

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, MARCH 13, 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 – February 27, 2013**
 - D.** **Commission Business**

- 7:05** **1.** **TRAINING FOR COMMISSIONERS**
 [Postponed from February 27, 2013 Meeting]
 Review the purpose of a General Plan, by City Attorney, Lisa Romney

- 7:25** **2.** **DISCUSSION ON WORK PROGRAM AND GOALS**
 Discuss changes to the 2013/14 Community Development Work Program and Goals, by
 Community Development Director, Cory Snyder

- 7:45** **3.** **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
 - a.** **Upcoming Meetings**
 - PC Meeting March 27, 2013: Island Parcel (Iggy's) lot split; MTC 2nd Bldg final site plan

- 7:50** **E.** **Adjournment**



PRELIMINARY DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, February 27, 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
Scott Kjar
Steven Markham
Kevin Merrill, Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT

Brian Holman
Debra Randall

STAFF PRESENT

Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director
Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

VISITORS:

Cindi Garlick	Robert Byrnes, Dayton Hudson
Brent Garlick	Alan Prince, Prince Development
Brandt Knowlton	Bruce Baird, Prince Development
Sue Wood	Brandon Atkinson
Paul Cutler	

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER

Commissioner Kjar

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held February 13, 2013 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Kjar made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holbrook and passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

**PUBLIC HEARING - WOODS PARK SUBDIVISION - REZONE/
CONCEPTUAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE - Consideration of
rezoning property from A-L (Agricultural-Low) to R-L (Residential-Low)/Planned
Development and PDO Concept Plan for the Woods Park Subdivision; which would create
29 building lots, located at approximately 2250 North 800 West. Alan Prince, Prince
Development LLC, Applicant.**

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported several months ago the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council approval of a rezone and a conceptual site plan for Woods Park Subdivision. The City Council reviewed the application and directed staff to research the drainage issues further. After careful research it was discovered there is inadequate drainage for this site due to undersized culverts and the added flow of the Lone Pine Creek which drains through this flood plain area. The City's master drainage plan includes an upgrade to the culverts that drain water from this flood plain area west under I-15 and the UTA/UP rail corridor. In order for the Woods Park Subdivision to move forward these upgrades to the drainage plan will need to take place. This is an opportunity for the City to partner with the developer in order to make these improvements to the drainage plan a reality. Staff requested the City Council table action regarding the rezone and the conceptual site plan and remand it back to the Planning Commission for further review, as the applicant has modified the original proposed Planned Development Overlay (PDO). Tonight, the Commission is being asked to review the new PDO plans and determine if the rezone and conceptual site plan are in accordance with zoning ordinances and then make a recommendation regarding the entire project to the City Council. The City Council will then make a decision regarding the rezone, the conceptual site plan, and the upgrades to the drainage system.

Mr. Snyder reviewed the newly proposed site plan. He explained the PDO process changes the typical cookie cutter subdivision standards. The PDO provides the developer incentives (i.e., increased density, modified setbacks, etc.) in order for the city to gain an enhanced subdivision (i.e., increased landscaping, enhanced architecture, etc.). The applicant has acquired some additional land and the proposed project is now six (6) acres. The applicant is proposing a 29-unit single-family development. Zoning ordinances allow 24 total units and the PDO process allows an additional 20% increase to that density. This would permit a total of 30 units on the proposed six (6) acres. As permitted per the PDO the applicant is requesting increased density, reduced right-of-way, elimination of sidewalk on one side of the street, and reduced front, side and rear yard setbacks. In exchange for these incentives, the applicant has agreed to enhanced and varying architecture, varying lot sizes, enhanced landscaping including streetscape trees, decorative interior and street lighting, entry monuments, common play area, connecting pathways, and perimeter fencing. In addition, the applicant will partner with the City to improve the drainage system as needed which will benefit the city as a whole.

