in. If the I-VH Zone is
14 eliminated and Syro Steele leaves, then another heavy industry use would be discouraged. She
15 also reminded the Commission that eliminating the I-VH Zone from the General Plan eliminates
16 the I-VH Zone from the city as a whole, not just West Centerville. It is the Zoning Map that is
17 area specific. However, the only I-VH Zone designations within the entire city are those in West
18 Centerville which have been discussed.

19
20 Commissioner Hayman agreed that West Centerville has changed in such a way that it is
21 clear that I-VH is no longer compatible nor desired. She questioned if the General Plan could be
22 amended at this time to clarify this vision but the Zone Map amendment put on hold until there is
23 a better understanding of what may be best in the future. She said this would allow current
24 property owners to continue as desired and perhaps give the city time to see where the market
25 may lead. Mr. Snyder said it is likely the Council will direct staff and the Commission to
26 continue on with the zone map amendment, but that process could lead to no changes.

27
28 Commissioner Kjar agreed it is clear that heavy industrial uses are no longer desired in
29 West Centerville and agreed it is not likely any industrial business would choose to locate here
30 even if allowed. In this regard, he questioned if it is even necessary to amend the General Plan at
31 this time. However, he also understands that amending the General Plan will help facilitate
32 possible future goals. He said he is sensitive to current property owners and wants to make sure
33 that any change is not prejudiced.

34
35 Vice Chair Johnson made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the General
36 Plan Amendment and recommend approval to the City Council regarding Section 12-480-6(1.I.),
37 as described:

38
39 **12-480-6(1.I.) Remove the Industrial-Very High Zoning District in the extreme**
40 **southeast area from this area of the Centerville Business Park District.**
41

Reasons for the Action:

1. The proposed amendment meets the requirements found in Section 12.21.070(d) of the Zoning Ordinance in relation to the general procedures.
2. The current use of Industrial-Very High was found to be incompatible to the surrounding neighborhoods and to the future goals for the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan [Sections 12.21.070(d)(vi), 12-480-6(1.)]
3. The proposed General Plan Amendment meets the approval standards found in Section 12.21.070(e) and 12.21.060(a)(2)(A) of the Zoning Ordinance for a comprehensive decision based on: incompatible development, does not promote the public interest for future uses, does not promote the public interest or general welfare.
4. The remaining uses found within the I-VH Zone may continue to operate as is, following the nonconforming standards in Chapter 12.22 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayman.

Commissioner Wright said this issue feels a bit like a cart before the horse situation but she also sees the value of providing a vision and a direction for future goals and planning.

Commissioner Daly agreed. He said it is clear this neighborhood is moving more and more toward mixed residential and commercial uses. It is clear that industrial uses are no longer desired but he too is sensitive to current property owners and their exiting uses. He said it seems the proposed amendment to the General Plan will not negatively impact current property owners and will allow them to continue.

Commissioner Hayman said she empathizes with the current I-VH property owners. She said she would like to protect property rights and property values. She also sees the value in amending the General Plan in order to provide direction in future planning.

Vice Chair Johnson called for a vote on the motion. The motion **passed** with 4-1 vote. Vice Chair Johnson opposed.

Vice Chair Johnson said he understands and agrees with both sides but chooses to error on the side of current property owners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 10, 2016.
2. Upcoming Agenda Items:
 - Zone Map Amendment for I-VH Zone in West Centerville Neighborhood
 - Legacy Storage CUP & Final Site Plan

- Martha's Place (347 North 400 East) CUP & Conceptual Site Plan
- Steve Tate, Code Text Amendment to allow storage in C-H Zone

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Logan Johnson, Vice Chair

Date Approved

Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/10/2016**

Item No. 1

Short Title: Public Hearing - Legacy Crossing Storage, 150 North 1250 West

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 7:10

SUBJECT

[Applicant requested to postpone to August 24, 2016 meeting]

Consider the proposed Final Site Plan and a Conditional Use Permit for a self-storage facility (Legacy Crossing Storage) on property located at approximately 150 North 1250 West

