



CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Due to Centerville City Mayor Clark Wilkinson's Determination (contained in body of below agenda) public meetings will be held electronically via Zoom and live streamed on the Centerville City YouTube channel. Public meetings conducted via Zoom may be terminated at any time due to hackers or inappropriate content.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON NOVEMBER 4, 2020 AT THE CENTERVILLE 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, Administrative Services Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

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

Centerville City Mayor Wilkinson Determination - Electronic Meetings without an Anchor Location Due to Substantial Health and Safety Risk

In accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4) of the Utah Open and Public Meeting Act, I have determined that conducting an electronic meeting of the Centerville City Council with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. This determination is based on the facts and circumstances surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic. Considering the continued number of COVID-19 case counts in Utah, meeting in an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those in attendance because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain at City Hall.

Zoom Information:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94049789954?pwd=ZmJnajhnYWZVUkQ1NDBaV05TdXRRCQT09>

Dial: 1 346 248 7799

Meeting ID: 940 4978 9954

Passcode: 152656

You Tube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/centervillecityutah>

A. ROLL CALL

B. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Councilmember Stephanie Ivie

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

D. OPEN SESSION (This item allows for the public to comment on any subject of municipal concern, including agenda items that are not scheduled for a public hearing. Citizens are encouraged to limit their comments to two (2) minutes per person. Citizens may request a time to speak during Open Session by calling the City Recorder's office at 801-295-3477, or may make such request at the beginning of Open Session.) Please state your name and city of residence.

E. BUSINESS

1. Public Hearing - Zoning Text Amendment - Residential Buffering Regulations
Consider Zoning Text Amendments establishing buffer requirements between differing types of Residential Zoning Districts - Ordinance No. 2020-11
2. Public Hearing - General Plan Amendments - Transportation Element
Consider General Plan Amendments enacting Section 12-450-6 of the Centerville General Plan regarding the Coordination of Transportation Planning with Moderate Income Housing Needs - Ordinance No. 2020-14
3. 2020 Annual Moderate Income Housing Report
Under the Utah Code, Municipal legislative bodies must annually:
 - Update 5-year estimates of moderate-income housing needs UCA 10-9a-408 and 17-27a-408
 - Conduct a review of the moderate-income housing element and its implementation; and
 - Report the findings for updated planning to the Housing and Community Development Division (HCDD) of the Utah Department of Workforce Services and their Association of Government or Metropolitan Planning Organization no later than December 1st, 2019; the report on progress of said plan is due on December 1st, 2020, and annually after that.
 - Post the report on their municipality's website.
4. Public Hearing - FY2021 Budget Amendments
Consider Resolution No. 2020-31 amending the Fiscal Year 2021 Centerville City Budget
5. Minutes Review and Acceptance
October 20, 2020 Work Session Minutes
October 20, 2020 City Council Minutes
6. City Council Report
Councilmember Bill Ince
7. Mayor's Report

8. City Manager's Report

F. CLOSED SESSION (Closed Meeting, if necessary, for reasons allowed by State Law, including, but not limited to, the provisions of section 52-4-205 of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, and for the Attorney-Client matters that are privileged pursuant to Utah Code ann. 78B-1-137, as amended)

1. Discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual

G. ADJOURNMENT

Leah Romero
Centerville City Recorder

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

11/4/2020

Item No.

Short Title: Centerville City Mayor Wilkinson Determination - Electronic Meetings without an Anchor Location Due to Substantial Health and Safety Risk

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

In accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4) of the Utah Open and Public Meeting Act, I have determined that conducting an electronic meeting of the Centerville City Council with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. This determination is based on the facts and circumstances surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic. Considering the continued number of COVID-19 case counts in Utah, meeting in an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those in attendance because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain at City Hall.

Zoom Information:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94049789954?pwd=ZmJnajhnYWZVUkQ1NDBaV05TdXRRCQT09>

Dial: 1 346 248 7799

Meeting ID: 940 4978 9954

Passcode: 152656

You Tube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/centervillecityutah>

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Covid-19 - Electronic Meeting Determination - Director Wilkinson - October 2020



CENTERVILLE CITY

250 North Main Centerville, Utah 84014-1824 • (801) 295-3477 • Fax: (801) 292-8034

Incorporated in 1915

Mayor

Clark A. Wilkinson

City Council

Tamelyn Fillmore

William Ince

Stephanie Ivie

George McEwan

Robyn Mecham

City Manager

Brant T. Hanson

Redevelopment Agency of Centerville City Director Wilkinson Determination

Electronic Meetings without an Anchor Location Due to Substantial Health and Safety Risk

Dated: 10/21/2020 | 8:40 PM PDT

In accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4) of the Utah Open and Public Meeting Act, I have determined that conducting an electronic meeting of the Redevelopment Agency of Centerville City with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. This determination is based on the facts and circumstances surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic. Considering the continued number of COVID-19 case counts in Utah, meeting in an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those in attendance because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain at City Hall.

I hereby authorize the Redevelopment Agency of Centerville City to conduct electronic meetings without an anchor location for the duration of this determination. This determination and the reasons stated herein shall be included in the public notice for each Redevelopment Agency of Centerville City meeting held electronically without an anchor location and shall be read at the beginning of each meeting. Public notice for each meeting shall also include directions for accessing the online meeting and information on how a member of the public may view or make a comment at the meeting.

This determination shall be effective for 30 days from the date of this determination and will continue to be reviewed and monitored for possible reissuance.

DocuSigned by:

Clark A. Wilkinson

6D14D7B51C3B476...

Clark A. Wilkinson

Director of Redevelopment Agency of Centerville



**CENTERVILLE
CITY COUNCIL
Staff Backup Report
11/4/2020**

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Zoning Text Amendment - Residential Buffering Regulations

Initiated By: City Council

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Consider Zoning Text Amendments establishing buffer requirements between differing types of Residential Zoning Districts - Ordinance No. 2020-11

RECOMMENDATION

Approve Ordinance No. 2020-11 amending Section 12.51.070 of the Centerville Zoning Code establishing buffer requirements between differing types of Residential Zoning Districts.

BACKGROUND

As a result of fairly recent comments regarding a proposed multi-family development project, the Council directed the Planning Commission and staff to review and recommend potential buffering standards between different types of Residential Zone Districts. At the October 14, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Code.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Ordinance No. 2020-11 - Residential Buffering Amendments
- 11-04-2020 CC Transmittal Report - Residential Buffering
- 10-14-2020 PC Staff Memo & Recommendation - Residential Buffering
- 08-26-2020 PC Staff Report for Residential Buffering Amendments

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-11

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 12.51.070 OF THE CENTERVILLE ZONING CODE REGARDING LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS TO ADD NEW LANDSCAPE BUFFERING REQUIREMENTS BETWEEN DIFFERENT RESIDENTIAL ZONES

WHEREAS, the City Council has previously adopted Section 12.51.070 of the Centerville Zoning Code regarding landscaping requirements for certain developments and properties within the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend Section 12.51.070 of the Centerville Zoning Code regarding landscaping requirements to add new landscape buffering requirements between different residential zones as more particularly provided herein; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Zoning Code regarding residential landscape buffering requirements 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.

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

Section 1. Amendment. Subsection 12.51.070(b) of the Centerville Zoning Code is hereby amended as follows:

- (b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and Non-Residential Development or a differing residential intensity zoning district. Landscaped buffers shall be required along side ~~alongside~~ and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or are adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.
 - (1) Non-residential m~~Minimum~~ buffer depth shall be as follows:
 - (A) In medium intensity (M) zones: 15 feet; and
 - (B) In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.
 - (2) Residential minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 - (A) In high intensity (H) zones meeting low intensity (L) zones: 25 feet
 - (32) An architectural buffer at least six feet in height shall be provided within the buffer zone. Such buffer may consist of either a block or concrete wall, fencing, or live plants sufficient to create the desired visual, noise, and aesthetic buffer in accordance with the requirements set forth herein and in accordance with the buffer screening guidelines set forth in the General Plan.
 - (A) If an architectural buffer consists of solid fencing or a wall, evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in

(B) If an architectural buffer does not consist of solid fencing or a wall, a sufficient quantity of evergreen trees and shrubs shall be provided which are reasonably anticipated to grow to approximately six feet in height to produce a solid landscape screen through all seasons of the year.

(C) Architectural buffers on corner lots shall be modified to comply with required sight and visibility standards set forth in CZC 12.55.230.

- (54) Artificial plants and landscaping shall not be permitted in the required landscaped buffer areas.

Section 3. 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.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY,
STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2020.**

CENTERVILLE CITY

By: _____
Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

	“AYE”	“NAY”
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.

City Recorder

DATE: _____

RECORDED this ____ day of _____, 2020.

PUBLISHED OR POSTED this ____ of _____, 2020.

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

PLANNING AND ZONING MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2020

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL

FROM: PLANNING COMMISSION

SUBJECT: RESIDENTIAL BUFFERING AMENDMENTS

PC RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

At the October 14, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission recommended **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendments, subject to needed section renumbering or edits, as follows [*non-substantive changes have been made by staff*]:

(b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and Non- Residential Development or a differing Residential Intensity District. Landscaped buffers shall be required along side and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or is adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.

- 1. Non-Residential Development - Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:*
 - 1. In medium intensity (M) zones: 15 feet; and*
 - 2. In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.*
- 2. Residential Development - Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:*
 - 1. Residential High (R-H) to Residential Low (R-L); 25 feet.*

[Suggested Reasons or Action/Findings]

- a. The Planning Commission finds that the Council directed the Planning Commission and city staff to review and recommend potential buffering standards between types of Residential Zone Districts*
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are consistent with and even further the objectives and policies of the City's General Plan.*
- c. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments can be deemed acceptable and/or consistent with review factors of Section 12.21.080(e) of Centerville City's Zoning Ordinance.*
- d. The Planning Commission finds that there are existing waiver provisions in the Zoning Ordinance to allow needed flexibility where future situations may warrant some buffering modifications.*

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE (5-1)

Commissioner	YES	NO	Not Present
Hayman (Chair)	X		
Daly	X		
Kjar	X		
Summerhayes		X	
Wilcox	X		
Wright	X		

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2020

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: PLANNING STAFF

SUBJECT: RESIDENTIAL BUFFERING AMENDMENTS

At the August 26, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission communicated the following directives back to the planning staff:

1. Use a “*simplified approach*” for establishing wanted residential buffers
2. Provide an “*escape hatch*” to use in certain circumstances.

PLANNING STAFF’S PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

➤ **RESIDENTIAL BUFFERING TEXT CHANGES** (*depicted in underline*):

12.51.070 Landscaping Requirements

(b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and NonResidential Development or a differing Residential Intensity District. Landscaped buffers shall be required alongside and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or is adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.

1. Commercial Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) zones: 15 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.
2. Residential Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) Zones: 15 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) Zones: 25 feet.

➤ **USE OF AN “ESCAPE HATCH” TOOL:**

The Zoning Code already has established an escape hatch tool for the landscaping regulations. It is labeled as a “waiver of strict compliance.” If adopted, as proposed in the referenced section, staff believes that this waiver allowance would provide the necessary “escape hatch.”