1 Mr. Snyder responded to questions from the Commission. He explained staff suggests the
2 applicant move the sidewalk proposed around the perimeter of the island in the middle of the
3 project to the opposite side of the street making the sidewalk more accessible to the entire
4 development. The sidewalk would still be connected to the pathway (via designated pedestrian
5 crosswalks) down the middle of the island which would serve as access for the eight (8) island
6 homes. There is a gate proposed for each rear yard fence of the island homes in order to access
7 the pathway. He explained the City Council will enter into an agreement with the developer
8 explaining the responsibilities of the drainage improvements. The applicant will be responsible
9 to provide proof of funding for both drainage improvements and PDO development at
10 preliminary approval. He also explained the FEMA regulations with regard to development in a
11 flood plain. All structures will be required to be above the flood plain, this is accomplished by
12 filling the site before construction. This is why it is important to upgrade the drainage culverts so
13 that all water can be drained appropriately and not flow onto neighboring properties.

14
15 Commissioner Fillmore said she is concerned with having sidewalk on only one side of
16 the street. She believes it is safer for children when there is sidewalk on both sides of a street
17 easily accessible to all homes. She questioned the need to narrow the street width to 44 feet. She
18 asked if this is necessary for the development or a cost convenience. She also suggested the
19 perimeter fencing be upgraded. She is not in favor of a long straight vinyl wall along streets. She
20 suggested a split rail fence, rod iron, or other adjustments in the perimeter fencing. She said it
21 seems other PDO developments within the city have been held to a higher standard. Chair
22 Merrill questioned the reduced setbacks. He does not want to see a deck, patio, or accessory
23 building encroach into the already reduced rear-yard or side-yard setback.

24
25 Mr. Snyder explained the right-of-way is being narrowed to 44 feet. This means the park
26 strip is being narrowed, it does not mean the street width will be narrowed. The asphalt width
27 will be the same as any other typical subdivision street, the narrowing of the right-of-way is what
28 eliminates the sidewalk on one side. He said the sidewalk system is aesthetically proportionate
29 for the development and there is access to the sidewalk system from every unit in the
30 development. Requiring sidewalk on both sides of the street will diminish the front-yard setback
31 and would require a narrowing of the asphalt width to the road. This is something the City
32 Engineer is not comfortable with. The elimination of sidewalk on one side of the street also
33 allows for snow storage. Mr. Snyder said he is not sure if there are decks or patios on the homes.
34 The conceptual plan only shows a building envelope. Any decks will have to be within that
35 envelope. In addition, all accessory buildings will have to comply with the rear-yard and side-
36 yard setbacks. The homeowners' documents will include these details.

37
38 Alan Prince, applicant, reviewed pictures of the current state of the site, explaining the
39 improvements to this site, through this project, will be a benefit to adjoining neighbors and the

community as a whole. The proposed project will beautify this area. He said the City is in need of drainage improvements and he is happy to help make this a reality. He explained the narrowed 44-foot right-of-way helps contribute land for the proposed drainage swall along the Frontage road, which is part of the master drainage plan for the city. He said this project will be similar to the Henry Walker Homes development just north of this site in Farmington City. In fact, Henry Walker Homes has approached him to buy lots within this proposed subdivision. He said they have not asked for the maximum density allowed because the proposed layout has a more fluid feel. He explained both Lot 8 and Lot 19 will have an enhanced setback so these lots are less intrusive to adjacent properties. This will also increase beautification. Mr. Prince explained the perimeter fence is proposed to be a two-tone solid vinyl fence, per City ordinances. He said the perimeter fence encloses the rear yards which is a privacy issue. He said he is in favor of jogging the fence every so often and adding planter boxes to help break up the solid feel along Lund Lane.

Mr. Snyder said the fence along Lund Lane will be setback from the roadway behind sidewalk and landscaping. The landscaping will diminish the visibility of the fence while providing privacy for residents and appropriate public space for pedestrians. The fence line along Lund Lane is also the drainage utility corridor.

