

CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2013, AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER AND CITY HALL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

Meetings of the City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Blaine Lutz, Centerville Finance Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. This agenda is also posted on the City's website: www.centervilleut.net.

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

- 7:00 A. Welcome and Roll Call
- B. Opening Comment / Legislative Prayer
- C. Minutes Review and Acceptance – January 9, 2013
- D. Commission Business

- 7:05 1. **PUBLIC HEARING – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, CHAPTER 12-490, MODERATE INCOME HOUSING PLAN [Tabled from January 9, 2013 Meeting]**
 - Consideration of a General Plan Amendment, Chapter 12-490, Moderate, Income Housing Plan; which consists of a significant reassessment of the City's "moderate income housing" element. Centerville City, Applicant

- 7:45 2. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
 - a. Upcoming Meetings
 - PC Meeting February 13, 2013: Pineae Grower's Outlet CUP, Wasatch Running Center, Woods Park PDO
 - Agenda 21 explanation from staff

- 7:50 E. **Adjournment**

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, January 9, 2013

7:00 p.m.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tamilyn Fillmore

Kent Holbrook

Brian Holman

Scott Kjar

Steven Markham

Kevin Merrill

Debra Randall

STAFF PRESENT

Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director

Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

VISITORS

Esther Ewell

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER

Commissioner Fillmore

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held December 12, 2012 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Randall made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kjar and passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Election of a Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for 2013

Commissioner Holbrook nominated Kevin Merrill to serve as Chair of the Planning Commission for 2013 and Commissioner Randall nominated Tamilyn Fillmore for the same. The Planning Commission voted on Kevin Merrill for Chair of the Planning Commission for 2013.

The vote passed with a 4-3 vote. Commissioners Kjar, Randall, and Fillmore opposed. Commissioner Merrill will serve as Chair of the Planning Commission for 2013.

Commissioner Merrill nominated Commissioner Fillmore to serve as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2013. The Planning Commission voted and unanimously agreed (7-0). Commissioner Fillmore will serve as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2013.

Chair Merrill delegated the continued conducting of this meeting to Vice Chair Fillmore.

Annual Training and Work Program Goals

The Planning Commission reviewed a list of possible training items distributed by Lisa Romney, City Attorney and the list of Work Program goals as prepared and prioritized by the Planning Commission and City Council in 2012. Ms. Romney explained the State requires mandatory training on conflict of interest and the open meetings act. In addition, the Commission may choose a few other items to be trained on throughout the year. The Commission agreed that multiple shorter trainings pertaining to upcoming applications would be beneficial. Commissioner Holbrook said training about the west side plan would be helpful, as it seems applications for this area of the city are most prevalent at this time. Commissioner Fillmore suggested the sign ordinance be added to the Work Program list as a high priority. It seems electronic signs have become a hot topic and could become an issue for Centerville in the near future. The Commission agreed. The Commission also agreed to continue working on the Work Program goals as already established. Commissioner Fillmore also distributed a list of work priorities prepared by her a few years ago with input from the Commission. The Commission agreed to continue working on this list as well.

PUBLIC HEARING – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, CHAPTER 12-490, MODERATE INCOME HOUSING PLAN (Tabled from December 12, 2012) - Consideration of a General Plan Amendment, Chapter 12-490, Moderate Income Housing Plan; which consists of a significant reassessment of the City's "moderate income housing" element. Centerville City, Applicant.

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reminded the Commission this item is being continued from the last meeting. Tonight the Commission should continue the public hearing and their discussion regarding the matter. Following tonight's discussion staff will prepare a new draft of the proposed ordinance for further action at the next Commission meeting.

Commissioner Fillmore opened the public hearing.

1 Esther Ewell, 809 South 650 East, said she spoke with the Parks Director who told her to
2 come tonight to discuss her request. She said she lives near Island View Park and her children
3 frequently play at that park. She said the playground equipment in this park is dilapidated and in
4 serious need of repair or replacement. She said this park is a popular location and she would like
5 to see it fixed.