[Existing Code] 12.51.050 Waiver Of Strict Compliance

1. *Waivers Authorized. Since site conditions and development constraints may vary greatly among sites, the Planning Commission may approve landscape plans that deviate from strict compliance with the provisions of this Chapter.*
2. *Application. A person desiring a waiver from requirements of this Chapter shall, in conjunction with an applicable development application, submit a written request which describes the proposed waiver, provides grounds justifying the waiver, and shows how the intent of this Chapter will be met by the proposed waiver.*
3. *Findings Required. The Planning Commission may authorize a waiver from the requirements of this Chapter, to the extent authorized herein, only if it finds the waiver:*
 1. *Preserves the intent of this Chapter and the provision for which a waiver is authorized.*
 2. *The granting of a waiver will not result in an adverse impact on surrounding properties; and*
 3.
 1. *The strict application of the provision in question is unreasonable or unnecessary for the specific use, design or site proposal given the nature of the proposal or alternate measures proposed by the applicant; or*
 2. *The property has extraordinary or exceptional physical conditions that do not generally exist on nearby property in the same zone and such conditions will not allow strict compliance with all of provisions of this Chapter.*

PLANNING STAFF'S PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION

[Draft Motion] "I hereby make a motion for the Planning Commission to recommend the following Zoning Text Amendments, for Residential Buffering standards, as underlined below and to include any renumbering for the ordinance section."

(b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and NonResidential Development or a differing Residential Intensity District. Landscaped buffers shall be required alongside and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or is adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.

1. Commercial Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) zones: 15 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.
2. Residential Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) Zones: 15 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) Zones: 25 feet.

[Suggested Reasons or Action/Findings]

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that the Council directed the Planning Commission and city staff to review and recommend potential buffering standards between types of Residential Zone Districts*

- b. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are consistent with and even further the objectives and policies of the City's General Plan.*
- c. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments can be deemed acceptable and/or consistent with review factors of Section 12.21.080(e) of Centerville City's Zoning Ordinance.*
- d. The Planning Commission finds that there are existing waiver provisions in the Zoning Ordinance to allow needed flexibility where future situations may warrant some buffering modifications.*

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

**STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 3**

APPLICANT: **CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL
c/o MAYOR WILKINSON
250 NORTH MAIN STREET
CENTERVILLE CITY, UT 84014**

APPLICATION: **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**

APPLICANT REQUEST: **AMEND THE ZONING CODE REGARDING
RESIDENTIAL BUFFERING STANDARDS**

RECOMMENDATION: **CONSIDER RECOMENDING THE PROPOSED CHANGES
TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

BACKGROUND

As a result of recent comments regarding a proposed multi-family development project, the Council directed the Planning Commission and staff to review and recommend potential buffering standards between types of Residential Zone Districts. Staff has prepared edits to CZC 12.51-Landscaping and Screening with regards to the desired Buffering Standards by adding a subsection listing the proposed buffer depths for types of residential development.

Additionally, the edits also include a change to the “*commercial medium depth*” for consistency. However, the only commercial medium area located in the City is along Main Street. The additional depth may increase the burden on commercial redevelopment for some of the properties.

PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT/POLICY EDITS

CZC 12.51.070 Landscaping Requirements

(b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and Non-Residential Development or a differing Residential Intensity District. Landscaped buffers shall be required alongside and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or is adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.

1. Commercial Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:

1. In medium intensity (M) zones: 20 feet; and
2. In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.

2. Residential Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) Zones: 20 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) Zones: 30 feet.

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT POLICY

Factors to be Considered

The Planning Commission is to consider four (4) factors when making a recommendation and a final decision for a Zoning Ordinance Text and Map amendments. These required factors are in Section 12.21.080(e) of Centerville City's Zoning Ordinance. The proposed changes, if approved, would apply to any property located in the listed Residential Zones above. Nonetheless, Factors Two (2) through Four (4) are related specifically to map amendments rather than text or code changes. Thus, staff's review and conclusions are limited to Factor One (1) the General Plan guidance, as provided below:

1. **Is the proposed amendment consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City's General Plan?**

CGP 12-435-1. Location Of Buffers. 1. Incompatible Use Areas Buffers should be used between incompatible land uses including, but not limited to, industrial, commercial, residential, and high density or low density uses. It is not desired that these uses occur in close proximity, but if they do, the adverse impacts of one use on the other shall be mitigated with distance, visual screening, access control, sound control, and other mitigation and buffering techniques.

Staff's Conclusion – From review of the General Plan, it is staff's position that the proposed amendments are consistent with and even further the objectives and policies of the City's General Plan.

SUGGESTED MOTION AND FINDINGS

[Suggested Motion] "I hereby make a motion to recommend APPROVAL of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments regarding "residential buffering" depicted in red, blue, or underlined and strike out text as follows:

CZC 12.51.070 Landscaping Requirements

(b) Buffer Landscaping between Residential and Non-Residential Development or a differing Residential Intensity District. Landscaped buffers shall be required alongside and rear property boundaries which abut a residential zone or is adjacent to a differing lower intensity residential zoning district.

1. Commercial Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:
 1. In medium intensity (M) zones: 20 feet; and
 2. In high intensity (H) and very high intensity (VH) zones: 30 feet.
2. Residential Minimum buffer depth shall be as follows:

1. In medium intensity (M) Zones: 20 feet; and
2. In high intensity (H) Zones: 30 feet.
3. An architectural buffer at least six feet in height shall be provided within the buffer zone. Such buffer may consist of either a block or concrete wall, fencing, or live plants sufficient to create the desired visual, noise, and aesthetic buffer in accordance with the requirements set forth herein and in accordance with the buffer screening guidelines set forth in the General Plan.
 1. If an architectural buffer consists of solid fencing or a wall, evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing.
 2. If an architectural buffer does not consist of solid fencing or a wall, a sufficient quantity of evergreen trees and shrubs shall be provided which are reasonably anticipated to grow to approximately six feet in height to produce a solid landscape screen through all seasons of the year.
 3. Architectural buffers on corner lots shall be modified to comply with required sight and visibility standards set forth in CZC 12.55.230.
4. In addition to plant and tree requirements for architectural buffers, a minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area.
5. Artificial plants and landscaping shall not be permitted in the required landscaped buffer areas.

Suggested Reasons for Action (findings):

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are consistent with and even further the objectives and policies of the City's General Plan.*
- b. *Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments can be deemed acceptable and/or consistent with review factors of Section 12.21.080(e) of Centerville City's Zoning Ordinance.*

**CENTERVILLE
CITY COUNCIL
Staff Backup Report
11/4/2020**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Public Hearing - General Plan Amendments - Transportation Element

Initiated By: City Council

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Consider General Plan Amendments enacting Section 12-450-6 of the Centerville General Plan regarding the Coordination of Transportation Planning with Moderate Income Housing Needs - Ordinance No. 2020-14

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt Ordinance No. 2020-14 amending the Centerville General Plan to enact Section 12-450-6 regarding the Coordination of Transportation Planning with Moderate Income Housing Needs.

BACKGROUND

The City is required by State law to adopt specific updates to the Centerville General Plan to coordinate the City's Transportation Element with the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan. These amendments are required to be adopted by December 1, 2020. The Planning Commission has discussed various concepts for coordinating the Transportation Element with the Moderate Income Housing Plan over the course of a number of meetings. On October 28, 2020, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Centerville General Plan enacting a new Section 12-450-6 regarding the Coordination of Transportation Planning with Moderate Income Housing Needs. The Staff Transmittal Report for this matter is attached.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Ordinance No. 2020-14 - MIH Transportation Amendments
- 10-28-2020 PC Recommendation - Transportation Element Amendments
- 10-28-2020 PC Staff Memo for Amendments to the Transportation Element

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-14

AN ORDINANCE ENACTING SECTION 12-450-6 OF THE CENTERVILLE CITY GENERAL PLAN REGARDING COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WITH MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to enact Section 12-450-6 of the Centerville City General Plan regarding coordination of transportation planning with moderate income housing needs in accordance with the requirements of Utah Code § 10-9a-403; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the General Plan 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 General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it is in the best interest of the public and the citizens of Centerville City to enact Section 12-450-6 of the General Plan regarding coordination of transportation planning with moderate income housing needs as more particularly provided herein to bring plan provisions into compliance with applicable provisions of State law.

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

Section 1. Enactment. Section 12-450-6 of the Centerville City General Plan regarding the coordination of transportation planning with moderate income housing needs is hereby enacted to read in its entirety as more particularly set forth in **Exhibit A**, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Section 2. Severability. If any section, part, or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable, 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 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective 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, THIS 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2020.

ATTEST:

CENTERVILLE CITY

City Recorder

By: _____
Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

Voting by the City Council:

	“AYE”	“NAY”
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.

City Recorder

DATE: _____

RECORDED this ____ day of _____, 2020.

PUBLISHED OR POSTED this ____ of _____, 2020.

EXHIBIT A

SECTION 12-450-6. COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WITH MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

In accordance with Utah Code 10-9a-403, Moderate Income Housing Opportunity Measures for residential and commercial development are to encourage, maintain or improve the connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation, and commerce. Consequently, the intent of this Section is to address this expected coordination and sets forth potential opportunities based the future needs for housing, as identified in the City's Moderate Income Housing Element.

Goal 1 – Moderate Income Housing placement opportunities should be based on their proximity to various collector or arterial transportation corridors.

Policy 1.A: As the City develops and adopts provisions and/or strategies for the allowance of accessory dwelling units or accessory apartments, the first focus for deciding appropriate locations should be properties fronting or substantially located within ½ block (*i.e. 300 feet*), along specified major collectors, minor arterials, and major arterial transportation corridors.

Policy 1.B: Owner-Occupied Accessory Dwelling Units should be encouraged along the following transportation corridors.

✓ Major North/South Corridors:

- 400 East Street – from Chase Lane south to City Limits
- Main Street – from North Centerville south to City Limits
- 400 West Street – from Porter Lane south to City Limits

✓ Major East/West Corridors:

- Chase Lane Street– from 400 East west to Frontage Road
- 400 North Street – from 400 East west to Main Street
- Porter Lane Street – from Main Street west to Frontage Road

✓ Transit Route Corridors:

- 400 East Street – from Chase Lane to south City Limits
- Main Street – from North City Limits to south City Limits

Policy 1.C: Accessory Apartment Units within commercial zones should be encouraged along the following transportation corridors.

- ✓ South Main Street Corridor – from Parrish Lane south to Porter Lane.
- ✓ South Frontage Road – from approximately 240 North south to City Limits

Goal 2 – Under-utilized properties, having street frontage, along transportation corridors should be evaluated for allowing possible infill opportunities.

Policy 2.A: As the future growth occurs in the City, a Flexible Lot Overlay Ordinance ought to be created and adopted. Such an overlay should allow greater flexibility for application of lot widths and setbacks to accommodate infill development where existing homes or parcel configurations may create difficulties with maximizing the allowed base zone density for housing development.

Policy 2.B: Flexible Lot Overlay opportunities should be limited to parcels, tracts, or lots with parcel frontages located on the selected transportation corridor or has its tract area substantially within 300 feet of such corridor.

Policy 2.C: Flexible Lot Overlay Development should be encouraged along the same transportation corridors listed in Goal 1, Policy 1.B of Section 12-450-6.

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

PLANNING AND ZONING MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 28, 2020

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL

FROM: PLANNING COMMISSION

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT AMENDMENTS

PC RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

At the October 28, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission recommended **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendments, as follows:

[edited] SECTION 12-450-5. *[Reserved for Alternative Transportation Planning]*

[new section] SECTION 12-450-6. COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WITH MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

In accordance with Utah Code 10-9a-403, Moderate Income Housing Opportunity Measures for residential and commercial development are to encourage, maintain or improve the connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation, and commerce. Consequently, the intent of this Section is to address this expected coordination and sets forth potential opportunities based the future needs for housing, as identified in the City's Moderate-Income Housing Element.

Goal 1 – Moderate Income Housing placement opportunities should be based on their proximity to various collector or arterial transportation corridors.

Policy 1.A: As the City develops and adopts provisions and/or strategies for the allowance of accessory dwelling units or accessory apartments, the first focus for deciding appropriate locations should be properties fronting or substantially located within ½ block (*i.e. 300 feet*), along specified major collectors, minor arterials, and major arterial transportation corridors.