Chair Merrill opened the public hearing.

Paul Cutler, 1872 North Main, said he appreciates the significant improvements the developer has made since the first proposal; however, he still has concerns. He said he is concerned with sidewalk on only one side of the street. He is concerned with only one point of egress. He understands the need for the egress to line up with the street opposite Lund Lane, but believes another egress would be beneficial. He is concerned the amount of traffic generated by this many homes will be too great for a single egress. He is concerned with the potential number of children this subdivision will attract. There is no safe sidewalk on Lund Lane or from this development to the nearest elementary school. Sidewalk improvements outside this development would be a significant cost for both Centerville and Farmington and the developer is not in favor of constructing sidewalk beyond the subdivision. He said perhaps an asphalt trail could be encouraged to the nearby elementary. He is concerned with the narrowed right-of-way and how that may affect on-street parking. He is concerned with the potential for the homeowners association to fail in such a small subdivision. There needs to be a guarantee that the homeowners association will be set up properly with funding in order to maintain landscaping. He also questioned if the culvert along Lund Lane will be completely enclosed to protect children from gaining access.

1 Brent Garlick, 2164 North Frontage Road, said his property borders this proposed
2 development on the south. He agreed with the many concerns voiced by Mr. Cutler. He
3 appreciates the adjustments that have been made to the detention swell along the Frontage Road.
4 He said the proposed subdivision may be better than the typical cookie cutter subdivision, but
5 there are still a number of concerns. He said the rear-yard setback is only fifteen (15) feet. This is
6 really close to his property line. He wondered if there is a way to inform residents that move into
7 this subdivision that they are locating next to an active agricultural use. He said the farming
8 activities on his property often smell unpleasant and he does not want any complaints. Overall,
9 he would not like this property rezoned, but if it must be then the things the developer has
10 promised must be guaranteed.

11
12 Cindy Garlick, 2164 North Frontage Road, said it seems the City may be putting the cart
13 before the horse with the drainage improvements. She said UTA/UP has not approved the
14 drainage upgrades, so how does the City know the improvements can be accomplished. Perhaps
15 the City should hold off on approving this rezone until there is a surety the improvements will
16 move forward. She has always anticipated development on this site, but never imagined it would
17 only be fifteen (15) feet from her property line. She too is concerned for the safety of children
18 walking within the neighborhood and from school as there are no sidewalks.

19
20 Chair Merrill closed the public hearing.

21
22 Mr. Snyder said street parking will not be affected by the reduced right-of-way because
23 the asphalt width will not change. He said the culvert will be sufficiently covered and safe from
24 children. He said UTA/UP will approve the drainage upgrades, all the studies and calculations
25 have been completed and the City has already met with UTA. He said the Public Works Director
26 has stated an asphalt pathway could easily be installed for children walking outside this
27 development. He said the elementary school is just under a mile away from this development. At
28 that distance busing is not approved and it is likely most parents will carpool their children.

29
30 Bruce Baird, Prince Development, agreed to provide a plat note and a seller disclosure
31 stating this subdivision is within the vicinity of existing agricultural uses. He agreed to install
32 additional landscaping along the Garlick's property line to further buffer the 15-foot rear-yard
33 setback and enhance privacy. He also explained that new State laws enforce and strengthen
34 provisions governing homeowners associations. He assured the Commission it is not likely the
35 homeowners association will fail. The homeowners association will maintain all front yards, all
36 common space, and the detention swell along the Frontage road.

Chair Merrill said he believes the proposed rezone is appropriate. He said there are many that would like to live in Centerville and the PDO is a good tool to provide an opportunity for others to move in and enjoy this great city.

