

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, February 8, 2017**

3 **7:00 p.m.**

4
5 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street,
6 Centerville, Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called
7 to order at 7:00 p.m.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

10 Kevin Daly
11 Cheylynn Hayman (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)
12 Kathy Helgesen
13 David Hirschi, Chair
14 Gina Hirst
15 Logan Johnson
16 Becki Wright

17
18 **STAFF PRESENT**

19 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
20 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
21 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner
22 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

23
24 **VISITORS**

25 Interested citizens

26
27 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

28
29 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Commissioner Hirst

30
31 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

32
33 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held January 25, 2017 were
34 reviewed. Amendments were requested. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to
35 accept the minutes as amended. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which
36 passed by unanimous vote (6-0). Commissioner Hayman arrived after approval of the
37 minutes.

38
39 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, 1150 SOUTH 240 EAST**

40
41 Ronn Marshall submitted a Zoning Map Amendment application for the property
42 at 1150 South 240 East. Based on his current Conceptual Subdivision Plans, a
43 Residential-Low (R-L) Zoning would fit best with his design, and perhaps the
44 surrounding properties. Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, explained the request to

1 rezone from Residential-Medium (R-M) to Residential-Low (R-L). Staff considers the
2 proposed rezone to be consistent with the goals of the General Plan. The two existing
3 single-family homes on or next to this lot set the precedent for R-L. Considering the
4 housing to the south, it is not unreasonable to believe that single-family would be
5 accepted there. R-M or R-L would be acceptable at this location as long as there would
6 be sufficient buffering on the north and west ends of the property. Existing facilities and
7 services either exist or will be provided in the subdivision regardless of the zone.

8
9 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, stated that the driving factor of
10 the request is the subtle difference between frontage requirements. If the property
11 remains R-M, a single Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be issued for the entire
12 subdivision, or individual CUPs would have to be issued for each house built. Ms.
13 Younger clarified that, although the southeast neighborhood is under the market yield
14 for town homes and duplexes, the City as a whole is over the market yield for town
15 homes and duplexes.

16
17 Ronn Marshall, applicant, stated that what he wants to accomplish will be much
18 easier with the R-L Zone. Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 7:26 p.m.

19
20 Craig Adams – Mr. Adams said he has been a neighbor of the subject property
21 for 27 years. He agreed that the two existing homes are nice, and agreed that R-L
22 would be a good fit for the property and the neighborhood. Mr. Marshall confirmed that
23 seven additional homes would be built on the property.

24
25 Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:27 p.m. Chair Hirschi commented
26 that the City may be looking in the future at something happening in the neighboring
27 commercial zone. He expressed concern about creating a precedent that could be
28 problematic going forward. Commissioner Johnson responded that he does not see R-
29 L and R-H in that context as being incompatible. Commissioner Hayman pointed out
30 the surrounding R-M Zones, and said she does not think R-L on the subject property
31 would inhibit or dissuade the City from doing something different with the commercial
32 area. Commissioner Wright said that, as a property rights issue, the zone change
33 allows the owner to do more of what he wants to do. She added that what he wants to
34 do would not detrimentally affect the area. Commissioner Daly commented that it is
35 refreshing to have a developer not trying to cram as many units as possible on the
36 property. He said he thinks R-L and R-M are compatible uses, and he is generally in
37 favor. Commissioner Hayman said single-family homes seem like a compatible fit
38 considering the surrounding homes. Commissioner Wright made a **motion** to accept
39 the Zone Map Amendment for 1150 South 240 East from a Residential-Medium District
40 into a Residential-Low District, with the following two reasons for the action.
41 Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Reasons for the Action:

1. The Zoning Map Amendment would still be consistent with the General Plan.
2. The proposed zoning change and subsequent development standards on this lot would be consistent with already existing single-family properties within this subdivision.

**PUBLIC HEARING – CHITOSE JOHNSON CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION,
1150 SOUTH 240 EAST**

Ms. Younger explained the proposed Conceptual Subdivision Plan, which consists of a nine-lot single-family residential subdivision (seven additional homes). Mr. Snyder explained that the two existing homes would be incorporated into the subdivision with boundary adjustments.

Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 7:42 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. The Planning Commission discussed setbacks in the development. Commissioner Daly made a **motion** to accept the Conceptual Subdivision Plat for the Chitose Johnson Subdivision, located at 1150 South 240 East, subject to the following conditions and findings, and subject to City Council approval of the R-L Zone change. Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Conditions:

- Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plats will have to be submitted in accordance with Title 15.
- Drainage would need to be addressed due to differing elevations on the lot and approved by the City Engineer.

