CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON JANUARY 25, 2017 AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER AND CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

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

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

A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. This Agenda is also posted on the City's website: and at http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic.

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

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

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Commissioner Logan Johnson

D. MINUTES REVIEW and ACCEPTANCE

January 11, 2017 Planning Commission

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7:10 1. Public Hearing - Chitose Johnson Subdivision, 1150 S 240 East

[Applicant has requested to postpone until February 8th Planning Commission]

Consider approving a Conceptual Subdivision application for a seven-lot single-family subdivision

7:10 2. Public Hearing - General Plan Text Amendment, Southeast Neighborhood Plan

LEGISLATIVE DECISION

Consider a proposed General Plan Text Amendment regarding the future residential density allowances in the Southeast Neighborhood [Neighborhood 1]

7:30 3. Community Development Director's Report

The next regularly scheduled meeting is February 8, 2017. Items to be considered are:

- Accessory Building Setbacks, Continued Discussion (PC Tabled Item on January 11, 2017)
- Chitose Johnson Tentative Rezone Application and Conceptual Subdivision

7:40 4. City Council Report

None to Report

F. ADJOURNMENT

CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
1/25/2017

Item No.

Short Title: January 11, 2017 Planning Commission

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description
D	01-11-2017 PC Preliminarydraft Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, January 11, 2017
7:00 p.m.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT
Kevin Daly
Cheylynn Hayman, Vice Chair
Kathy Helgesen
David Hirschi, Chair
Gina Hirst
Logan Johnson
Becki Wright

STAFF PRESENT
Emily Hatch, Recording Secretary
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Cassie Younger, City Planner

VISITORS
Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER
Chair Hirschi

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held December 14, 2016 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Elections were held for the positions of Planning Commission Chair and Planning Commission Vice Chair for 2017. Commissioner Johnson nominated David Hirschi for the position of Chair, and Chair Hirschi nominated Commissioner Hayman for the position of Chair.

Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to close nominations, seconded by Commissioner Helgesen. The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Chair Hirschi was elected to the position of 2017 Chair of the Planning Commission with 4 votes.

Commissioner Wright nominated Commissioner Hayman for the position of Vice Chair. Commissioner Hayman nominated Commissioner Johnson for the position of Vice Chair. Commissioner Johnson nominated Commissioner Daly for the position of Vice Chair.

Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to close nominations, seconded by Commissioner Daly. The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Commissioner Hayman was elected to the position of 2017 Vice Chair of the Planning Commission with 5 votes.

PUBLIC HEARING – YORK AUTOMOTIVE, 825 SOUTH FRONTAGE ROAD - Consider approving a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed auto sales facility on property located at 825 South Frontage Road - Jacob York, Applicant

York Automotive currently operates a facility at 875 South Frontage Road, which is located on a large piece of property along with one other building. The applicant currently has a Conditional Use Permit specific to their use of the south building. However, the applicant has been given the opportunity to lease the north building, at 825 South Frontage Road. The north building is larger and so would require more parking than the current building: a change from 8 spaces to 12 spaces. Staff has reviewed the current CUP and has concluded that, since this CUP was granted by the Council in the past, it is likely the applicant will qualify for the new CUP, with some specific conditions.

The site does not conform to today's landscaping standards. According to City Ordinances, as long as there are no specific site changes being made, the applicant is in compliance, until such time as new elements are introduced.

In 2015, the owner of the field to the north of the property approached the Board of Adjustment for a determination on whether the property had any development rights attached to it, specifically with regards to curb, gutter, paving, etc. The family argued before the BOA that they had used the property in the past for equipment storage and sales, as well as parking for the businesses in the two buildings. The BOA voted to grant them this use, on the conditions that the use and area not change.

Mr. Snyder, Community Development Director, reported that Staff's analysis is generally supportive of the issuance of this new CUP. However, the Fire Marshall is currently looking at

the fire access and needs for the new location. If the current state of the location is unacceptable, then any changes made to address this issue would violate the conditions of the decision made by the BOA, which would result in an inability to simply transfer the CUP to the new location of York Automotive.

Staff recommends approval of the CUP. However, this CUP is just for the use of the building, and could not be approved if any changes were determined to be necessary. If the Fire Marshall determines that changes to the north site are necessary to allow for access of fire equipment, then the applicant would need to return to the Council with a Site Plan to include these changes. It is Staff's opinion that the transfer of the CUP is compatible with the previous approval by the BOA, so Staff recommends approval with the caveat that this approval only applies if the Fire Marshall does not require any changes.

Chair Hirschi asked for clarification on the seventh condition of the Staff Report, inquiring as to why one of the conditions of the CUP would be to fulfill any changes required by the Fire Marshall, when any changes would negate the CUP. Mr. Snyder clarified that this means that changes would be required in the form of a Site Plan, which would be reviewed by the Planning Commission, in order to maintain the validity of the CUP. Commissioner Helgesen asked if any of the circumstances mentioned in condition 7 would then require a Site Plan. Mr. Snyder explained that changes to the existing site would not constitute a need for an amended Site Plan, but changes to the field to the north would.

Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder if the Commission's consideration of this issue is premature, due to the pending decision from the Fire Marshall. Mr. Snyder stated that the decision is up to the Commission. Staff has made efforts to include both possible outcomes in the CUP. If no changes are needed to the site, then approval of the CUP at this time this would expedite the transfer process for York Automotive.

Jacob York, applicant and part-owner of York Automotive, had no comments for the Commission. Chair Hirschi asked the applicant if he was aware of the concerns regarding the Fire Marshall's approval. Mr. York answered that he only knew this based on the agenda he was provided for the Planning Commission meeting, that he has not taken steps to discuss the proposed use of the site with the Fire Marshall.

Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing at 7:30 pm. As there was no one with any questions or comments, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:30 pm.

Chair Hirschi stated that he is uncomfortable with the knowledge that this decision is being made with a forfeiture clause included; he would prefer to table the decision until they have received the necessary information from the Fire Marshall. Commissioner Johnson asked Lisa Romney, City Attorney, if the Commission should be viewing the CUP as completely

separate from the Site Plan. Ms. Romney answered that the Fire Marshall approval is part of the CUP. While this is a complicated situation due to the non-conforming status of the vacant lot, Staff has framed the CUP so that it is possible to move forward if the Fire Marshall's approval is received without having to wait for another meeting.

Commissioner Daly asked if a review by the Fire Marshall is a requirement for all Conditional Use Permits, or just this specific one. Mr. Snyder answered that the Fire Marshall must approve all Site Plans and Conditional Use Permits. Commissioner Daly asked if this property had been reviewed previously. Mr. Snyder answered that no, it had not, due to the decision by the BOA to allow limited use on the vacant property. York Automotive currently operates on this site with a CUP, which was approved previously by the Fire Marshall. If the Fire Marshall returns with the same decision as was made previously, then the applicant can proceed. If the Fire Marshall needs to access and stage equipment on the north side of the building, in that vacant lot, then that would go against the allowed usage decided by the BOA, and the vacant lot would need to be brought to meet current City Codes. The CUP does state that if there are concerns from the Fire Marshall, the CUP is on hold until an Amended Site Plan is approved.

Chair Hirschi again stated that he is concerned with the phrasing of condition 7, as it does not speak to the fact that the CUP would be void if the Fire Marshall requires changes to the property to allow access by the Fire Department. Mr. Snyder clarified that it is not void if the applicant addresses any required changes with an Amended Site Plan.

Commissioner Daly said he is inclined not to table the decision on the CUP so as not to hold up the process for the applicant. Commissioners Wright and Helgesen agreed. Commissioner Helgesen suggested a change to the phrasing of condition 7 to address Chair Hirsch's concerns. Chair Hirschi proposed that the following be added to the condition: "including, if necessary, a Site Plan Amendment to comply with City Ordinances."

Mr. York asked Mr. Snyder if the process with the Fire Marshall had been started, and if everything was on hold until a decision had been made. Mr. Snyder suggested that Mr. York contact the Fire Marshall to obtain an estimated time frame.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the Conditional Use Permit for York Automotive, to be located at 825 South Frontage Road, with the following conditions. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. All applicable fees shall be paid

2. This Conditional Use Permit shall only apply to the space for York Automotive, located at 825 South Frontage Road, and terminates the use for 875 South Frontage Road (i.e. south building).
3. The display area shall be limited to the 12 parking stalls located west of the building.
4. York Automotive shall not occupy any parking stalls required for all other businesses located on site.
5. In addition to the 12 parking stalls for a display area, the use shall be required to have to provide and maintain a minimum of 21 stalls for the auto sales use.
6. The applicant shall verify with the City Engineer and the Public Works Director to create a BMP to ensure EPA requirements for drainage of water from the washing of vehicles have been met, prior to issuance of a City Business License.
7. The applicant shall obtain approval of the South Davis Fire Marshall and address or fulfill any circumstances that are deemed necessary to comply with the applicable Fire Code, including, if necessary, a Site Plan Amendment to comply with City Ordinances.
8. If the applicant is required to change or modify the site in order to comply with other applicable regulations, such as the Fire Code, then the applicant shall submit an Amended Site Plan Application for review and approval by the Planning Commission.
9. All deliveries and transporting of vehicles shall occur during the listed regular business hours of the application, which is Monday thru Saturday, from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
10. As stated in the submittal, all cars shall be driven to the site individually and no transport truck shall be used.
11. All desired business signs shall obtain a sign permit approval from the City.