Policy 1.B: Owner-Occupied Accessory Dwelling Units should be encouraged along the following transportation corridors

- ✓ *Major North/South Corridors:*
 - 400 East Street – from Chase Lane south to City Limits

- Main Street – from North Centerville south to City Limits
- 400 West Street – from Porter Lane south to City Limits
- ✓ Major East/West Corridors:
 - Chase Lane Street– from 400 East west to Frontage Road
 - 400 North Street – from 400 East west to Main Street
 - Porter Lane Street – from Main Street west to Frontage Road
- ✓ Transit Route Corridors:
 - 400 East Street – from Chase Lane to south City Limits
 - Main Street – from North City Limits to south City Limits

Policy 1.C: Accessary Apartment Units within commercial zones should be encouraged along the following transportation corridors.

- ✓ South Main Street Corridor – from Parrish Lane south to Porter Lane.
- ✓ South Frontage Road – from approximately 240 North south to City Limits

Goal 2 – Under-utilized properties, having street frontage, along transportation corridors should be evaluated for allowing possible infill opportunities

Policy 2.A: As the future growth occurs in the City, a Flexible Lot Overlay Ordinance ought to be created and adopted. Such an overlay should allow greater flexibility for application of lot widths and setbacks to accommodate infill development where existing homes or parcel configurations may create difficulties with maximizing the allowed base zone density for housing development.

Policy 2.B: Flexible Lot Overlay opportunities should be limited to parcels, tracts, or lots with parcel frontages located on the selected transportation corridor or has its tract area substantially within 300 feet of such corridor.

Policy 2.C: Flexible Lot Overlay Development should be encouraged along the same transportation corridors listed in Goal 1, Policy 1.B of Section 12-450-6.

[Suggested Reason for Action]

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that all cities are required to adopt specific updates to the City's General Plan to coordinate the Transportation Element with the City's Moderate-Income Housing Plan by December 01, 2020*
- b. *The Planning Commission finds that state statutes require our plan to address "residential and commercial development in areas that will maintain and improve connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation and commerce."*
- c. *The Planning Commission finds that transportation and future MIH needs are tied to the following General Plan goals and policies:*

- *The City shall not allow racial, ethnic, religious, or economic discrimination in the provision and procurement of decent housing in this City.*
 - *The City shall assure an adequate supply of housing for future population through identification of optimum locations for housing development and provision of City services as required.*
 - *It is the desire of Centerville City to provide a variety of housing options within the community, including variable densities.*
 - *In furtherance of the above stated goal, it is the policy of Centerville City to provide appropriate housing for all Centerville residents giving consideration to ongoing lifestyle changes and circumstances that are increasingly prevalent in the normal life cycle of the aging residents.*
- d. *The Planning Commission further finds that the Moderate-Income Housing Element primary goals are as follows:*
- *Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones.*
 - *Preserve existing moderate-income housing.*
 - *Any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income*
- e. *Therefore, Planning Commission finds that the proposed Transportation Element Amendments are consistent with the above stated findings and will maintain and improve connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation and commerce.”*

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE (5-0)

Commissioner	YES	NO	Not Present
Hayman (Chair)	X		
Daly	X		
Kjar	X		
Summerhayes	X		
Wilcox			X
Wright	X		

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 28, 2020

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: PLANNING STAFF

**SUBJECT: CITY’S GENERAL PLAN REGARDING THE MODERATE-INCOME
HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT COORDINATION
DISCUSSION**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY
COUNCIL**

BACKGROUND

As established by recent state statute amendments to the *Land Use Management Act*, all cities are required to adopt specific updates to the City’s General Plan to coordinate the Transportation Element with the City’s Moderate-Income Housing Plan by December 01, 2020. The state code transportation element requirements can be viewed at the following link and scrolling to Section 3(a)(ii) and Section 3(d):

[https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title10/Chapter9A/10-9a-S403.html?v=C10-9a-S403_2019051420190514#:~:text=General%20plan%20preparation.,-\(1\)&text=The%20planning%20commission%20shall%20make,the%20area%20within%20the%20municipality.](https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title10/Chapter9A/10-9a-S403.html?v=C10-9a-S403_2019051420190514#:~:text=General%20plan%20preparation.,-(1)&text=The%20planning%20commission%20shall%20make,the%20area%20within%20the%20municipality.)

The purpose of this process is to simply adopt future planning policies for the General Plan in order to bring it into compliance with state statutes. Thus, the City needs to focus on adopting just the policy considerations and not become overwhelmed with full implementation at this time. The required zoning implementation tools can be vetted and debated at a future time. Additionally, the Commission should focus on the need goal of 411 housing units. Keep in mind the state statute language of “realistic opportunity,” which is different than achieving the actual result. It is the opinion of staff, that there are market forces and variables that cities cannot not ultimately control.

After a few recent discussions conducted by the Planning Commission, the below listed policies, goals, or concepts were chosen to help guide the direction for correlating the future growth in the city, specifically with regards to encouraging the development of Moderate-Income Housing.

1. *Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones,*

2. *Consider additional housing (i.e. accessory apartments and accessory dwellings) within Single Block Measurement for select areas along a transportation corridor,*
3. *Consider creating an “Infill Overlay” that adjusts the base density to allow for infill development within 600 feet of select collector and arterial streets.*

PLANNING STAFF’S RECOMENDATION

The Planning Staff has now prepared the proposed goal and policy amendments for the Transportation Element. These amendments are depicted in the related attachment for this report. Staff recommends the following:

[MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL] *“I hereby motion to recommend an **APPROVAL** to the City Council the drafted amendments, as proposed in the staff report attachment, regarding the City’s Transportation Element.”*

[Suggested Reason for Action]

- a. *The Planning Commission finds that all cities are required to adopt specific updates to the City’s General Plan to coordinate the Transportation Element with the City’s Moderate-Income Housing Plan by December 01, 2020*
- b. *The Planning Commission finds that state statutes require our plan to address “residential and commercial development in areas that will maintain and improve connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation and commerce.”*
- c. *The Planning Commission finds that transportation and future MIH needs are tied to the following General Plan goals and policies:*
 - *The City shall not allow racial, ethnic, religious, or economic discrimination in the provision and procurement of decent housing in this City.*
 - *The City shall assure an adequate supply of housing for future population through identification of optimum locations for housing development and provision of City services as required.*
 - *It is the desire of Centerville City to provide a variety of housing options within the community, including variable densities.*
 - *In furtherance of the above stated goal, it is the policy of Centerville City to provide appropriate housing for all Centerville residents giving consideration to ongoing lifestyle changes and circumstances that are increasingly prevalent in the normal life cycle of the aging residents.*
- d. *The Planning Commission further finds that the Moderate-Income Housing Element primary goals are as follows:*
 - *Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones.*
 - *Preserve existing moderate-income housing.*
 - *Any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income*
- e. *Therefore, Planning Commission finds that the proposed Transportation Element Amendments are consistent with the above stated findings and will maintain and improve connections between housing, transportation, employment, education, recreation and commerce.”*

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

11/4/2020

Item No. 3.

Short Title: 2020 Annual Moderate Income Housing Report

Initiated By: Community Development Director

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Under the Utah Code, Municipal legislative bodies must annually:

- Update 5-year estimates of moderate-income housing needs UCA 10-9a-408 and 17-27a-408
- Conduct a review of the moderate-income housing element and its implementation; and
- Report the findings for updated planning to the Housing and Community Development Division (HCDD) of the Utah Department of Workforce Services and their Association of Government or Metropolitan Planning Organization no later than December 1st, 2019; the report on progress of said plan is due on December 1st, 2020, and annually after that.
- Post the report on their municipality's website.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Staff has prepared and attached the required Annual Report and the required submittals to the State. The City Council should review the information and decide whether the Council sanctions the findings in the report. Also, the Council should direct staff to make any necessary alterations or additions the legislative believes are necessary.

Website Link to City's MIH Plan - <http://centervilleut.net/file/2020/02/12-490-moderate-income-housing-and1-adopted-cln.pdf>

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- 2020 MIH Annual Report
- Centerville City Five Year MIH Estimate
- State Data Projection Calculator

ANNUAL MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING REPORTING FORM

Under the Utah Code, Municipal legislative bodies must annually:

- Update 5-year estimates of moderate-income housing needs UCA 10-9a-408 and 17-27a-408
- Conduct a review of the moderate-income housing element and its implementation; and
- Report the findings for updated planning to the Housing and Community Development Division (HCDD) of the Utah Department of Workforce Services and their Association of Government or Metropolitan Planning Organization no later than December 1st, 2019; the report on progress of said plan is due on December 1st, 2020, and annually after that.
- Post the report on their municipality's website.

In accordance with UCA 10-9a-401 and 17-27a-401 municipalities that must report regularly are:

- Cities of the first, second, third, and fourth class (or have 10,000 or more residents).
- Cities of the fifth class:
 - Having an estimated population greater than or equal to 5,000 residents; **AND**
 - That are located in a county with a population greater than or equal to 31,000 residents.
- Metro Townships:
 - Having an estimated population greater than or equal to 5,000 residents;
 - Having an estimated population less than 5,000 **BUT** is located in a county with a population greater than or equal to 31,000 residents.
- Not a town with fewer than 1,000 residents.

To find out if your municipality must report annually, please visit:

<https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/affordable/moderate/reporting/>

For additional moderate-income housing planning resources:

<https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/affordable/moderate/index.html>

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION:

Municipal Government: **CENTERVILLE CITY**

Reporting Date: **TBD**

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Centerville City

250 North Main Street

Centerville, UT 84014

Mayor's First and Last Name: **Clark Wilkinson**

Mayor's Email Address: **clark@centervilleut.com**

PREPARER CONTACT INFORMATION:

Preparer's First and Last Name: **Corvin Snyder**

Preparer's Title: **Community Development Director**

When did the municipality last adopt moderate-income housing element of their general plan? **November 09,2019**

Link to moderate-income housing element on municipality website: <http://centervilleut.net/file/2020/02/12-490-moderate-income-housing-amd1-adopted-cln.pdf>

UCA 10-9a-403 (2)(b)(iii) and 17-27a-403 (2)(b)(ii) requires municipalities to include three or more strategies in their moderate income housing element of their general plan. In addition to the recommendations required under 10-9a-403 (2)(b)(iii) and 17-27a-403 (2)(b)(ii), for a municipality that has a fixed guideway public transit station, shall include a recommendation to implement the strategies described in 10-9a-403 (2)(b)(iii)(G) or (H) and 17-27a-403 (2)(b)(ii)(G) or (H). Municipalities shall annually progress on implementing these recommendations.

STRATEGIES

[State Statue Strategy Reporting]

Strategy 1

1. State strategy municipality included in the moderate-income housing element of its general plan below.
 - ✓ ***Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones.***
2. Please state the municipality's goal(s) associated with the strategy
Consider adopting an owner-occupied accessory dwelling ordinance.
3. What are the specific outcomes that the strategy intends to accomplish?
Due to housing market demand, the approval and construction of multi-family dwelling has not resulted in development of moderate-income housing. Market rents are significantly higher. Thus, it is the desire of the City to allow for the potential development of accessory dwellings that may help create market rents that may more closely match persons and families with incomes at a moderate level.
4. Please describe how the municipality has monitored its annual progress toward achieving the goal(s).
The adoption of the City's 2020 Transportation Element update has set a goal of encouraging the development and use of accessory dwellings along select transportation corridors of the City.

Strategy 2

1. State strategy municipality included in the moderate-income housing element of its general plan below.
✓ ***Preserve existing moderate-income housing.***
2. Please state the municipality's goal(s) associated with the strategy
When and where possible the City has and will use RDA funds that are specifically set aside for the preservation of housing stock that serves existing moderate-income persons and families.
3. What are the specific outcomes that the strategy intends to accomplish?
Such funds have been and are made available for storm-water management, private roadway re-surfacing, and other utility improvements.
4. Please describe how the municipality has monitored its annual progress toward achieving the goal(s).
As funds become available, the City's RDA monitors and distributes funding as the need arises.