6
7 Commissioner Fillmore apologized to Mrs. Ewell telling her this is the wrong venue for
8 this issue. She provided Mrs. Ewell with the dates and times of the next City Council meeting
9 and the next Parks and Recreation Committee meeting. Cory Snyder, Community Development
10 Director, said the Parks and Recreation Committee is aware of the need for new playground
11 equipment at this park and has called this out on a priority list. However, he is not sure if there is
12 budget available. He too encouraged Mrs. Ewell to contact the Parks and Recreation Committee
13 for further information.

14
15 The Commission reviewed the proposed amendment to the Moderate Income Housing
16 Plan page by page. The Commission called out several typographical, punctuation, and
17 numbering errors. In addition, they also discussed the vision and purpose of the proposed
18 amendment and made several other suggestions as follows.

19
20 Commissioner Fillmore said she believes this proposed document should provide the
21 tools necessary to encourage moderate income housing. State law requires cities to evaluate
22 average yearly incomes against the cost of available housing within a city. She said the proposed
23 Plan provides this evaluation and also calls out what will be needed to continue to meet moderate
24 income housing needs in the future. However, a side by side comparison within this document
25 would make it easier to read. She suggested the predicted Open Market Yield numbers (page 11)
26 be placed next to the Residential Use Types table (page 4). She also suggested a summary
27 statement be added to the beginning of the Plan (page 3, E) explaining that Centerville's goal is
28 to evaluate moderate income housing based on open market demand and that the open market
29 should not be prohibited. In addition, shifts in demographics should be recognized and tools
30 provided to meet the lifestyle demands of those changing demographics. Mr. Snyder will prepare
31 a summary statement as discussed to be reviewed at the next meeting.

32
33 Commissioner Kjar said in order for moderate income housing to succeed, zoning must
34 be provided to allow for such. This means smaller lots, higher density, and more rental
35 opportunities. He explained the reality of moderate income housing is often something citizens
36 do not want in their own neighborhoods. If Centerville is not willing to provide the necessary
37 tools and incentives then this plan will not work.

38

1 Mr. Snyder said the proposed plan encourages some tools that are currently missing
2 which will help provide opportunity for moderate income housing in all areas of the city. He said
3 the plan is not so aggressive as to require specific forms of moderate income housing, but does
4 call out options. Moderate income housing may not happen in all neighborhoods but the
5 possibility should be provided.

6
7 Commissioner Fillmore stated at the last meeting the Commission discussed rental units
8 and the recognition that not all rental units have been evaluated and/or calculated with regard to
9 this plan. She suggested a statement be provided explaining this. Mr. Snyder said there is no way
10 to accurately calculate the number of rentals within a city (i.e., rented homes, rented basements,
11 etc). He said he will provide a statement explaining this discrepancy to be reviewed at the next
12 meeting.

13
14 Mr. Snyder said the estimated future need table (page 7) will be expanded to include
15 County data as required by State law. Commissioner Fillmore said it may be beneficial to include
16 some stronger language in this section pointing out the weaknesses of using this table.

17
18 Commissioner Holman suggested, as discussed at the last meeting, including a paragraph
19 discussing other possible corridor options for mixed-use developments. The Commission agreed
20 and further decided to call out possible corridors by name.

21
22 Commissioner Fillmore said the 2002 Moderate Income Housing Plan states, "consider
23 adopting an accessory dwelling ordinance to allow for accessory units as a conditional use in all
24 residential zones." She suggested adding this language to the proposed Plan (page 13) as stated.
25 She said this is aggressive language but it is important to realize this concept was encouraged in
26 2002 and has essentially been ignored for the past ten years. It would also be beneficial to
27 include the reasons this concept was encouraged in 2002. She realizes this is a hot topic and that
28 many issues arise as a result, but believes the concept is appropriate. She explained this is only a
29 General Plan statement and is encouraged only as a conditional use. The majority of the
30 Commission agreed.

31
32 Commissioner Fillmore said she is not convinced that flag lots are a good option for
33 providing moderate income housing. She said it seems all the flag lots in the community have
34 been used to supply only single-family homes. She asked how flag lots may be used for
35 moderate income housing. Mr. Snyder said flag lots are a limited use in Centerville and can
36 provide for moderate income in a reverse order. That is they supply a property owner the
37 opportunity to supplement their own income and perhaps allow that property owner to maintain
38 their own current housing.

