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 14, 2019 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 Jacob Smith, Centerville Management Services Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

The full packet of backups can be found at http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic.

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

7:00 PM **A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL**

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Thomas Hunt, Commissioner

D. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Public Meeting - Island View Park Final Site Plan Approval

   ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

   Consider the proposed Final site Plan for Island View Park Phases 1 and 2, a renovation of the park facilities at 700 East 500 South.

2. Public Hearing - Legislative Decision - Zoning Code and Municipal Code Amendments - Letters of Credit

   Consider the proposed Zoning Code and Municipal Code Amendments regarding the use of letters of credit for bond security - Ordinance No. 2019-16

3. Public Hearing - Legislative Decision - Zoning Code Amendments - Expiration of Subdivision Approvals

   Consider proposed Zoning Code Amendments to CMC 15 (Subdivisions) regarding expiration dates for subdivision approvals - Ordinance No. 2019-17

4. Discussion - Subdivision Ordinance Updates - Chapter 11 (Plat Amendments)

   Continue discussion of proposed revisions to City Subdivision Ordinance - CMC 15 (Subdivision)

5. Discussion - General Plan - South Main Street Corridor

   Commission Review and Feedback for Preliminary South Main Street Corridor

Plan

6. Community Development Director's Report & City Council Report

E. MINUTES REVIEW and ACCEPTANCE

July 10, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Public Meeting - Island View Park Final Site Plan Approval

Initiated By: Bruce Cox, Applicant

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
Consider the proposed Final site Plan for Island View Park Phases 1 and 2, a renovation of the park facilities at 700 East 500 South.

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- 8-14-19 PC Staff Report - Island View Park Final Site Plan
- Engineer Memo
- Parking Evaluation

CENTERVILLE CITY
COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

655 North 1250 West, Centerville, Utah 84014
(801) 292-8232

STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 1

APPLICANT:	**CENTERVILLE CITY** **c/o BRUCE COX** **250 NORTH MAIN ST** **CENTERVILLE, UT 84014**
PROPERTY:	**ISLAND VIEW PARK** **700 EAST 550 SOUTH**
ZONING:	**PUBLIC FACILITY – LOW *(PF-L)***
APPLICATION:	**FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL**
RECOMMENDATION:	**ACCEPT THE FINAL SITE PLAN**

BACKGROUND

On June 12, 2019, the Planning Commission reviewed and accepted the applicable Conceptual Site Plan and provided a few directives to the applicant. This purpose of this report is to review and determine whether to grant approval of the final site plan.

PREVIOUS CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN ACCEPTANCE

Below is a list of the previous directives and brief compliance status by the planning staff:

1. *The park renovation may seek a phasing approach, as part of the Final Site Plan submittal.*
2. *Any new accessory building (e.g. pavilion, restrooms, etc.) must not exceed an average building height of 20-feet, as measured to the mid-point of the roof. [INCOMPLETE]*
3. *Any new accessory building must not have a floor area larger than 1,000 square feet.[COMPLETE]*
4. *The City Engineer will need to review the plans in regards to storm water management and verify compliance with city specifications.[COMPLETE see attachment]*
5. *Any new fencing must meet the applicable height limitations of 4 feet in any front yard area and 6 feet all other yard areas, unless otherwise submitted to the*

Planning Commission for approval (up to a maximum height of 10 feet).[COMPLETE]

6. *All lighting fixture designs must include the use of external/internal shield to direct the light downward and/or away from residential homes. [INCOMPLETE]*
7. *A "Parking Study" is required (see CZC 12.52.110.e for study requirements). This study must be performed and submitted as part of the Final Site Plan review and approval.[COMPLETE see attachment]*
8. *The new sign must meet the sign area requirements, which is limited to a maximum area of 75 square feet.[COMPLETE]*

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

[*Suggested Motion*] *I hereby motion that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Final Site Plan for Island View Park Renovation Phases 1 and 2 subject to the following conditions:*

1. *Applicant shall provide time frames for Phases 1 and 2.*
2. *Applicant shall provide building heights for new accessory buildings. Buildings must not exceed an average building height of 20-feet, as measured to the mid-point of the roof.*
3. *Applicant shall provide lighting fixture designs which include the use of external/internal shield to direct the light downward and/or away from residential homes.*

Suggested Findings (reasons for action):

a. *The Planning Commission finds that with the conditions of this approval, the proposed development remains compliant with the applicable development provisions of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance of the City. [Title 12].*

Mackenzie Wood

From: Kevin Campbell <Kevin.Campbell@esieng.com>
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2019 2:26 PM
To: Mackenzie Wood
Cc: Dave Walker
Subject: Island View Park - Erosion Control plan & SWPPP

Mackenzie,

After review this morning I have no exceptions with the Erosion Control or SWPPP provided in the design drawings for the Park.

Kevin

Kevin Campbell, P.E.
Centerville City Engineer

Kevin Campbell, P.E.
ESI Engineering, Inc
3500 S. Main St.
SLC, Ut 84115
801.263.1752

This email may contain confidential or privileged information. If you believe you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message without copying or disclosing it.

Bruce Cox

From: Bruce Cox
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 4:07 PM
To: Cory Snyder
Cc: kevin campbell (kevin.campbell@esieng.com); cody pedersen (cody.pedersen@esieng.com)
Subject: FW: CZC 12.52.110.e., Parking Study

Cory,
Below are the most recent parking guidelines by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and a recommendation from Cody at ESI Engineering for Island View Park.
I agree with Cody that we should take the public park ratio plus the Racquet/Tennis Club ratio and have between 8 – 38 parking stalls.
If this park was in a more visible/accessible location like that of Porter/Walton Park it would draw more attention but with where is tucked back in a neighborhood the location probably brings the parking needs down a bit.
The Island View Renovation plan shows 44 total parking stalls, 29 stalls on the top level remain unchanged and 15 parking stalls on the lower level expanded parking lot. This is a few more than the high end of the range but I don't think we should change the plans to reduce the parking.
I thought I would do a few car counts at Smoot park before the next meeting with the planning commission meeting as it has two tennis courts, Sand Volleyball court, a large soccer field area and a large playground/swing set area near it's pavilion that is very similar to Island View Park, for another reference.
Thanks,
Bruce

From: Cody Pedersen [mailto:Cody.Pedersen@esieng.com]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 4:31 PM
To: Kevin Campbell; Bruce Cox
Subject: RE: CZC 12.52.110.e., Parking Study

Bruce / Kevin,

Island View Park is a public park with mixed use options. There is an open space for a ball field, 2 tennis courts, a sand volleyball court, a pavilion with 4 tables, a large playground area, path trails and general landscape area.

The most recent Parking Generation Manual, 5th Edition, by Institute of Transportation Engineers has information pertaining to public parks that vary widely as to type of amenities. Here are the ratio ranges provided for several different types of Land Use:

- **Public Park** (including ball fields, pavilions, hiking trails, etc.) = range is 0.47 – 5.08 veh / acre. Island View is about 4.5 acres, so parking stall range is 2 – 23.
- **Tennis Courts** = a single ratio of 2.67 veh / court. Island View has two courts, so parking stalls would be 6.
- **Soccer Complex** (numbers represent tournament or league games) = range is 45 – 74 veh / field. Island View has one field, so parking stall range is 45 – 74.
- **Racquet/Tennis Club** (membership clubs that may include spa, weight room, snack bar and daycare) = range is 3.08 – 7.33 veh / court. Island View has two courts, so parking stall range is 6 – 15.

There is no one category that best fits (which is typical) so judgement must be used. Caution is given for Manual data that only has one data point (i.e. Tennis Courts) or survey site which may not reflect a particular local or condition. A survey of a similar site or historical data as to how much parking was used at Island View Park may be best method to estimate parking demand. Was the current parking adequate or was the demand more or less most of the time?

RECEIVED JUL 30 2019

I would recommend using the general Public Park ratio and add the ratio for Racquet/Tennis Club.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thanks,

Cody Pedersen, PE

ESI Engineering, Inc.
Civil - Structural - Land Survey
3500 South Main. Suite 205
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
Off.: 801.263.1752 - Cell: 801.898.6255

From: Kevin Campbell <Kevin.Campbell@esieng.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:51 PM
To: Cody Pedersen <Cody.Pedersen@esieng.com>; Bruce Cox <bcox@centervilleut.com>
Subject: Fwd: CZC 12.52.110.e., Parking Study

Cody,

Could you take a look at the latest manual when you get back in town and respond to Bruce's question below.

Thank you,

Kevin

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

-------- Original message --------
From: Bruce Cox <bcox@centervilleut.com>
Date: 6/11/19 2:45 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: Kevin Campbell <Kevin.Campbell@esieng.com>
Subject: FW: CZC 12.52.110.e., Parking Study

Kevin do you have any recommended parking ratios for a city park or something closely related to a park like Island View Park?
I have a 2004 recommended parking ratios for a racquet/tennis club with 4 courts and a recreational center of 4.13 and 6.26 from the institute of Transportation Engineers
Thanks,
Bruce

From: Donna Wilkinson
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 1:26 PM
To: Bruce Cox
Subject: CZC 12.52.110.e., Parking Study

Bruce,

CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Legislative Decision - Zoning Code and Municipal Code Amendments - Letters of Credit

Initiated By: Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Consider the proposed Zoning Code and Municipal Code Amendments regarding the use of letters of credit for bond security - Ordinance No. 2019-16

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of Ordinance No. 2019-16 regarding the use of letters of credit for bond security.