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/10/2016**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Martha's Place, 347 North 400 East

Initiated By: Chad Morris, Applicant

Scheduled Time: 7:15

SUBJECT

Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Martha's Place (formerly 347 Subdivision), on property located at 347 North 400 East, for the purpose of a multi-family development; consisting of 1 tri-plex and 1 single-family dwelling

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ☐ 08-10-2016 PC Staff Report Martha's Place Concept SP & CUP
- ☐ Martha's Place Conceptual Site Plan 081016

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

**STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 2**

APPLICANT/ **CHAD MORRIS**
PROPERTY OWNER: **533 WEST VALLEY DRIVE**
CENTERVILLE, UT 84014

EMAIL: **chadmorris33@gmail.com**

PROPERTY: **347 NORTH 400 EAST**

ACREAGE: **.52**

ZONING: **RESIDENTIAL-MEDIUM (R-M)**

APPLICATIONS: **CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN FOR A MULTI-FAMILY
DEVELOPMENT**

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR 7.6 UNITS PER ACRE

RECOMMENDATION: **ACCEPT THE CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN
APPROVE THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

BACKGROUND

On May 11, 2016, Chad Morris received approval for a flag lot on his property located at 347 North 400 East. However, after reviewing his options, Mr. Morris has chosen not to record the flag lot and seek approval for a multi-family development on his property. The lot is .52 of an acre and the site plan indicates the existing single-family home with a tri-plex in the rear of the property. This would bring the total density to 7.6 units per acre, which requires a conditional use permit review. At this point, the applicant is still looking at options of a single or two-story tri-plex. For the final site plan, this information will need to be submitted for Planning Commission review. Once the final site plan has been approved, the property would then be subdivided into a "planned unit development" to allow each dwelling to be individually purchased by a future resident.

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN REVIEW, SECTION 12.12.110(d)

Table of Uses Allowed - Chapter 12.36

Within the Zoning Ordinance, the "Table of Uses" does allow for a multiple-family dwelling and a single-family dwelling within the Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone. The multi-family use is permitted at 4 units per acre and 8 units with the approval of a conditional use permit. In addition, a single-family dwelling also requires a conditional use permit approval (see Table 12.32.1). As stated previously, the applicant has requested 4 units on the .52-acre parcel, which would be 7.6 units per acre.

General Plan - Section 12.480.2(1)(b)

The General Plan calls out this location as Neighborhood 1, Southeast Centerville and within the Centerville Elementary Area [Section 12.480.2(1)(b)]. This section states that the area was Zoned R-2 (R-M today), "partly in an effort to recognize the number of duplexes that were in existence in the area, and also to allow for more efficient development of the block interiors." This section further states that in Goal 1, "The residential area around the Centerville Elementary School shall allow for low and medium density residential development to accommodate more efficient use of the large interior blocks that are common in this area."

The proposed lot is maintaining the Residential-Medium Zone and is creating a development that is more efficient in a larger interior block. Therefore, the proposal meets the goals of the General Plan.

Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District – Chapter 12.49

This property is also found in the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District that was created to encourage the preservation of the original Centerville townsite. This voluntary program does not prohibit any development by a property owner, which is currently allowed within the Zoning Ordinance. When Mr. Morris met with the Planning Commission in May, several citizens expressed concern that the house facing 400 East would be removed. However, at this point the applicant has chosen to maintain the home as a separate dwelling. If the applicant maintains the historical integrity, all exterior construction will receive a 50% reduction of all building permit review fees. In order to ensure the architectural style of new construction within the district is compatible with existing structures, voluntary development standards have been outlined (see Section 12.49.080). If the applicant takes advantage of these design standards on the tri-plex, he may receive up to 25% off all building review fees.

Staff would encourage the applicant to take advantage of these guidelines and incentives as to become more in line with the architectural styles found within the surrounding neighborhood. These historic styles do not necessarily need to mimic the styles of the late 19th Century and early 20th Century that are found within the central core of the district. The applicant may choose to include those design styles of mid-century modern that can also be found in close proximity to the subject property.