Strategy 3

1. State strategy municipality included in the moderate-income housing element of its general plan below.
✓ **Any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income.**
 2. Please state the municipality's goal(s) associated with the strategy
Centerville City's Moderate-Income Housing Element identifies an additional four (4) strategies to help encourage the potential development of needed housing. The City has specific objectives describing the expected outcomes.
 3. What are the specific outcomes that the strategy intends to accomplish?
There are several outcomes such as developing mixed-use areas, evaluation of housing supply yields, further balancing of zoning districts and housing types, etc.
 4. Please describe how the municipality has monitored its annual progress toward achieving the goal(s).
In addition to the state required MIH Annual Report, each year prior to the City's budget session in early Spring, the Planning Commission and City Council set planning goals for the coming fiscal year. The Planning Commission now tracks the progress for the selected goals for that year on every meeting agenda.
-

5. In the boxes below, outline the following objectives associated with the goal(s) stated in item 2.
 - a. Please identify the key tasks of each stage needed to accomplish the goal(s) stated in item 2.
Strategy #1 – ULTC is working on creating unified provisions for developing ADU's. The City has been monitoring their progress; The City has developed a draft Accessory Dwelling Ordinance. However, the adoption of an ADU Ordinance is still pending; The City will then need to implement a ADU Ordinance and any associated approval procedures.

Strategy #2 – Annual Tax Increment Assessment, Project Need Identification, and Redevelopment Agency Distribution Approval

Strategy #3 – Annual Planning Goal Assignment, Annual Goal Programing, Planning Commission Recommendations and Ordinance Adoption by City Council

- b. Please identify the parties that are responsible for completing the key tasks of each stage identified in item 5a.

Strategy #1 – Planning & City Staff, Planning Commission, and City Council

Strategy #2 – County Collection of Increment Tax, Distribution of Collected Tax, RDA Staff and Redevelopment Agency

Strategy #3 – Planning and City Staff, Planning Commission, and City Council

- c. Please describe the resources that the municipality must allocate to complete the key task of each stage identified in item 5a.

Strategy #1 – Budget Allocation, Planning & City Staff Research and Evaluation

Strategy #2 – RDA Staff Research and Evaluation of Available Funds and Project Eligibility

Strategy #3 – Budget Allocation, Planning & City Staff Research and Evaluation

- d. Please state specific deadlines for completing the key tasks of each stage identified in item 5a.
There are no specific deadlines lines for task completion.

- e. Which of the tasks stated in item 5a have been completed so far, and what have been their results?

Strategy #1 – Initial ADU Draft Developed; Building Codes may require costs that inhibit ADU affordability; ULCT working on creating unified ADU provisions.

Strategy #2 – Ongoing budgeting for tax increment expenditures

Strategy #3 –For 2020, several new Transportation Element Strategies has been identified to use ADU's and Accessory Apartments; Additionally, a Flexible Lot Overlay allowance along specified transportation corridors has been identified.

- f. How is the municipality addressing results described in 5e that deviate from the desired outcomes specified in item 3? What barriers has the municipality encountered during the course of implementation of said goals?

Generally, market driven pricing in Centerville and surrounding communities frequently keeps rents and housing costs (*both single-family and multi-family housing units*) well above persons and families with moderate incomes. Consequently, such persons and families are spending above 30% of their income for housing needs, more specifically for those with incomes 50% and 30% of adjusted gross income. Additionally, small communities like Centerville have limited staff and resources to develop and implement a municipal sponsored housing program.

Nonetheless, the City will continue forward with these goals in hopes that the housing market will at some point respond to and construct housing that targets the moderate income needs as wages continue to lag behind current sales and rent trends.

- g. (Optional) Have you considered efforts to use a moderate-income housing set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency within your community. **Not Currently**

PLEASE SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION FROM THE EVALUATION PERIOD THAT SUPPORTS PROGRESS AS OUTLINED ABOVE.

Municipal legislative bodies are also required to review and submit the following:

UCA 10-9a-408(2)(c)(i):

A **CURRENT ESTIMATE** of the city's rental housing needs for the following income limits:

- 80% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **69 available units**
- 50% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **131 additional units needed**
- 30% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **240 additional units needed**

UCA 10-9a-103(41)(b):

An updated projection of 5-year affordable housing needs, which includes:

- 2025 Projected Growth of Households (*housing demand*):
6,874 Total Households / 897 New Households Projected
 - ✓ 20.02% at 80% MIH = 181 New Households
 - ✓ 32.3% at 50% MIH = 289 New Households
 - ✓ 50.6% at 30% MIH = 454 New Households
- 2025 Projected Housing Stock (*housing supply*):
6,874 Total Housing Units / 897 Total Future Housing Units Needed
 - ✓ 80% MIH = 260 Needed Housing Units
 - ✓ 50% MIH = 419 Needed Housing Units
 - ✓ 30% MIH = 698 Needed Housing Units
- 2025 Projected median housing costs:
\$1,047 per Month / \$12,561 Annually (*est. 2.9-person household*)
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 80% MIH = 20.2% of the Projected Households
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 50% MIH = 32.3% of the Projected Households
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 30% MIH = 53.8% of the Projected Households
- 2025 Projected median household income:
\$80,859 for Centerville City / \$94,657 for Davis County (*est. 2.9-person household*)
 - ✓ 80% MIH = \$64,687 City / \$75,725 County
 - ✓ 50%MIH = \$40,429 City / \$47,329 County
 - ✓ 30% MIH = \$24,258 City / \$22,717 County

To complete the annual reporting requirements above, please download the state's FIVE YEAR HOUSING PROJECTION CALCULATOR: <https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/affordable/moderate/>

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES:

Moderate-income housing review reports are due on **December 1, 2019 and annually thereafter.**

1. Emails must include the following items as separate attachments:
 - An updated estimate of the municipality's 5-year moderate-income housing needs
 - A findings report of the annual moderate-income housing element review
 - The most current version of the moderate-income housing element of the municipality's general plan
 - Submitted moderate-income housing elements must include their adoption date on a cover page.
2. Acceptable electronic document formats include:
 - (a) DOC or PDF
3. Emails **MUST** be addressed to: dfields@utah.gov

CENTERVILLE CITY

ESTIMATED 5-YEAR MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

UCA 10-9a-408(2)(c)(i):

A **CURRENT ESTIMATE** of the city's rental housing needs for the following income limits:

- 80% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **69 available units**
- 50% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **131 additional units needed**
- 30% of the County's Adjusted Median Family Income = **240 additional units needed**

UCA 10-9a-103(41)(b):

An updated projection of 5-year affordable housing needs, which includes:

- 2025 Projected Growth of Households (*housing demand*):
6,874 Total Households / 897 New Households Projected
 - ✓ 20.02% at 80% MIH = 181 New Households
 - ✓ 32.3% at 50% MIH = 289 New Households
 - ✓ 50.6% at 30% MIH = 454 New Households
- 2025 Projected Housing Stock (*housing supply*):
6,874 Total Housing Units / 897 Total Future Housing Units Needed
 - ✓ 80% MIH = 260 Needed Housing Units
 - ✓ 50% MIH = 419 Needed Housing Units
 - ✓ 30% MIH = 698 Needed Housing Units
- 2025 Projected median housing costs:
\$1,047 per Month / \$12,561 Annually (*est. 2.9-person household*)
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 80% MIH = 20.2% of the Projected Households
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 50% MIH = 32.3% of the Projected Households
 - ✓ Cost Burdened at 30% MIH = 53.8% of the Projected Households
- 2025 Projected median household income:
\$80,859 for Centerville City / \$94,657 for Davis County (*est. 2.9-person household*)
 - ✓ 80% MIH = \$64,687 City / \$75,725 County
 - ✓ 50%MIH = \$40,429 City / \$47,329 County
 - ✓ 30% MIH = \$24,258 City / \$22,717 County

Section 1: Population by tenure in Centerville city

Table B01003 Table B25008	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
Total Population: (ACS Table B01003)	15,449	17,013	223	18,414	1,401
Total Population in occupied housing units (ACS Table B25008)	15,449	16,961	216	18,306	1,345
Total Population in owner- occupied housing (ACS Table B25008)	13,906	14,570	76	14,949	379
Total Population in renter- occupied housing (ACS Table B25008)	1,543	2,391	140	3,357	966

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B01003: Total population. American Community Survey.

Source 2: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25008: Total population in occupied housing units by tenure. American Community Survey.

Section 2: Supply of housing units by structure type in Centerville city

Table B25001 Table B25032	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
TOTAL HOUSING UNITS (ACS Table B25001)	4,620	5,687	116	6,584	897
Total occupied units (ACS Table B25032)	4,546	5,512	108	6,342	830
Owner-occupied structures (ACS Table B25032)	4,002	4,625	60	5,124	499
1 unit, detached	3,377	3,684	23	3,777	93
1 unit, attached	392	511	18	774	263
2 units	28	0	-4	-35	-35
3 or 4 units	38	116	10	233	117
5 to 9 units	56	160	9	150	-10
10 to 19 units	36	89	6	136	47
20 to 49 units	0	0	-2	28	28
50 or more units	0	0	0	0	0
Mobile homes	75	65	-1	62	-3
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0	0	0	0
Renter-occupied structures (ACS Table B25032)	544	887	48	1,219	332
1 unit, detached	136	275	26	477	202
1 unit, attached	58	204	20	324	120
2 units	44	26	4	88	62
3 or 4 units	204	142	-12	49	-93
5 to 9 units	60	0	-9	-69	-69
10 to 19 units	42	54	2	71	17
20 to 49 units	0	74	5	105	31
50 or more units	0	112	13	178	66
Mobile homes	0	0	-1	-3	-3

Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0	0	0
---------------------	---	---	---	---

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25001: Total housing units. American Community Survey.

Source 2: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25032: Tenure by units in structure. American Community Survey.

Section 3: Housing occupancy in Centerville city

Table B25003 Table B25081	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
Total households in occupied housing units (ACS Table B25003)	4,546	5,512	108	6,342	830
Total households in owner-occupied housing (ACS Table B25003)	4,002	4,625	60	5,124	499
With a Mortgage (ACS Table B25081)	2,765	3,183	38	3,493	310
Without a Mortgage (ACS Table B25081)	1,237	1,442	22	1,630	188
Total households in renter-occupied housing (ACS Table B25003)	544	887	48	1,219	332

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25003: Tenure. American Community Survey.

Source 2: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25081: Mortgage status. American Community Survey.

Section 4: Housing vacancy in Centerville city

Table B25004	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
Total vacant units (ACS Table B25004)	74	175	8	242	67
For rent (ACS Table B25004)	44	127	12	205	78
Rented, not occupied (ACS Table B25004)	0	0	0	0	0
For sale only (ACS Table B25004)	17	0	-7	-40	-40
Sold, not occupied (ACS Table B25004)	0	0	0	0	0
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (ACS Table B25004)	0	0	0	0	0
For migrant workers (ACS Table B25004)	0	0	0	0	0
Other vacant (ACS Table B25004)	13	48	3	77	29

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25003: Tenure. American Community Survey.

Section 5: Average household size in

Table B25010	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	2025 Projection
Average Household Size (ACS Table B25010)	3.4	3.08	2.89
Average Owner Household Size (ACS Table B25010)	3.47	3.15	2.92
Average Renter Household Size (ACS Table B25010)	2.84	2.70	2.75

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25010: Average household size of occupied housing units by tenure. American Community Survey.