BACKGROUND

Staff recommends the elimination of letters of credit as an option for security bonds for subdivision developments, land use projects, landscaping, franchise agreements, and any other type of bonding required by the City. The City has determined that such bonds require more administrative time to track and they often have expiration dates that do not cover the warranty period. In accordance with State law set forth in Utah Code 10-9a-604.5, the City is required to provide at least two forms of acceptable bonds. The City complies with this law by providing the cash bond and escrow deposit forms of bonding.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Ordinance No. 2019-16 - Letters of Credit

ORDINANCE NO. 2019-16

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 12.51.100 OF THE CENTERVILLE ZONING CODE REGARDING LANDSCAPING BONDS, AMENDING SECTIONS 15.01.040 AND 15.04.090 OF THE CENTERVIILE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING ACCEPTABLE FORMS OF DEPOSIT FOR BOND AGREEMENTS, AND AMENDING SECTION 17.07.010 REGARDING INSURANCE AND SECURITY FOR FRANCISE AGREEMENTS

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend the type of acceptable security bonds for subdivision development, land use projects, required landscaping, and franchise agreements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the proposed amendments to the Zoning Code and Municipal Code regarding the type of acceptable security bonds for subdivision development, land use projects, required landscaping, and franchise agreements are in the best interest of the City and the public and provide a reasonable balance between developer options for bond security and municipal efficiency; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Zoning Code and Subdivision Ordinance as set forth herein have been reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council and all appropriate public notices have been provided and appropriate public hearings have been held in accordance with Utah law to obtain public input regarding the proposed revisions to the Zoning Code and Subdivision Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. **Amendment.** The types of landscaping bonds allowed as set forth in Subsection 12.51.100(b) of the Centerville Zoning Code is hereby amended as follows:

12.51.100 Definitions

* * *

(b) Bond. When landscaping is required as part of a special amenity, public improvement, planned development, or for increased density, the developer shall provide the City with a ~~an irrevocable letter of credit,~~ cash bond~~,~~ or escrow agreement, in an amount equal to the estimated landscaping cost, to guarantee installation and maintenance of landscaping. Such security shall be retained, withdrawn, and/or released in accordance with the City's adopted bond procedures for site plan and subdivision approval.

* * *

Section 2. **Amendment.** The definition of Bond Agreement as set forth in Subsection 15.01.040(e) of the Centerville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

15.01.040 Definitions

* * *

(e) "Bond Agreement" means an agreement to install improvements secured by ~~a stand by letter of credit, or~~ an escrow agreement with funds on deposit in an acceptable financial institution~~,~~ or a cash bond with the City, in an amount corresponding to the City Engineer's estimate. All bonds shall be on forms approved by the City Council wherever a bond is required pursuant to this Title.

* * *

Section 3. **Amendment.** The type of Security for Public Improvements as set forth in Subsection 15.04.090(b) of the Centerville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

15.04.090 Security for Public Improvements

* * *

(b) The Improvements Agreement shall be one of the following types as prescribed by the City~~.~~:

(1) A cash bond agreement accompanied by a cashier's check payable only to the City~~.~~; or

(2) An escrow agreement and account with a federally insured bank or credit union. If the bank is located outside of the State of Utah and/or requires presentment of the sight draft outside of the State of Utah, additional language shall be provided in the Bond allowing for presentment by fax or other electronic means acceptable to the City.

~~(3) A letter of credit agreement and irrevocable stand-by letter of credit with a federally insured bank or credit union. If the bank is located outside of the State of Utah and/or requires presentment of the sight draft outside of the State of Utah, additional language shall be provided in the Bond allowing for presentment by fax or other electronic means acceptable to the City.~~

Section 4. **Amendment.** The type of Improvement Agreements as set forth in Subsection 15.04.090(b) of the Centerville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

17.07.010 Insurance, Indemnity, and Security

Prior to the execution of a Franchise, a Provider will deposit with the City an irrevocable~~, unconditional letter of credit or~~ surety bond as required by the terms of the Franchise, and shall obtain and provide proof of the insurance coverage required by the Franchise. A Provider shall also indemnify the City as set forth in the Franchise.

Section 5. **Severability**. If any section, part or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable.

Section 6. **Omission Not a Waiver.** The omission to specify or enumerate in this ordinance those provisions of general law applicable to all cities shall not be construed as a waiver of the benefits of any such provisions.

Section 7. **Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon publication or posting, or thirty (30) days after passage, whichever occurs first.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 20th DAY OF AUGUST, 2019.

ATTEST: **CENTERVILLE CITY**

_____ By:_____

Leah Romero, City Recorder Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

Voting by the City Council:

	"AYE"	"NAY"	"ABSENT"
Councilmember Fillmore	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Ince	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Ivie	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember McEwan	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Mecham	_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING

According to the provisions of the U.C.A. § 10-3-713, as amended, I, the municipal recorder of Centerville City, hereby certify that foregoing ordinance was duly passed by the City Council and published, or posted at: (1) 250 North Main; (2) 655 North 1250 West; and (3) RB's Gas Station, on the foregoing referenced dates.

_____ DATE: _____
LEAH ROMERO, City Recorder

RECORDED this ____ day of _____, 2019.

PUBLISHED OR POSTED this ____ of _____, 2019.

CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Legislative Decision - Zoning Code Amendments - Expiration of Subdivision Approvals

Initiated By: Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Consider proposed Zoning Code Amendments to CMC 15 (Subdivisions) regarding expiration dates for subdivision approvals - Ordinance No. 2019-17

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of Ordinance No. 2019-17 for amendments to CMC 15 (Subdivisions) regarding expiration dates for subdivision approvals.

BACKGROUND

Staff recommends amendments to various provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding expiration of subdivision approvals. The main intent of the amendments are to address the expiration issue regarding small subdivision waivers and plat amendments. It has been assumed that such approvals expire within the same time frame as set forth for final plat approvals. In reviewing the current code provisions, however, this expiration date is not clearly specified. Staff recommends the proposed amendments to clearly specify expiration of approvals for small subdivision waivers and plat amendments. Other changes to the expiration provisions for concept plan, preliminary plat, and final plat are also recommended to provide more consistent and affirmative language regarding expiration of approvals.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Ordinance No. 2019-17 - Expiration of Subdivision Approvals

ORDINANCE NO. 2019-17

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PROVISIONS OF TITLE 15 OF THE CENTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING TIME FRAMES FOR THE EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION APPLICATION APPROVALS

WHEREAS, the City Council has previously adopted Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Subdivisions; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend various provisions of Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding time frames for the expiration and extension of subdivision application approvals, including approvals for concept plans, preliminary plats, final plats, small subdivisions, and plat amendments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the proposed amendments to Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code as more particularly set forth herein are in the best interest of the City and the public to provide a reasonable balance between vested rights for development applications and timely pursuit of such rights; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to land use provisions of the Centerville Municipal Code as set forth herein have been reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council and all appropriate public notices have been provided and appropriate public hearings have been held in accordance with Utah law to obtain public input regarding the proposed revisions to the Subdivision Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. **Amendment.** Section 15.02.060 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Expiration of Concept Plan Approval for subdivisions is hereby amended as follows:

15.02.060. Expiration of Concept Plan Approval

Once a concept plan has been approved by the Planning Commission, or approved by the City Council if the concept plan was referred to the City Council, ~~by the Planning Commission for review as provided herein,~~ the subdivider may apply for preliminary plat approval consistent with the concept plan. Concept plan approval shall expire and have no further force or effect if a complete application for preliminary plat approval is not submitted within 12 months from the date of approval of the concept plan. This time period may be extended for up to 6 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the Planning Commission for an extension prior to the expiration date. Only one extension may be granted for each approved concept plan. ~~If preliminary plat approval for any portion of an approved concept plan has not been obtained within 12 months of the date on which concept plan was approved, a resubmittal and reapproval of the concept plan may be required by the Planning Commission or the City Council prior to the filing of an application for preliminary plat approval.~~

Section 2. **Amendment.** Section 15.02.070 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Small Subdivision Waiver for subdivisions is hereby amended as follows:

15.02.070. Small Subdivision Waiver

(a) Upon review and approval of a concept plan for a small subdivision, the Planning Commission can waive the requirements for ~~preparation and~~ approval of a preliminary and a final plat if it can be shown that:

(1) The small subdivision does not require dedication of land for street or other public purpose;

(2) The small subdivision is not traversed by the mapped lines of a proposed street or a street to be widened, as shown on the Master Street Plan; and

(3) The lots are not part of a small subdivision approved less than three years earlier.

(b) Each of the lots in a small subdivision must meet the frontage, width, and area requirements of the zone district in which it is located, or must have been granted a variance from such requirements by the Board of Adjustment.

(c) The Planning Commission may require as part of the approval of the concept plan for a small subdivision any improvements or utility easements that are required of other subdivisions, as set forth in this Title.

(d) Although preliminary and final plat approval is not required for small subdivisions, applicants for small subdivisions shall be required to prepare and submit a final plat for recording in accordance with the requirements of Section 15.04.030 and all public improvement, bonding, recording, and other applicable provisions for final plats as set forth in this Title.

~~(c)~~(e) Small subdivision approval shall expire and have no further force or effect if the small subdivision is not recorded within 12 months from the date of approval of the small subdivision. This time period may be extended for up to 6 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the Planning Commission for an extension prior to the expiration date. Only one extension may be granted for each approved small subdivision.

Section 3. **Enactment.** Section 15.03.015 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Filing Deadline for preliminary subdivision plat approval is hereby enacted as follows:

15.03.015. Filing Deadline

Application for preliminary plat approval shall be made within the required time frame as set forth in Section 15.02.060 regarding expiration of concept plan approval.

Section 4. **Amendment.** Section 15.03.050 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Expiration of Preliminary Plat Approval for subdivisions is hereby amended as follows:

15.03.050. Expiration of Preliminary Plat ~~Plan~~ Approval

(a) Once preliminary plat approval has been granted, the subdivider may apply for final plat approval. Preliminary plat approval shall expire and have no further force or effect if a complete application for final plat approval is not submitted within 12 months from the date of approval of the preliminary plat. This time period may be extended for up to 6 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the Planning Commission for an extension prior to the expiration date. Only one extension may be granted for each approved preliminary plat. ~~If the final plat has not been recorded within one year of the date of the preliminary plat approval by the Planning Commission, the preliminary plat must again be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and approval.~~

(b) In those cases where a subdivision is proposed to be developed in phases, preliminary plat approval for the remaining portions of the subdivision shall not be voided if a complete application for final plat approval for the first phase is submitted within 12 months from the date of approval of the ~~approved and recorded within one year of the date of~~ preliminary plat ~~approval~~ and subsequent phases are recorded in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Section 5. Amendment. Section 15.04.020 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Filing Deadline for final subdivision plat approval is hereby amended as follows:

15.04.020. Filing Deadline

Application for final plat approval shall be made within the required time frame as set forth in Section 15.03.050 regarding expiration of preliminary plat approval. ~~12 months after approval or conditional approval of the preliminary plat by the Planning Commission. This time period may be extended for up to 6 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the Planning Commission for an extension prior to the expiration date, however only one extension may be granted.~~

Section 6. Amendment. Section 15.04.120 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Expiration of Final Plat Approval for subdivisions is hereby amended as follows:

15.04.120. Expiration of Final Plat Approval

Final plat approval shall expire and have no further force or effect if the approved ~~If the~~ final plat is not recorded within 12 ~~six~~ months from the date of City Council approval~~, such approval shall be null and void~~. This time period may be extended for up to 12 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the City Council for an extension prior to the expiration date. Only one extension may be granted for each approved final plat. ~~by the City Council for up to an additional six month period for good cause shown. The subdivider must petition in writing for an extension prior to the expiration of the original six months.~~ No extension will be granted for final plat approval if it is determined that it will be detrimental to the City. If any of the fees charged as a condition of subdivision approval have increased, the City may require that the bond estimate be recalculated and that the subdivider pay any applicable fee increases or provide additional bond funds as a condition of granting an extension.