Development Standards

R-M Development Standards, Table 12.35.1			
Development Standard	Required	Actual	Compliance
Building Standards			
Maximum Height	35 Feet	Not Defined	
Distance Between Buildings	6 Feet	15.23	Yes
Lot and Parcel Standards			
Minimum Area	10,000 sq. ft.	19,933	Yes
Minimum Width	60 Feet	100 Feet	Yes
Setbacks			
Front	25 Feet	30	
Rear	20 Feet	20	
Side	8 feet Minimum total width of both side yards: 18 Feet	10 Feet - South	Yes
		43 Feet - North	

The proposed project meets the required development standards for development within the Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone. The applicant will need to provide architectural drawings for the final site plan indicating the height of all proposed new structures.

Additional Standards for Development within the Residential-Medium Zone

Required Landscaping Summary Chapter 12.51			
Guidelines	Standard	Required	Compliance
Total Area Landscaping	40%	7,950 Sq. Ft.	Yes
Total Required Trees	1 Tree & 2 Shrubs per Dwelling Unit	4 Trees and 8 Shrubs	Not defined
Trees for Street Frontage	1 per 25 linear feet	4 Trees	
Total Interior Parking Lot Landscaping	10%	10%	
Total Interior Parking Lot Trees and Shrubs	For every six required stalls: 1 tree	8 Trees	
Total Interior Parking Lot Trees and Shrubs	For every six required stalls: 2 shrubs	16 Shrubs	
Public Street Landscaping	10 Feet for Local Streets	10 Feet for Local Streets	

The applicant will need to submit a complete landscaping plan with the final site plan submittal.

Off-Street Parking Requirements – Section 12.52.1

According to Table 12.52.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, residential uses have parking requirements that must be adhered to by the applicant. A single-family dwelling requires two spaces per dwelling and a multi-family dwelling requires one and a half spaces per studio or one bedroom and two spaces for two or more bedrooms. The proposed project appears to have two-car garages for each unit and the existing home has a driveway, which also allows for 2 spaces. The plans also indicate 3 visitor stalls on the west side of the project.

The private lane from 400 East to approximately 85 feet into the property is measured at a width of 24 feet. From this point to the parking stalls, the width is increased to 27 feet. This extra width allows turning maneuvers in and out of the driveways and parking stalls. The driveways in front of each garage is measured at 6 feet, however, with the additional 3 feet of space for the drive-isle, the 9-foot parking stall requirement has been satisfied. Staff is recommending that no parking signs be placed along the drive-isle to ensure proper fire safety has been addressed.

Screening – Section 12.51.110

The conceptual site plan indicates existing fences only and does not show proposed screening or fencing. On the final site plan, the applicant will need to show the location of and type of fencing proposed for the property. No dumpster will be located on site and all homeowners will be responsible to place their garbage cans along 400 East for City pick up.

Signage – Section 12.54

The applicant did not propose any signage on the conceptual site plan. If Mr. Morris would like to take advantage of his right for signage, this would be handled under a separate permit. Yet, the final site plan still requires all sign location and detail to be called out for review by the Planning Commission (Section 12.21.110(e)(i)(f)).

Utility Plans and Easements – Section 12.21.110(d)(2)(A)(xiv)

At the meeting in May, citizens expressed concern over sewer lines and drainage of the property. The South Davis Sewer District slipped the existing lines and ensured the line was now adequate to handle a larger number of dwellings. The South Davis Sewer District also stated that more lines connected together will actually help flush out the system on a regular bases. In addition to sewer, the applicant has indicated other existing and proposed utilities. One concern is the overhead telephone line located across Unit 1. Staff would request that the applicant address this line and what the utility provider will require in moving, burying or leaving the wire. On the final site plan the applicant will also need to show a 10-foot public utility easement along the front of 400 East and then 2 additional sides (preferably the west and south), with 7-foot public utility easements. Finally, the plans indicate a new fire hydrant located in the project at the far west end of the drive-isle. This will need to be reviewed by South Davis Metro Fire to ensure this is adequate, and the location will meet the needs for fire protection.