Section 6: Monthly housing costs in Centerville city

Table B25088 Table B25064	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
Total owner-occupied housing unit costs (ACS Table B25088)	\$1,213	\$1,219	-\$8	\$1,120	\$ (99)
Units with a mortgage (ACS Table B25088)	\$1,566	\$1,552	-\$10	\$1,427	\$ (125)
Units without a mortgage (ACS Table B25088)	\$381	\$425	\$4	\$446	\$ 21
Median gross rent (ACS Table B25064)	\$1,031	\$1,079	\$15	\$1,194	\$ 115

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25088: Median selected monthly owner costs (rental) by mortgage status. American Community Survey.

Source 2: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25064: Median gross rent (Dollars). American Community Survey.

Section 7: Median household income in Centerville city

Table B25119	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
Median household income (ACS Table B25119)	\$80,452	\$84,436	\$93	\$80,859	\$ (3,577)
Owner-occupied income (ACS Table B25119)	\$83,946	\$90,927	\$491	\$90,119	\$ (808)
Renter-occupied income (ACS Table B25119)	\$55,802	\$47,978	-\$2,002	\$26,492	\$ (21,486)

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B25119: Median household income that past 12 months by tenure. American Community Survey.

Section 8: Davis County Area Median Income (AMI)*

Table B19019 Table B19119	2009 American Community Survey	2017 American Community Survey	Annual Growth Rate (Slope)	2025 Projection	Difference between 2017 and 2025
--------------------------------------	---	---	----------------------------------	--------------------	--

Median HOUSEHOLD income (ACS Table B19019)	\$0	\$75,961	\$5,437	\$122,602	\$ 46,641
1-person household	\$34,078	\$36,438	\$206	\$36,934	\$ 496
2-person household	\$66,386	\$73,397	\$661	\$75,729	\$ 2,332
3-person household	\$70,328	\$82,974	\$1,616	\$94,657	\$ 11,683
4-person household	\$72,166	\$85,642	\$1,377	\$92,002	\$ 6,360
5-person household	\$80,283	\$92,481	\$1,337	\$99,838	\$ 7,357
6-person household	\$84,414	\$95,779	\$1,346	\$104,404	\$ 8,625
≥ 7-person household	\$97,380	\$97,103	-\$245	\$93,143	\$ (3,960)
Median FAMILY income (ACS Table B19119)	\$72,272	\$83,850	\$1,208	\$90,475	\$ 6,625
2-person family	\$63,833	\$74,157	\$912	\$78,382	\$ 4,225
3-person family	\$67,456	\$81,473	\$1,744	\$94,585	\$ 13,112
4-person family	\$76,227	\$85,332	\$1,096	\$88,859	\$ 3,527
5-person family	\$79,255	\$91,280	\$1,270	\$98,872	\$ 7,592
6-person family	\$84,221	\$96,175	\$1,324	\$104,125	\$ 7,950
≥ 7-person family	\$95,482	\$96,614	-\$300	\$92,404	\$ (4,210)

Source 1: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B19019: Median household income that past 12 months by household size. American

Community Survey

Source 2: U.S. Census Bureau. Table B19119: Median family income in the past 12 months by family size. American Community

Survey

*NOTE: AMI is calculated at the COUNTY level.

UCA 10-9a-408(2)(c)(i)

Calculate the municipality's housing gap for the current year by entering the number of moderate-income renter households, affordable and available rental units from TABLE 1 below:

2020 Shortage	Renter Households	Affordable Rental Units	Available Rental Units	Affordable Units - Renter Households	Available Units - Renter Households
≤ 80% HAMFI	525	855	594	330	69
≤ 50% HAMFI	405	365	274	-40	-131
≤ 30% HAMFI	260	50	20	-210	-240

Calculate the municipality's housing gap for the previous annual by entering the number of moderate-income renter households, affordable and available rental units from TABLE 2 below:

2016 Shortage	Renter Households	Affordable Rental Units	Available Rental Units	Affordable Units - Renter Households	Available Units - Renter Households
≤ 80% HAMFI	400	660	430	260	30
≤ 50% HAMFI	255	200	140	-55	-115
≤ 30% HAMFI	165	100	60	-65	-105

Subtract Table 2 from Table 1 to estimate progress in providing moderate-income housing

PROGRESS	Renter Households	Affordable Rental Units	Available Rental Units	Affordable Units - Renter Households	Available Units - Renter Households
≤ 80% HAMFI	125	195	164	70	39
≤ 50% HAMFI	150	165	134	15	-16
≤ 30% HAMFI	95	-50	-40	-145	-135

UCA 10-9a-408(2)(c)(ii)

Report the number of all housing units in the municipality that are currently subsidized by each level of government below:

Municipal Government:

0

Subsidized by municipal housing programs

State Government:

0

Subsidized by Utah's OWHLF multi-family program

Federal Government:

0

Subsidized by the federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program

UCA 10-9a-408(2)(c)(iii)

Report the number of all housing units in the municipality that are currently deed-restricted for moderate-income households in the box below:

0

**CENTERVILLE
CITY COUNCIL
Staff Backup Report
11/4/2020**

Item No. 4.

Short Title: Public Hearing - FY2021 Budget Amendments

Initiated By: Jacob Smith - Finance Director

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Consider Resolution No. 2020-31 amending the Fiscal Year 2021 Centerville City Budget

RECOMMENDATION

Approve Resolution No. 2020-31 amending the Fiscal Year 2021 Centerville City Budget.

BACKGROUND

Sales Tax revenues came in \$118,887 higher than expected in October, 2020.

Staff recommends the following amendments to help restore the City's budget:

General Fund

Revenues:

- Increase Sales Tax revenue to 3,522,363 (an increase of 72,562)
- Increase other Admin Overhead revenue by 27,188 to cover shared expenses
- Increase CARES Act money by 466,409 - received 3rd tranche

Expenditures:

- Restore Education and Training budgets - 10,200
- New Police Vehicle - 47,500
- General maintenance and repair on equipment and buildings - 41,300
- Uniform Allowance for Elected Officials - 750
- Increase CARES Act related expenses by 466,409

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Resolution No. 2020-31 - Budget Amendments #4
- Budget Amendments Nov 4

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-31

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2021 BUDGET OF FUNDS AND
ACCOUNTS FOR CENTERVILLE CITY, UTAH**

WHEREAS, in order to conform with Utah State Code and Accounting Procedures as outlined in the Uniform Accounting Manual, it is necessary to amend the budget of funds and accounts for Centerville City for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2021 as more particularly provided herein.

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

Section 1. Amendment. The FY 2021 Budget of Funds and Accounts for Centerville City is hereby amended as shown in **Exhibit A** as attached and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Severability. If any section, part or provision of this Resolution is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Resolution, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Resolution shall be severable.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY,
STATE OF UTAH, THIS 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2020.**

CENTERVILLE CITY

By: _____
Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

I hereby certify that the above Resolution entitled "A Resolution Amending the FY 2021 Budget of Funds and Accounts for Centerville City, Utah" is a true and accurate copy of the Resolution passed on the 4th day of November, 2020.

ATTEST:

City Recorder

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND EFFECTIVE DATE

According to the provisions of the U.C.A. § 10-3-719, as amended, resolutions may become effective without publication or posting and may take effect on passage or at a later date as the governing body may determine; provided, resolutions may not become effective more than three months from the date of passage. I, the municipal recorder of Centerville City, hereby certify that foregoing resolution was duly passed by the City Council and became effective upon passage or a later date as the governing body directed as more particularly set forth below.

City Recorder

DATE: _____

EFFECTIVE DATE: ____ day of _____, 2020.

EXHIBIT A

FY 2021 APPROVED AMENDED BUDGET

GENERAL FUND

Budget Amendments FY20/21 - November 4, 2020

2020/21

REVENUE		ADOPTED	AMENDED	
10-31-300000	SALES TAX - GENERAL	3,449,801	3,522,363	
10-34-900000	ADMIN OVERHEAD - WATER FUND	855,232	874,357	
10-34-910000	ADMIN OVERHEAD - SANITATION	146,449	148,182	
10-34-920000	ADMIN OVERHEAD - DRAINAGE/DRAINAG	453,068	458,836	
10-34-940000	ADMIN OVERHEAD - RDA/RDA Board	201,636	202,199	
10-33-202000	CARES ACT	1,048,108	1,514,517	
		Net Increase		
TOTAL REVENUE		6,154,294	6,720,453	566,159
EXPENDITURES				
<u>Emergency Management</u>				
10-4150-326	CRF Related Expenses	1,048,108	1,514,517	Tranche 3
<u>Elected</u>				
10-4111-200	Uniform Purchase	-	750	
<u>Attorney</u>				
10-4135-330	Education and Training	1,600	1,800	
<u>Police</u>				
10-4210-330	Education and Training	15,500	19,000	
10-4210-740	Police Vehicle	56,000	103,500	
<u>Public Works Admin</u>				
10-4405-740	Iron Worker for Steel	0	15,000	
<u>Streets</u>				
10-4410-330	Education and Training	3,500	6,500	
<u>GIS</u>				
10-4470-330	Education and Training	1,500	3,000	
10-4410-481	<u>Parks</u>			
10-4510-330	Education and Training	3,000	4,000	
10-4510-750	Smoot Park Irrigation Filter	0	6,500	
10-4410-486	<u>Community Development</u>			
10-4610-330	Education and Training	1,500	2,500	
<u>Parks Facility</u>				
10-4596-740	Overhead Door Repair and Computer Replacen	1,500	4,600	
<u>Public Works Facility</u>				
10-4596-482	Maintenance and Repair	11,000	17,000	
10-4596-740	Welding Bay Repair and Pressure Washer	12,000	19,700	
<u>City Hall</u>				
10-4597-482	Maintenance and Repair	9,000	12,000	
		Net Increase		
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		1,164,208	1,730,367	566,159

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
11/4/2020**

Item No. 5.

Short Title: Minutes Review and Acceptance

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

October 20, 2020 Work Session Minutes
October 20, 2020 City Council Minutes

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- October 20, 2020 Work Session Minutes
- October 20, 2020 City Council Minutes

Minutes of the Centerville **City Council work session** held Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 6:40 p.m. with participants present electronically via Zoom and streamed on YouTube due to infectious disease COVID-19.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor	Clark Wilkinson
Council Members	Tamilyn Fillmore William Ince Stephanie Ivie George McEwan Robyn Mecham

STAFF PRESENT

Brant Hanson, City Manager
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Leah Romero, City Recorder
Bruce Cox, Parks and Recreation Director
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Jacob Smith, Administrative Services Director

VISITOR

Dailee Gardner, Parks and Recreation Committee Chair
Lynn Keddington, Parks and Recreation Committee

DETERMINATION

Mayor Wilkinson read aloud a determination regarding electronic meetings without an anchor location due to COVID-19

PARKS AND RECREATION DISCUSSION

Lynn Keddington, member of the Parks and Recreation Committee, explained the idea of financially partnering with South Davis Recreation District to provide pickle ball courts at Community Park. He suggested the Centerville Community Foundation could raise a portion of the money, and the City could apply for a grant to help reach the estimated \$600,000 needed. He proposed the following break-down: \$250,000 from the South Davis Recreation District, \$250,000 from Centerville City, and \$100,000 from the Centerville Community Foundation. In exchange for Recreation District funding, the Recreation District could be granted priority scheduling of the pickle ball courts for leagues for a specific length of time. Mr. Keddington commented that both entities would benefit from partnering financially. If a grant were received, grant funds could be split between the two entities, used for additional amenities at Community Park, or given entirely to the Recreation District.

