

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 MARCH 27, 2019 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 City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Jacob Smith, Centerville Management Services 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. The full packet can also be viewed on the City's website: <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>.

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

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

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

D. COMMISSION BUSINESS

- 7:10
1. Discussion - Recap of Work Session on Main Street Overlay Amendments
The Commission will review and summarize the previous March 13th Work Session with the City Council and discuss how to proceed forward with amendments to the Main Street Overlay.
 2. Land Use Training #1 - What Hat Do You Wear?
[Tabled from March 13th Meeting]
 3. Community Development Director's Report
 4. City Council Report

E. MINUTES REVIEW and ACCEPTANCE

February 27th and March 13th, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
3/27/2019**

Item No.

Short Title: Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

3/27/2019

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Discussion - Recap of Work Session on Main Street Overlay Amendments

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 7:10

SUBJECT

The Commission will review and summarize the previous March 13th Work Session with the City Council and discuss how to proceed forward with amendments to the Main Street Overlay.

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- 3-27-19 Recap Work Session Memo

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: MARCH 27, 2019

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING STAFF

SUBJECT: SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLANNING – JOINT WORK SESSION FOLLOW-UP

BACKGROUND

As the Planning Commission is aware, on March 13, 2019 the Council and Commission met together for a work session regarding the South Main Street area. The purpose of this memo is to summarize what staff heard and have the Commission weight in. The desired outcome is for the Commission to synthesize a thematic outline of conclusions. These conclusions then would be used to begin drafting, over the next few months, the needed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments to address the vision and subsequent development regulations for the South Main Street area.

WORK SESSION HIGHLIGHTS SUMMARY – STAFF VERSION

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS THAT WERE ASKED:

Is Main Street “Unique” or the “Heart of the City?”
Is Main Street “deteriorating” or in “need of restoration or revitalizing?”

[STATEMENT PROVIDED BY STAFF AT THE MEETING] The currently adopted framework of SMSC Form-based development strategy was developed with a “*significant expectation*” for “*re-development and reinvestment*” and likely occur over a long period of time.

Does, it match, meet, facilitate, or fulfill the expectations/ conclusions discussed in the answers/ conclusions above?

STAFF STATEMENTS REFLECTING WHAT WE HEARD

From what we heard at the meeting, Staff created the following statements that could be used to begin the foundation for policy creation. The Planning Commission should review, add to, eliminate, or alter, these to reflect any impressions garnered from the work session. Statements are:

- ✓ *The area on Main Street between 400 South (Porter Lane) and 400 North (Parrish Lane) has been regarded somewhat as the traditional commercial center of Centerville, though in reality it never became a strong focal point.*
- ✓ *The Main Street commercial area is aging now and somewhat deteriorating, though a few new buildings have been constructed here in recent years.*
- ✓ *Significant growth and enhancement of commercial synergy is not likely to occur in the future*
- ✓ *Some revitalization is warranted and should be encouraged, but in a limited manner to maintain the local service-oriented uses (aka: “soft commercial”) for the community.*
- ✓ *The currently adopted South Main Street Plan and associated Zoning Ordinances do not adequately support or be advantageous in balancing the current and future needs of the commercial property owners and adjacent residential uses for the South Main Street area*
- ✓ *Nonetheless, future commercial development along Main Street should conform to performance [e.g. design] guidelines which require landscaping, appropriate parking, minimal traffic impact upon Main Street, and buffering from adjacent residential areas*

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS FUNDAMENTALS

Staff is recommending that the city create a reformat of the existing SMSC corridor plan and zoning ordinance. The existing SMSC Plan (*General Plan Document*) would need to be rescinded and replaced in a manner, such as:

- Re-write/modify the existing Generalized Sections of the General Plan’s Goals regarding Main Street.
- Create an alternative/reformat for the adopted independent SMSC Plan (*Section 12-480*) that identifies what the new goals and objectives are to be.
- The SMSC Overlay Zone (*Zoning Ordinance*) would need to be rescinded and replaced in a manner, such as:
 - Create a substitute Zoning Overlay that is customized to the desired development and design outcomes, specific to Main Street,

OR

- Eliminate the SMSC Overlay Zone and write new design performance regulations that are specific for Main Street. This would be analogous to what has been done in other Zoning Districts, such as the Parrish Lane Gateway Design or the Shorelands Commerce Design regulations.

AND

- Consider reducing the corridor area to be regulated – example limit General Plan and Zoning Ordinance changes from Parrish Lane to Porter Lane – rather than from Parrish to Pages

QUESTIONS YET NEEDING TO BE ANSWERED:

A new plan will be problematic to develop without a clear understanding of what is the expected “*land use pattern*” for the future of Main Street. Is it to:

- *Maintain or enhance the existing commercial uses?*

AND/OR

- *Encourage additional commercial uses and/or revitalization?*

AND/OR

- *Add residential uses in some manner in the future to enhance or replace existing commercial development?*

ALSO

- *What should be threshold for bring any “non-conformities” up to a new design standard:*
 - *Change of same use (difficult legally)?*
 - *Change to a new use (possible but challenging)?*
 - *Additions above 30% of the building (current standard)?*
 - *Additions less than 30% of the building (an additional constraint may lessen synergy to make any real changes)?*
 - *Other Ideas*

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
3/27/2019**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Land Use Training #1 - What Hat Do You Wear?