Conceptual Site Plan Conclusion

It appears the applicant has identified how the property may be developed for a multi-family use within the R-M Zone. The proposed project appears to have met the development standards as

indicated within the Ordinance pertaining to lot configurations, setbacks, parking and density. Landscaping and building detail will still be required as part of the final site plan review.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVIEW, SECTION 12.21.100

In a Residential Medium (R-M) Zone, the maximum permitted density is 4 units per acre. With a conditional use permit, the Planning Commission may approve up to 8 units per acre. In addition, the Table of Uses within the Zoning Ordinance requires a conditional use permit for a single-family dwelling within the R-M Zone.

Evidence – Section 12.21.100(e)(3)

The applicant would like to utilize his development rights by building a tri-plex on his property. The .52 acre lot will have a tri-plex, and 1 existing single-family home; which makes a density of 7.6 units per acre. Since this development is found within the R-M Zone on a parcel that is underutilized, this project appears to be well suited for its surroundings. In addition, the proposal has been designed as to meet the requirements as stated in the Zoning Ordinance and discussed in the above conceptual site plan review.

Factors to be Reviewed – Section 12.21.100(e)(5)

Suitability of the property and harmony with adjacent development (A, B, F)

Multi-family housing is acceptable in a Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone and works very well for this lot. With the lot being long in depth, it is underutilized for just one single family home. The property seems to be ideal for a tri-plex. On the north side of Parrish Lane from 400 East to the school, is a variety of housing types, from single-family homes to duplexes and Granite Square, which has 10 dwelling units. Granite Square is also the only property within this area with a conditional use permit for density. The proposed duplex and single-family dwelling appear to be in harmony with surrounding development located on Parrish Lane. However, to the south of the development are single-family residential, which may have a negative impact. The single-family dwelling is existing and already in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. By the dwelling remaining in place, the applicant has greatly reduced the negative aesthetic appearance.

Negative impact to the surrounding development (C, D, E, K)

The tri-plex could have somewhat of a negative impact to the homes located to the south. Since the project is higher in elevation than the homes to the south, it may feel as if the homes are rising above their backyard. In order to mitigate this issue, the applicant will need to place a solid fence along the south property line and plant additional trees along the north side of the fence. Height is also a topic that has come up in the past. However, the Ordinance allows a maximum of 35 feet in all residential zones and is not found to be an impact on the surrounding community. Some may see traffic as a potential impact, however, staff does not see the increase of traffic from 3 additional dwellings as being significant on 400 East (which is considered a collector road).

Utilities, traffic and drainage (G, H)

The conceptual site plan indicates utilities on the lot. Staff has also received utility provider sheets showing adequate service to the area. One issue that was discussed in May was that of the

sewer line. However, Dal Wayment, with the South Davis Sewer District submitted a letter stating the pipe that will feed to the development is connected to the neighbor to the south, and has been slipped and should be adequate for all the properties. The applicant will need to place public utility easements on the property as indicated in the Conceptual Site Plan. As a reminder, the overhead phone line will also need to be addressed for realignment or burial. Traffic appears not to be an issue; however, the applicant will need to show proper ingress and egress from 400 East on the final site plan and all other physical improvements. In order to minimize the number of driveways onto 400 East, staff is recommending the single-family home utilize the paved driveway for the tri-plex. The applicant will need to ensure the driveway entrance from 400 East to the tri-plex meets the clear view requirements found in Section 12.55.230(a). This will need to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The last issue is that of proper drainage. The applicant has been working with the City Engineer in creating a drainage design that will not have a negative impact on the lower lots. This includes a berm, drainage swell and a new storm drain connection. The applicant will need to receive final approval from the City Engineer for the recently submitted drainage plan.