39

Commissioner Kjar made a **motion** to table this item and continue both the discussion and the public hearing until the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Randall and passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on January 23, 2013.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Tamilyn Fillmore, Vice Chair

Date Approved

Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

A. Background

Title 10, Chapter 9a, Section 403 of the Utah Code Annotated requires all municipalities to adopt a Moderate Income Housing element and Section 408 requires the cities to biennially review their “moderate income housing” element of the General Plan. Centerville’s Moderate Income Housing Element was originally adopted in February of 2002. Additionally, the City has submitted several biennial reports to the State, as required.

However, since the initial adoption of the plan element, there has not been a significant reassessment of “moderate income housing” status for the City. Therefore, both the Planning Commission and City Council have deemed it a priority to update the City’s Moderate Income Housing Element, as shown on the 2012/2013 list of planning priorities.

B. Summary of Past Findings of the 2002 Moderate Income Housing Plan

Listed below is a brief narrative of the adopted findings or conclusions of the initial plan element to address the requirements of the statute:

- a) Approximately 20% of the housing stock sales and assessments were deemed affordable and supply was likely adequate for that moment in time.*
- b) Generally, the affordable housing stock was built prior to 1990 and mainly consisted of condominiums rather than single-family homes. Less than 10% of the new construction (after 1990) would likely be affordable.*
- c) It was assumed moderate income population would remain at 20% in*

the “near” future. Thus, with growth in population, new affordable housing would need to be built.

- d) Given, existing land costs and property values, existing and projected zoning, construction trends, etc. it is unlikely that any new housing stock constructed would be affordable to meet the new demands assuming a sustained 20% moderate income population.*
- e) Approximately 80% of the City’s housing stock consisted of single family homes. The 2000 Census indicated a decline in household size and an increase in the median age and an increase with both young adults and seniors. These changes may point to the need for a wider variety of housing types.*
- f) There was a lack of supply with regards to rental housing and it may be getting smaller. The Census 2000 numbers indicated a 5% decrease in renter occupied housing from the 1990 Census.*

C. Summary of 2002 Plan’s Past Strategies to Promote Moderate Income Housing

The previous strategies were developed using both the required state criterion and a few local ideas. These strategies were as follows:

State Strategies:

- a) Rezoning – Consider some additional multi-family zoning districts.*
- b) Density Bonus – Consider a binding commitment to provide affordable housing when granting density bonuses.*

- c) Mandatory Set Asides – Consider setting aside specific properties for exclusive development of moderate income housing.
- d) Infrastructure Expansion – The use of infrastructure expansion as a “technique” will likely have limited applicability for Centerville.
- e) Rehabilitation of Uninhabitable Housing – This “technique” will likely play no role in Centerville’s Plan.
- f) Waiving Construction & Other Related Fees – Because such fees are relatively small compared to land and construction costs, fee waivers may need to be coupled with other incentives.
- g) Use of Federal and State Funds or Incentives – Providing information about such programs may be useful and the City may need to consider requiring participation in such programs to receive any local incentives.

Other Local Strategies:

- h) Consider Allowing Accessory Units - The use of accessory units throughout the community could potentially provide a source of moderate income housing.
- i) Create More Flexible Zoning Classifications – Options to consider were:
 - a. Use R-2 and R-3 Zoning to accommodate multi-family development.
 - b. Consider using “mixed use” zoning classifications.
 - c. Promote a variety of lots sizes with overall lot density standards rather than minimum lot sizes.

- d. Consider using flexible performance based zoning.
- e. Review and consider “Envision Utah’s” production of tools and model ordinances, as a starting point in creating flexible zoning incentives.

D. Summary of Centerville’s Previous Implementation Efforts

Centerville has made or taken significant efforts to implement the strategies of the 2002 Moderate Income Housing Plan. These efforts have resulted in opportunities for various types of housing to be preserved or to be developed. Listed below is a summary the efforts and opportunities that have occurred over the past decade.

2003:

- a) Zoning Ordinance Overhaul
 - ✓ Eliminated minimum lot sizes for most residential districts
 - ✓ Established a gross density standard for each district
 - ✓ Changes allows flexible lots sizes to encourage a range of home pricing in each development
- b) Garden View Apartments
 - ✓ 1st new apartment complex (59 townhome style units) using the new Residential High (R-H) Zone, which allows up to 12 units per acre.