Reasons for the Action:

a) The Planning Commission finds that the applicant has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit [12.21.100(d)(1)].
b) The Planning Commission finds that the use of vehicle and equipment rental or sales is an allowed use within the commercial-very high zone upon issuance of a conditional use permit [12.36]
c) The Planning Commission finds that the use is consistent with the General Plan of Centerville City [12-430-1]
d) The Planning Commission finds that the request is a relocation of the same use on the site from the south to the north building.
e) The Planning Commission finds that the site continues to be a suitable candidate site for relocating the vehicle sales and repair from the south to the north building.

f) The Planning Commission finds that according to Section 12.22.080, Non-conforming Development that is consistent with the originally approved plan shall be deemed compliant with the current zoning ordinance.

g) The Planning Commissions finds that the Board of Adjustment's recognition of the use allowed for the north area of the property were narrowly defined to machinery and licensed vehicle parking.

h) The Planning Commission finds that in its review of the site plan submittal, that is required as part of the CUP application, York Automotive is not proposing any changes to the site that triggers correcting any site plan related non-conformities.

i) Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that approving with the CUP request conditioned upon using comparable conditions of the previous approval will not create additional issues that need to be mitigated and sufficient evidence has been shown to meet the review criteria for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

PUBLIC HEARING – MOTO UNITED POWERSPORTS, 940 & 950 NORTH 960 WEST - Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for a power-sports dealership and repair facility - Cameron Eggertz, Applicant

Staff reported that the Conceptual Site Plan is for automotive and power-sports sales and would include a dealership, display, office, and repair shop. This space is not currently owned by the applicant; it is an open site of two lots, which would need to be combined. There are no current occupants to the north or south of the lot. The applicant is interested in the space because high visibility and ease of access from the freeway.

So far, the Conceptual Site Plan adequately addresses development standards: the proposed site is within required setbacks and the planned layout looks good. The applicant will need a more detailed landscaping plan that includes the required 1 tree every 25 feet along the frontage, which is a significant distance. Currently, up to 18% of the plan is landscaped, and only 10% is required. Zoning Code recommends xeriscaping or drought tolerant landscaping when possible, by a xeriscape experienced architect. Staff recommends that the applicant consider this for the east side of the property.

Most of the west side of the property has 20-feet deep landscaping in place and has building frontage. There is a potential parking lot on the southern half of the property, and the applicant has proposed a 6-foot fence on this half of the property. Staff recommends that the applicant consider something more aesthetically pleasing than the proposed block wall, and that the applicant maintain the sidewalks and landscaping to their current depth.

The parking was miscalculated on the Site Plan, so the applicant must resubmit the square footage by the area of use, rather than combined as it is currently. Currently, they have 10 spots more than their estimated need.

Special regulations for the zone require that buildings share an attractive visual quality with regards to elements such as material, color, screening, etc. Full architectural plans with detailed architectural renderings have not yet been submitted in order for Staff to judge that the visual qualities meet the requirements.

A CUP will be necessary for the sale of vehicles, but has not been included in the current application and will need to be considered in the future.

With regards to the economic impact on the area, which is an industrial zone, there are no neighbors to the north or south right now, and the freeway to the east, so noise and circulation aren't an issue at this time and concerns about these issues can be mitigated on the Final Site Plan.

Sufficient landscaping, ideally xeriscaping, attractive street frontage, sufficient screening for vehicles, and parking are the biggest concerns for this CUP.

Commissioner Hayman asked if the site being discussed was near the movie theater, and originally planned to be a restaurant or retail site. Cassie Younger, City Planner, explained that the applicant had looked at two sites, and this CUP is for the alternative site in a High-Industrial Zone, not the one in the Commercial-Very-High area, near the movie theater, that had been discussed previously.

Chair Hirschi asked what exists to the west of the site. Mr. Snyder answered that a software company occupies the lot to the west, as well as sales for Bluebird Bus Repair.

Camron Eggertz, applicant, informed the Commission that Moto United is open to discussing xeriscaping, and have used that style for landscaping at their headquarters are in St. George. With regards to the aesthetics of the building, Moto United is a high-end retailer, and plans to build high-end buildings.

Chair Hirschi inquired if sales would include ATVs, motorcycles, 4x4s, to which the applicant responded that all of these would be sold, those by Honda, Suzuki, BRP, and one other brand that is still pending.

Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Eggertz what had caused the applicant to pursue this new site. Mr. Eggertz explained that they had secured a better deal on this site, and will also avoid the issues that the other site had presented, including the lack of gutters and hydrants, which will enable them to proceed with fewer delays.

Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. Seeing no one with any questions or comments, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the Commission had spent a good amount of time discussing the previous CUP for the applicant, and this new site seems like a much better fit for the company. Commissioner Wright agreed.

Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the Conceptual Site Plan for Moto United Powersports, located at 940 & 950 North 950 West, with the following conditions. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. A final site plan application shall be submitted following the criteria found in Section 12.21.110(e)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. A Conditional Use Permit shall be submitted following the criteria found in Section 12-21-100 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. Architectural drawings shall be submitted with the final site plan indicating the exact material and color of the storage units. These plans must be prepared and stamped by a licensed architect and meet the Architectural Design Standards as found in Chapter 12.35 of the Zoning Ordinance
4. A complete landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect and follow the criteria found in Chapter 12.51 of the Zoning Ordinance. This plan shall be submitted with the final site plan and indicate the following: type and location of all vegetation, total calculations and percentages of landscaping vegetation, and irrigation plan. Preference is given to designs and plans with xeriscaping and drought tolerant species.
5. The final plans shall indicate the location and types of all signage, which follow the codes in 12.54.
6. Ensure all utility lines are noted on the Final Plan. All applicable Utility Provider Sheets shall be submitted as part of the final site plan application.
7. Applicant will need to provide a stand-alone storm drain easement for the Northeast corner of the lot; the developer will need to provide a legal description for easement with final site plan application
8. Public Utility Easements are to be vacated in the middle of the site.
9. Area (in square footage) per use of the property must be provided in order to specify parking calculations set out in Chapter 12.52.
10. Adequate fire safety measures and protections have been checked by South Davis Fire Department.