Safeguards provided to minimize any negative impacts (I, J)

Negative Impacts and Safeguards	
Possible Negative Impacts	Mitigation
Sewer line is inadequate	• South Davis Sewer District has slipped the line and stated that it is sufficient
Traffic	• The increase in vehicles from a tri-plex will have minimal impact on 400 East • Only one curb cut and shared driveway be constructed for the tri-plex and the single-family home • The driveway must be constructed to meet City Standards • A clear view of the driveway must be maintained along 400 East • No parking signs must be placed along the driveway to ensure adequate fire access
Buffering from R-L properties	• A solid 6-foot fence must be placed on the southern boundary at a minimum, directly behind the tri-plex • Additional vegetation and trees shall be planted along the property line to ensure adequate screening
Drainage	• A proper berm, detention basin and storm drain outlet must be created and approved by the City Engineer

Conclusion

Staff believes the proposed tri-plex meets the intent of the Ordinance for development within the R-M Zone. In addition, any negative impacts to this specific site may be mitigated by the applicant.

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

I hereby make a motion for the Planning Commission to accept the Conceptual Site Plan for Martha's Place, located at 347 North 400 East, with the following conditions:

1. Architectural renderings shall be submitted, clarifying the height of each building.
2. The applicant should address the design standards for the tri-plex as found within Chapter 12.49 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. A complete landscaping plan shall be submitted meeting the requirements for a multi-family development as found within Chapter 12.51 of the Zoning Ordinance. This landscaping plan shall address the requested additional trees on the south property line and the vegetation found around the single-family home.
4. No parking signs shall be posted along the driveway to ensure adequate space for a fire lane.
5. The final site plan shall indicate all new and existing fencing.
6. If the applicant desires to have signage for the project, this shall be indicated on the final site plan and meet the requirements found in Chapter 12.54 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Three public utility easements must be located on the site and depicted on the final site plan, as follows:
 - a. 10-foot easement on the east property line adjacent to 400 East
 - b. 7-foot easement along the south property line
 - c. 7-foot easement on the west property line

All easements shall be accepted by the City Council and recorded at the Davis County Recorder's Office.

8. The applicant shall address the overhead telephone line with the proper utility company for relocation, burial or allowing the line to stay in place.
9. The location of the fire hydrant shall receive final approval from the City Engineer and the South Davis Metro Fire.
10. A final site plan shall be submitted following all applicable standards found in Section 12.21.110(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. The applicant shall receive the approval of a conditional use permit for the density of 4 units; which includes the use of a single family dwelling.

SUGGESTED 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 12.480.2(1)(b)].
- c) The proposed conceptual site plan, with the directives given, appears to be capable of meeting applicable Development Standards for the R-M Zone.

- d) A conditional use permit is required for a single-family development, and a multi-family use over 4 units per acre.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

I hereby make a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Martha's Place, to be located at 347 North 400 East, with the following conditions:

1. This Conditional Use Permit shall allow for the density of 7.6 units per acre on the property located at 347 North 400 East; which consists of .52 acres and is limited to 4 individual units (1 tri-plex, 1 single-family dwelling). This Conditional Use Permit also allows for the use of 1 single-family dwelling, which is part of the total allowable units.
2. A solid fence shall be constructed on the south property line along with increased vegetation, consisting of trees which shall mitigate a multi-family use adjacent to a single-family residential use.
3. Proper drainage shall be identified and approved by the City Engineer, which shall consist of a berm and drainage swell along the south and west property lines and a storm drain outlet within the drainage swell.
4. To reduce the number of curb cuts along 400 East, the project shall consist of 1 driveway with access from the tri-plex and single-family home.
5. The ingress and egress shall be constructed to meet City Standards. Detail of this standard shall be indicated on the final site plan and shall be approved by the City Engineer.
6. The driveway shall maintain a clear view of the road at all times and be consistent with Section 12.55.230.
7. No parking shall be allowed on the north and south driveway from 400 East to the back property line, except for in designated parking stalls found on the approved site plan.
8. No parking signs shall be posted as to ensure a clear fire lane at all times.