Section 7. **Enactment.** Section 15.09.130 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Expiration of Amended Plat Approval for subdivisions is hereby enacted as follows:

15.09.130. Expiration of Amended Plat Approval

Amended plat approval shall expire and have no further force or effect if the approved amended plat is not recorded within 12 months from the date of City Council approval. This time period may be extended for up to 6 months for good cause shown if the subdivider petitions the City Council for an extension prior to the expiration date. Only one extension may be granted for each approved amended plat. No extension will be granted for amended plat approval if it is determined that it will be detrimental to the City. If any of the fees charged as a condition of subdivision approval have increased, the City may require that the bond estimate be recalculated and that the subdivider pay any applicable fee increases or provide additional bond funds as a condition of granting an extension.

Section 8. **Severability**. If any section, part or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable.

Section 9. **Omission Not a Waiver.** The omission to specify or enumerate in this ordinance those provisions of general law applicable to all cities shall not be construed as a waiver of the benefits of any such provisions.

Section 10. **Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon publication or posting, or thirty (30) days after passage, whichever occurs first.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 20th DAY OF AUGUST, 2019.

ATTEST: **CENTERVILLE CITY**

_____ By:_____

Leah Romero, City Recorder Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

Voting by the City Council:

	"AYE"	"NAY"	"ABSENT"
Councilmember Fillmore	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Ince	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Ivie	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember McEwan	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Mecham	_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING

According to the provisions of the U.C.A. § 10-3-713, as amended, I, the municipal recorder of Centerville City, hereby certify that foregoing ordinance was duly passed by the City Council and published, or posted at: (1) 250 North Main; (2) 655 North 1250 West; and (3) RB's Gas Station, on the foregoing referenced dates.

_____ DATE: _____
LEAH ROMERO, City Recorder

RECORDED this ____ day of _____, 2019.

PUBLISHED OR POSTED this ____ of _____, 2019.

CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 4.

Short Title: Discussion - Subdivision Ordinance Updates - Chapter 11 (Plat Amendments)

Initiated By: Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Continue discussion of proposed revisions to City Subdivision Ordinance - CMC 15 (Subdivision)

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

As part of the process to update and revise the City Subdivision Ordinance, a copy of the latest Chapter 11 (Plat Amendments) is attached for Planning Commission review and discussion. Chapter 11 addresses the application and review process for amending a recorded subdivision plat.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Subdivision Ordinance - Chapter 11 (Plat Amendments)

TITLE 15
SUBDIVISIONS

CHAPTER 15.11. PLAT AMENDMENTS.

15.11.010. Purpose.
15.11.020. Authority.
15.11.030. Initiation.
15.11.040. Procedure.
15.11.050. Application.
15.11.060. Submittal Requirements.
15.11.070. Determination of Completeness.
15.11.080. Distribution.
15.11.090. Review by Department Heads.
15.11.100. Review by Development Review Committee.
15.11.110. Recommendation by Zoning Administrator.
15.11.120. Decision by Planning Commission.
15.11.130. Notice of Decision.
15.11.140. Submittal of Final Paper Amended Plat.
15.11.150. Recording of Final Amended Plat.
15.11.160. Approval Requirements.
15.11.170. Approval Standards.
15.11.180. Appeal.
15.11.190. Effect of Approval.
15.11.200. Amendment.
15.11.210. Revocation.
15.11.220. Expiration.
15.11.230. Subdivision Name Change.
15.11.240. Plat Correction.

15.11.010. Purpose.

The purpose of this Chapter is to set forth procedures and standards to amend or vacate some or all of a recorded subdivision plat (collectively referred to as a "plat amendment"). Additional provisions regarding property line adjustments are more particularly set forth in CMC 15.10 (Property Line Adjustments). The intent of this Chapter is to comply with Utah Code § 10-9a-608 and other applicable provisions of Utah law regarding plat amendments.

15.11.020. Authority.

The Planning Commission is authorized to review and approve plat amendments as set forth in this Chapter.

15.11.030. Initiation.

An application to amend a recorded subdivision plat may be submitted by the fee owner property in a recorded subdivision plat, or the owner's agent, as provided in this Chapter. An agent of a property owner shall provide an affidavit of authorization in accordance with CMC 15.03.160 (Owner Authorization Affidavits).

15.11.040. Procedure.

The plat amendment process is a one-step process requiring review and approval from the Planning Commission. Any plat amendment that contains a request to vacate or amend a public street,

public utility easement, or municipal utility easement is also subject to the provisions and requirements of Utah Code 10-9a-609.5 and CMC 15.xx (Public Street and Easement Vacations) as more particularly provided in this Title.

15.11.050. Application.

The owner, or the owner's agent, desiring to amend some or all of a recorded subdivision plat shall submit an application to amend a plat to the Community Development Department in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter, together with the application fees and deposits set forth in the City Fee Schedule. The application shall be considered as provided in this Chapter.

15.11.060. Submittal Requirements.

An application to amend a recorded subdivision plat shall be submitted in writing on forms provided by the City and shall include the following:

(1) The name and address of each owner of record of the land contained in the entire plat or in that portion of the plat described in the plat amendment application;

(2) The signature of each owner identified in Subsection (1) who consents to the plat amendment;

(3) Three hard copies and one electronic copy of an amended plat that complies with the requirements for final plat as set forth in CMC 15.07 (Final Plats) and applicable provisions of Utah Code § 10-9a-603;

(4) If the application proposes to vacate some or all of a public street, right-of-way, or easement (including public utility easements and municipal utility easements), the application shall also include an application for public street or easement vacations in accordance with CMC 15.xx (Public Street and Easement Vacations).

15.11.070. Determination of Completeness.

The Zoning Administrator shall determine whether an application to amend a plat is complete as provided in CMC 15.03.050.

15.11.080. Distribution.

Once the Zoning Administrator has determined that an application to amend a plat is complete, the Zoning Administrator shall distribute copies of the completed application and amended plat to City department heads and any governmental departments or agencies deemed appropriate.

15.11.090. Review by Department Heads.

Upon receipt of a completed amended plat application, each department head shall review the application for compliance with applicable Approval Requirements which are administered by the department and submit any comments and recommendations to the Zoning Administrator and Development Review Committee.

15.11.100. Review by Development Review Committee.

(a) Review by Development Review Committee. The Development Review Committee shall review the completed amended plat application and any comments received from department heads and

other applicable governmental departments or agencies.

(b) Meeting. The Development Review Committee may meet with the Zoning Administrator and the applicant or applicant's agent to discuss and review the proposed application.

(c) Comments. The Development Review Committee may provide the Zoning Administrator with information and advice regarding compliance of the proposed application with Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.xxx and may identify modifications needed to bring the proposed amended plat application into compliance with such requirements.

15.11.110. Recommendation by Zoning Administrator.

(a) Review by Zoning Administrator. The Zoning Administrator shall review the completed amended plat application for compliance with the Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.160, including comments received from the department heads, other departments or agencies, and the Development Review Committee.

(b) Additional Information. Before preparing a staff report and making a recommendation concerning the amended plat, the Zoning Administrator may reasonably require the applicant to provide additional information, data, or studies as may be needed to determine compliance with Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.160.

(c) Written Recommendation. The Zoning Administrator shall prepare a staff report and recommendation to the Planning Commission that the amended plat be approved, approved with conditions, or disapproved based on compliance with Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.160. The staff report shall include written findings and recommendations that show the basis for the Zoning Administrator's recommendation.

15.11.120. Decision by Planning Commission.

(a) Public Hearing. The Planning Commission shall schedule and hold a public hearing on the proposed plat amendment. When applicable in accordance with Utah Code 10-9a-608, the Planning Commission shall hold the public hearing on the proposed plat amendment within 45 days after the day a completed plat amendment application is filed. Notice of the public hearing and public meetings regarding the amended plat application shall be provided in accordance with Subsection (b). At the time and place specified, the Planning Commission shall hold the public hearing and review the amended plat for compliance with applicable Approval Requirements as set forth in CMC 15.11.160.

(b) Notice. Notice of the public hearing and public meetings regarding amended plat application shall be provided in accordance with CMC 15.03.070.

(c) Decision. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may approve, approve subject to conditions, or disapprove the amended plat based on written findings and recommendations regarding compliance with Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.160. The Planning Commission shall base its decision on the Approval Standards set forth in CMC 15.11.170.

(d) Additional Information. Before recommendation for approval or disapproval of the amended plat, the Planning Commission may reasonably require the applicant to provide additional information, data, or studies as may be needed to determine compliance of the proposed plat amendment with Approval Requirements set forth in CMC 15.11.160.

15.11.130. Notice of Decision.

The Zoning Administrator shall provide written notice of the Planning Commission's decision regarding the amended plat application to the applicant in accordance with CMC 15.03.070 and to applicable department heads.

15.11.140. Submittal and Review of Final Paper Plat.

(a) Applicant Submittal of Paper Plat. Following Planning Commission approval of the amended plat, the applicant shall prepare a final paper plat for review by staff prior to preparing and submitting the final mylar plat for recording. The final paper plat shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted to the Community Development Department together with the following:

(1) Three hard copies and one electronic copy of a finalized paper plat, including all corrections requested by staff and addressing all conditions of approval imposed by the Planning Commision;

(2) Two hard copies and one electronic copy of the complete set of finalized construction drawings for public improvements and utility services, if such improvements and utility services will be changed, installed, or required to be brought up to code;

(3) A title report prepared and dated within 30 days of submittal;

(4) Approval letters from utility companies verifying availability of utility services, if new services are required for the property within the amended plat;

(5) Proposed deed restrictions or covenants, conditions, and restrictions, if any, including any corrections requested by staff and addressing conditions of approval imposed by the Planning Commission; and

(6) A tax clearance evidencing that all taxes, interest, and penalties, if any, have been paid for all parcels and property within the amended subdivision.

(b) Staff Review of Paper Plat. Upon receipt of the applicant's submittal of the final paper plat, the Zoning Administrator shall review the final paper plat for completeness in accordance with CMC 15.03.070. If the submittal is deemed complete, the Zoning Administrator shall thereafter forward copies of the final paper plat and construction drawings to City staff for the following review:

(1) The Zoning Administrator shall review the plat for compliance with the City's subdivision plat format requirements;

(2) The Zoning Administrator shall review the plat for compliance with the terms and conditions of Planning Commission approval;

(3) The City Engineer shall perform a final check of plat compliance with applicable Approval Requirements;

(4) The City Engineer shall prepare a cost estimate of public improvements and utility services to be included in an Improvement Assurance and Warranty Agreement; and

(5) The City Attorney shall review the updated title report and any covenants, conditions, or restrictions for compliance with applicable Approval Requirements.

(c) Development Review Committee Meeting. Upon completion of the foregoing, a meeting may be scheduled with the applicant and the Development Review Committee to address any outstanding issues prior to preparation of the mylar version of the plat.

15.11.150. Submittal and Recording of Final Mylar Plat.

(a) Applicant Submittal of Final Mylar Plat. Following resolution of any outstanding issues regarding the final paper plat, the applicant shall prepare and submit a final mylar plat in recordable form

to the City Recorder along with the following:

(1) The final mylar plat with dedication, signatures, and acknowledgments of all property owners, mortgagees, and lienholders of record within the amended plat;

(2) An executed Improvement Assurance and Warranty Agreement for any incomplete and required public improvements and warranty of all public improvements, including the required bond;

(3) Payment of applicable fees, including but not limited to, impact fees, development fees, and recording fees as estimated by the City Recorder;

(4) Evidence that outstanding professional service costs, if any, have been paid; and

(5) An electronic version of the amended plat and construction drawings prepared in AutoCAD and pdf (or other digital format acceptable to the City); and

(6) An updated title report if the date of the title report submitted with the final paper plat review is not current within 30 days of amended plat recording.

(b) Staff Review and Recording of Mylar. After the final mylar plat has been submitted, the City Recorder shall:

(1) Internally route the amended plat to obtain required City signatures;

(2) Internally route the Improvement Assurance and Warranty Agreement to the City Attorney;

(3) Prepare and submit the amended plat to the Davis County Recorder's Office; and

(4) Advise the applicant and department heads when the amended plat has been recorded.

15.11.160. Approval Requirements.

All amended plat applications shall be reviewed for compliance with the following ("Approval Requirements"):

(a) Final plat submittal requirements set forth in CMC 15.07.060;

(b) Conditions of amended plat approval by Planning Commission;

(c) Applicable provisions of CMC 15 (Subdivision Ordinance);

(d) Applicable provisions of CMC 12 (Zoning Code);

(e) Applicable provisions of the Centerville Municipal Code;

(f) Applicable provisions of the Construction Codes;

(g) Applicable provisions of the City Standards and Specifications; and

(h) Applicable provisions of State law.

15.11.170. Approval Standards.

Approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of an amended plat is an administrative decision which shall be based upon compliance with Approval Requirements and applicable decision-making standards set forth in CMC 15.03.090. The Planning Commission may approve the plat amendment upon the following findings:

(a) There is good cause for the plat amendment; and

(b) No public street, right-of-way, or easement is proposed to be vacated in whole or in part.

15.11.180. Appeal.

Any person adversely affected by a final decision of the Planning Commission regarding an amended plat may appeal that decision to the Board of Adjustment as provided in CMC 15.03.160.

15.11.190. Effect of Approval.

(a) Authorization to Record Plat. Subject to the expiration provisions of CMC 15.11.160, approval of an amended plat shall authorize recording of the amended plat subject to applicable requirements of this Title.

(b) Scope of Approval. Approval of an amended plat shall not be deemed approval of any other procedure or permit required by this Title, the Centerville Zoning Code, or the Centerville Municipal Code. Such approvals shall be obtained in accordance with applicable provisions of the Approval Requirements.

(c) Vesting of Applicable Code Requirements. An amended plat application which is timely submitted shall be reviewed and considered under this Title and the applicable ordinances in effect on the date when the completed application for the amended plat was submitted. Certain exceptions apply to this general vesting rule, such as pending ordinance, compelling, countervailing public interest, and proceeding with reasonable diligence concepts provided under Utah law.

15.11.200. Amendment.

Except as otherwise provided by law, any amendment to a recorded subdivision plat shall comply with the provisions of CMC 15.11 (Plat Amendments) or applicable provisions of CMC 15.10 (Property Line Adjustments).

15.11.210. Revocation.

An amended plat approval may be revoked as provided in CMC 15.17.070.

15.11.220. Expiration.

(a) Failure to Record Amended Plat. An amended plat shall be deemed withdrawn, and shall expire and have no further force or effect, if the amended plat is not recorded within 12 months after Planning Commission approval of the amended plat.

(b) Extension of Time. Notwithstanding Subsection (a), the applicant may request an extension of time to record the amended plat as provided in CMC 15.03.050(i).

15.11.230. Subdivision Name Change.

(a) Procedure. The name of a recorded subdivision may be changed by recording an amended plat making that change as provided in this Section and in accordance with applicable provisions of Utah Code 10-9a-608.

(b) Survey. In accordance with Utah Code 10-9a-608, the surveyor preparing the amended plat to change the name of a recorded subdivision shall certify that the surveyor: (1) holds a license in accordance with the Utah Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors Licensing Act, as set forth in Utah Code §§ 58-22-101, et seq.; (2) has completed a survey of the property described on the plat in accordance with Utah Code § 17-23-17 and has verified all measurements; and (3) has placed monuments as represented on the plat.

(b) Same Name Prohibition. An owner of land may not submit for recording an amended plat that gives the subdivision described in the amended plat the same name as a subdivision plat already recorded in the Davis County Recorder's Office.

(c) Void. Except as provided in this Subsection, the recording of a declaration or other document that purports to change the name of a recorded plat is void.

15.11.240. Plat Correction.

Minor typographical or clerical errors in a subdivision plat may be corrected as provided in Utah Code § 57-3-106.

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 5.

Short Title: Discussion - General Plan - South Main Street Corridor

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Commission Review and Feedback for Preliminary South Main Street Corridor Plan

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- 08-14-2019 Staff Memo For SMSC Plan Review
- Preliminary Draft - South Main Street Corridor Plan

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: **AUGUST 14, 2019**

TO: **CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

FROM: **PLANNING STAFF**

SUBJECT: **GENERAL PLAN - SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR – CONTINUED DISCUSSION**

Previously, the Planning Commission set a rough schedule for reviewing different sections for formulating the revamp of the South Main Street Corridor *(SMSC)* Plan. Staff began this process with the first review by the Planning Commission in early July regarding the North Parrish Gateway and the Civic Cultural areas. Due to the July 24th Pioneer festivities, the Commission was not able to meet for the regularly schedule second meeting of July. Nonetheless, the planning staff continued with drafting concepts for the SMSC Plan.

To date, the planning staff has substantially completed an entire conceptual draft rewrite. Therefore, with this memorandum, the roughly completed entire draft is being provided to the Commission. The Commission can now preview the concepts prior to each meeting of the Commission and scrutinize the different sections at the time discretion of the Commission over the next few Commission Meetings. For this upcoming meeting, Staff is roughly expecting the Commission to review and provide feedback and direction for the following:

- Objective 2.D- Traditional Main Street Area, and
- Section III – Built Environment Design Expectations *(i.e. Goal 3)*

SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR

[GENERAL PLAN DRAFT LANGUAGE CONCEPTS]

CHAPTER 12-430-2. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES.

[existing language edits] Policy 2, Main Street commercial area:

The area on Main Street between 400 South (Porter Lane) and 400 North (Parrish Lane) has been regarded somewhat as the traditional commercial center of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong merchant focal point. The Main Street commercial area is aging now and somewhat deteriorating, though a few new buildings have been constructed here in recent years. Some revitalization is warranted and should be encouraged in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented uses for the community.

CHAPTER 12-480-2. NEIGHBORHOOD 1, SOUTHEAST CENTERVILLE.

[existing language edits] Policy 2.b, Main Street Commercial Area:

The area on Main Street between 400 North (Parrish Lane) and 400 South (Porter Lane) is generally regarded as the traditional commercial area of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong merchant focal point. The present structure of commercial development with its numerous individual properties, small frontages, short setbacks, and older buildings tends to work against the possibility of any large scale, unified commercial development.

1. The Main Street commercial area should be allowed to remain as a local service needs or specialty retail area. To encourage any larger scale commercial development would be detrimental to surrounding residential areas and to the future function ability of Main Street as an arterial road.

2. The Main Street commercial area is aging and somewhat deteriorating. Significant enhancement of commercial viability is not likely to occur in the future. Nonetheless, some revitalization is warranted and should be encouraged in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented uses for the community.

3. Future commercial development in the Main Street area should conform to performance guidelines which require landscaping, appropriate parking, minimal traffic impact upon Main Street, and buffering from adjacent residential areas.

4. To preserve the residential integrity of surrounding areas, future commercial development on Main Street shall not be allowed south of 400 South or north of 400 North, and shall not extend more than one-half block east of Main Street.

CHAPTER 12-480-3. NEIGHBORHOOD 2, SOUTHWEST CENTERVILLE.

[existing language edits] Policy 2.a, Main Street Commercial:

The area on Main Street between 400 South (Porter Lane) and 400 North (Parrish Lane) is generally regarded as the traditional commercial area of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong merchant focal point. The present structure of commercial development in this area, with its numerous individual properties, small frontages, short setbacks, and older buildings tend to make larger scale unified commercial development unlikely.

1. The Main Street commercial area should be allowed to remain as a local service needs and specialty retail area. To encourage any larger scale commercial development would be detrimental to the surrounding residential areas and to the future functionability of Main Street as an arterial road.

2. The Main Street commercial area is aging and somewhat deteriorating. Significant enhancement of commercial viability is not likely to occur in the future. Nonetheless, some revitalization is warranted and should be encouraged in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented uses for the community.

3. Future commercial development in this area should conform to performance guidelines which require landscaping, appropriate parking, minimal traffic impact upon Main Street, and buffering from adjacent residential areas.

4. To preserve the residential integrity of surrounding areas, future commercial development on Main Street shall not be allowed south of 400 South or north of 400 North, and shall not extend more than one-half block west of Main Street.

CHAPTER 12-480-7 – SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN

(*rescind all of PART 12-480-7*)

[***replace with***] A. Background

Over the past few years, the City Council has increasingly expressed concerns regarding the density and design standards regarding the 2008 South Main Street Corridor Plan. Early on, after its adoption, residents expressed discomfort regarding the "*residential densities*" that the "*mixed-use*" concepts allowed. In 2015, the allowable "*residential densities*" were altered in a reduced manner in response to public concerns. Around this same time, the expected "*public space*" plan was tempered in response to additional concerns from both elected officials and the public. The initial effort to adopt a "*public space plan*" had raised concerns regarding liability and maintenance issues related to streetscape furniture and furnishings. Some of these streetscape features conflicted with UDOT's traffic regulations, while others were deemed too expensive or took up space along

Main Street that competed with the City's 4th of July Annual Parade. Ultimately, the anticipated "*public space plan*" was rejected in the initial form that it was presented.

In early to mid-2018, the City Council and Planning Commission met and undertook an effort to re-review the allowable uses of Main Street and the resulting outcome raised added concerns about the relationship of the allowable land uses and the regulations adopted in the South Main Street Overlay. Also, near this same time, the City reviewed several regulatory amendments that were needed to accommodate the construction of the proposed new Centerville Fire Station, which further confirmed the development conflicts with the SMSC Overlay regulations. All of these matters culminated in a March 2019 work session meeting between the City's Planning Commission and City Council. The fundamental findings reached in this meeting regarding South Main Street can be reviewed in "*Section D*" of this Chapter.

Subsequently, the general consensus of this meeting was that currently adopted South Main Street Plan and associated Zoning Ordinances would not adequately support or be advantageous in balancing the current and future needs of the commercial property owners and adjacent residential uses for the South Main Street area. Therefore, it was time to reevaluate the original 2008 Vision and formulate a replacement vision to better balance these challenging and sometimes competing land use patterns. The recommendation of how to proceed from the Planning Commission and then acceptance by the City Council entailed the following:

a. ***GENERAL PLAN*** - Re-write/modify the existing Generalized Sections of the General Plan's Goals regarding Main Street to reflect a consistency with the Corridor Plan.
b. ***GENERAL PLAN*** - Create an alternative/reformat for the adopted independent SMSC Plan (*Section 12-480*) that identifies what the new goals and objectives are to be.
c. ***ZONING ORDINANCE*** - The SMSC Overlay Zone District would need to be annulled and replaced in a manner, such as:
    1. Eliminate the SMSC Overlay Zone District and write new design with performance regulations that are specific for Main Street. This would be analogous to what has been done in other Zoning Districts, such as the Parrish Lane Gateway Design or the Shorelands Commerce Design regulations.
    2. Consider reducing the corridor area to be regulated – example limit General Plan and Zoning Ordinance changes from Parrish Lane to Porter Lane – rather than from Parrish to Pages

B. Formation of an updated South Main Street Corridor Context

The overall context of the South Main Street Corridor Plan is to admit that although ***South Main Street was previously viewed as the traditional commercial center of Centerville, in reality it never became a strong focal point of the Community***. Overtime, Pages Lane and Main Street declined in any strong commercial focus and were replaced with the placement of the interchange

for Interstate 15 at Parrish Lane and the subsequent regional commercial center that developed along the Parrish Lane Corridor. Though one remaining strong point for the South Main Street area is that of local ownership and land uses that provide services predominately oriented to the local community. Accordingly, the *"the South Main Street Corridor Context"* is to maintain and even promote opportunity for local owners to be successful for as long as possible and any future additional land uses are to be viewed in a manner to mitigate conflicts with and espouse the character of the surrounding residential environment, including, but not limited to the Deuel Creek Historic District (*see CZC, Chapter 12-49*).

C. South Main Street Corridor Plan Guiding Principles

In 2018, the City's Planning Commission conducted several "*public outreach*" meetings to discuss South Main Street Corridor, particularly with regards to the allowable commercial uses. The Planning Commission later met in 2019 and reviewed the comments that were received. The following topics and guiding principles were developed to assist with developing the vision for the Corridor Plan:

- ✓ **Housing -** *Residential use may play a limited or accessory role on Main Street.*
- ✓ **Commercial -** *Small business and local ownership is desirable.*
- ✓ **Identity -** *Respect the local historic feel of our community while blending business and residential needs.*
- ✓ **Long Range Pledge -** *Compromise to achieve consistency for a committed, realistic outcome.*
- ✓ **Design -** *Encourage improvements to achieve a local historic feel through options and incentives.*
- ✓ **Transportation -** *Balance local business and residential access needs with the through traffic of the corridor and Consider the safety of pedestrians and other users in the corridor.*

D. South Main Street Corridor Plan Vision

The South Main Street Corridor is considered the "heart" of Centerville City. Most importantly it is desired that the streetscape and built environment reflect the localized civic, social, and commercial service area that make up the Centerville City Community. Additionally, walking and biking within this area ought to at least be an equal priority mode of travel that occurs within the Corridor.

The South Main Street Corridor Plan's (*SMSC*) Vision establishes a comprehensive guide to future physical land use patterns and desired attributes that have been expressed by the public and City's appointed and elected officials (aka "*Vision*"). Additional planning notions and concepts have also been included to help establish the policies of the overall SMSC Plan Vision.

In the case of the SMSC Plan, the "**fundamental notions" used for formulation of the South Main Street Corridor Plan are:**

- ✓ *The area on Main Street between 400 South (Porter Lane) and 400 North (Parrish Lane) has been regarded somewhat as the traditional commercial center of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong merchant focal point.*

- ✓ *The Main Street commercial area is aging now and somewhat deteriorating, though a few new buildings have been constructed here in recent years.*

- ✓ *Some revitalization is warranted and ought to be encouraged, but in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented uses (aka: "service commercial") for the community.*

- ✓ *Significant growth and enhancement of commercial synergy is not likely to occur in the future. Consequently, some strategic residential development and use may be appropriate in parts of the corridor area.*

- ✓ *The Main Street Corridor should be addressed in whole, however there are differentiating characteristics between the east and west sides of the roadway that need to be considered in defining an appropriate land use and development pattern.*

- ✓ *All future commercial development along Main Street should conform to performance [e.g. design] guidelines which require landscaping, appropriate parking, minimal traffic impact upon Main Street, and buffering from adjacent residential areas*

Furthermore, for the South Main Street Corridor, the **Plan's Vision is expressed using five (5) different elements or goals.**

- **Corridor Wide Viewpoints**
- **Land Use Expectations**
- **Built Environment Design Expectations**
- **Corridor's Street Space Expectations**

[OPTIONAL COMPONENT]

- **Residential Re-introduction Opportunities**

In addition to the elements, the South Main Street Corridor area is divided into **three (3**) different sub-areas. Each sub-area plays a slightly different and at sometimes distinct role in how land use patterns are to develop in that particular area of the neighborhood. These sub-areas are identified as follows:

- **North Parrish Lane Gateway Area –** South from Parrish Lane; 1) East Side to Smith Park, 2) West Side to the Post Office located at 261 North Main.
- **Civic/Cultural Area –** South from; 1**)** East Side from Smith Park south to 100 North, 2) West Side from Post Office to 100 North Street.
- **Traditional Main Street Area –** Both sides of street, from 100 North to north side of Porter Lane.

These principles, goals and objectives associated with the SMSC Plan are to be considered as statements of policy and are to be used in the decision-making process for land use ordinance amendments, applicable land use application reviews, and/or related capital improvement programs. Additionally, each goal may be accompanied by descriptive text that is intended to assist with understanding the purpose, intent, and interpretation of the goal.

The SMSC Plan identifies five (5) corridor planning essentials, with goals and objectives being included for implementation. These planning essentials, goals, objectives, and graphical maps for the South Main Street Corridor Plan are described on the remaining pages of this document.

SMSC PLAN PROPOSED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

I. Overall Corridor Context

Goal 1 - Maintaining the Local and Historic Character of Main Street

Main Street has been generally regarded as the traditional commercial area of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong merchant focal point. The present structure of commercial development in this area, with its numerous individual properties, small frontages, short setbacks, and older buildings tend to make larger scale unified commercial development undesirable with the residential neighborhood located adjacent to the corridor.

Historically, the City's General Plan has addressed South Main Street as a boundary between the Southeast and Southwest Neighborhoods in its geographical extent (*i.e. ½ block limitations for commercial zoning*). The SMSC Plan now desires to better unify the land use and design pattern for the corridor, but to recognize the differing elements of the east versus west sides. These differences are, but not limited to, topographical differences, parcel sizes, acceptable or desirable uses, and adjacent residential use types.

OBJECTIVES:

1.A. *Land Use Pattern Expectations* - The Main Street commercial area is to remain as a local service needs and specialty retail area. To encourage any large-scale architype commercial development would be detrimental to the surrounding residential areas and to the vehicular functionability of Main Street as an arterial state road.

1.B. *South Main Street Character* - The Main Street Corridor should be addressed in whole, however there are differentiating characteristics between the east and west sides of the roadway that need to be considered in defining an appropriate land use and development pattern.

1.C. *Historical Context* - The Deuel Creek Historic District, which includes a portion of the South Main Street area, is primarily located just east of Main Street. The District not only includes many historic homes interior to the neighborhood, there are two National Register Sites located within the corridor area, which are the Randall Gas Station and the Whitaker Museum.

All development adjacent to any historic site needs to be contextually sensitive to the built historical presence of these structures.

II. Land Use Planning Expectations

Goal 2 - Preserving and Encouraging Local Owner Investment of South Main Street Properties and Encouraging Partial Future Re-Development

To date, the South Main Street Corridor is predominately comprised of localized property ownership and investment. Approximately, 62% of the properties are owned by Centerville residents and business owners and increases to 89% when adding the Davis County area residents. About 83% of the County Assessed Value comes from commercial uses with 64% of the land devoted to commercial type uses. The estimated 2015 Davis County Market Value of commercial land was over $27 million (*see August 04, 2015 SMSC Data and Analysis presentation to City Council and Planning Commission*). This local owner investment and commitment is a desirable attribute and is what creates a unique community identity for Centerville City, which needs to be encouraged to continue.

OBJECTIVES:

2.A Corridor-Wide:

2.A.1 *Commercial Area Limitations* - Commercial development on Main Street must not be allowed south of 400 South or north of 400 North, and must not extend more than one-half block east of Main Street.

2.A.2 *Revitalization Intent* - Some revitalization is warranted and ought to be encouraged, but needs to be done in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented type of uses (*aka: "service commercial"*) for the community

2.A.3 *Adjacent Residential Context* - Although it is the desire of the Corridor Plan to bring unity to the street, there are some differentiating elements between the east and west sides of the street. These differences can be generalized as "topography" and "adjacent neighboring residential types," or single-family verses multi-family development.

i. *Adjacent neighborhood type, Single-family*. The east side of Main Street is predominately bounded by single-family neighborhoods. The Deuel Creek Historic District is the City's traditional residential area. The land use pattern and its uses along the east side need to be compatible and harmonious with the preservation of this Historic District (*see Goal 3 – Built Environment Design Expectations*).

ii. *Adjacent neighborhood type, Multi-family*. The west side of Main Street is predominately bounded by multi-family neighborhoods. The land use pattern and it's uses can tolerate some increase of intensity and or bulk/area (*e.g.*

building heights) regulations and remain compatible with adjacent residential uses.

2.A.4 *Desirability to Preserve the Corridor's Local Interests* – South Main Street's unique identity is that of local resident ownership. These residents likely have a commitment to keep the corridor as a local community asset. Consequently, balancing the economic success of this small business community and interests of adjacent residential uses will be important in ensuring the preservation of the Corridor's small community identity.

2.B NORTH PARRISH LANE GATEWAY AREA:

2.B.1. *Preferred Land Use Pattern* - The preferred land uses for this area are commercial uses that are typical Commercial Medium (*C-M*) Zone allowances for the east corner and the typical Commercial High (*C-H*) Zone allowances for the west corner and then Commercial Medium (*C-M*) south along Main Street.

2.B.2. *Southeast Intersection Corner*. This commercial site lacks the proper landscape area fronting both Main Street and Parrish Lane. Additionally, vehicular parking and circulation is inadequate. Additional commercial use expansion should be discouraged. However, building and landscaping design re-development should be encouraged.

2.B.3. *Southwest Intersection Corner*. This commercial site is constrained and has an older and aged style commercial building. Due to the parcel sizes, additional commercial intensities are not desirable. Although the site has frontage within the Parrish Lane Gateway Corridor Area, it also functions as the entry onto Main Street (*from Parrish Lane*). Therefore, site and associated building ought to function as a transition into the South Main Street Corridor. Changes to the architectural and landscaping design ought to be oriented to Main Street rather than to Parrish Lane.

2.B.4. *Future Intensity or Density*. Due to the very small lot sizes located in this area, building sizes ought to be limited to the scale of the C-M Zone (*i.e. 10,000 sq. ft*.) for both sides of Main Street. Additionally, given the parcels sizes, future commercial intensity ought to be limited in use and scale. There needs to be sufficient incentives to encourage a feasible building and landscaping design redevelopment opportunity for this area. Nonetheless, it needs to be done in a scale and design manner that keeps the small-town community identity of Centerville. Commercial intensity ought to be explored carefully and with a justifiable focus on market minimums needed to achieve a redevelopment objective.

2.C CIVIC/CULTURAL AREA:

2.C.1. *Preferred Land Use Pattern* - The preferred land uses for this area are Public and/or Civic Use types that are typical of the Public Facility Low and Medium Districts, or uses that are public/civic in nature, as deemed appropriate by the City. Other acceptable uses ought to be limited to those typical Commercial Medium (C-M) Zone allowances.

2.C.2. *Future Intensity or Density* - Primary or main buildings for Civic or Cultural Uses ought to be allowed an intensity increase of up to 20,000 sq. ft. in size (*e.g. City Hall*), provided such development meets the public/green space design and layout expectations for creating a civic/cultural identity for this area. However, for commercial uses building sizes should generally reflect the scale of the C-M Zone (i.e. 10,000 sq. ft.).

2.D TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET AREA:

2.D.1. *Preferred Land Use Pattern* - The preference of the City is to maintain a smaller scale land use pattern that supports the viability of "*small business*" sector ownership and/or entrepreneurial endeavors that help preserve the existing high percentage of local resident land ownership of the area. The expected uses are to be limited to the Commercial Medium (*C-M*) allowances and/or uses that are deemed compatible with directly providing local services to the community.

2.D.2. *Future Commercial Use Intensity and Compatibility* – Due to the small lot sizes located in this area, building sizes are to be limited to the scale of the C-M Zone (*i.e. 10,000 sq. ft.*). Intensity decisions ought to be measured by restraining uses that impose problems with business hours of operation, local on-street overflow parking, noise, smells, excessive lighting, outdoor storage, etc. Compatibility ought to be measured by limiting building heights, buffering adjoining residential zones, the provision of park strip and front yard landscaping, and historical context building design and use of materials.

III. Built Environment Design Expectations

Goal 3 – The Built Environment needs to visually resonate with the City's localized Community Identity. The South Main Street Corridor is considered the "***heart***" of Centerville City. Most importantly it is desired that the streetscape and built environment reflect the civic, social, and neighborhood commercial locale that it has been to date. Furthermore, the intersection of Center and Main Streets is designated as the central focal area of the Corridor. In and around this "focal area," the public space is to be strongly emphasized in design in harmony with the desired built environment. Additionally, other modes of travel, such as walking and biking, are to be at least equal in priority to vehicular travel that occur within this area of the Corridor.

OBJECTIVES:

3.A CORRIDOR-WIDE:

3.A.1. *Design Guidelines* - The City should develop building and site design standards that over time improve the overall built environment of the Corridor. All future development along Main Street ought to conform to these adopted Corridor Performance [*i.e. design requirements*] Guidelines, which in a contextual manner, should define and unify the corridor with regards to use of building materials, landscaping, street appeal, and site features.

3.A.3 *Architectural Building Design Improvements*. The City should develop building design standards that require the use of building materials and architectural elements in the Corridor that are compatible and/or complementary to the Deuel Creek Historic District. These design expectations need to be maximally emphasized within the Traditional Main Street Area, which along the east side, is located within the Historic District.

3.A.4. *Contextually Appropriate Building Heights* - Building heights ought to be scaled in a manner that reflects the character of the overall area in which it is located. Generally, building heights ought to be lower along the east side of the corridor and may be higher on the west side of the corridor.

3.A.2 *Performance Implementation* - All existing development ought to be held accountable to implement, to the extent possible, the standards adopted by the City. All new development ought to be required to implement the standards adopted by the City.

3.B NORTH PARRISH LANE GATEWAY AREA:

3.B.1. *Development Site Orientation* - Site layout and building design ought to directly address orientation towards the intersection corners and provide elements that accommodate pedestrian users, public art, corridor gateway features, and/or other creative design elements to create a gateway appearance for entry and exit of the corridor area.

3.B.3 *Building Height and Orientation* - Buildings ought not exceed an overall height of 35 feet in height for the east side and not exceed 40 feet in height for the west side of the corridor. Building entrances ought to face the Main Street frontage and provide a pedestrian connection with the public sidewalk system.

3.B.4 *Gateway Identity Features* - Entry Signs/Monuments ought to be constructed to frame the streetscape when entering/exiting this gateway area. The City ought to participate with property owners in creating and funding selected desirable entry features to create the intended gateway identity.

3.C CIVIC/CULTURAL AREA:

3.C.1 *Civic Style Design* - Provide distinctive elements and architectural styles for civic buildings to set them visually and physically apart from other commercial development and associated buildings along Main Street. Civic Design ought to include the following:

i. Civic buildings need to be more than one-story to allow for developing a smaller building footprint occupying the site.
ii. Provide a significant use of public or green space around the buildings and parking areas.
iii. City's Hall's west porch (*i.e. steep steps*) and surrounding front yard and streetscape ought to be re-designed for improved public access and create a civic style tiered grand staircase/public plaza.
iv. Design amenities and changes needed to focus on providing pedestrian pathways, plaza spaces with seating and other design furnishings for outdoor/semi-outdoor use by the public.
v. The sidewalk system along the street ought to have a civic style pedestrian oriented promenade theme with wider sidewalks and protection bollards that can double as lighting.
vi. Due to the presence of overhead power lines, streetscape trees ought to be discouraged and placed in the interior on-site landscaping.

3.C.2 *City Hall Master Plan Amendments* – Site development of the City Hall and Smith Park area needs to be further designed in a manner akin to a town/community square. Green space and community-based facilities, such as walkways, gardens, garden plazas, fountain or outdoor water features and other public use amenities, ought to be incorporated in the layout of these sites. Specific amendment needed are:

i. The Ron Randall Service Station is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Consequently, the City Hall Master Plan needs to be amended to further encourage the preservation of the service station.
ii. Due to vehicular left turn conflicts, the northern access from Main Street should be eliminated or relocated. Primary access to City Hall could be from 100 East with emergency or congestion exiting on the South side of the City Hall Building.

3.D TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET AREA:

3.D.1 *Historic Preservation* - Encourage and support the preservation of historic buildings that do or would qualify for National Historic Nomination within the South Main Street Corridor.

3.D.2 *Historic Context for Building Design* - The design guidelines ought to address the use of building materials and other appropriate elements that complement the historic context on Main Street. In determination of establishing a historic context, the following concepts ought to be considered:

i. Use of the same architectural elements and materials for structures as listed on the City's Landmarks Register and located within the Deuel Creek Historic District.
ii. Use of architectural elements and materials that match or are similar to the time relevant periods on either the City's Landmarks Register, similar Utah structures on the National Parks Register, or the City's Significant Sites List, as recommended by a certified architect.
iii. Use of architectural elements and materials that are contextually compatible with the time periods of the nominated built historic fabric found within the Deuel Creek Historic District, as recommended by a certified architect.

3.D.3 *Incentive Programming* - Consider establishing options and incentives to encourage existing and new development to implement designs and materials with a historical context.

3.D.4 *Small Scale Lot/Parcel Conservation* - Consider establishing limited parcel sizes, maximum building footprints, and other bulk and area regulations to prevent the combining of parcels and large building footprints to mitigate commercial encroachment by larger chain stores and regional style development.

3.D.5 *Central Focal Place* – Establish a central intersection (*e.g. Center and Main Streets*). Concentrate on developing spaces and features, both private and public, that highlight it as the designated "Center of the Town" the "Place Between" City (origin theme of *Centerville*).

3.D.6 *Building Story Heights* – Building stories and heights adjacent to single-family neighborhoods (*i.e. east side*) ought to be limited two-stories and adjacent to multi-family neighborhoods (*i.e. west side*) may be increased to three-stories. An exception to these parameters would be the Civic Sector, where such buildings are developed with an increased amount of expected landscaping and public gathering spaces within the layout of the development.

IV. Corridor's Street Space Expectations

Goal 4 – Enhance the Corridor's Built Environment by Visually Improving Relationship between Private Development and the Public Space.

In addition to the preservation and/or redevelopment of land uses along the corridor, the redevelopment and revitalization of the streetscape is needed to reflect the desired relationship between public space and private development. It is the intention of the SMSC Plan to contextually influence the physical and visual relationship of private verses public space along the corridor by creating a neighborhood style scheme. This relationship is defined using the following three (3) *descriptions*:

A. TRAFFIC SECTOR - This area serves cars, trucks, buses, bicycles, and any type of mass transit as mixed traffic in a limited number of travel lanes. Traffic flow through the Corridor is to be at low to moderate speeds for safety and to protect the pedestrian as well, which will enhance the visual appeal and functions of the Corridor.

B. PEDESTRIAN SECTOR - This area is essential in creating a form and frame for the Corridor. Sidewalks and Park Strip elements are critical design details to implement for enhancement of the pubic space along the Corridor.

C. DEVELOPMENT SECTOR – The front yard area and building fronts are important in creating the character or visual appeal of the Corridor. Land use development is to include robust building designs, with landscaping features that front and frame the public space, particularly in partnership with the Pedestrian Sector.

Objectives:

4.A TRAFFIC SECTOR:

4.A.1 Priority Roadway Design Stipulations:

i. *Posted Speed* – Travel speeds ought to be between 30 to 40 miles per hour, reflecting or balancing that this is a local roadway through the traditional central core of South Main Street, but also its primary function is a Utah Department of Transportation operated thoroughfare.

ii. *Number of Through Lanes* – One (1) in each direction with a center turn lane. Maintaining needed left turns for local streets is an important priority.

iii. *Lane Widths* – Twelve-feet (12') per travel lane. In constrained situations, minimum 11 feet per travel lane is acceptable. Eleven-feet (11') for the center median lane.

iv. *Bike Lanes* – Provide a bike lane each direction. At minimum provide a six-foot (6') shoulder. Improved programming ought to be considered as future investment allows.

4.A.2 Priority Signing Stipulations:

i. *Traffic Management and Control – To minimize visual pollution with other public signing uses, traffic control signs ought to be used only to the extent needed for safety. Support structures (i.e. poles and frames) for signs ought to be enhanced to create a traditional main street or historical visual aspect to the sign placement.*

ii. *Public/ Private Street Addressing– Support structures (i.e. poles and frames) for signs ought to be enhanced to create a traditional main street or historical visual aspect to the sign placement.*

iii. *Wayfinding – The City ought to prepare and adopt a wayfinding system for identifying areas and sites that are of interest to various users. Wayfinding signs and support structures (i.e. poles and frames) for signs ought to be enhanced to create a consistent and visually appealing aspect to the wayfinding system. Additionally, within the Corridor such support structures ought to be designed in a subtle manner to add to the traditional main street or historical visual appeal.*

4.A.3 **Priority Parking Stipulations:**

i. *On-street Parking* – Due to the limited amount of street right-of-way, on-street parking is not anticipated for the commercial use land use pattern. The Plan's preference is to maintain the bike lanes, as a higher priority.

4.B PEDESTRIAN SECTOR:

4.B.1 **Priority Park Strip Stipulations:**

i. *Park Strip Width* – Park Strips ought to be a minimum of four (4) feet in depth from curb for *BOTH* sides of South Main Street. The west side of the street does not currently meet this expectation.

ii. *Park Strip Materials* – Park Strip areas ought to consist predominately in plantings, such as turf, shrubs, and where appropriate and of sufficient size street trees. Hard-surfacing should be prohibited, except where it's integrated with a plaza or other pedestrian oriented feature (*e.g. Civic District Design style*).

4.B.2 **Priority Sidewalk Stipulations:**

i. *Sidewalk Width* – Sidewalks ought to be a minimum of four-feet (4') in width for *BOTH* sides of South Main Street (*see decorative frame in 4.B.2.ii to achieve an overall 6' width*). Generally, the current sidewalk system only has four-feet (4') on the east side and five-feet (5') on the west side (*however, west side is missing the desired park strip*).

ii. *Sidewalk System Decorative Framing* – As sidewalks are replaced or when sites are re-developed, a decorative hard surface framing strip (e.g. *dark*

stain & surface brush) of at least 12 inches, both sides, ought to be provided adjacent and parallel to the sidewalk system (*overall 6' width scheme*). A pedestrian/sidewalk easement (*along the corridor fronting properties*) may be required to complete the design expectation.

4.B.3 **Priority Streetscape Lighting Stipulations:**

i. Traffic Safety Lighting – Intersection and mid-block lighting ought to comply with state or local regulations. Lighting design and fixtures ought to be upgraded in a manner that distinguishes the corridor area from other road corridors within the City.

ii. Pedestrian, Streetscape Feature, and Information Sign Lighting – Primarily pedestrian style lighting ought to be utilized within the Civic/Cultural Area. Lighting style ought to be of the bollard type (*rather than pole mounted*) and integrated as part of a security bollard system to protect public spaces and buildings from vehicular and security threats. Secondarily, lighting ought to be used as part of the wayfinding and street addressing elements to provide evening and night hour readability of the signing features.

4.B.4 **Priority Streetscape Feature Stipulations:**

i. *Utility Poles and Lines* – Recognizing the importance of this system on the East Side of South Main Street, encourage a mutual and beneficial partnership with the power and utility companies. Develop a scheme to utilize the lower pole space for streetscape enhancement (*e.g. community banners, decorative frames, painting, texturing, public art, etc.*). As poles are replaced, encourage use of rust patina type steel rather than galvanized (*e.g. core-ten steel*) for a more natural color appeal.

ii. *Community Banner/Flags* – Continue and enhance the use of community banners/flags within the corridor area. In addition to the joint use of the utility pole system along the east side, the City ought to create a "sense" of balance along the west side and install a pole specific banner system. The west side system may not be as frequent, but instead create a generalized visual unifying appearance to the corridor.

iii. *Public Art* - The City ought to develop a public art plan as part of any re-development or economic plan for the corridor. Public art ought to be included in strategic areas, such as gateway development, civic space placement, and even part of enhancing utility service infrastructure.

4.C DEVELOPMENT SECTOR:

4.C.1 **Priority Landscape Depth – Fronting Public Streets Stipulations:**

i. *Street Landscape Depth* – Except for approved driveways and pedestrian walkways, landscaping ought to be provided along public streets (*e.g. a minimum depth of 10-12 feet*) paralleling along the public right-of-way frontage on South Main Street. This objective may require adjustments to the parking requirements to achieve this priority.

ii. *Parking Lot Screening* – When a parking stall or lot fronts the public street landscaping area, a screening/buffer feature ought to be provided up to a height to a headlight light height of a parked vehicle to create a barrier to visually buffer the parking area from view along the public street.

iii. *Street Tree Planting Depth and Canopy* – Trees planted within the Public Street Landscape area ought to be a sufficient depth away from a sidewalk or other like public improvement to reduce root damage to the sidewalk system. Also, large tree species that would interfere with overhead utility lines ought to be prohibited.

4.C.2 **Priority Lighting Stipulations:**

i. *Building Lighting, Exterior* – Lighting ought to be primarily used for architectural enhancement, which in turn provides a neighborhood style lighting scheme. Any lighting facing or adjacent to residential zones ought to be minimal and limited in scope for needed for security.

ii. *Free-standing Lighting* – Except for traffic safety lighting, the use of free-standing pole lighting ought to be discouraged, specifically near and adjacent to residential uses. If outdoor lighting is used, pedestrian bollard and landscape lighting is the preferred outdoor lighting for the corridor to enhance a neighborhood style scheme.

4.C.2 **Priority Signing Stipulations:**

i. *Free-standing Signs* – The preferred method of free-standing signs are the low-profile or monument-based signs within the Corridor area.
(*Note: Historically, free-standing pole signs have been sparse and, in a study, performed in the 1990's the City decided to prohibit free-standing pole signs along Main Street.)*

ii. *Business Wall Signs* – The preferred method of the sign design ought to be reformatted to create a differentiation from the typical box style commercial found on Parrish Lane. Business signing ought to be simplified and scaled down to reflect a local small-town style scheme. The style, colors, materials ought to compliment the architectural design of the buildings associated with the sign.

[OPTIONAL COMPONENT]

V. Residential Re-introduction Opportunities

Goal 5 – Consider Future Residential as a Supplementary Allowable Use.

Although South Main Street never became a strong merchant focal point, this small section of the Main Street corridor did and does provide needed local community services. Additionally, there ought to be an effort to preserve opportunities for small business establishments and entrepreneurial endeavors within the community. As a supportive or supplementary role to these small-scale commercial enterprises, missing or needed housing stock could play a role in the economic success of preserving and maintaining a domestic commercial land use investment. Consequently, the re-introduction of residential uses in a secondary or supplementary manner may be advantageous. If future attempts are made, the following policies ought to be the guiding essentials:

OBJECTIVES:

5.A CORRIDOR-WIDE:

5.A.1 *Option for Future Allowance* - Significant growth and enhancement of commercial synergy is not likely to be substantial in the future. Consequently, some strategic residential use re-introduction or re-development in the future may be appropriate in certain parts of the corridor area.

5.A.2 *Strategic Nature of Allowance* - If residential is re-introduced, such development needs to be strategic in nature and limited in a manner to compliment the preservation of the local or domestic property and business ownership and preservation of the supportive commercial that directly serves the local residents.

5.A.3 *Small-scale Land Use Pattern* - Due to the proximity of existing single-family neighborhoods along most of the corridor, residential re-introduction opportunities need to be primarily be developed in a small-scale manner.

5.A.4 *Re-introduction Parameters* - The re-introduction of any residential land use pattern would be appropriate is as follows:

i. Maintaining or accommodating the traditional and historical pattern of single-family homes along Main Street, if so desired by a property owner.
ii. Supporting the preservation of commercial uses by allowing a limited amount of accessory residential uses, as a subsidized economic return on commercial investment.
iii. Further developing underutilized or vacant lands, when additional commercial development is not likely to occur in the market place.
iv. Providing housing options that support a moderate-income accommodation strategy that has been adopted by the City.