Reasons for the Action:

a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [Section 12.21.110(d) (2)].
b) The development appears to be consistent with the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan. [12-480-3]
c) The Conceptual Site Plan that has been submitted depicts how the site could be appropriately developed and with some alteration could be designed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Industrial-High Zone and other relevant regulations, including a Conditional Use Permit, as discussed in the Planning Staff Report.

PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – ACCESSORY SETBACKS - The City Council has directed City Staff and the Planning Commission consider amending the current zoning text to increase accessory building setbacks in R-L, R-M, and R-H Zones

Staff reported that this proposal is solely for residential zones, but may be revisited later for agricultural zones. Mr. Snyder explained that each lot is required to have a minimum 2000 square foot build pad for the home. The main use building is eligible for 35-feet heights, typically allowed in residential areas. Typical setbacks in an R-L Zone are 8 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other, 25 feet for the front, and 20 feet for the rear. Accessory buildings are required to be at least 6 feet behind the home, have a lower height requirement, and must be a minimum of 3 feet from the side and rear lot lines. Accessory buildings over 200 square feet and less than 5 feet from the lot line require a 1-hour firewall.

The current standard for measuring the height of accessory buildings is to measure from the mid-point of the roof, which is halfway between the eave and the peak, then down to the grade. The maximum allowed height for accessory buildings is 20 feet. Staff is hesitant to pursue changes to this requirement, so as to not limit design options with regards to roof pitch of an accessory building.

Mr. Snyder discussed an accessory building that started the discussion of setbacks, at Porter Lane and Main Street, which was in compliance with required setbacks, being 14 feet from the south property and 6 feet from the west property line. However, the owner of the neighboring property is unhappy with the height of this structure, even though it is just under the allowed 20-foot height.

The proposed change for required setbacks is to increase the required distance from the property line to 5 feet for structures over 200 square feet and up to 400 square feet, and increase the required distance to 8 feet for structures over 400 square feet. The Building Code does except buildings under 200 square feet, so the required setback for these structures will remain at 3 feet.

Mr. Snyder expressed his desire to maintain simplicity of Building Codes, so as to keep from overwhelming citizens with too many and too complicated requirements.

Chair Hirschi expressed his concern that owners of older structures, which may be closer to the property line than currently allowed, would hesitate to improve or rehabilitate these older buildings, as they would then have to conform to these new standards. Mr. Snyder agreed, and said this would also cause problems for those wanting to build additions to their current accessory buildings. Chair Hirschi explained that the two choices for these situations would be to go to the Board of Adjustment to seek an exception or to comply with the new Ordinance, which would cause additional burdens on the members of the BOA. His biggest concern is that, rather than seeking one of these options, the owners would simply decide not to take action and let the building decline further.

Mr. Snyder explained that the goal of implementing these new Ordinances is to eventually have all structures in conformance of this new rule. Current code states that non-conforming structures can go to the BOA and must meet three requirements in order to be allowable:

- Must be compatible with the adjoining property
- Must not be detrimental to the community
- Must not have an effect on traffic, value of adjacent property, adequate utility and services

Mr. Snyder's concern is that almost all expansions to non-conforming structures will meet these three requirements, so the City will not meet the goal of eventually having all structures in conformance with this new Ordinance, but only new structures.

Commissioner Hayman said that it seems as if the suggested changes are based on the assumption that everyone will build their accessory buildings to their maximum allowed height, and asked if it is possible to instead determine the setback using a sliding scale based on the height of the structure, to allow buildings with a lower height to be closer to the property line and require structures with a taller height to be further from the property line. Mr. Snyder acknowledged that this is a creative solution, and it is possible to investigate this option. However, the downside of this suggestion is the difficulty of implementation and the complexity involved. Commissioner Hayman agreed that simplicity is ideal, but stated that, if the main concern is the height of the building, then perhaps a compromise can be reached. Mr. Snyder expressed the willingness of Staff to, revisit the issue and brainstorm other possibilities, if the Commission wishes it.

Commissioner Wright stated that she is hesitant to support the suggested changes when the biggest contributor for the requested change is the shadow created by tall buildings, and would like to give property owners the choice to avoid this issue and avoid impacting the neighbor by building a shorter building with a smaller required setback. Mr. Snyder explained

that this would be ineffectual for homes with smaller lots, on which the homes are built to the minimum setbacks, which could result in a structure with a height of 35 feet right at the 8-foot setback on the side yard. However, the area on the rear could benefit from the suggestion of a sliding scale. Chair Hirschi stated that most people have differing expectations for backyards as opposed to side-yards, and expect to be able to make their own decisions as to what is allowed.