SUGGESTED REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

- a) A Conditional Use Permit is required for a single-family dwelling and any multi-family above four units per acre (Chapter 12.36)
- b) The applicant has provided sufficient evidence for a conditional use permit to be reviewed by the Planning Commission (Section 12.21.100).
- c) The project was found to have somewhat of a negative impact on the property to the south, yet may be mitigated through proper screening (Section 12.21.100(e)(5)(C)(E)).
- d) The Zoning Ordinance allows up to 8 units per acre with a conditional use permit within the R-M Zone (Chapter 12.32).

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/10/2016**

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Code Text Amendment, Allow Climate Controlled Storage in Various Zones

Initiated By: Steve Tate, Applicant

Scheduled Time: 7:35

SUBJECT

Consider the proposed Code Text Amendment regarding Section 12-12-040-Definitions, by adding "Climate Controlled Storage" and Chapter 12-36-Table of Uses Allowed, by allowing "Climate Controlled Storage" in various zones; including C-H (Commercial-High) Zoning District

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ☐ 08-10-2016 PC Staff Report Code Text Amend., Climate Controlled Storage
- ☐ Tate Letter for Code Text Amendment 081016

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

**STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 3**

APPLICANT: **STEVE TATE
PARRISH SQUARE, LLC
P.O. BOX 1153
CENTERVILLE, UTAH 84014
(steve@tateproperties.com)**

APPLICATION: **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**

APPLICANT REQUEST: **AMEND THE ZONING CODE TO ALLOW “CLIMATE
CONTROLLED STORAGE” IN THE C-H (COMMERCIAL-
HIGH) ZONE**

RECOMMENDATION: **CONSIDER THE PROPOSED CHANGES**

BACKGROUND

The applicant, Mr. Steve Tate, desires to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance to add a “climate controlled storage” to the Zoning Code Definitions and Table of Uses to allow this use in the C-H (Commercial-High) Zone. Mr. Tate owns the Parrish Square “strip mall” center just west of Dicks' Market (where Auto Zone and TonyBurgers are located). Mr. Tate has a building suite (previously a gym) where he would like to establish a “climate controlled storage” type use. Currently, this type of use is not listed in Centerville's Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, his petition is to create a definition, list the use on the Table of Uses, and allow such use to be located in the C-H Zone.

PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT EDITS – *as drafted by Planning Staff*

SECTION 12-12-040-DEFINITIONS:

[new] Storage, Climate Controlled - *a type of self-storage use that provides climate controlled storage, within a single building or suite, containing one or more enclosed areas providing individually accessible interior compartments within the building, each of which is leased to the general public for the purpose of storing non-hazardous personal property of households and businesses and not used for residential occupancy, the conducting of business operations, the storage of vehicles, or storage of bulky commercial/industrial types of machinery.*

CHAPTER 12-36-TABLE OF USES ALLOWED:

[add] To Commercial Uses Section: *Storage, Climate Controlled to C-H Zone Matrix either Permitted (P) or Conditional Use (C).*

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT**Factors to be Considered**

The Planning Commission is to consider three (3) factors when making a recommendation and a final decision for a Zoning Ordinance amendment. These required factors are located in Section 12-21-080(e) of Centerville City's Zoning Ordinance. Nonetheless, Factors 2 & 3 are related more specific to map amendments rather than text changes. Thus, staff's review and conclusions are limited to the General Plan guidance, as provided below:

1. **Is the proposed amendment consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City's General Plan?**
 - ✓ **Section 12-430-1, Need for Commercial and Industrial Development Policies** – "...To assist in the provision of revenues for high quality local services, and to provide needed personal and business services..."
 - ✓ **Section 12-430-2, Pages Lane Commercial Area (e.g. Zoned C-H)** – "...future growth should be as attractive and functional as possible."
 - ✓ **Section 12-430-2., Parrish Lane Commercial Corridor (e.g. areas of C-H exist)** – "...has been strong and the area will continue to be the dominant commercial center of Centerville."
 - ✓ **Section 12-430-3.1 South Frontage Road (e.g. small area located on south end)** – "As existing heavy commercial and industrial uses...are discontinued or moved, such should be replaced with more attractive, commercial and retail-oriented businesses."