Commissioner Fillmore made a **MOTION** for the Planning Commission to recommend approval to the City Council for a Planned Development Overlay Concept Plan for the Woods Park Subdivision, located at 2250 North 800 West, subject to the following:

Conditions:

1. This PDO Concept Plan acceptance is subject to approval of the R-L/PD by the City Council.
2. Upon R-L/PD approval by the City, all future development must substantially comply with the Concept Plan booklet, the landscaping plan, and color/materials scheme submitted by the developer to the Planning Commission & City Council, except as amended by the City.
3. Alterations to the City's Zoning or Subdivision Ordinances are acceptable as follows:
 - a. May receive up to a 20% density bonus consisting of no more than 29 single-family homes
 - b. May reduce the right-of-way down to 44 feet, or as determined appropriate by the City Engineer.
 - c. May eliminate the public sidewalk along one side of the street.
 - d. May reduce front yards to 20 feet.
 - e. May reduce side yards to 5 feet or 10 feet between units.
 - f. May reduce rear yards to 15 feet.
4. This PDO Concept Plan acceptance is amended to include the following:
 - a. Provide a connecting pathway from the interior development pathway system to the landscape detention area and the Frontage Road sidewalks.
 - b. Switch the interior sidewalk around the island to the outside loop and re-connect the pathways.
 - c. Reduce congested driveway (i.e., amount of impervious surface) areas for Lots 1-3 and Lots 19-21 to improve front-yard green space and appearance for these units.
 - d. Provide secondary landscaped feature areas at Lots 2/3 and Lot 19 (e.g. angling rear-yard fence lines), along the Lund Lane frontage.
 - e. The building architecture for rear elevations are to be enhanced with additional architectural and material design elements.
 - f. All primary buildings and attached accessory building elements are to comply with the approved setbacks.

- g. The use of detached accessory buildings is to be addressed with any preliminary subdivision plan submittal.
 - h. Stamped-colored concrete crosswalks are to be added to all designated pedestrian crossing areas within the public right-of-way and must meet City Standards.
 - i. Provide increased architectural interest and detail on the perimeter fencing facing the roads.
 - j. Trees for privacy added in the landscaping plan along the backs of Lots 9-14.
 - k. A plat note added and a seller disclosure provided that this development is next to existing agricultural zoning.
5. As part of any preliminary subdivision submittal, the applicant shall provide a development schedule indicating when the project will begin construction and estimated timeline for build out.
 6. This PDO Concept Plan acceptance is subject to all other applicable City ordinances and other related development applications and approvals.
 7. The PDO Concept Plan acceptance is subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer and City Attorney, and subject to applicable City ordinances.

Reasons for the Action (Findings):

1. The Planning Commission finds that the propose PDO Concept Plan, with the listed conditions, results in a residential project design and layout that could not be accomplished through conventional zoning.
2. The Planning Commission finds that the PDO request, with the listed conditions, sufficiently addresses the PDO Development Standards found in Section 12-41-080.
3. The Planning Commission finds that the PDO Concept Plan, with the listed conditions, provides sufficient evidence in regard to the project's design and amenities to receive a bonus density of up to 20% [Section 12-41-080(c)(2)].
4. The Planning Commission finds that the PDO Concept Plan is in harmony with the General Plan's residential base density [Section 12-480-5].
5. The Planning Commission finds that the PDO Concept Plan is in harmony with the General Plan's desire to have future development to occur within small PUDs [Section 12-480-5].

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holbrook.

Commissioner Kjar said he is in favor of the proposed development and it will improve the neighborhood for the better.

Commissioner Markham said he is not in favor of the rezone. He said there is no driving reason to rezone from agricultural at this time. He is sympathetic to the neighbors.

Chair Merrill called for a vote on the motion. The motion *passed* with a roll-call vote (4-1). Commissioner Markham opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING – CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN - MTC BUILDING #2 & PARKING STRUCTURE - Consideration of a conceptual site plan for a second building and parking structure for the Management and Training Corporation (MTC), to be located on Lot 202 of the Centerville Corporate Park Amended Subdivision, 550 North Market Place Drive, in the C-VH Zone. Dayton West, LLC, Applicant.

Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner, reported the applicant is seeking conceptual approval for a second Management and Training Corporation (MTC) building and a parking structure on Lot 202 of the Centerville Corporate Park Subdivision. The proposed use is consistent with the Commercial Very-High (C-VH) Zone and the General Plan for this area. Staff has received the necessary utility provider sheets stating services are available at this location. The proposed building and parking structure appear to meet the development standards for the C-VH Zone. The proposed site plan, including the parking structure, consists of 338 parking stalls with a shared parking agreement. The applicant has submitted a site plan showing the general location of landscaping, but will be required to submit a more detailed plan, including vegetation types, quantities and irrigation at final site plan. The applicant is still working with the City Engineer regarding the dumpster location so it does not conflict with water lines. In addition, all dumpsters, utility equipment, and service areas will need to be screened appropriately. Also, any signage will be reviewed and approved according to applicable City ordinances.

Mr. Toponce explained the proposed site is located within the Parrish Lane Gateway and is subject to the Parrish Lane Design Guidelines. Staff believes the proposed building plans for both the building and the parking structure do not meet the articulation standards and suggests additional architectural features be added, such as column bump outs, decorative trim, canopies, archways, or stepping of the building walls. The applicant will be required to provide a storyboard showing the exact color and materials at final site plan approval. The applicant will also be required to show details concerning the parking garage roof and how the snow will be held back to avoid sheeting. The proposed plans appear to meet the requirements for pedestrian access as there are adequate pedestrian connections to the first MTC building (Lot 201) and the proposed parking structure. However, staff suggests additional public amenities be added, such as benches or raised landscaping beds that could be used as benches. The applicant is also encouraged to provide a safe pedestrian walkway from the CenterPoint Legacy Center around the parking garage to the Frontage Road. The applicant proposes to continue the high standard of landscaping already established on Lot 201. The overall design of the landscaping should have a

1 theme that carries throughout the development, including the parking lot. This could include rock
2 features throughout all the planting beds, or the same type of plantings, decorative gravel, or
3 perhaps specific shaped plantings beds. Mr. Toponce explained the "other development issues"
4 as listed in the staff report. There are a number of agreements, easements, and restrictions
5 associated with this subdivision. The applicant will be required to review and comply with each
6 of these provisions. In addition, this development is also subject to Redevelopment Agency
7 approval.

8
9 Dave Broadbent, Dayton West, responded to questions from the Commission. He said the
10 parking structure is accessible to the public 24/7 and will have security cameras constantly
11 recording. The structure will be well lit with both sky lights and lighting. He said an elevator is
12 not required for the parking structure but there will be two stairwells. The parking garage will
13 have clearly marked pedestrian crosswalks to both MTC buildings and the Centerpoint Legacy
14 Center. The MTC will not occupy the proposed building but rather lease the entire building to
15 tenants. He explained they do not anticipate any 24-hour tenants so parking should not be an
16 issue, but they are not excluding 24-hour tenants. Any tenant interested in the site, will be made
17 aware of the shared parking arrangements. He explained they are still working closely with
18 Chick-Fil-A to resolve circulation and dumpster location issues. He is confident this will be
19 resolved soon and those plans will be brought to the City during subsequent approval processes.
20 He said they have not anticipated any signage on the parking structure because they do not want
21 to promote a park-n-ride situation, but they will look at options for informing patrons that the
22 parking structure is available for their use. Mr. Broadbent reviewed the buildings plans pointing
23 out the windows, the entrance canopy, sun shades, and wall lighting. He said the building will
24 match the current MTC building. He believes there is adequate visual articulation.

25
26 Chair Merrill opened the public hearing. There was no comment; he closed the public
27 hearing.