Commissioner Johnson suggested another alternative, similar to that of Commissioner Hayman, where, instead of setting a minimum setback, the City instead sets an allowed angle from the property line to the roof, whether it be the peak or mid-point or another feature. Commissioner Hayman added that this would also address Mr. Snyder's concern and still allow for flexibility of design for the building, including pitch. Mr. Snyder said this is an option, though it is more complicated. Commissioner Wright argued that this would be more complicated to start with, but would simplify the code itself. Commissioner Johnson agreed, since this would eliminate the need for a table and instead replace the requirement with a simple value.

Mr. Snyder stated Staff's willingness to investigate this option, but said this would likely only address new buildings, and would potentially still cause issues for existing buildings, as Chair Hirschi mentioned earlier. Chair Hirschi believes that this alternative approach would cover many of the older, existing buildings and allow them to remain. Commissioner Hayman suggested that Staff investigate existing buildings to determine what measurements they have, as more evidence of this being an appropriate approach.

Mr. Snyder said he would like to table the decision with those directives for further investigation, and will be doing so with the intent of preserving the option to maximize the opportunity for accessory buildings in the build area.

Ms. Romney added that, since the Commission seems inclined to table the decision, she would like to add Public Utility Easements to the considerations for this change. Currently, City Code requires Public Utility Easements on three sides of the lot: 10 feet in the front, and 7 feet on two sides or one side and the rear, and buildings are not allowed in the PUE. She would like to add a statement to this proposed change to reinforce that buildings cannot be placed in a PUE without approval, and any buildings that are placed in a PUE must be moved at the owner's expense, should the utility company ever require access.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to table the decision regarding the current zoning text to increase accessory building setbacks in R-L, R-M, and R-H Zones, pending further investigation into determining required setbacks based on the angle of the building to the property line, as well as adding a disclaimer with regards to Public Utility Easements. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Items scheduled for January 25, 2017:
   - C. Johnson Conceptual Subdivision & Southeast Neighborhood Plan Amendments
   - Southeast Neighborhood Plan Amendments

Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder about the work session at the start of 2016, in which the Commission set several goals for the year, and the status of the goal to move some of the administrative decisions to Staff to enable the Commission to plan more effectively. Mr. Snyder explained that it was first necessary to rewrite the Subdivision Ordinance, which is being worked on by Ms. Romney. These changes will partially address some of these concerns. However, Staff has not yet addressed the changes to Site Plan and Conditional Use processes, and whether or not these can be handled by the Development Review Committee.

Chair Hirschi would like to investigate whether the process for Public Hearings, such as those for administrative decisions, could be improved. Mr. Snyder suggested a work session to discuss the circumstances in which a public hearing is valuable. Commissioner Wright added that some public hearings for administrative decisions seem unnecessary, as there is no real way to take public input into consideration. Mr. Snyder agreed and explained that, between the APA and Utah League of Cities and Towns, most are moving away from public hearings for administrative decisions. Commissioner Hayman referenced the December Planning Commission Meeting, in which a neighbor spoke during a public hearing and provided many helpful and relevant comments and suggestions.

Mr. Snyder committed to meeting with the DRC to determine how to handle some administrative issues without putting them before the Planning Commission.

Chair Hirschi inquired about the new fence on the west side of the cemetery. Mr. Snyder explained that the City Council is currently investigating how to maximize use of the existing cemetery, which would require some retaining and filling of the west side, to add some additional burial plots. Ms. Romney added that the issue was discussed briefly at the last City Council meeting, and the engineer is working on some calculations to make sure the process is financially feasible.

Ms. Romney informed the Commission that, at an upcoming meeting, she will be bringing suggested edits for the bulk of the Municipal Code for approval by the Commission, in order to then make it available online. However, part of the Municipal Code, Title 15 - the Subdivision Ordinance, is currently being completely redrafted by a consultant, and will not yet have been completed.

CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS REPORT

Mr. Snyder reported to the Commissioners recent actions taken by the City Council:

- **January 3, 2017:** Final Plans for the Ray Subdivision
  Motion: Approved

Commissioner Helgesen informed the Commission that she will not be present for the March 8 meeting. Commissioner Wright reminded the Commission that she will be absent for all meetings in March. Commissioner Daly informed the Commission that he will be absent for the February 22 meeting.

Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

_____ _____

David Hirschi, Chair Date Approved

_____

Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
1/25/2017

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Public Hearing - General Plan Text Amendment, Southeast Neighborhood Plan

Initiated By: City Council

Scheduled Time: 7:10

SUBJECT

LEGISLATIVE DECISION

Consider a proposed General Plan Text Amendment regarding the future residential density allowances in the Southeast Neighborhood [Neighborhood 1]

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- 01-25-2017 PC Staff Report Southeast Neighbood Residential Rewrite
- Southeast Neighborhood Draft Edits

CENTERVILLE CITY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

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

STAFF REPORT
AGENDA: ITEM 2

APPLICANT: **CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL**
C/O MAYOR PAUL CUTLER
250 NORTH MAIN STREET
CENTERVILLE CITY, UTAH 84014

APPLICATION: **GENERAL PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR SECTION 12-480-2, SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD, RESIDENTIAL SECTION REWRITE**

RECOMMENDATION: **CONSIDER THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AMENDMENTS ANDN MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

BACKGROUND

Near the end of 2016, the City Council directed the planning staff and Planning Commission to review the Southeast Neighborhood and update the plan. Specifically, they wanted to address the pressure or trend to rezone properties for high-density residential development (*e.g. Scott Balling Townhomes Proposal*) and to also address the long-standing goal of redeveloping Pages Lane Commercial Area.

To accomplish this task, the planning staff recommended that the City consider first the residential density component of the neighborhood plan and allow for a specific discussion and debate about future housing and density. Then, second to hold a joint work session between the City Council and the Planning Commission regarding the future land use/redevelopment of the Pages Lane area. Accordingly, the planning staff has prepared a draft of edits to the *RESIDENTIAL COMPONENT ONLY* of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan. The Planning Commission should review, debate, and hold a public hearing and when deemed ready, make a recommendation to the City Council.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW

Procedures for a General Plan Text Amendment, Section 12.21.070

A decision to amend the General Plan is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC 12.21.060(a). After the public hearing described in Subsection (*d*)(*5*), the City Council may make any modifications to the proposed General Plan amendment that it considers appropriate. The City Council may adopt or reject the proposed General Plan amendment either as proposed by the Planning Commission or after making any revision that the

City Council considers appropriate. The City Council may also table the matter for further information, consideration or action.

DRAFT EDITS FOR THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – RESIDENTIAL POLICIES ONLY

Staff has prepared edits based on previous discussions with the City Council and Planning Commission. The proposed edits and change can be summarized as follows:

- *Main Theme – Promotes the southeast community's desire for traditional single-family neighborhood stability that is being affected by the South Davis region's housing market patterns related to multi-family development.*
- *Prohibits future use of high density residential development (e.g. the R-H Zoning District) in the residential areas of the neighborhood. High Density is considered 9-12 dwelling units per acre, as described in Section 12-420-2 of the General Plan.*
- *Substitutes the "old townsite" phrase with recognizing the adoption of Deuel Creek Historic District area.*
- *The edits update various spatial narratives regarding surrounding development descriptions.*

(FOR ALL EDITS SEE THE ATTACHMENT OF THIS STAFF REPORT)

GENERAL PLAN POLICY REVIEW

The Southeast Neighborhood Plan is a sub-element of the City's General Plan. Any recommendation or decision about modifying a neighborhood plan ought to include how it may coincide with the generalized policies of the City's General Plan. It is staff's opinion that there are three (3) other main elements of the General Plan to at least consider. These three (*3*) elements are; 1) the "Residential Development" – Section 12-420; 2) the "Moderate Income Housing" – Section 12-490; and 3) the "Historic Preservation Plan" – Section 12-480.

Staff suggests that the Planning Commission read these three (*3*) elements are part of considering the proposed neighborhood plan amendments. Upon our review of these elements, Staff believes that the following ideas should be considered as part of the review of the proposed amendments:

- *Centerville City has a strong desire to maintain a low density single-family environment.*
- *Notwithstanding, the residential policies recognize that there may be "appropriate locations" for medium to high densities within the City.*
- *Diversity is desirable in the procurement of decent housing.*
- *Future population growth and housing supply needs should be considered.*
- *Utah Code requires Cities to regularly review their moderate-income housing needs and identify strategies to allow opportunities to encourage such housing needs.*
- *Historic Districts are formed to preserve and celebrate a geographic location, in this case the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District.*
- *Infill and other types of development should preserve and be contextually sensitive to an established historic district.*

To illustrate how some of these ideas can be considered, staff has selected the City Strategy 6-B of the Moderate-Income Housing Element. This strategy focuses on the evaluation of City's

housing supply in comparison to an "Open Market Yield." The staff asked the GIS Division to query available information for the Southeast Neighborhood Plan and compare the housing supply to an open market yield. The GIS Division provided the following information:

Residential Unit Types in **The Entire City**

Residential use Types	**Centerville City**	**Open Market Yield**	**Difference**
Single Family	73%	60%	= +13%
Townhome/ Duplex	19%	14%	= + 5%
Multi-Family	8%	26%	= -18%

Residential Unit Types in **The Southeast Quadrant**

Residential use Types	**Number of Units**	**Percentage**	**Open Market Yield**	**Difference**
Single family	901	81%	60%	+21%
Townhome/ Duplex	112	10%	14%	-4%
Multi-Family	103	9%	26%	-17%
Total	1116			

Accordingly, this information tells us that the entire City continues to struggle with closing the gap of the *"housing"* with regards to an *"open market yield."* Additionally, the Southeast Neighborhood's deficit is primarily in the multi-family housing type. This is neither good or bad, it is just a measure to keep in mind as land use policy is developed and enacted. Nonetheless for Centerville, the staff has been informed that the cost of remains relatively high even with townhomes selling up to $311,000 in the Porter-Walton Project (*i.e. Hafoka Property*).

In looking to providing a diversity of lower cost housing styles and to plan for future population growth and changing lifestyles, are there areas within the neighborhood to consider encouraging development multi-family housing? Should the predominate form of single-family housing be afforded the protection from this housing type and to what extent (*e.g. Deuel Creek District*)? Should the search for appropriate areas for multi-family development should occur in other neighborhood locations? Is there a balance that can be achieved?

Staff Suggested "Thoughts to Consider"

- The South Davis area will likely continue to see a market pressure, today and in the future, for higher density housing development, whether its small lot single-family, townhome, or multi-family style developments.

- With being located within an area with higher market housing costs, Centerville City will likely continue to struggle with providing actual moderate income level housing.
- Nevertheless, Centerville City can still look for and consider areas to allow a variety of housing stock to accommodate various lifestyles and incomes of residents living or desiring to locate in the City.
- Consider looking within the Southeast Neighborhood for areas that may be appropriate for medium or high density residential development. Examples could be along collector or arterial streets such as Main Street or Pages Lane.
- If such opportunities within this neighborhood are not desirable or not available, then any shortages or deficits likely have to be made up in other areas of the City (*i.e. "kicking the can down the road" to other neighborhoods*).

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is of the opinion that the residential areas of the Southeast Community are substantially single-family residential and it's reasonable that this neighborhood should be afforded the general plan polices of maintaining its stability. However, there are still opportunities along the collector and arterial streets to allow for at least Medium Density Residential development. These places could include the redevelopment of the Page Lane Commercial area and along the Main Street commercial corridor. These areas have yet to reviewed in the second phase of the neighborhood plan that will come after this first phase moves forward.

PROPOSED ACTION: I hereby make a motion for the Planning Commission to RECOMMEND the General Plan Amendments of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan, as written in the attachment for this report (or any changes made by the Commission).

SUGGESTED REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

a. *The Planning Commission finds that a decision to amend the General Plan is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC 12.21.060(a).*
b. *The Planning Commission finds that Centerville City has a strong desire to maintain a low density single-family environment as described in the General Plan Element, "Residential Development" – Section 12-420.*
c. *The Planning Commission finds that the residential areas of the Southeast Community are primarily single-family residential and should be afforded the general plan polices of maintaining this style of housing.*
d. *The Planning Commission finds there are still opportunities along the collector and arterial streets to allow for at least Medium Residential Development, such as the redevelopment of the Page Lane Commercial area and along the Main Street commercial corridor.*
e. *The Planning Commission finds that these areas have yet to reviewed in the second phase of the neighborhood plan that will come after this first phase.*

PART 12-480

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING POLICIES

SECTION 12-480-1. GENERAL.

For planning purposes, Centerville City has been divided into several individual neighborhoods (see map on page 54). These neighborhoods are distinguished by certain common characteristics, and have been reviewed to determine the best land use and community features to be preserved and enhanced. The following are the land use and development policies for Centerville's neighborhoods.

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

Neighborhood 1 is that portion of Centerville City that is located east of Main Street and south of Parrish Lane (400 North). The neighborhood is characterized by the original Centerville townsite, with its older homes and gridiron street pattern; by the newer homes built in subsequent years east and south of the original townsite; by the "traditional" downtown along Main Street; and by the ~~newer~~ shopping center at Pages Lane, which is currently experiencing a decline in commercial synergy for the past few years. Much of the land in this neighborhood is built upon, and most of the remaining vacant land is in relatively smaller tracts~~.~~ or parcels with limited ability to be subdivided in the future.

Furthermore, due to the region's continued population growth, multi-family development has become a dominant form of newer housing development in the South Davis area. Historically, due to its spatial relationship to surrounding commercial corridors, the South area of Centerville has experienced a significant development of medium to high-density residential housing. Future housing growth pressures will likely continue to target the Southeast Neighborhood through redevelopment of underutilized commercial areas or infill of underutilized parcels. The communities desire for traditional single-family neighborhood stability competes with the development of these market patterns related to multi-family development. Therefore, it is the desire of the Southeast Neighborhood to minimize housing density conflicts and maintain low to medium density residential allowances in this area and encourage higher density housing development to other less concentrated locations in other parts of the City and/or region.