2004:

- c) General Plan Modification
 - ✓ Encourage greater density in the Northwest Neighborhood Area
 - ✓ Locate such density near service areas and where transportation options are most available

2006:

- d) Pineae Village Estates

- ✓ *A master planned community of 227 dwelling units was approved allowing a variety of housing types; Single family homes 49, Townhomes 94, Stacked flat dwellings 84.*

2007:

e) Zoning Ordinance Update

- ✓ *Removed the five (5) acre minimum for any residential development desiring to use the Planned Development Overlay District, a density centered incentive based zoning tool.*

2008

f) General Plan/Zoning – Main Street Corridor Plan

- ✓ *Accentuated the existing local commercial zoning district to allow flexible uses using a form based code. Uses from single family to multi-family dwellings were introduced to create mixed use focal areas along the corridor.*
- ✓ *Changes implemented the Wasatch 2040 Plan to establish the desired boulevard community within Centerville.*

g) Cedar Springs Condominiums

- ✓ *Preservation - CBDG funds were used to improve access streets and utilities for the 200-unit Cedar Springs development.*

2009

h) Pheasantbrook Condominiums

- ✓ *Preservation - CBDG funds were used to improve access streets and drainage system for the 144-unit Pheasantbrook development.*

2010:

i) Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane

- ✓ *A Master Planned Mixed Use development, which approved 158 apartments, a complex of three buildings; 2 buildings with 64 dwellings each and 1 building with 30 units.*

E. Guiding Principles of the Moderate Income Housing Plan Element

The guiding principles that are being used to give direction to the Moderate Income Housing Plan are as follows:

1. The Plan update recognizes that, over the past decade, the City has made significant strides in its efforts to alter or modify Zoning Regulations to encourage the development of a variety of housing types.
2. Each city's market characteristics and demands will vary from one to another, the primary focus of the Plan is to regularly track and review the City's housing stock types in order to improve the decisions made regarding community plan updates and zone map amendments.
3. Due to political and geographical constraints, the Plan additionally focuses on the efficient use of existing infrastructure and utilizes "infill" or "redevelopment" scenarios that might assist with creating moderate income housing.
4. Lastly, the basic tenant of livable communities is "good design," particularly when providing more density to encourage development lesser housing types.

F. Moderate Income Housing Plan

In the case of the Moderate Income Housing Plan, the **Guiding Policies and Directives of the Plan** are expressed using the required elements or strategies of 10-9a.-403, as well other strategies identified by the City. Each element is addressed

separately within the Plan and consists of the following:

- A survey of the total residential land use.
- An estimate of existing housing supply.
- An estimate of need over the next five (5) years.
- Evaluation of how existing land uses and zones affect opportunities for moderate income housing
- A description of the plan to encourage an adequate supply of moderate income housing.

Within the descriptive “element” of the Plan, various required analyses or strategies are identified and any associated conclusions or policies related to these strategies are listed and explained. **These strategies, conclusions, or policies are to be used in the decision-making process for land use ordinance amendments, applicable land use application reviews, and/or related capital improvement programs.** Additionally, each element or strategy may be accompanied by descriptive text that is intended to assist with the understanding the purpose, intent, and interpretation of the strategy as it relates to moderate income housing in Centerville.

PLAN ELEMENTS**PLAN ELEMENT 1:****1. A Survey of Total Residential Land Use.**

The statute requires cities to conduct a survey of the total residential land use. Such an assessment for the City was made using the City's GIS system and data from the County Recorder's and Assessor's Offices, and the City's Building Department to perform the survey. Within the survey, housing was categorized into "use types" labeled single-family, townhomes and duplexes, and multi-family. These are the common categories used for various reports and surveys regarding residential uses and are similarly used later in this plan element. Furthermore, due to the difficulty of obtaining reliable data, the distinctive isolation and evaluation of apartments or rentals was not performed and was either assumed or combined with the multi-family calculations.