As the City representative on the South Davis Recreation Board, Councilmember Fillmore said she appreciated the creativity in trying to reduce the cost of the project for the City. She expressed concern that citizens would expect pickle ball courts at the City park to be available for citizen use, and spoke of potential complications in partnering with the Recreation District. She commented that the Recreation District was created to provide recreation facilities that were too expensive for individual cities to provide on their own. Councilmember Fillmore said she did not

- 1 know if it had ever been a goal of the Recreation District to build pickle ball courts. A majority of
- 2 the Council indicated they were in favor of exploring the possibility further.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Cox informed the Council that the cost of wetland credits would increase at the start
2 of 2021, and suggested the Council consider mitigating remaining wetland at Community Park
3 while possible. Councilmember Fillmore suggested adding a discussion to the next Council
4 meeting agenda. Mayor Wilkinson expressed agreement.

5
6 **ADJOURNMENT**
7

8 At 6:57 p.m., Councilmember Ince **moved** to adjourn the work session. Councilmember
9 Ivie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
10

11
12
13
14 _____
15 City Recorder/Deputy City Recorder

16 _____
17 Date Approved

18
19 _____
Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

Minutes of the Centerville **City Council** meeting held Tuesday, October 20, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. with participants present electronically via Zoom and streamed on YouTube due to infectious disease COVID-19.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor	Clark Wilkinson
Council Members	Tamilyn Fillmore William Ince Stephanie Ivie George McEwan Robyn Mecham

STAFF PRESENT

Brant Hanson, City Manager
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Leah Romero, City Recorder
Jacob Smith, Administrative Services Director
Bruce Cox, Parks and Recreation Director
Kevin Campbell, City Engineer
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

VISITORS

Marcus Arbuckle, Keddington & Christensen
Russell Wilson, Symphony Homes
Bruce Robinson, Symphony Homes
Kevin Anderson, Symphony Homes
Jeremy Surrow, Symphony Homes

PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Councilmember Ince

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

DETERMINATION

Mayor Wilkinson read aloud a determination regarding electronic meetings without an anchor location due to COVID-19

OPEN SESSION

None

PUBLIC HEARING – SUMMERHILL LANE SUBDIVISION – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AND PDO CONCEPTUAL PLAN

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, explained changes to the Summerhill Lane Subdivision conceptual plan since last reviewed by the Council, including proposed setback adjustments. The Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval of the Zoning Map Amendment and PDO Conceptual Plan on September 23, 2020. City Engineer Kevin Campbell emphasized to the Council the importance and benefit of constructing the entire drainage system at one time.

Police Chief Paul Child shared details of an accident that took place in March of 2019 in which a 5-year-old child was struck by a car on 2025 North in Centerville, near the proposed development.

1 Russell Wilson with Symphony Homes showed a proposed PDO Conceptual Plan, with
2 3.8 residential units per acre. He explained that 0.7 acres were purchased from the school district
3 and incorporated in the plan to have residential lots backing the neighboring elementary school
4 property. Mr. Wilson described the proposed storm water, land drain, and yard drain systems for
5 the development. Detention basins would be owned and maintained by the HOA, and yard drain
6 systems would be maintained by the HOA.

7
8 Bruce Robinson with Symphony Homes explained that proposed side setback variances
9 would allow construction of wider homes on the lots, allowing more interesting elevations and
10 improving overall aesthetics. Mr. Wilson stated that 400 West and 2150 North were included on
11 the City's Street Master Plan, and said a UDOT representative had indicated to him that UDOT
12 would not be in favor of direct access to Frontage Road from the proposed subdivision.

13
14 Jeremy Surrow, Traffic Engineer with Symphony Homes, shared data regarding
15 anticipated traffic impact of the proposed subdivision on existing streets. Councilmembers Ivie
16 and Mecham questioned whether the traffic standards used to estimate traffic impact were
17 applicable to Centerville. Councilmember Ince said traffic engineers always reported that traffic
18 impacts would be minimal and not cause a problem, and when a development was complete,
19 citizens complained about the traffic impact. He said he was concerned. Councilmember Fillmore
20 commented that traffic engineers were going to use standardized data, and it was for the Council
21 to determine if they accepted the standardized data. She said she did not question the work done
22 by the Symphony Homes Traffic Engineer.

23
24 Mayor Wilkinson opened a public hearing at 8:08 p.m.

25
26 Carrie Smith – Ms. Smith said she lived on 400 West near 2025 North. She said the
27 parking lot at the nearby elementary school was not large enough, so vehicles frequently lined
28 2025 North for school programs and events. She said her husband had counted vehicles during
29 elementary pick-up/drop-off times and submitted the numbers to the City. Ms. Smith said she did
30 not understand why access to Frontage Road from the new development would not be allowed,
31 especially with the planned West Davis Corridor construction. She said the residents were
32 concerned about the amount of traffic, and reminded the Council that a child had already been hit
33 on 2025 North.

34
35 Ben Seelos – Mr. Seelos said he lived on 400 West in Centerville. He requested that the
36 Council reject the proposed Zoning Map Amendment and PDO Conceptual Plan because it did
37 not meet the needs of the community. He said he believed many facts and justifications used by
38 the Planning Commission to vote in favor of forwarding a recommendation were flawed,
39 misunderstood, or factually incorrect. He said he believed the applicant had failed to provide
40 sufficient drainage plans to address drainage issues prevalent in the area, and said he did not
41 agree with approving the subdivision without access to Frontage Road.

42
43 Chris Cutler – Mr. Cutler said he was opposed to the proposed development because he
44 believed the setbacks and lot sizes should be aligned with the neighboring Lexington Park
45 Subdivision. He said he owned property neighboring the subject property, and had significant
46 concerns about the proposed drainage system. Mr. Cutler expressed concern with the lack of
47 planning by Symphony Homes to accommodate the West Davis Corridor Project that will have an
48 impact on the alignment of Frontage Road. He said he agreed that the proposed subdivision
49 should have direct access to Frontage Road, and emphasized that 2150 North would remain a
50 "planned" master street since he had no intention of developing his property.

51
52 Rob Scott – Mr. Scott said he lived in the subject neighborhood. He asked the Council to
53 decline the current proposal and more closely study traffic impact. He said that, as an experienced

1 police officer, he believed the proposed subdivision would have significant impact on traffic and
2 safety in the neighborhood.

3
4 Lisa Robinson – Ms. Robinson asked Council members to remember that many of them
5 ran campaigns with the promise to do everything they could to maintain a low-density community.
6 She said she believed lot sizes smaller than 0.25 acres should not be tolerated, and said she did
7 not believe the requested setback variations were needed in the development. Ms. Robinson said
8 she believed direct access to Frontage Road was important for development of the subject
9 property. She commented that multiple Frontage Road access points in the neighborhood were
10 not designed for or available to general traffic, putting a lot of traffic burden on 2025 North.

11
12 Sharon Cutler – Ms. Cutler said she lived on Main Street in the subject neighborhood. She
13 said her biggest concern was safety and traffic, and said she disagreed with the traffic impact
14 estimates presented by the applicant.

15
16 Rebecca Greer – Ms. Greer said she lived on Main Street in the subject neighborhood.
17 She said residents in the neighborhood were not opposed to development of the subject property,
18 and were not opposed to the rezone, but were concerned about traffic and safety. She said she
19 spoke with a traffic professional who said his professional finding would be similar to that of
20 Symphony Homes, but said he would be concerned as a resident in the neighborhood about the
21 volume of traffic that would originate from the proposed development. Ms. Greer said the traffic
22 professional encouraged her to push for direct access to Frontage Road considering the location
23 of the elementary school and the fact that proposed development was heavily weighted on the
24 west side of the property. She said she believed the requested setbacks represented too much
25 change, and said she was concerned about drainage on the property. Ms. Greer asked the
26 Council to make sure the drainage plan was clearly documented, and requested the Council reject
27 the proposal.

28
29 Brooke Lewis – Ms. Lewis said she lived on 2025 North, and said there were mornings
30 when she had to wait in her driveway for five minutes for traffic to clear to a point that she could
31 leave. She expressed concern with the idea of additional traffic, and said she disagreed that
32 sufficient access to Frontage Road already existed.

33
34 Brett Booth – Mr. Booth said he was a resident of the Lexington Park Subdivision. He said
35 he believed addition of the proposed 66 homes would add an unacceptable amount of traffic to
36 the existing streets. He asked the City Council to reject the proposal until a dedicated access
37 point to Frontage Road was granted.

38
39 Jeanette Booth – Ms. Booth commented that 725 West was not large enough to handle
40 the volume of traffic that would be added by an additional 66 homes. She expressed concern for
41 child safety in the neighborhood.

42
43 Katie Harwood – Ms. Harwood said she lived on 725 West. She said she agreed that the
44 proposal should not be approved.

45
46 Jim Stewart – Mr. Stewart said he lived on 2025 North. He said traffic was a big issue
47 because of the location of the elementary school. He said he did not agree with the requested
48 setback changes and lot sizes for the west side of the property, and expressed concern about
49 drainage.

50
51 Janet Tolman – Ms. Tolman said she lived in the subject neighborhood and was very
52 concerned about traffic impact. She said she believed a majority of the traffic would be drawn to

1 725 West to access Frontage Road, and commented that 725 West was the smallest of the three
2 outlets presented. She requested the Council reject the proposal.

3
4 Ivan Cutler – Mr. Cutler said he lived on 2150 North. He requested the Council reject the
5 proposal, stating he did not believe the traffic issue had been resolved.

6
7 Cindi Garlick – Ms. Garlick said she lived in the subject neighborhood, just off Frontage
8 Road. She said she agreed with the previous comments, and stated that lot sizes in the proposed
9 development west of 400 West should resemble lot sizes in Lexington Park. She said she had
10 watched homeowners in Woods Park do crazy things to make their small lot sizes functional for
11 their families. She questioned the wisdom of leaving a HOA in charge of ensuring the drainage
12 systems continued to function as designed.

13
14 Brendon Allen – Mr. Allen thanked the Council for implementing the PDO process to allow
15 community comment. He expressed agreement with the concerns expressed regarding traffic and
16 drainage. He commented that the homes proposed west of 400 West only averaged 0.153 acres
17 with a median of 0.13 acres, and pointed out that lots in neighboring Lexington Park had a median
18 of 0.2 acres. Mr. Allen referred to the reason Symphony Homes gave for reduced setbacks,
19 aesthetics, and stated that aesthetics equated to dollars for Symphony Homes. He urged the
20 Council to reject the proposal.

21
22 Mark Greer – Mr. Greer said he echoed the previous comments and appreciated the time
23 provided for citizen comment. He said traffic was a huge concern, said he believed the traffic
24 numbers presented were low, and said he did not like the idea of the proposed number of small
25 homes crammed west of 400 West. Mr. Greer expressed concern for the safety of children near
26 the elementary school with the increased traffic.

27
28 Ian Tolman – Mr. Tolman said he lived in the Lexington Park Subdivision, and thanked the
29 Council for the opportunity to comment. He said his neighborhood dealt with a lot of standing
30 water, and expressed concern with a HOA being the enforcement body for the proposed drainage
31 systems. Mr. Tolman said he shared the opinion that the proposed lot and home sizes were too
32 small. He predicted that the bulk of the traffic from the predicted development would choose to
33 use 725 West.

34
35 Lisa Fowers – Ms. Fowers said she lived at the north end of 400 West. She emphasized
36 that traffic was already a problem at the 2025 North/400 West intersection, and referred to
37 comments made by Chief Child at a previous meeting in which he recommended access to
38 Frontage Road for the new subdivision. She said she would want the new homes to be
39 proportionate to existing homes in the neighborhood. Ms. Fowers said she did not believe
40 community concerns were adequately addressed by the Planning Commission.

41
42 Dusty Jacobs – Mr. Jacobs said he was a Centerville resident, and echoed concerns
43 previously expressed. He said he believed the traffic numbers presented were dramatically
44 understated. He emphasized the need to adequately address drainage concerns.