1. Residential Policies

Southeast Centerville is characterized by the older homes found in the original Centerville townsite, today known as the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District and its gridiron street pattern and small blocks, and by the newer homes built in subsequent years around the original townsite. Most of the remaining vacant land in this neighborhood is in relatively smaller tracts, or parcels with limited opportunity for large new housing developments.

a. ~~Old Townsite~~Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District

The ~~old Centerville townsite~~Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District may be generally considered the area bounded by 100 North, 400 South, Main Street, and 400 East. The ~~townsite~~ Historic District was originally developed with small stone homes on the large interior blocks. As the homes aged and the population of the City grew, many of the large parcels on the blocks were divided and sold for homes. However, in many cases, the deep interiors of the blocks remained undeveloped. These block interiors soon proved to be attractive for residential development, and, as the area grew older, it seemed that many were also looking toward developing duplexes and small apartments, much as has occurred in older residential areas in Salt Lake City. The citizens of Centerville and of the

neighborhood have expressed a desire to preserve and maintain the ~~single family~~single-family nature of the ~~old townsite~~Historic District, to avoid problems with dense development on small lots and to ~~avoid overtaxing the limited and aging City services (water, sewer) that exist here. In 1978, therefore, the old townsite remains.~~ discourage the dismantling of this historic area through demolition of older homes to facilitate lot or parcel combinations for the construction of larger new homes or the allowance of multi-family redevelopment in response to the region's housing market.

1. The residential Zoning within the ~~old Centerville townsite~~Deuel Creek Historic District shall be maintained in a low density, single-family residential housing character.

   No medium or high density residential development shall be allowed for future new or redevelopment in this area.

b. Centerville Elementary Area

The residential area immediately around the Centerville Elementary School has a less distinct character than ~~does the old townsite~~what is found in the Deuel Creek Historic District. A number of duplexes have been built in the area ~~over the~~in past years, as ~~have~~ well as some ~~newer~~ modern style single family homes. The gridiron street pattern of the ~~old townsite~~Historic District was not duplicated fully in this area, leaving some large block interiors that are undeveloped. In 1978, this area as zoned R-2, partly in an effort to recognize the number of duplexes that were in existence in the area, and also to allow for a more efficient development of the block interiors. Later in 2003 the area was rezoned to the new Residential-Medium (R-M) which continued this expectation. The boundaries of this area are approximately along Parrish Lane -- (between Main Street & 400 East – South Side Only), along 100 North~~East~~ - from Parrish Lane to 100 North (Both Sides), ~~Main street and 400 East~~ and along 100 North – from Main Street to 100 East (North Side Only).

1. These residential areas around the Centerville Elementary School and City Hall shall allow for low and medium density residential development to accommodate more efficient use of the large interior blocks that are common in this area.

2. Residential rezoning and subsequent development in this area should take into consideration the possible impacts upon the elementary school and from any future commercial or office development on Main Street, and buffer accordingly.

3. No high density residential development shall be allowed for future new or redevelopment in this area.

c. Centerville Junior High Area

The area around the Centerville Junior High School is also somewhat different in character than the remainder of the neighborhood. The "Riviera Townhouses," one of the highest density residential developments in this neighborhood~~e city~~, and is located just south of the school. ~~Several large properties north and south of the junior high are currently vacant. Considerable interest has been shown recently to develop much of these remaining properties with projects similar to the Riviera Townhouses.~~ The developed areas north and east of the junior high are all low density single family. The area around the northeast corner of Pages Lane and Main Street ~~currently designated for commercial development~~, has been developed with medium density project known as "The Courtyard at Pages Lane."

1. ~~The areas north and east~~ New residential zoned development surrounding ~~of~~ the Centerville Jr. High School shall be developed and maintained in low density single family residential development, primarily to be compatible with the existing residential development already in existence.

2. ~~The area south of the Riviera Townhouses may be considered for medium or low density residential development. The use of planned unit developments to achieve the foregoing objectives is desirable and preferred.~~

No high density residential development ~~will~~ shall be allowed for future new or redevelopment in this area.

d. Extreme South Main Street Area (Centerville/Bountiful Boarder)

The area located south of the Pages Lane commercial center and east of Main Street is often regarded by many people as being part of Bountiful. However, the vacant property just south of the commercial center and north of the twin duplex development on 1200 South is in Centerville City. The nature of the development existing in this area (duplexes) and the proximity of the commercial buildings suggests that this area may appropriately develop with medium or low density residential or even commercial uses.

1. The extreme south Main Street area should be developed with appropriate medium or low density residential development, or with commercial uses. Any development in this area should be carefully designed to be compatible with existing development in the area, and to carefully buffer the rear of the buildings of the Pages Lane commercial center. The use of planned unit developments to achieve the foregoing objectives is desirable and preferred for residential development.

2. No high density residential development shall be allowed for future new or redevelopment in this area.

e. Southeast Residential Area

The greatest portion of southeast Centerville has been developed primarily in typical residential suburban style, with single family homes on medium and large lots. These residences are located primarily to the east and south of the ~~old Centerville townsite~~Deuel Creek Historic District. Not much vacant land exists in this area. Much of what does remain is on the hillside, where care must be taken in development to avoid erosion and other hillside problems.

1. The southeast residential area shall be developed and maintained in low density single-family residential development. Those areas on hillsides shall be carefully developed with strict adherence to City hillside development regulations.

~~1.~~2. No medium or high density residential development shall be allowed for future new or redevelopment in this area.