Additionally, the survey includes the current zoning districts that contain any of the selected use types. The survey did not include whether the use types were within the allowed densities of a particular zone or determine the non-conforming status of a specific use type.

REVIEW/ANALYSIS:**A. Results of the Survey of Residential Use Types (as of 2012):**

<i>Res. Use Type</i>	<i>Zone Districts</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>%</i>
Single Family	A-L/R-L/R-M	3,852	73%
Townhomes/ Duplexes	A-L/R-M/ R-H/ R-H(PD)	981	19%
Multi-family (inc. apartments)	R-L/R-M/ R-H/R-H(PD) C-VH(PD)	423	8%
Total Units = 5,256			100%

Table 1

B. Survey Synopsis – From review of the data, single family dwellings are the predominate residential use type. This is not unusual for most cities and more particularly in other similar small communities. However, the townhome/duplex residential use type is higher than a normal an open market yield (see City Strategy 8). Thus, it can be deduced that, in spite of having a prevailing single family residential use type, Centerville's efforts to address moderate income housing since the adoption of the moderate income element have had a positive affect towards encouraging a variety of housing types.

C. Future Policy Considerations – The Wasatch area has grown rapidly in the last few decades, future residential needs for the City may likely reflect the following characteristics and trends:

- a) The region is predicted to continue to grow by as much as 2.2. percent per year.
- b) Two-thirds of this growth is expected to come from our children growing up, settling this area, and starting their own families.
- c) Utah's baby boomers had more children than their non-Utah counterparts and had them earlier in life.
- d) There are more single-parent households than in the past leading to added growth.
- e) Household diversity creates a demand for a variety of housing types to meet the different lifestyle groups.

PLAN ELEMENTS**PLAN ELEMENT 2:****2. An Evaluation of How Existing Land Uses and Zones Affect Opportunities for Moderate Income Housing.**

According to the publication “Urban Planning Tools for Quality Growth” the evaluation of zoning densities is one of the biggest factors in making housing affordable. “If the wide spread practice of zoning for mostly large-lot homes is not modified, economic problems will increase and people will be extremely limited in their life style and household choices (*Chapter 2 - Meeting Housing Needs, page, 31*).

Since the original adoption of the City’s Moderate Income Housing Element, the City has implemented several changes to its Zoning Ordinance (*see Section “D” of this Plan Element*) to encourage the development of a variety of housing choices. These changes have allowed greater densities in areas of redevelopment that can capitalize on the efficient use of existing infrastructure or created projects with housing choices that do not result in typical large-lot style development.

REVIEW/ANALYSIS:**A. Existing Zoning District Opportunities:**

	Zones	Acres	Density Capacity
Standard Zoning	Ag. Low (A-L)	487	974
	Res. Low (R-L)	1,127	4,508
	Res. Med. (R-M)	118	944
	Res. High (R-H)	45	540
Mixed Use/ Flexible Zoning	FVSD	19	70
	R-H/ (PD)	30	227
	West Side/ Mixed Use Overlay	~ 50	750
	So. Main Street/ Mixed Use Overlay	~19	196 to 392
	C-VH(PD)/ Mixed Use Overlay	30	206
Totals		1,925	8,415 to 8,611

Table 1

B. Evaluation Synopsis – From review of the information, the typical standard zoning used by the City predominately consisted of single family, low-density, development. However, since the adoption of the 2002 Moderate Income Element, the City has implemented several flexible zoning tools that allow opportunities for various housing types. These efforts should be supported and continued into the future.

C. Future Policy Considerations – Decisions regarding land use planning in the future should consider the following:

- As people move through life’s stages, they ought to be able to live and/or grow up in the same community.
- Increase opportunities for redevelopment to reduce the demand for new extensions of utility lines and services.
- Encourage the development of sustainable and walkable neighborhoods, where employment, goods, and services can be obtained with less driving.
- Encourage opportunities for establishing a variety of housing types in keeping with the incomes range of more families.

PLAN ELEMENTS**PLAN ELEMENT 3:****3. An Estimate of City's Existing Supply of Moderate Income Housing.**

In order to estimate the available supply of moderate income housing, the city staff obtained parcel and improvement valuation data from Davis County. The 2011 Market Values (not the taxable value) data was queried using the City's GIS system and broken down into 50K increments. The "market value contained both land and improvement value (if present) of all residential type properties.