28
29 Commissioner Fillmore said she agrees with staff in that additional public amenities are
30 warranted. She suggested condition #4 be modified to include the possibility of a water feature,
31 art and/or furnishings. This type of sleek design would welcome either or both a water feature
32 and public art. She also agrees with staff that some additional architectural detail and relief
33 should be added to the buildings. She said this is already a proposed condition of approval and
34 believes it is appropriate. She trusts the applicant can work with staff on these details. She said
35 the buildings, as proposed, would fit better in the industrial zones of Centerville. Within the
36 Parrish Lane Gateway corridor a higher standard is expected. Commissioner Markham agreed.
37 He believes there is more that can be done with color, materials, and articulation for both the
38 building and the parking structure.

39

Mr. Broadbent explained the proposed landscaping will flow into each lot of this subdivision and is of greater standard and quality than expected per City ordinances. He said they plan to add benches and a lunch area as part of the common space. There has also been discussion about adding a water feature to the common area as well. He said they take pride in making this area a place where people would like to work and it will be a great asset to the Parrish Lane Gateway corridor.

Commissioner Merrill made a **MOTION** for the Planning Commission to accept the conceptual site plan for the second MTC Building, located at 550 North Market Place Drive, with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in Section 12-21-110(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. A landscaping plan shall be created and stamped by a licensed landscape architect and submitted to staff for review. The plans shall depict the following:
 - a. All applicable requirements found in Chapter 12-51 in relation to landscaping shall be completed
 - b. Location and type of all vegetation
 - c. Total number of trees and shrubs
 - d. Total percentage of overall landscaping and parking lot landscaping
 - e. An irrigation plan shall be created
3. All landscaping for the second MTC Building shall be cohesive to the design and landscaping of the existing MTC Building.
4. Public amenities and water features, art, and furnishing should be addressed, which may include but shall not be limited to benches or raised landscaping beds that would act as a permanent bench.
5. All areas around pedestrian crossings and pathways should have increased landscaping designs.
6. Pedestrian circulation should be reevaluated to ensure proper connection from all buildings within the Centerville Corporate Park. Special consideration should be evaluated as to the most likely path pedestrian will take and to draw the flow of traffic to other adjacent restaurants and businesses.
7. The dumpster shall be properly screened from view following the criteria found in Section 12-51-110(a) of the Zoning Ordinance.
8. The following engineering concerns shall be addressed and shown on the final site plan:

- a. Detail regarding the waterline location and the dumpster construction detail shall be submitted and reviewed by the City Engineer to ensure no conflict shall take place
- b. All easements shall be clearly marked on the site plan
- c. The location of the subdrain shall be located and depicted
- d. Detention calculations shall be submitted
- e. A bond must be established for all on-site improvements by the City Engineer and posted by the applicant prior to receiving a building permit
9. All utility provider sheets shall be submitted as part of the final site plan process.
10. All proposed signage shall follow applicable standards found in Chapter 12-54 of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. A lighting plan shall be submitted as part of the final site plan application and shall include:
 - a. Parking lot lighting which matches other designs found within the Centerville Corporate Park
 - b. Pedestrian bollards should be considered, in order to enhance the pedestrian experience
 - c. Applicant shall work the with the Public Works Director concerning any required pedestrian lighting along Market Place Drive and their exact location and design
 - d. Lighting for the parking lot structure shall ensure safety within the structure and should be designed as to soften the design on the outside
12. A storyboard for all proposed buildings shall be submitted as part of the final site plan and include all material and color detail:
13. The architectural detail for the new MTC Building shall be re-evaluated and address the following:
 - a. The building shall be stepped horizontally and vertically in order to meet the requirements of Section 12-63-040 (a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance
 - b. Architectural upgrades shall be located on the building and may include: column bump-outs, decorative trim elements, additional canopies or other similar architectural detail
 - c. Architectural upgrades shall include 25% of the primary wall, 15% of the secondary wall and 5% all other walls
14. Architectural detail for the parking garage shall also be depicted and include the following:
 - a. Enhanced architectural features such as color, differing cement designs, lighting, landscape trellis or other architectural designs to soften the appearance of the garage
 - b. Roof covering design including proper water and snow run off design