45
46 Paul Obray – Mr. Obray said he echoed previous comments and encouraged the Council
47 to send the proposal back to the Planning Commission. He emphasized that drainage was a
48 serious concern in the area. Mr. Obray said he knew Symphony Homes built beautiful homes, but
49 said he believed some changes were needed to the plan before approval.

50
51 Katie Moss – Ms. Moss said she lived on 2025 North across from the elementary school.
52 She echoed concerns about traffic, stating that 2025 North already had a lot of traffic, with drivers

1 often not paying attention and driving too fast. She said she believed the setbacks should match
2 setbacks in the neighboring development.

3
4 Heather Healy – Ms. Healy said she lived at the west end of 2025 North, and said she was
5 extremely concerned about the amount of traffic the proposed development would add to 2025
6 North. She said it was her daughter who was hit in the accident described by Chief Child, and
7 said her number one concern was safety of children in the neighborhood. Ms. Healy said she
8 believed the setbacks should match those in Lexington Park, and stated there was plenty of space
9 for the land to be developed without the proposed reduced setbacks.

10
11 Rob Franklin – Mr. Franklin said he shared the concerns expressed regarding drainage.
12 He said he had drainage issues in his backyard, and commented that the drainage at the Woods
13 Park Subdivision was so poor that the playground area in the subdivision could often not be used.
14 He spoke of existing traffic issues around the elementary school, and said the traffic would only
15 get worse with the proposed added homes.

16
17 Amy Neal – Ms. Neal said she lived on 725 West with four young children. She
18 emphasized that 725 West was a little road, not designed for the amount of traffic that would be
19 added with the proposed development. Ms. Neal asked that the Council reject the proposal until
20 access to Frontage Road was granted.

21
22 Cody Hood – Mr. Hood said he lived on 2025 North, and echoed the concerns expressed.
23 He said he was a professionally licensed land surveyor, and said the proposed drainage plan
24 included the smallest on-site detention basin he had ever seen. He agreed that traffic was a
25 concern, already a problem on 2025 North.

26
27 Lisa Hood – Ms. Hood expressed concern for the safety of children with existing traffic
28 and the potential increase in traffic. She said she believed the new development needed direct
29 access to Frontage Road.

30
31 Casey Christensen – Ms. Christensen said she lived just off 725 West. She said she was
32 against the proposed zoning change and potential increased traffic. She stated that increased
33 traffic would be a safety issue. She asked the Council to send the proposal back to be
34 reconsidered.

35
36 Jill Godfrey – Ms. Godfrey said she lived on 725 West near the proposed subdivision. She
37 said her main concern was traffic impact, and emphasized that 725 West was not a large road.
38 Ms. Godfrey said she did not believe 725 West would be able to support the increased traffic that
39 would result from the proposed subdivision.

40
41 Karen Hansen – Ms. Hansen said she lived in the Lexington Park Subdivision. She stated
42 that she believed the estimated traffic impact presented by Symphony Homes was incorrect, and
43 described a recent incident with traffic congestion in the area. She said between commuter traffic
44 and school traffic, traffic in the area did not slow down. Ms. Hansen suggested the size of homes
45 proposed for the west portion of the property would be “starter homes” with a high turnover. She
46 asked that the Council send the proposal back so it could be done properly.

47
48 Brent Garlick – Mr. Garlick thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak. He requested
49 the Council reject the proposal and ask the applicant to rework the plan based on comments
50 made during the public hearing. He described some of his experiences with drainage problems in
51 the area. He stated that, as an owner of property adjoining the Cutler property to the north of the
52 proposed development, he had no intention of selling his property for development and did not
53 anticipate that master planned 2150 North would become a reality anytime soon.

1 Alison Garlick – Ms. Garlick said she appreciated the opportunity to comment. She said
2 she agreed with drainage, lot size, and traffic concerns expressed. She said she did not think
3 anyone was against Symphony Homes developing the property. She said she believed the
4 concerns were based on safety: safety for their homes, safety for the children and community
5 members, and safety for their culture as residents in the north part of Centerville.
6

7 Cole Smith – Mr. Smith said he lived on 400 West. He expressed disappointment that
8 Planning Commissioners had not visited the subject neighborhood, and invited Council members
9 to visit the neighborhood, especially during peak traffic hours to understand the concerns
10 expressed. He asked Symphony Homes to be a good neighbor and revise the plan to provide
11 something that would work. Mr. Smith appealed to the City Council and Police Chief, and asked
12 them to please fund a crossing guard at the 2025 North/400 West intersection.
13

14 John Ruedas – Mr. Ruedas said he lived in the subject neighborhood. He said he echoed
15 concerns about drainage, traffic, and proposed setbacks. He said he was skeptical of the
16 “aesthetics” motivation given by Symphony Homes, and asked that the Council reject the proposal
17 and send it back to the Planning Commission.
18

19 Allyson Hale – Ms. Hale said she lived in the Lexington Park Subdivision near 2025 North.
20 She said she echoed everything that had been said. She thanked the Council for the opportunity
21 to comment. Ms. Hale emphasized that the 2025 North/400 West intersection was dangerous.
22 She said she had been interested for some time in moving to the subject property when it was
23 developed, but was not interested in living in the subdivision as planned. She asked that the plan
24 be reworked so it would be safe.
25

26 Trent Packer – Mr. Packer said he was a Centerville City resident near Freedom Hills
27 Park. He said his family used 2025 North to access Frontage Road frequently, and agreed that
28 traffic was a concern. He agreed that drainage was very much an issue. Mr. Packer suggested
29 planning for the best and expecting the best. He requested the Council not approve the proposal
30 as submitted.
31

32 Spencer Packer – Mr. Packer said he shared the setback and density concerns already
33 expressed. He spoke of access rights to property he owned north of the subject property. He
34 expressed concern with the current plat proposal, stating that proposed access for his property
35 that was shown on the plat at the Planning Commission level, was removed for the City Council
36 presentation. He said he challenged Symphony Homes’ attempt to remove his access. He
37 emphasized that the access issue was not resolved.
38

39 Kirk Fowers – Mr. Fowers said he lived on 400 West, and said he appreciated the
40 opportunity to express concerns. He said he believed all parties concerned had the same goal: to
41 create a balanced solution. Mr. Fowers said the residents who had spoken trusted the Council to
42 balance their concerns with the desires of Symphony Homes within the PDO. He asked the
43 Council to send the proposal back with a goal of adding access to Frontage Road, setbacks that
44 more closely matched the neighboring development, and a drainage system that would be
45 adequate for the ground water and storm water that was a part of the natural topography.
46

47 Marc Holyoak – Mr. Holyoak said he lived on 2025 North. He shared traffic counts he
48 collected in front of his home, and questioned the estimated traffic impact provided by Symphony
49 Homes. Mr. Holyoak asked that the Council reject the proposal.
50

51 Kelly Brown – Mr. Brown said he lived on 725 West near 2025 North. He expressed
52 concern with the higher density requested for the west side of the subject property, stating he
53 believed it to be out of character for the area. He said he believed direct access to Frontage Road

1 would relieve traffic stress that the proposed development would cause. He asked the Council to
2 reject the plan and send it back for reconsideration.

3
4 Mary Brown – Ms. Brown said she echoed the concerns expressed. She stated the traffic
5 data provided was incorrect.

6
7 Mayor Wilkinson closed the public hearing at 9:50 p.m. Referring to the many citizen
8 requests that the Council send the project back to the Planning Commission, Mr. Snyder stated
9 the application was a complex legislative matter already reviewed and recommended by the
10 Planning Commission. Responding to other public comments, Mr. Snyder explained that the PDO
11 allowed the Council to alter the base zoning and vary setback standards, but the Council was not
12 obligated to vary the setback standards. He commented that, as a planner, he liked the idea of
13 providing multiple accesses and options for traffic; however, he acknowledged differing
14 professional opinions related to Frontage Road and street planning. Mr. Snyder stated that every
15 development was required to handle its own drainage. He expressed confidence that the
16 developer would be able to address drainage on the property.

17
18 Kevin Campbell, City Engineer, said one of the main drainage challenges for the Woods
19 Park PDO was the fact that it was an island of property developed without the benefit of continued
20 east-to-west drainage planning. He emphasized that the proposed development's ability to plan
21 the drainage system from Main Street to Frontage Road was a benefit. Mr. Campbell stated the
22 subject property may be affected by the planned West Davis Corridor, but the City could not base
23 decisions on that eventuality until property had changed hands with UDOT. He said he was
24 confident the subdrain system would lower the ground water table and protect basements as long
25 as it was maintained. Mr. Campbell said he greatly respected the safety concerns. He said the
26 streets would handle the traffic, and referred to the Pineae Gardens development with outlets at
27 both Main Street and 400 West.

28
29 City Manager Brant Hanson clarified that no off-ramp was planned for the area. He said
30 the Council would discuss adding funding to the budget for a crossing guard at the 2025 North/400
31 West intersection later in the meeting.

32
33 Russell Wilson, applicant, said Symphony Homes relied on professional traffic engineers
34 and discussions with UDOT, who all stressed that safety would be a concern if access to Frontage
35 Road were included. He stated access to Frontage Road would increase the amount of traffic that
36 entered the proposed development. He showed a rough design of the subdivision with Frontage
37 Road access, and said Symphony Homes would include access if directed, but emphasized that
38 it was not their preferred choice. He said Symphony Homes relied on professional drainage
39 engineers for the drainage plan, and said the development may be the only neighborhood in
40 Centerville with a fully integrated drainage system from Main Street to Frontage Road.

41
42 Bruce Robinson with Symphony Homes said he appreciated the civil nature of the public
43 meeting, and said Symphony Homes took citizen input seriously. He said Frontage Road access
44 would be added if directed, but said they felt the plan would be safer without. Mr. Robinson said
45 without the requested setback adjustments, the entire development would become more
46 homogenous, which would affect the aesthetics. Mr. Robinson said both revenue and aesthetics
47 mattered to Symphony Homes. He said he liked the idea of different types of product in the
48 development.

49
50 Mr. Snyder said he understood the desire for like-development next to like-development.
51 However, he pointed out that aesthetics was an issue with such planning. He emphasized the
52 need to provide a range of housing types within a community, and stated that creating lots in a
53 homogenous way with increased housing prices, did not fit a lot of lifestyles.

1 Councilmember McEwan stated the proposed development was the lowest possible
2 density across the amount of land involved that the City could get, which he said was important
3 to him. He said he would rather have a well-planned development with fairly low density in terms
4 of the overall project. He said he knew there were many people who wanted homes with small
5 yards. Councilmember McEwan said adding access to Frontage Road would take care of a large
6 portion of the concerns expressed by citizens.
7

8 Councilmember Fillmore said she believed diversity of lot sizes was a benefit. She asked
9 if it would be possible with the PDO to limit garage width to a certain percentage of front
10 elevations. Mr. Snyder confirmed such a limit would be possible at this stage in the process. She
11 said she agreed with safety concerns expressed, and said she felt strongly about the need for
12 connectivity and would be in favor of the Frontage Road access shown by Symphony Homes.
13 Councilmember Fillmore asked for Mr. Campbell's viewpoint on safety concerns with Frontage
14 Road access. Mr. Campbell said Frontage Road access, if allowed, should be pushed as far to
15 the north as possible to give as much distance from the 2025 North connection as possible. Mr.
16 Snyder said the Council could table action and direct Staff to review related issues.
17 Councilmember Fillmore said she would like to solve the matter at the legislative level. She
18 suggested the Council make adjustments they believed were necessary.
19

20 Councilmember Mecham said she was impressed with the neighborhood members. She
21 said she would not consider approving the PDO without Frontage Road access. She expressed
22 concern with proposed lot sizes, and said she would want the extremely small lots adjusted.
23 Councilmember Mecham asked that the PDO specify a minimum house size, said she agreed the
24 City needed to be careful with the drainage issue, and said she agreed the matter did not need to
25 be returned to the Planning Commission.
26

27 Councilmember Ince said he would like to hear more from Staff regarding the statement
28 that adding Frontage Road access would create problems. He said he believed it would be unfair
29 to existing residents in the area to add the amount of traffic the proposed development would add.
30 He said he agreed with Councilmember Mecham that the smallest proposed lot sizes were too
31 small. Councilmember Ince referred to previous experience in the City with HOAs having not
32 adequately maintained drainage systems, and said he believed the proposed arrangement would
33 open the door to problems. Councilmember Ivie said she agreed.
34

35 Responding to a question from Councilmember Mecham, Mr. Snyder said the lot sizes in
36 the Sheffield Downs Subdivision were smaller than the lot sizes proposed for the Summerhill Lane
37 Subdivision. Councilmember Ivie said she had walked the property and stood in the water. She
38 said she agreed with the need for diversity in housing, but said she believed the smallest proposed
39 lot sizes were too small. She said she believed traffic was already a problem in the area. Mr.
40 Campbell explained that typical city street right-of-way width was 50 feet, and typical asphalt
41 pavement width was 29 feet. Councilmember Ivie said she agreed there was a risk of bringing
42 traffic from Frontage Road into the development, but said the obvious danger of increasing traffic
43 on existing streets was of more concern to her. She stated she would vote against the proposal
44 without Frontage Road access.
45

46 Councilmember McEwan emphasized that he requested the CC&Rs include a
47 requirement to maintain the drainage system. The PDO allowed the City to require an integrated
48 drainage system, and the CC&Rs would provide the HOA with the right to enforce maintenance
49 of the system.