Additionally, the city staff used several web-based home affordability calculators to develop the potential home purchase range to estimate the existing supply. The short-comings for this analysis are that the County's market data may be on the low end of the scale and it is difficult to adequately estimate the debt amount of various households while calculating the potential purchase price. Thus, the estimated supply may be somewhat generous.

Nonetheless, with the current housing market recession (correction of home values) and the broad data set available for every housing type within the City, the estimated moderate income housing supply is better developed than the often used method of sampling some recent housing sales within the City.

REVIEW/ANALYSIS:**A. Estimate of Supply:**

County's Market Value	Residential Unit Counts	Estimated Supply
0-50K	95	-
50K – 100K	260	260
100K – 150K	1133	1133
150K – 200K	1447	1447
200K – 250K	897	-
250K – 300K	931	-
300K – 350K	459	-
350K or more	472	-
Total	5,694	2,840

Table 2

B. Existing Supply Synopsis – According to the 2012 Median Family Income Documentation System (HUD publication), the moderate income level for the Ogden-Clearfield MSA (which includes Davis County) is \$71,500. Thus, an 80% of moderate income level would be an annual income \$57,200. At current market rates (2012) and assuming a family unit with two children, this allows a possible home purchase price ranging from about \$175,000 to just over just over \$200,000, depending the type of loan (e.g. FHA, VA, or Conventional). Thus, the estimated supply of moderate income housing for Centerville is potentially 2,840 units or about 49% of the City's housing stock.

Future Policy Considerations – Future decisions about land use planning for the City should consider the following:

- The housing mix of the Greater Wasatch area will change in the next 20 years (*see publications for state population forecasts*).
- There will be a rise in senior households (>60 yrs. old) from 21 to 27 percent.
- Household size will decline from an average of 3.15 to 2.78 persons by 2020.
- Fewer two-income households will likely be a result (need to do more with less).
- There will be a demand for housing types needing less maintenance.

*PLAN ELEMENT 4:***4. An Estimate of the City's Future Need of Moderate Income Housing.**

In order to estimate the future need of moderate income housing, the city staff used the 2009 Income, Earnings, and Wages Data that is available from City-Data.com. This helps to establish a baseline demand as to the status of available housing verses family incomes. The baseline demand indicates that 1,678 households fall at or below the County 80% MIH, which is approximately 31% of the City's residents (est. 3.1 persons in avg. household size). To estimate the future need this 31% is extrapolated to the estimated future buildout population of 20,154 (see *City's Impact Fee analysis*). A simplistic conclusion indicates the current supply will be able to meet the estimated future demand.

However, it is difficult to accurately predict changes over time and also there appears to be a number of families well below the 80% MIH standard or threshold. Thus, any policy decision about future needs ought to account for the short falls of this analysis. Thus, City should still consider establishing strategies for encouraging the development of moderate income housing within the City.

PLAN ELEMENTS*REVIEW/ANALYSIS:***A. Estimate of Future Need:**

2009 Estimate of Wages	Number of Households	Number of Total Households at or Below Moderate Income Level	
<10,000	13	Current Est. = 1,678	
10,000-20,000	146		
20,000-30,000	418		
30,000-40,000	201		
40,000-50,000	571		
50,000-60,000	329		
Existing Population		16,339	
Est. Existing Population w/ Moderate Income Need (Avg. 3.1 persons/household)		5,202	31%
Est. Future Population		20,154	
Est. Future Population w/ Moderate Income Need (Avg. 3.1 persons/household)		6,248	31%
Total Future Households (Avg. 3.1 persons/household)		Future Est. = 2,015	

Table 3

B. Future Needs Synopsis – Although the baseline supply is adequate for the current and projected future family incomes within the City, what can be deduced about future needs? The 2009 Income, Earnings, and Wages data depicts a number of families that are actually below the 80% MIH threshold (i.e. 1,349 households). Thus, the City needs to continue its efforts to encourage opportunities for alternative types of housing to be constructed within the City.