Staff's Conclusion – From review of the General Plan, it is staff's position that the proposed amendments are too specific and the General Plan policies are broader in scope. It is staff's position that "Climate Controlled Storage" is an ancillary use to the primary desire of the City to establish strong commercial services. Staff also believes that this type of storage likely has a limited need for our local commercial area, but may be more convenient for residents storing excess personal property. Therefore, the Commission should determine if additional primary commercial services are needed or can this proposed secondary use to serve both residents and businesses be made available within the land use pattern for C-H (Commercial-High) District.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Allowance in Other Similar Zoning Districts – The amendment request is limited to allowing "Climate Controlled Storage" in the C-H Zone. Typically, uses from a specific zone are also made available in a similar but greater intensive district. In reviewing the Table of Land uses, storage type uses are already allowed in the more intensive Industrial Zoning Districts. If there is a potential to allow this use in a C-H Zone, the Commission ought to also consider the possibility of allowing the proposed use in the C-VH (Commercial Very-High) District.

Permitted versus Conditional – Although there is on-going debate whether land uses should simply just be listed as a permitted use rather than using the more subjective criteria of the CUP process, staff believes that in the case of Mr. Tate's specific commercial site, the CUP process would mitigate concerns with "hours of operation" and "loading and unloading" activities resulting from the north dock area that is located adjacent to residential uses. Staff believes that this use development scenario is predominately similar in all of the C-H Zone locations. Therefore, the Commission should consider allowing "Climate Controlled Storage," at minimum as a "Conditional Use" for C-H and then evaluate if the use can be a "Permitted Use" or "Conditional" in the C-VH Zone.

SUGGESTED MOTION AND FINDINGS

OPTION #1 (If Recommending Approval is Desired) *"I hereby make a motion to recommend APPROVAL of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments regarding "Climate Controlled Storage" as follows:*

Section 12-12-040-Definitions:

[new] Storage, Climate Controlled - *a type of self-storage use that provides climate controlled storage, within a single building or suite, containing one or more enclosed areas providing individually accessible interior compartments within the building, each of which is leased to the general public for the purpose of storing non-hazardous personal property of households and businesses and not used for residential occupancy, the conducting of business operations, the storage of vehicles, or storage of bulky commercial/industrial types of machinery.*

Chapter 12-36-Table of Uses Allowed:

[add] To Commercial Uses Section: "Storage, Climate Controlled"

- **C-H Zone Matrix :** *Conditional Use (C)*
- **C-VH Zone Matrix :** *Conditional Use (C)*

Suggested Reasons for Action (findings):

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments are too specific and the General Plan policies are broader in scope.*
- b. *The Planning Commission finds that Section 12-430-1, Need for Commercial and Industrial Development Policies states that "...To assist in the provision of revenues for high quality local services, and TO PROVIDE NEEDED PERSONAL AND BUSINESS SERVICES..."*
- c. *The Planning Commission finds that this type of storage likely has a limited need for our local commercial area, but may be more convenient for residents storing excess personal property.*
- d. *The Planning Commission finds that typically uses from a specific zone are also made available in a similar but greater intensive district.*
- e. *In reviewing the Table of Land Uses, the Planning Commission finds that storage type uses are already allowed in the more intensive Industrial Zoning Districts. Therefore, the Commission desires to allow the proposed use in the Commercial Very-High District.*

- f. *The Planning Commission finds that there is on-going debate whether land uses should simply just be listed as a permitted use rather than using the more subjective criteria of the CUP process.*
- g. *The Planning Commission finds that in the case of Mr. Tate's specific commercial site, the CUP process would mitigate concerns with "hours of operation" and "loading and unloading" activities resulting from the north dock area that is located adjacent to residential uses.*
- h. *The Planning Commission finds that the scenario above is predominately similar in all of the C-H and C-VH Zone locations.*