1 The Council discussed the proposed lot sizes on the west portion of the property.
2 Councilmember Mecham said she trusted Symphony Homes to come up with a proposal that
3 increased the sizes of the smallest proposed lots.
4

5 Mr. Campbell said it was his understanding that UDOT was trying to obtain property
6 needed for the West Davis Corridor project. He estimated that UDOT negotiations with Symphony
7 Homes could take place before homes were built.
8

9 Councilmember McEwan said he believed the community needed to look at reduced
10 landscaping options for the future, and suggested smaller yards were one way to achieve that
11 goal. Councilmember Mecham said she did not want Symphony Homes to even out the sizes of
12 all the lots, but repeated that she felt some of the lots were too small. The Council discussed the
13 comments from residents who expressed confidence in Symphony Homes, and residents who
14 said they wanted to see the property developed.
15

16 City Attorney Lisa Romney agreed with Councilmember McEwan that including a drainage
17 maintenance requirement in the CC&Rs would provide additional assurance that the drainage
18 system would be properly maintained with HOA enforcement. She said she agreed with the
19 suggestion to require additional information on the proposed drainage system and suggested
20 adding a condition to require a drainage easement and note on the plat.
21

22 Mr. Snyder pointed out that the recommendation from the Planning Commission included
23 a condition that the access matter with the Packer property be resolved. Ms. Romney expressed
24 the opinion that the Packer property access matter was a private dispute that needed to be settled
25 between the parties or resolved by a court of law. Ms. Romney said the City did not have authority
26 or jurisdiction to determine whether Mr. Packer has a prescriptive easement over or across
27 Symphony's property. The City's authority in this matter is to review and consider the zoning and
28 subdivision ordinances applicable to the application. Ms. Romney further noted the City is not in
29 the position to settle this dispute and that it would be problematic for the City to try to regulate a
30 solution. Applicable ordinances merely require new development to provide reasonable access
31 for future development. Ms. Romney stated it was her opinion the City did not have the authority
32 to hold up plat approval over this dispute.
33

34 Mayor Wilkinson commented there were many connections to Frontage Road, but there
35 were few thoroughfares providing north to south access. Councilmember Fillmore **moved** to table
36 this matter to the next Council meeting directing the applicant to work with Staff and bring back a
37 suggested plat with connection to Frontage Road, and front elevation designs with proposed
38 maximum garage widths under 40% if adjusted setbacks were desired. Councilmember Ince
39 **moved to amend** the motion adding direction for the applicant to explain why they could not do
40 something to shift some of the lot sizes and increase the size of the smallest lots, and specify a
41 minimum house size on lots less than 10,000 square feet. Councilmember Mecham seconded
42 the motion to amend. Councilmember Fillmore said she was uncomfortable with the motion to
43 amend because she did not believe the Council should dictate the market. She pointed out that
44 the ordinance allowed for gross calculation of density, and stated she did not believe the Council
45 should push against the ordinance. Councilmember Fillmore stated the applicant did not request
46 a density bonus. Councilmember McEwan said he believed the two motions together would be
47 trying to pull too many levers.
48

49 Councilmember Mecham said she wanted to require a minimum house size because the
50 applicant stated a desire to put larger homes on smaller lots as the reason for requesting the
51 setback variance. She said she did not want them to come back later proposing small house
52 sizes. Mr. Snyder said the City had dictated elevations before, but not house size. He suggested
53 the Council focus on pulling the levers that would accomplish what they were wanting.

Councilmembers McEwan and Fillmore discussed that requiring Frontage Road access would involve a revision of the plan. Mr. Campbell revised his earlier thought, stating that with the master planned road at 2150 North, Frontage Road access for the proposed development should probably be centered between 2025 North and the planned 2150 North. The Council discussed the motion and motion to amend. Mayor Wilkinson called the question, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0). The **motion to amend passed** by majority vote (3-2), with Councilmembers Mecham, Ince, and Ivie in favor, and Councilmembers McEwan and Fillmore dissenting. Councilmember Fillmore said she agreed that with both motions together, too many levers were being pulled. The amended motion directing the applicant to work with Staff and bring back a suggested plat with connection to Frontage Road, front elevation designs with proposed maximum garage widths under 40% if adjusted setbacks were desired, explain why they could not shift some of the lot sizes and increase the size of the smallest lots (or alternatively make the change), and specify a minimum house size was restated. Councilmember Mecham seconded the **amended motion**, which **passed** by majority vote (3-2), with Councilmembers Fillmore, Mecham, and Ince in favor, and Councilmembers McEwan and Ivie dissenting.

The Council took a break at 11:25 p.m., and returned at 11:32 p.m.

FINANCE REPORT

Marcus Arbuckle, the City's Contract CPA Advisor, presented a financial report for the quarter ending September 30, 2020. The Council and Staff discussed CARES Act funding.

PUBLIC HEARING – FY 2021 BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Jacob Smith, Administrative Services Director, presented the following proposed amendments to the FY 2021 Budget:

General Fund

Revenues:

- Increase Sales Tax revenue to \$3,449,801 (an increase of \$125,988)
- Increase other Admin Overhead revenue by \$24,363 to cover shared expenses
- Increase CARES Act money by \$524,054 – receive 2nd tranche

Expenditures:

- Restore service levels in both streets and parks - \$32,000
- Capital Equipment purchases including a police vehicle, police storage container, grapple bucket, and salt rack - \$70,000
- Personnel – additional streets employee at \$39,151 (for remainder of year), crossing guards at 400 West for \$8,200, police uniforms for new personnel at \$1,000
- Increase CARES Act related expenses by \$524,054

Total increase in expenditures - \$150,351

Park Fund

Budget for transfer from the RDA to the Park Fund for the purchase and development of park property - \$350,000

Mayor Wilkinson opened a public hearing at 11:50 p.m.

Brendon Allen – Mr. Allen expressed appreciation to the Council for considering and approving a crossing guard at 400 West.

1 The Mayor closed the public hearing at 11:51 p.m. Councilmember McEwan **moved** to
2 adopt Resolution No. 2020-30 amending the Fiscal Year 2021 Centerville City Budget.
3 Councilmember Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

4 **PARRISH LANE – MARKET PLACE DRIVE AND 400 WEST INTERSECTION**
5 **DISCUSSION**
6

7 At the Council's October 6, 2020 work session, UDOT representatives and Staff proposed
8 to the Council that combining the Parrish Lane/400 West intersection and Parrish Lane/Market
9 Place Drive intersection projects would yield cost savings and construction benefits. The projects
10 were currently scheduled to be built separately in 2022 and 2023. Mayor Wilkinson and
11 Councilmembers expressed support for combining the projects during the October 6 work session.
12

13 Councilmember McEwan **moved** to approve combining the Parrish Lane/400 West
14 intersection and the Parrish Lane/Market Place Drive intersection projects into one project.
15 Councilmember Ince seconded the motion. Councilmember Ince said he could see the logic in
16 combining the projects, but did not like thinking about the temporary impact construction would
17 cause. Councilmembers Ince and Ivie stated they believed the City was better off with the Parrish
18 Lane/Main Street intersection before it was rebuilt, and they were not happy with the proposed
19 end product for the other two intersections. Councilmember Fillmore said it was her experience
20 that the intersection lights were very reactive when sensors were set correctly. Councilmember
21 McEwan said he believed the Parrish Lane/Market Place Drive intersection project had been
22 overdue for years. He said he wanted to get the projects done to alleviate the existing problems.
23 The motion passed by majority vote (4-1), with Councilmember Ivie dissenting.
24

25 **RANDALL PROPERTY PURCHASE AGREEMENT AND FUNDING**
26

27 The City Council previously authorized the City Manager and Mayor to negotiate and enter
28 into a Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) with the owners of the Randall Property located at
29 285 North 100 East. The City entered into a fully executed REPC with the owners of the Randall
30 Property. The agreed upon purchase price for the property was \$300,000 plus all closing costs to
31 be paid by the City. Mr. Hanson recommended the Randall Property be purchased by the City
32 with funds from the Parks Capital Improvements Fund. As previously agreed, the RDA would
33 provide the funds for the purchase of the property, to be accomplished by transferring funds from
34 the RDA to the Parks Capital Improvements Fund. It was recommended the Council approve up
35 to \$350,000 for the purchase of the property including closing costs and demolition costs.
36

37 Councilmember Ince **moved** to ratify approval of the REPC and approve funding for the
38 purchase of the Randall Property located at 285 North 100 East. Councilmember Mecham
39 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
40

41 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**
42

43 Minutes of the October 6, 2020 Work Session and City Council Meeting were reviewed.
44 Councilmember McEwan **moved** to accept both sets of minutes. Councilmember Ince seconded
45 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
46

47 **CITY COUNCIL REPORT**
48

49 Councilmember Fillmore stated she did not have additional information to report.
50

51 **MAYOR'S REPORT**
52

- 53
- Mayor Wilkinson reported a new bike park had opened in Ogden City.

- The Mayor reminded the Council of the “Walk-tober” program sponsored by Centerville Cares.
- Mayor Wilkinson reported on businesses that recently opened in Centerville, and reported that the new Veterans Park in Bountiful City was completed.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

- Mr. Hanson reported Staff was researching the possibility of a cemetery ballot initiative.
- The City received applications for the City Recorder position and would begin interviewing the following week.
- Mr. Hanson updated the Council on CARES Act funding. He said he would be exploring the possibility of using some of the funds to cover the CenterPoint Theatre rent responsibility. Councilmember Ivie suggested directing compensation to City crossing guards for days school was not in session. Mr. Hanson said he would look in the possibility.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12:15 a.m., Councilmember McEwan **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

City Recorder/Deputy City Recorder

Date Approved

Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

11/4/2020

Item No. 6.

Short Title: City Council Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Councilmember Bill Ince

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

City Council may report on meetings/events attended and issues discussed in meetings/events attended by a Councilmember in their official capacity as the City's representative.

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

11/4/2020

Item No. 7

Short Title: Mayor's Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

This is the Mayor's opportunity to make appointments and report on meetings/events attended and issues discussed in meetings/events attended, in his official capacity as the City's representative.

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
11/4/2020**

Item No. 8.

Short Title: City Manager's Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

This is the City Manager's opportunity to give notice to the City Council of current events impacting the City.