C. Future Policy Considerations – Future decisions about land use planning for the City should consider the following:

- Encouraging an open market yield of housing types.
- Supporting mixed-use or flexible development in selected areas of the city.
- A reuse of redevelopment or underutilized lands through flexible development standards, or other similar opportunities.

STRATEGIES - STATE STATUTE***State Statute Recommendations:*****5. Section 10-9a-403(ii) of the Utah Code Lists Several Means or Techniques That May be Considered in Providing a Realistic Opportunity for the Development of Moderate Income Housing.**

The state statute provides some suggested techniques for cities to consider in encouraging the preservation or future development of moderate income housing. The suggested techniques are not mandatory requirements to be implemented. These techniques are being outlined in the plan element so that decision-makers may understand and decide whether these potential ideas are applicable for the moderate income housing needs within the City. If such techniques, or parts thereof, are deemed realistic, then such ideas will be listed or incorporated in the "city strategies and objectives" described later in this plan.

State's Suggested Techniques:

- 5.A. Rezoning for densities necessary to assure the production of moderate income housing.
- 5.B. Facilitate the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that will encourage the construction of moderate income housing.
- 5.C. Encourage the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into moderate income housing.
- 5.D. Consider general fund subsidies to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the City.
- 5.E. Consider utilization of state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of moderate income housing.
- 5.F. Consider utilization of programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity.
- 5.G. Consider utilization of affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services.

*PLAN ELEMENTS**PLAN ELEMENT 5:***6. A Description of the City's Plan to Encourage an Adequate Supply of Moderate Income Housing.**

This section summarizes the City's chosen strategies to encourage a realistic opportunity for the preservation or development of moderate income housing. However, it is also the position of the City that the local government can only encourage the opportunity and that there are other forces at work that affect such opportunities.

Thus, it is the City's commitment to assist, where possible, to allow such opportunities and the identified strategies of this section will be individually addressed later in this plan.

City Strategies:

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

STRATEGIES – CITY EFFORTS***City Strategies:*****6-A. Continue to Support Allowing Mixed Use Zoning and Related Development in Strategic Areas of the City.**

The allowance and development of mixed use centers can encourage housing developments that have an improved chance of meeting the needs of moderate income families. Such housing areas create not only a variation in housing types and sizes, it can help with secondary living costs such as those associated with transportation where other modes (e.g. walking, biking, bus, van pools, etc.) can be more efficiently offered to mitigate the reliance on multiple vehicles, or reduce time and travel distances to work areas or obtaining basic services and products.

City Objectives:

- 6-A.1 Consider amending the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan to expand the mixed use concepts found in the Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane Development to surrounding areas, particularly west and south of this project area.
- 6-A.2 In the future, develop a strategic redevelopment plan in partnership with the property owners and residents within and around the Gateway Mixed Use Districts (i.e. South Main Street Corridor Plan area), and consider other corridor options (e.g. south ends of 400 west and the frontage road) to encourage actual development of a mixed use area with a residential component that includes opportunities for creating moderate income housing.
- 6-A.3 Remain committed to land use policies that support developing other future mixed-use for flexible use development areas.

STRATEGIES – CITY EFFORTS**City Strategies:****6-B. Monitor and Review Existing Housing Patterns the City in Comparison to a Pattern of an Open Market Yield.**

According to the publication “Urban Planning Tools for Quality Growth” background research data indicated that if existing zoning patterns among the Greater Wasatch Area remain in place until 2020, the housing supply yield would be:

- 77% Single-family
- 9% Townhomes and duplexes
- 14 % Apartments (multi-family)

Whereas, a 2020 demand based on income and demographic characteristics in an open market housing approach would yield:

- 60% Single-family
- 14% Townhomes and duplexes.
- 26% apartments (multi-family)

Although, each city’s market characteristics and demands will vary from one to another, the City should regularly track and review its housing stock types to improve the decisions made regarding community plan updates and zone map amendments.

City Objectives:**6-B.1 Evaluation of City’s Current Housing Supply Yield:**

<i>Residential Use Type</i>	<i>Current City’s Yield</i>	<i>Open Market Yield</i>
Single Family	73%	60%
Townhomes/ Duplexes	19%	14%
Multi-family (inc. apartments)	8%	26%

Table 4

6-B.2 Tabulate and review the housing stock or inventory of the City every five (5) years. Determine if there is a significant disparity between the developed housing supply verses an open market yield and if so, consider goals for the next two years to alter or change land use related policies or identify opportunities to encourage a more open market yield.