OPTION #2 (If Recommending Denial is Desired) *"I hereby make a motion to recommend Denial of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments regarding "Climate Controlled Storage" with the following findings:*

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments are too specific and the General Plan policies are broader in scope.*
- b. *The Planning Commission finds that Section 12-430-1, Need for Commercial and Industrial Development Policies states that "...TO ASSIST IN THE PROVISION OF REVENUES FOR HIGH QUALITY LOCAL SERVICES, and to provide needed personal and business services..."*
- c. *The Planning Commission finds that this type of storage likely has a limited need for our local commercial area, but may be only convenient for residents storing excess personal property.*
- d. *The Planning Commission finds that there is on-going debate whether land uses should simply just be listed as a permitted use rather than using the more subjective criteria of the CUP process.*
- e. *The Planning Commission finds that in the case of Mr. Tate's specific commercial site, there would be concerns with "hours of operation" and "loading and unloading" activities resulting from the north dock area that is located adjacent to residential uses.*
- f. *The Planning Commission finds that the scenario above is predominately similar in all of the other C-H and C-VH Zone locations.*

PARRISH SQUARE, LLC
PO BOX 1153
CENTERVILLE, UT 84014
801-712-9524 Tel.

July 15, 2016

CENTERVILLE PLANNING & ZONING

Attn: Mr. Corvin Snyder
655 North 1250 West
Centerville, UT 84014

RE: Zone Text Amendment Application – Parrish Square – 158 West Parrish Lane

Dear Cory:

Thank you for working with us on this Zone Text Amendment Application for the above referenced property in Centerville City. We have been very happy with our investment in Centerville and hope that the leasing and investment we have made has been beneficial to the city.

The purpose of our Zone Text Amendment Application is to amend the C-H Zone to allow for internal self-storage. Historically, self-storage has been limited to traditional storage units that have been located in industrial zones. In my experience in commercial real estate, which has been considerable (well over twenty years with most being in retail leasing), I would have never desired self-storage in a retail project. However, our industry has changed dramatically over the last few years and this use has proven to be a positive element in shopping centers where developers and cities have allowed it.

Our intent is to offer a solution to the public in a convenient location, eliminate historical vacancy problems, and do it in a way that is pleasing to the public. When this shopping center was built, the developer built large corner spaces with very little frontage. In fact, Wasatch Crossfit Race is relocating from our building to Craig Salmon's new building on the northwest part of Centerville leaving us with over 4,000 square feet of vacancy with only approximately 36" of total frontage. We have approached many tenants to try and fill this vacancy with no success. As we have counseled with associates in our field, every person we have talked to has suggested that we make application to Centerville City and build some small, climate controlled, internal self-storage pods in that space.

Parrish Square has plenty of access in the rear (north and west areas) of the shopping center with docks for loading/unloading. Internal self-storage will also reduce the significant parking demand at the shopping center, especially during the peak hours in the afternoon/evening, while still providing the public the convenience of "one stop shopping" by being adjacent to Dick's Market and the other retailers. Further, in conversation with some of our existing

RECEIVED JUL 15 2016

tenants, they welcome the idea as they have overflow merchandise and files that they could store in the storage pods at the same property at a favorable cost.

Internal self-storage is popping up in commercial high zones in markets all over the country. It is being done well and the response has been tremendous. The public has embraced this concept as it fills a need that is growing all the time.

Please feel free to contact me as I am happy to sit down with you and your staff to discuss this application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve Tate', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Steve Tate

PARRISH SQUARE, LLC

Co-Manager

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/10/2016**

Item No. 4.

Short Title: Community Development Director's Report 081016

Initiated By: Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

Scheduled Time: 8:00

SUBJECT

The next regularly scheduled meeting is August 24, 2016. Items to be considered are as follows:

- Zone Map Amendment for I-VH Zone, West Centerville Neighborhood
- Youngblood Storage Conceptual Site Plan
- Legacy Crossing Storage CUP and Final Site Plan
- Bartile Storage Sheds Final Site Plan

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND