



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON JULY 27, 2022 AT CENTERVILLE CITY HALL, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH.

Centerville City Planning Commission meetings are open to the public, unless otherwise closed for reasons allowed by law. Centerville City Planning Commission meetings may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code § 52-4-207. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations due to a disability may contact the City Recorder at (801) 295-3477, at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting. The Commission reserves the right to modify the sequence of agenda items in order to facilitate special needs or provide greater efficiency.

The full agenda packet and backup materials can be found on the Centerville City website at:

<https://centervilleutah.gov/129/Agendas-Minutes>

A. CALL TO ORDER

- 1. ROLL CALL**
- 2. LEGISLATIVE PRAYER OR THOUGHT**
- 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

B. BUSINESS ITEMS

Business action or discussion items to be considered by the Planning Commission.

1. Moderate Income Housing Strategies Review (HB 462)
HB 462 (of 2022) requires cities to review and update their General Plan in relation to Moderate Income Housing (MIH)

C. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS REPORT

1. Community Development Director's Report
Next Planning Commission Meeting - August 10, 2022
Tentative Items:

- Update Single-family Unplatted Lots Approval Process - Moved to PC Agenda 08-10-2022
- Landscaping Ordinance Update Discussion - Council has directed staff and the Commission to review requirements for further water conservation opportunities.

City Council Action Report:

- Nothing to Report

Planning Commission Goals:

- Parking Update - Council Tabled for Further Review
- Subdivision Ordinance - In Progress, needs 2022 State Amendments
- Update Single-family Unplatted Lots Approval Process - Moved to PC Agenda 08-10-

2022

- Landscaping Ordinance Update - Council has directed staff and the Commission to review requirements for further water conservation opportunities.
- General Plan/Economic Update - City did NOT secure funding assistance, City is Re-evaluating

D. MINUTES

Minutes of prior meetings may be reviewed and accepted. Minutes review and approval shall comply with the Centerville City Minutes Approval Policy.

1. Minutes Review and Approval
June 8, 2022 Commission Meeting Minutes

E. ADJOURNMENT

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

I hereby certify that this notice and agenda was posted at Centerville City Hall, published on the Utah Public Notice Website, and provided to a newspaper or media correspondent in accordance with the requirements of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, including, but not limited to, provisions of Utah Code § 52-4-202.

Jennifer Robison
Centerville City Recorder

**PLANNING
COMMISSION**

Staff Report
7/27/2022

Item No. 1.

Title: Moderate Income Housing Strategies Review (HB 462)

Initiated By: State of Utah

Staff Representative: Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

SUBJECT:

HB 462 (of 2022) requires cities to review and update their General Plan in relation to Moderate Income Housing (MIH)

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 2022 PC Staff Memo MIH Strategies - Commission Discussion

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: PLANNING STAFF

SUBJECT: MODERATE INCOME HOUSING 2022 STRATEGIES DISCUSSION

BACKGROUND

As the Planning Commission is aware, HB 462 (of 2022) requires cities to review and update their General Plan in relation to Moderate Income Housing (MIH). The Bill requires municipalities to adopt a minimum of three (3) strategies with an implementation plan, or five strategies for priority consideration of Transportation Investment Funds* (TIF) or Transit Transportation Investment Funds* (TTIF). The Bill also requires a report to be submitted to the Housing and Community Development (HCD) by October 1, 2022.

This memorandum will summarize the currently adopted strategies of the City's MIH Plan. Additionally, the report will categorize the various new strategies by feasibility and possible cost. The Commission should discuss these and identify a list of feasible strategies relevant to Centerville and possibly narrow the list to a few potential top strategies that could be discussed with further with the City Council.

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY CITY ADOPTED MIH STRATEGIES

1. **Strategy 6-A.** *Continue to support allowing mixed use zoning and related development in strategic areas of the city.*
2. **Strategy 6-B.** *Monitor and review existing housing patterns within the city in comparison to a pattern of an open market yield.*
3. **Strategy 6-C.** *Make an effort to balance the number and size of zoning districts with the demand for various housing types.*
4. **Strategy 6-D.** *Consider adopting basic or flexible design standards for small-lot or underutilized land parcels within existing developed areas of the city.*

Staff Comments: The above listed items are the four (4) specific strategies. However, akin to the new "implementation" requirement, each of these strategies have additional objectives to guide the city in the decision-making process.

* Note: TIF & TTIF were programs created in 2005 and are used for improving or optimizing capacity. Funding revenue is from legislative appropriations using sale tax and vehicle registration fees

These objectives can be reviewed using the following link:

<https://www.centervilleutah.gov/DocumentCenter/View/109/Part-12-490-Moderate-Income-Housing-Plan-11-19-2019-PDF>

NEW HB 462 MIH STRATEGIES CATEGORIZATION

Below is an initial rough categorization of these new strategies. Staff has categorized them in a simplified manner using two measures. First, feasibility and then cost, as staff reviewed each one. It is not intended to be final, but a starting point for further discussion in the selection process.

HIGH FEASIBILITY

\$ - Rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing

\$ - Implement zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments

\$ - Reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing

\$\$ - Demonstrate utilization of a moderate-income housing set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency to create or subsidize moderate income housing

\$\$ - Ratify a joint acquisition agreement with another local political subdivision for the purpose of combining resources to acquire property for moderate income housing

\$\$ - Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, multifamily residential dwellings compatible in scale and form with detached single-family residential dwellings and located in walkable communities within residential or mixed-use zones

\$\$\$ - Identify and utilize county [municipal] general fund subsidies or other sources of revenue to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the county/municipality for the construction or rehabilitation of moderate-income housing

\$\$\$ - Implement a mortgage assistance program for employees of the county/municipality, an employer that provides contracted services for the county/to the municipality, or any other public employer that operates within the county/municipality

Completed - ~~Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones~~

Completed - ~~Eliminate impact fees for any accessory dwelling unit that is not an internal accessory dwelling unit as defined in Section 10-9a-530~~

MODERATE FEASIBILITY

- \$ - Create a program to transfer development rights for moderate income housing
- \$ - Amend land use regulations to eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on the resident's own vehicle, such as residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities
- \$\$\$ - Demonstrate implementation of any other program or strategy to address the housing needs of residents of the county/municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income, including the dedication of a local funding source to moderate income housing or the adoption of a land use ordinance that requires 10% or more of new residential development in a residential zone be dedicated to moderate income housing
- \$\$\$\$ - Demonstrate investment in the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that facilitates the construction of moderate-income housing
- \$\$\$\$ - Develop a moderate-income housing project for residents who are disabled or 55 years old or older

LOW FEASIBILITY

- \$ - Amend land use regulations to allow for single room occupancy developments
- \$ - Zone or rezone for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers
- \$ - Amend land use regulations to allow for higher density or new moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors
- \$ - Create a housing and transit reinvestment zone pursuant to Title 63N, Chapter 3, Part 6, Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone Act
- \$\$ - Demonstrate creation of, or participation in, a community land trust program for moderate income housing
- \$\$ - Develop and adopt a station area plan in accordance with Section 10-9a-403.1
- \$\$\$ - Apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of moderate income housing, an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter

13, Interlocal Cooperation Act, an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create moderate income housing, or any other entity that applies for programs or services that promote the construction or preservation of moderate income housing

\$\$\$ - Demonstrate investment in the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into moderate income housing

\$\$\$\$ - Preserve existing and new moderate-income housing and subsidized units by utilizing a landlord incentive program, providing for deed restricted units through a grant program, or establishing a housing loss mitigation fund

**PLANNING
COMMISSION**

Staff Report
7/27/2022

Item No. 1.

Title: Community Development Director's Report

Initiated By: Planning Commission

Staff Representative: Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

SUBJECT:

Next Planning Commission Meeting - August 10, 2022

Tentative Items:

- Update Single-family Unplatted Lots Approval Process - Moved to PC Agenda 08-10-2022
- Landscaping Ordinance Update Discussion - Council has directed staff and the Commission to review requirements for further water conservation opportunities.

City Council Action Report:

- Nothing to Report

Planning Commission Goals:

- Parking Update - Council Tabled for Further Review
- Subdivision Ordinance - In Progress, needs 2022 State Amendments
- Update Single-family Unplatted Lots Approval Process - Moved to PC Agenda 08-10-2022
- Landscaping Ordinance Update - Council has directed staff and the Commission to review requirements for further water conservation opportunities.
- General Plan/Economic Update - City did NOT secure funding assistance, City is Re-evaluating

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:

ATTACHMENTS:

CENTERVILLE
city

**PLANNING
COMMISSION**

Staff Report
7/27/2022

Item No. 1.

Title: Minutes Review and Approval

Initiated By:

Staff Representative:

SUBJECT:

June 8, 2022 Commission Meeting Minutes

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 7-13-22 PC Draft Minutes

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**
2 **Wednesday, July 13, 2022**
3 **7:00 p.m.**
4

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

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Kevin Daly, Chair
10 Shawn Hoth
11 Mason Kjar
12 Matt Larsen
13 Heidi Shegrud
14 Christina Wilcox
15 Becki Wright, Vice Chair
16

17 **STAFF PRESENT**

18 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
19 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
20 Jennifer Robison, City Recorder
21

22 **VISITORS**

23 Chad Morris
24 Ken Stuart
25

26 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

27
28 **LEGISLATIVE PRAYER OR THOUGHT** Commissioner Larsen
29

30 **FINAL SITE PLAN – CANYON POINT IN CENTERVILLE – 347 N 400 E**
31

32 Community Development Director Cory Snyder explained the Canyon Point in
33 Centerville Development was proposed to include seven single-family homes and two duplexes.
34 Mr. Snyder explained changes to drainage retention since Conceptual Site Plan acceptance
35 (February 9, 2022), and expressed staff concern regarding the side setback of one duplex, and
36 the height of retaining walls entering into front yard setbacks. Mr. Snyder commented that the
37 proposed development was within the overlay of the Deuel Creek Historic District, and new
38 development could qualify for adjusted setbacks with inclusion of certain historic architectural
39 elements in a separate application process.
40

41 Commissioner Larsen asked if the proposed five-foot drop on the west side next to the
42 sidewalk could be adjusted to make the drop less steep for safety and aesthetic reasons.
43 Commissioner Shegrud said she believed a safety rail would be required if a drop were within
44 30 inches of the flat space below, and the proposed drop would exceed 30 inches.
45 Commissioner Shegrud asked who would maintain the detention facility. Mr. Snyder responded
46 that the owner of the property would be responsible for maintenance; however, he was aware of
47 the intention on the part of the applicant to do a planned unit development with an HOA
48 eventually responsible for maintenance.
49

50 Mr. Snyder answered questions from the Planning Commission regarding landscaping,
51 artificial turf, and the historic architectural element application process for reduced setback
52 approval. Responding to a question from Commissioner Kjar, Mr. Snyder confirmed that artificial
53 turf was included in the permeable surface calculation for the proposed development. He
54 explained it was currently the responsibility of the Public Works Director to determine if a
55 particular use of artificial turf would be considered permeable or impermeable. Responding to a

question from Commissioner Larsen, Mr. Snyder said the City did not have an ordinance requiring snow storage areas for privately maintained properties.

Chad Morris, applicant, confirmed the engineered retaining wall on the west side of the existing home would be approximately five feet next to sidewalk and five feet three inches next to the duplex. Mr. Snyder explained that retaining walls within the defined public setback may not exceed four feet in height. Mr. Morris said he understood some of the concern expressed about the drop-off, but pointed out there were other similar drops in the area. He said he considered the incline to be fairly gradual after the three-foot point. Mr. Morris explained that the planned dog area would be fully fenced, and landscaping in the park strip would follow City ordinance. Commissioner Shegrud made suggestions regarding landscaping. Responding to a question from Commissioner Wright, Mr. Morris said he was advised by a landscape professional that pickleball courts generated a lot of noise that could cause problems with neighbors.

Commissioner Shegrud said she would want the retaining wall in the front yard setback to be reduced to four feet. She said she liked that the applicant listened to neighbor concerns about drainage and found a solution with which the City Engineer was comfortable.

Chair Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the Final Site Plan for Canyon Point in Centerville Development, located at approximately 347 North 400 East, subject to the following conditions and with the following reasons for action. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. The Final Site Plan Approval consists of the following exhibit sheets:
 - a. Sheet C400 – Site Plan, dated 06-09-2022;
 - b. L101 – Landscaping Plan, dated 5-24-2022;
 - c. Duplex Elevations A-2 and A-4, as submitted to the City;
 - d. Single Family Elevations A-2 and A-4, as submitted to the City.
2. The Final Site Plan shall be corrected and submitted, as follows:
 - a. Front Yard Setback from 400 North shall be 25 feet unless it is modified by compliance with the Deuel Creek Design Incentive program.
 - b. All retaining walls located in the Front Yard Setback areas shall not exceed four (4) feet in height.
3. The Final Site Plan Improvement Construction Drawings shall be submitted for final review and acceptance by the City Engineer.
4. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) Subdivision Plat is required to be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the listing or selling of any individual dwelling unit.

Reasons for the Action:

- a) The Planning Commission finds that Final Site Plans are reviewed and approved in accordance with CZC 12.21.110(f).
- b) The Planning Commission finds that the property is located in the Residential Medium Zone and is subject to the development standards related to this zone.
- c) The Planning Commission finds that a Conceptual Site Plan was previously accepted by the City on February 09, 2022.
- d) The Planning Commission finds that the submitted Final Site Plan conforms with the accepted Conceptual Site Plan.
- e) The Planning Commission finds that the Final Site Plan develops the entire property without any phasing.

- 1 f) The Planning Commission finds that the submitted Final Site Plan, with the
2 conditions imposed, ensures compliance with the applicable R-M Zone Development
3 Standards, as also reviewed in the related Staff Report.
4

5 **PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY AMENDMENT –**
6 **PARRISH CREEK BUSINESS PARK – 1160 N 950 W – TOM STUART CONSTRUCTION**
7

8 Community Development Director Cory Snyder said the applicant listed two critical
9 issues that needed to be addressed in moving forward with construction of lots on the north side
10 of Parrish Creek Business Park.
11

- 12 1. The buildings were smaller and were slated toward office use, which had seen
13 dramatic changes in the post Covid-19 world.
14 2. The Fire Marshall maintained the total occupancy in the park was limited to 124,000
15 square feet based on his interpretation of section of code.
16

17 Mr. Snyder explained PDO amendments requested for Lots 1, 3, and 4, and said the
18 primary concern staff identified was the creation of a dual-purpose parking/storage area. It was
19 staff's understanding that the applicant was proposing a chain-link and slat screening fence for
20 the storage area. According to CZC 12.51.110, a chain-link slat system was a "base-zone
21 element" and not the expected "enhanced design" of PDO Zoning and the originally approved
22 PDO elements. Mr. Snyder said he would consider burning with fencing and retention to be an
23 upgraded option. Commissioner Wright said she would be concerned about vinyl slats
24 considering the high winds experienced in Centerville. Mr. Snyder said chain link fencing could
25 usually withstand high winds, but the slats often got bent up.
26

27 Ken Stuart, representing the applicant, said the objective was to get as many buildings
28 on the property as possible to maximize profit. Responding to the Fire Marshall's interpretation,
29 Mr. Stuart argued that wider lanes were used in the development, and concrete was the primary
30 building material, which did not burn. He said that with retirement of the current Fire Marshall,
31 he believed he had a good chance of pushing the matter forward. He said he thought the
32 applicant had done a good job of presenting attractive buildings. Mr. Stuart spoke of the high
33 cost of concrete, and explained the desire to provide storage space for one of the tenants
34 without the expense of a permanent storage structure that would eventually need to be removed
35 for an additional building. He said the applicant wanted an attractive development. Mr. Stuart
36 stated Yard "A" already had a security gate in place. He said he did not think there would be a
37 problem with a security fence shorter than the proposed eight feet.
38

39 Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 8:23 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing
40 that no one wished to comment. Chair Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to
41 recommend approval for a Planned Development Overlay Amendment for the Parrish Creek
42 Subdivision, Lots 1, 3, and 4, subject to the following conditions and with the following reasons
43 for action. Commissioner Shegrud seconded the motion.
44

45 **Conditions:**
46

- 47 1. The Amendments of the PDO Approval and Conceptual Site Plan shall consist of the
48 following elements:
49 a. Alteration #1 – Combine Lots 1, 3, and 4 into a singular development site.
50 b. Alteration #2 – Reduce the numbers of buildings from four to two (one
51 existing/one proposed).
52 c. Alteration #3 – Develop additional parking that would function also as an
53 outdoor storage area labeled Yard "A" for the various users.

- d. Alteration #4 – Allow for the option to convert the proposed Yard “A” into an additional building if applicable development codes and regulations allow in the future.
 - e. Alteration #5 – Create a fleet vehicle parking secured area to the northwest corner of the development.
 - f. Alteration #6 – Create a new landscaping design plan for developing the rest of the business park.
 - g. Alteration #7 – Relocate the approved outdoor passive feature (pavilion & table) from near the end of the cul-de-sac to the southern end of the site associated with the new proposed building. A pedestrian path would be constructed leading to the feature.
2. All further development approvals and permits shall be deemed consistent by the approving authority, applying the amended PDO Approval and Conceptual Site Plan submitted to the City, as shown on the following exhibit sheets:
 - a. Sheet AS.1 – Site Plan, dated June 30, 2022;
 - b. Sheet L-1 through L-4 – Landscaping Plan with berm [i.e., Parrish Creek Building B – Proposal 2], dated June 30, 2022.
 3. A Final Site Plan shall be submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, and the submittal shall also address the following:
 - a. Compliance with applicable Off-street Parking Standards of CZC 12.51, Off-street Parking for uses being proposed.
 - b. Compliance with applicable Landscaping and Screening Standards of CZC 12.51, Landscaping and Screening.
 - c. The use of chain link fencing with slats shall be upgraded to a non-reflecting coating with slats of a natural tone, consistent with the design of the SCP Zone across the Legacy Highway, as deemed acceptable by the approving authority at Final Site Plan Approval.
 4. All other applicable PDO and Development Agreement Approval provisions shall remain in effect that have not been amended by this Approval.
 5. A Subdivision Plat Amendment petition shall be submitted in accordance with CMC 15.09.020, Plat Amendments, which shall be secured and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit for the new building.

Reasons for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that amendments to a PDO approval are subject to the original procedure for obtaining a PDO Approval.
- b. The Planning Commission finds that PDO industrial projects are to be developed in a manner that allows design flexibility, integration of mutually compatible uses, integration of open spaces, clustering of dwelling units, and optimum land planning with greater efficiency, convenience and amenity than is possible under conventional zone regulations.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that in order to make findings necessary to approve a PDO Zone, conditions of approval may be imposed on a conceptual site plan to assure the planned development will:
 - i. Accomplish the purpose of the PDO Overlay Standards;
 - ii. Be developed as one integrated land use rather than as an aggregation of individual and unrelated buildings and uses; and
 - iii. Meet the requirements of the zone in which the proposed development is located except as such requirements are modified by the PDO approval and as shown on an approved conceptual site plan for the planned development.
- d. The Planning Commission finds that the original PDO Approval created four lots, with proposed buildings oriented to both Interstate 15 and Legacy Highway.

- 1 e. The Planning Commission finds that the buildings and landscaping oriented to I-15
2 was a more formal business/office environment. While the buildings and landscaping
3 oriented to Legacy Highway, specifically the landscaping, was less formal in design
4 since it was facing the Shorelands Commerce Park.
5 f. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments, with the
6 conditions imposed, are consistent with the intent of the PDO Approval Criteria of
7 CZC 12.41.080(b), and are compatible with the original PDO Overlay Approval.
8

9 Chair Daly said he was generally in favor of proceeding with the proposed plan.
10 Commissioner Wright repeated that she was concerned about chain link fencing with vinyl slats
11 being a base-zone element. Mr. Snyder suggested upgraded landscaping around the chain link
12 fencing as an option. Commissioner Larsen said he did not have a problem with chain link
13 fencing and vinyl slats in the industrial area, especially with upgraded landscaping. Chair Daly
14 commented that subdivisions changed over time, and suggested perhaps the vision for the
15 Parrish Creek development area had changed since originally approved. Responding to a
16 question from Commissioner Wright, Mr. Snyder said the City benefited from the original
17 agreement with upgraded architecture, upgraded road design, and landscaping. In exchange,
18 the applicant received a longer cul-de-sac than would usually have been approved. He
19 emphasized that additional outdoor storage would require another amendment.
20

21 Commissioner Kjar made a **motion to amend** the motion to add Condition 3(d): The
22 height of the chain link fence shall be limited to six feet (6') and no security measures on top of
23 the fence shall be used such as razor or barbed wire. Commissioner Wright seconded the
24 motion to amend, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0). The **amended motion passed** by
25 unanimous vote (7-0).
26

27 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

28
29 The Planning Commission was scheduled to meet next on July 27, 2022.
30

31 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

32
33 Minutes of the June 8, 2022 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Chair Daly
34 **moved** to approve the minutes. Commissioner Shegrud seconded the motion, which passed by
35 unanimous vote (7-0).
36

37 **ADJOURNMENT**

38
39 At 8:52 p.m., Chair Daly **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded
40 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).
41
42
43
44

45 _____
Jennifer Robison, City Recorder

Date Approved