6-B.3 Review the existing and projected demographics and characteristics of the City every five (5) years. Use such information to identify the existing potential future economic needs of residents and determine if changes to the housing stock are necessary (i.e. their existing and future income opportunities and/or desired living preferences). Determine if related land use policies can be altered to meet any missing need or preference.

STRATEGIES – CITY EFFORTS**City Strategies:****6-C. Make an Effort to Balance the Number and Size of Zoning Districts with the Demand for Various Housing Types.**

This strategy supports a fundamental provision of state law that indicates that “in drafting the moderate income housing element, the planning commission shall consider the Legislature’s determination that cities shall facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing types, including moderate income housing;

- To meet the needs of people desiring to live there; and
- To allow persons with moderate incomes to benefit from and fully participate in all aspects of neighborhood and community life...”

While the state law focuses on moderate income housing, the best strategy is to concentrate on quality city-scaled residential design, while aiming to meet such housing needs. “A community should mix and arrange the various uses and densities so that an optimal city-scale design emerges, complete with quiet neighborhood, parks, and busy business districts [*Urban Planning Tools for Quality Growth, 2000*].”

City Objectives:

- 6-C.1 Evaluate the various Neighborhood Plans and determine if there are opportunities for allowing infill development, or areas that could be rezoned for additional density, or to encourage the use of the Planned Development Overlay Zone (*reflects strategy 6.A*).
- 6-C.2 Consider establishing standards with the R-M and R-H Districts that require a variety of housing types that are to be used within such zones. Additionally, limit unit densities within each building of the R-M zone to no more than 8 units, and within the R-H Zone to no more than 12 units.
- 6-C.3 Consider the following housing types to be implemented within the R-M and R-H zones:
- Courtyard apartments in high density locations
 - “Big house” apartments in medium and high density zones
 - Garden courts in medium and high density zones
 - Townhomes or alley fed townhomes with shorter front yard setbacks in medium density zones.
 - In medium density zones, if single-family is used, allow use of accessory apartments
- 6-C.4 Consider establishing additional architectural design standards for the R-M and R-H Districts. Ensure that the appearance and layout of buildings within these zones are visually compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods.

STRATEGIES – CITY EFFORTS**City Strategies:****6-D. Consider Adopting Basic or Flexible Design Standards for Small-Lot or Underutilized Land Parcels Within Existing Developed Areas of the City.**

This strategy reflects a component of state strategy 6.B. that focuses on areas of existing development and infrastructure. The original Centerville Townsite parcels were not created using typical zoning practices. Consequently, there are a variety of unconventional lot sizes and configurations. Therefore, there are likely several opportunities for “infill” or “redevelopment” scenarios that could assist with creating moderate income housing in the older areas of the City.

A consideration to allow more flexible lot standards may be not only a benefit to the needs of moderate income families, but also to the owners of properties in these areas. However, additional design standards are likely needed to preserve the visual and physical context and layout of these areas.

City Objectives:

- 6-D.1 Provide continued support for the limited use of flag lot development in areas where older or original divisions (typically done through metes & bounds descriptions) of land have taken place, which tends to create underutilized land that could be further developed.
- 6-D.2 Consider adopting a “small lot-floating” overlay ordinance or standard to allow greater flexibility for placement of lot lines in relation to existing homes and a new infill home, where underutilized or underused properties exist.
- 6-D.3 Consider adopting a “group dwelling” lot ordinance or standard that could be utilized on larger irregularly shaped or constrained parcels which would allow for more than one dwelling to be constructed on a single parcel.
- 6-D.4 Consider adopting an “accessory dwelling” ordinance with design standards. Such allowances may also be considered “conditional uses” in single family zones [see original strategy of the 2002 MIH Housing Plan, Section 12-490.4(d)]
- 6-D.5 Consider adopting additional design and layout standards with these additional opportunities for development to ensure compatibility with the surrounding context and appearance of the neighborhood.