Findings:

- a) The conceptual subdivision appears to be consistent with the General Plan
- b) It follows the Municipal Code Subdivision Ordinance in Chapter 15.5
- c) Adequately meets the Development Standards laid out for an R-L Zone in CZC 12.32.300
- d) The applicable review standards of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to a Conceptual Subdivision application have been reviewed and directives established to allow the proposal to proceed to preliminary subdivision plan submittal.

**PUBLIC HEARING – SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS,
MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 15**

Lisa Romney, City Attorney, presented proposed amendments to Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Subdivisions, and answered questions from the Commission. Ms. Romney noted that these changes to Title 15 are not the major edits and rewrite to the subdivision ordinance that the City and consultant are currently preparing. Those edits will be brought to the Planning Commission when ready. The edits currently proposed to Title 15 are formatting, numbering and text changes necessary to transition the Municipal Code to an online format and other necessary edits to bring Title 15 into compliance with State law. The Planning Commission went through each page of the proposed edits to Title 15 and asked questions as applicable. Ms. Romney noted more substantive changes to the Planning Commission. Chair Hirschi and Commissioner Hayman suggested minor punctuation changes.

Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 8:25 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding Subdivisions as amended, based on the following findings. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Findings:

1. The proposed Subdivision Ordinance amendments are consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan;
2. The proposed Subdivision Ordinance amendments are in the best interest of the public health, safety and welfare by providing more accessible online codes and updating provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance consistent with State law; and
3. The City is authorized to enact and amend land use ordinances consistent with the purposes set forth in the Utah Land Use Development and Management Act as set forth in Utah Code 10-9a-101, et seq.

PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – ACCESSORY SETBACKS

On January 11, 2017, the Planning Commission directed staff to review additional information regarding accessory building setbacks, specifically the use of a roof slope or building setback ratio. Mr. Snyder explained that staff has reviewed the idea of using a ratio system and has determined that it would be complicated or “not user friendly” given the current minimum lot frontage standards and buildable area expectations set by the Zoning Ordinance. Staff did modify its original version of the edits to assist with recognizing that there are differing building sizes versus building codes (portable/permanent) and that a two-story building creates a different mass size

versus a single-story building. The building terms of the industry generally reference "a story" as 10 feet from floor to ceiling of the structure. Therefore, staff used the 10-foot height as a target for establishing some of the setback expectations. Mr. Snyder presented the following table:

Setback Standards – Rear Yard	R-L	R-M	R-H
Accessory building (portable, one-story) – less than 200 square feet ⁴	3 feet	3 feet	3 feet
Accessory building (one-story) – 200 square feet or greater ⁴	5 feet	5 feet	5 feet
Accessory building (two-story or greater than 10 feet in height) – All Sizes ⁴	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet

⁴Setback is measured from any interior and/or rear lot line

Mr. Snyder answered questions regarding the definition and use of "portable". Commissioner Wright pointed out that the term may cause confusion. Chair Hirschi asked about the ability to improve existing large accessory buildings that do not meet the new eight-foot setback requirement. Mr. Snyder responded that the Board of Adjustments can approve an expansion if the degree of nonconformity is not increased. Commissioner Wright said she would like things to be as easy to understand as possible, and pointed out that not everyone would understand that the numbers are averages. Mr. Snyder responded that more explanation is included in the ordinance. Commissioner Johnson commented that a ratio seems simpler to him, but he can see that a table can also be clear. Commissioner Hayman said she feels the proposal is a good compromise that addresses the concern expressed by the City Council. Chair Hirschi and Commissioner Helgesen agreed.

Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to recommend approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments regarding "accessory buildings". Chair Hirschi seconded the motion. Commissioner Hayman stated she would prefer to remove the word "portable". Commissioner Helgesen and Chair Hirschi accepted removal of "portable" from the table as an amendment to the motion. The motion as amended passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Planning Commission will meet next on February 22, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 p.m. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).




David Hirschi, Chair

2-22-2017
Date Approved



Katie Rust, Recording Secretary



CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, February 8, 2017
7:00 p.m.

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS**

POWELL MARSHALL

13 WEST 2200 SO BELL

JAKE WILLIAMS

C. I.

** Your address will be used only in the event the City staff needs to contact you pertaining to an issue discussed in the Planning Commission meeting.