15. Detail concerning the mitigations for the possible vehicular conflict area at the bottom of the parking garage ramp, shall be indicated on the final site plan.
16. Applicant shall comply with all Governing Documents of the Centerville Corporate Park Subdivision, as amended and conditions of lot split approval for the subdivision. Staff shall review submitted documents and plans for compliance with Governing Documents with final site plan review.
17. Applicant shall obtain acceptance of the site plan and development by the RDA and the City Council as required under the Governing Documents for the Subdivision prior to final site plan approval.

Reasons for Action (Findings):

1. The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [Section 12-21-110(d)(2)].
2. The MTC Building is found within the Parrish Lane Gateway and is subject to all requirements found there in [Section 12-63-020(b)].
3. The MTC is part of the Centerville Corporate Park and is subject to other restrictions, conditions and guidelines [Parrish Lane Gateway Neighborhood Development Plan, August 1 1989, and as amended February 1, 2008, Conditional Use Permit for the Planned Center, May 10, 2000 and as amended 2008, Development Agreement May 24, 2000, Grant of Easements and restrictions, June 23, 2000].
4. Upgraded articulations and design detail for all buildings is required by the Centerville City Ordinance within the Parrish Lane Gateway [Section 12-63-040].

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kjar and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (5-0).

TRAINING FOR COMMISSIONERS – Review the purpose of the General Plan

This item was postponed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Work Session with the City Council regarding Work Program & Goals on March 5, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.
2. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 13, 2013.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

1
2
3
4
5
6

Kevin Merrill, Chair

Date Approved

Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

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

PLANNING STAFF MEMORADUM

DATE: MARCH 13, 2013
TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: CORY SNYDER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
MEMO: 2013/14 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORK PROGRAM AND GOALS

BACKGROUND

As previously discussed at the PC/CC Work Session of March 5, 2013, staff has prepared the suggested changes to the Work Program and Goals for the Community Development Department. From staff's opinion of the meeting, the following lists the current projects and changes that are proposed, parsing out the various issues with infill development, and various issues with no clear consensus:

Current Priorities:

1. General Plan Update – Moderate Income Housing Element
2. General Plan Update – West Side Neighborhood, revise due to developing Legacy Crossing with regards to residential
3. General Plan Update – Comprehensive City Trail and Pathways Element
4. Zoning Ordinance – Old Town Site & Historic Preservation

Changed Priorities:

5. General Plan – Public Space Strategic Plan move to a priority "A"
6. General Plan – Geologic/Natural Hazards Element Update move to a priority "A"
7. Zoning Ord. – Adopt a Geologic Hazards Map & Update Sensitive Lands Ordinance move to a priority "A"
8. Misc. Projects – Complete the Parrish Gateway Design Area & include re-addressing the use of street lighting move to a priority "A"
9. Misc. Projects – Combine Infill with Accessory Dwelling Units & break issues up into stand-alone components:
 - a. Infill – Old Town Historic Area currently is a priority "A"
 - b. Infill – Accessory Dwelling Units move to _____?
 - c. Infill – Small Lot Floating Zone move to a priority _____?
 - d. Infill – Use of Group Dwellings (more than one dwelling per lot) move to _____?
 - e. Infill – Use of Alternative Housing Types move to _____?
 - f. Infill – Inclusionary Zoning Programs move to _____?

No Clear Consensus:

10. Zoning Ordinance – Revisiting Temporary Use allowances & standards
11. Misc. Projects – Redevelopment of Pages Lane Area
12. Zoning Ordinance – Use of Electronic Copy Signs

As you may have deduced, the above items could not possibly be completed within one (year), however, it would help prioritize the focus and efforts for the planning staff in the upcoming few years.