5.A 5 *Accessory Use Expectation* - Residential uses are to be developed as part of or integrated with a primary commercial use building, except for a single-family detached use.

5.A.6 *Accessory Use Intensity Limitation* - Residential use should be accessory to the primary commercial use and ought not exceed three (3) dwelling units per commercial use lot and when located within a structure should not occupy more than 40% of the gross floor area of the primary commercial building.

5.A.7 *Primary Use Redevelopment Density* - If any residential redevelopment allowance is be to introduced through the complete elimination or removal of a commercial use pattern, the density contemplations or allotments for residential re-redevelopment are not to exceed the residential medium intensity range of 6-8 units per acre.

5.B *Residential Built Environment Design Expectations*

5.B.1 *Residential Design Expectations* - All residential development mixed with commercial ought to comply or incorporate the applicable Built Environment Design Expectations listed in this plan. Nonetheless, single family detached and/or residential only re-development must also include the elements described in this section.

5.B.2 *Building Orientation* - Residential buildings, fronting South Main Street, are to orient front elevations and/or front yards towards South Main Street and provide pedestrian connections to South Main Street sidewalk system.

5.B.3 *Public Street View Restrictions*- Where multiple residential buildings occur, all interior side and rear elevations that face Main Street must visually be kept to a minimum, as viewed from South Main Street. Residential rear yard areas are to be prohibited from visually being seen from South Main Street

5.B.4 *Pedestrian Enhancement* - To maintain the walkability of South Main Street, residential fencing and walls may not be located within five (5) feet of the right-of-way or a public pedestrian pathway along the South Main Street Corridor.

5.B.5 *Front Yard and Building Design* – Front yard spaces for residential development shall use bold gestures in the layout and landscaping design. Elements such as porches, garden courts, balconies, brownstone style stoops, and other elements are desirable. Fencing may be used to create privacy; however, an open style design is required to maintain a visual appeal and connection to the corridor.

5.B.6 *Residential Parking* – Parking for single-family uses ought to be detached and located to the rear yard areas to prevent the backing of vehicles on to South Main Street or excess hard-surfacing (*e.g. semi-circular driveways*) in the front yard areas. Parking for multi-family or residential only re-development ought to locate parking areas to the middle

or rear areas of the development sites to allow buildings to screen such areas from view of South Main Street.

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No. 6.

Short Title: Community Development Director's Report & City Council Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

Next Meeting, August 28, 2019:

- Final Site Plan - Thiros Landscaping Changes (aka CupBop Site)
- South Main Street Corridor Plan - Continued Review of Preliminary Draft
- Continuation of Subdivision Ordinance Review

City Council Report:

- Adopted Updated State Construction Codes

BACKGROUND

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report
8/14/2019

Item No.

Short Title: July 10, 2019

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description
🗋	7-10-19 PC Preliminary Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, July 10, 2019
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, Vice Chair
Cheylynn Hayman, Chair
Logan Johnson
Isaac Workman
Becki Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT
Kai Hintze
Thomas Hunt

STAFF PRESENT
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Mackenzie Wood, Assistant Planner

VISITORS
Interested citizens

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER Commissioner Workman

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT – 181 SOUTH MAIN STREET

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, explained that the applicant desires to amend the approved Site Plan for property located on 181 South Main Street. The changes involve the "landscape design" for the property. Because such changes alter the August 1999 final site plan approval that involved several specifics during the Planning Commission's original review, the amendment is being resubmitted to the Planning Commission for review and decision regarding the changes to the landscaping. Mr. Snyder explained the following two options available regarding trees, adding that any tree planted in the park strip must be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department:

- Comply with the 1999 tree count approval, which is four trees; or
- Comply with the current ordinance for required trees, which is approximately nine total trees.

Sameer Farah, part-owner and applicant, said his desire is to make the property look nice. He explained that he did not realize at first that he would need to consult two different City departments regarding landscaping changes. Dorie Farah, part-owner, pointed out there are four existing trees on the north side of the property. Bessy Thirus, part-owner, emphasized that conflicting information was communicated to them by the two different City departments. She described some of the specific types of plants they plan to use on the property. Commissioner Wright questioned whether clematis would be a wise choice at the front of the property. She said she would be more comfortable if a landscape architect signed-off on the idea. Ms. Thirus

said she is willing to be flexible on the choice of plants. Mr. Farah emphasized that they will make sure the property looks nice.

Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:39 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Lisa Romney, City Attorney, clarified that the original 1999 conditions required two trees at the rear of the property and two trees along the Main Street frontage. Vice Chair Daly said he thinks it would be fairly easy for the property owners to comply with the 1999 conditions. Mr. Snyder pointed out that in cases of nonconformity the City default is to align the subject property with the current code. Mr. Snyder said he became involved in the situation when a complaint/query came into his office regarding the use of gravel instead of turf on the property. Chair Hayman said that, regarding trees, she leans toward bringing the property into compliance with current code.

Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to accept the conceptual site plan to amend the August 1999 Final Site Plan Approval for 181 South Main Street, subject to the following directives and findings. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

Directives:

1. The applicant shall prepare and submit a Final Site Plan Application, as described by the Zoning Ordinance.
2. As part of the subsequent Final Site Plan submittal, the applicant will need to address the following regarding landscaping compliance:
    a. Required landscaping areas shall include live plant material with an internal landscaping coverage of at least 75%.
    b. A landscape design professional must review and provide written comment regarding the design and plantings to help ensure a successful outcome to comply with the intent of the regulations
    c. The landscape plan must comply with the current ordinance for required trees, which is approximately 9 total trees.
3. Any trees to be planted in the park strip must be reviewed and approved in accord with applicable regulations by the Public Works Department.

Findings:

a) The Planning Commission finds that a conceptual site plan is not intended to permit actual development of property pursuant to such plan but is to be prepared and reviewed merely to represent how the property could be developed in accordance with applicable regulations.
b) The Planning Commission finds that, with to the stated directives, the applicant is equipped sufficiently to proceed with a submittal of a Final Site Plan Application.

The applicants pointed out that many properties in Centerville are not in compliance.

SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR DISCUSSION

The Commissioners reviewed and discussed guiding principles for the SMSC planning process drafted at the previous Planning Commission meeting. It was suggested that the principle under “Design” change to: “Encourage improvements to achieve a local historic feel through options and incentives.”

Mr. Snyder presented proposed planning concepts for the North Parrish Lane Intersection Area of the SMSC. The Commissioners discussed whether a residential option should be included for the southeast and southwest corners of the North Parrish Lane Intersection Area. Vice Chair Daly said he does not see the City having an appetite for residential on the southeast corner at this time, but it could be included as a long-term option. Commissioner Johnson said he would draw the line at accessory residential units as an ancillary role to a much more dominant commercial use.

Chair Hayman suggested the Commission would do the process a disservice if residential were not considered as a long-term possibility in the North Parrish Lane Intersection Area. Vice Chair Daly said he could support the proposed language for the Southeast Intersection Corner, but not for the Southwest Intersection Corner.

Vice Chair Daly suggested the southwest corner may fit better within the Parrish Lane commercial corridor plan. Commissioner Wright said she would prefer to leave the southwest corner in the SMSC Overlay, but treat it differently than the east side of the North Parrish Lane Intersection Area. Chair Hayman said that, if the goal is to provide options, she would prefer to present the Council with the option to include residential as a possibility. Commissioner Johnson said he is fine with the language as drafted. Commissioner Workman suggested approaching the intersection with the goal of creating identity and helping people recognize they are in Centerville when they pass through. He said it seems as though there may be different goals for the North Parrish Lane Intersection Area than for further south on Main Street. Mr. Snyder agreed there has been some separation, but emphasized that unity could be achieved through design.

Commissioner Wright suggested that if change is desired, the stumbling blocks to change need to be identified and addressed. Commissioner Johnson said he believes the properties have not redeveloped because the demand for commercial use is at other locations. He suggested the biggest hindrance to the properties is the zoning. Commissioner Johnson said it is his opinion that the highest and best use of those areas would be high-density residential. Vice Chair Daly pointed out that the demand for housing changes over time, and the City needs to identify what it wants long-term. Mr. Snyder commented that population growth rate along the Wasatch Front is predicted to continue increasing through 2050. Commissioner Wright said she believes small, locally-owned commercial on Main Street is part of the identity of Centerville.

Vice Chair Daly cautioned against giving away all the City's commercial space to residential. Commissioner Wright added that the result of giving up all commercial would be a completely residential community whose residents have to drive to other towns for all amenities. Commissioner Workman said he thinks the only way the commercial would be replaced by residential is with high density. He said he thinks the City should favor the commercial possibilities, and proceed with great caution if setting it up for residential. Mr. Snyder reminded the Commission that State moderate income housing law requires providing opportunity for a variety of housing types. If opportunity is not provided in one part of the city, it must be provided in another.

Commissioner Wright said she is more comfortable with the Residential Medium density referenced in the language for the southeast corner. She pointed out that even if the market wants higher density, the City can stick with medium. Chair Hayman said she is most comfortable with the idea of residential on the southeast corner. A majority of the Planning Commission agreed with including the long-term option for Residential Medium on the southwest corner, but not Residential High.

Mr. Snyder presented proposed planning concepts for the Civic/Cultural Area of the SMSC. He suggested increasing the allowed size from 10,000 square feet to 20,000 square feet in the Civic Area. A majority of the Commissioners indicated support for the change to 20,000 square feet.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT & CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Mr. Snyder informed the Planning Commission of items on the next meeting agenda, and updated the Commission on actions taken by the City Council at the last Council meeting. The Planning Commission is scheduled to meet next on Tuesday, July 23rd.

MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE

The minutes of the June 26, 2019 Joint Planning Commission/Landmarks Commission meeting and regular Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Wright requested an amendment to the regular Planning Commission minutes, and made a **motion** to accept the June 26, 2019 Planning Commission minutes as amended. Vice Chair Daly seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0). Commissioner Wright **moved** to accept the minutes of the June 26, 2019 Joint Planning Commission/Landmarks Commission meeting. Vice Chair Daly seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:05 p.m., Chair Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

_____ _____

Leah Romero, City Recorder Date Approved

_____

Katie Rust, Recording Secretary