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

[Tabled from March 13th Meeting]

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission has identified land use training as one of its goals for 2019. As part of that commitment, the Planning Commission has agreed to work through the informative and entertaining videos created by the Land Use Academy of Utah (LUAU). The first video selected for this training is entitled "What Hat Do You Wear?" and is intended to explain the different types of land use decisions that are made, including legislative and administrative decisions. This video is about 6 minutes long. We will watch this video as a group at the meeting and then discuss any questions or comments.

What Hat Do You Wear? Understanding Legislative and Administrative Decisions:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LMeFQiAJ56k&feature=youtu.be>

From the LUAU Website: *LUAU was created by a grant from the Utah State Legislature in 2014. Spearheaded by the Utah League of Cities and Towns, LUAU is made up of a consortium of Utah interest groups who support training and education in land use for our local elected and appointed officials. Our goal is to create the first statewide uniform and comprehensive online land use website resource to train, inform and educate elected and appointed officials and the general public in statutory land issues and best planning practices. The site is housed and managed by the Utah League of Cities and Towns working with a review board for content and oversight direction.*

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
3/27/2019**

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Community Development Director's Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
3/27/2019**

Item No. 4.

Short Title: City Council Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report 3/27/2019

Item No.

Short Title: February 27th and March 13th, 2019

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▣ Preliminary Draft PC 2-27-19
- ▣ Preliminary Draft PC 3-13-19

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, February 27, 2019**

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

4
5 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah, the
6 meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

10 Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

11 Kai Hintze

12 Gina Hirst

13 Thomas Hunt

14 Becki Wright

15
16 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

17 Logan Johnson

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

21 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

22 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

23 Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary

24
25 **VISITORS**

26 Interested citizens

27
28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29
30 As Thomas Hunt had recently been appointed to serve on the Planning Commission, Chair Hayman asked
31 him to introduce himself. Commissioner Hunt explained that he was a Civil Engineer, grew up in West
32 Bountiful and had lived in Centerville for the past six years. He hoped to contribute to the community in
33 which he and his wife had chosen to raise their children.

34
35 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Kai Hintze

36
37 **PUBLIC MEETING – LEGACY LANDS FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT – 1243 N 1300 W**

38
39 Cory Snyder explained that the applicant wished to subdivide his industrial property. One unique
40 aspect of the corner parcel was that it was zoned as I-H. The property to the south and west of that piece
41 was the area that the applicant hoped to subdivide. It was believed that the I-H zoning classification was
42 an error and that it could be rectified by submitting an affidavit of correction to the City Recorder who
43 could verify that the ordinance changing the zoning of the surrounding property had been signed and
44 supported the intended rezone of the corner piece to Shorelands Commerce Park Zone.

45
46 There were several things that had yet to be completed. For example, the wetlands had not been
47 mitigated so it was important that their location be spelled out clearly on the subdivision plat.
48 Additionally, the access easement must not encumber the wetlands. A title report has not been submitted
49 to the City Attorney because the applicant is waiting until the aforementioned corner parcel has been

1 purchased. The City Engineer was still in the process of reviewing the construction plans. Despite these
2 shortcomings, Staff recommended approval as highlighted in the staff report.

3
4 Commissioner Hintze asked for Mr. Snyder to clarify the situation regarding the wetlands. Mr.
5 Snyder explained that there had been a soil study in the past which showed a delineation of wetlands. Part
6 of the subdivision process was to identify the existence of any wetlands so that future property owners
7 would understand that the area was restricted for future development. The boundary of the wetlands will
8 need to be shown on the plat.

9
10 Commissioner Wright pointed out that indicating the wetlands on the final plat did not appear on
11 the list of conditions, although it was included elsewhere in the staff report. Mr. Snyder stated that was an
12 oversight and would need to be an additional condition.

13
14 Chair Hayman invited the applicant to step forward and speak on the item. Jeff Cook of Cook
15 Builders introduced himself as well as property owner Gary Smith. Mr. Cook stated he was unaware of
16 the zoning difference but agreed it should be consistent with that of the surrounding property.

17
18 Lisa Romney asked if the corner parcel had been purchased. Mr. Cook responded that the sale
19 would close within the next several days. Ms. Romney asked that he could notify the City when the
20 purchase was completed and he agreed that he would. He stated he was notified earlier in the day that the
21 title search had been completed.

22
23 Mr. Cook stated that the wetlands would be noted on the plat as required. Additionally, there was
24 an easement at the rear of the property which was approximately 50' and was for petroleum lines. The
25 wetlands were roughly 46' so there was no room for a structure of any kind anyway.

26
27 Chair Hayman opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m. There was no one who wished to address
28 the Commission so Chair Hayman closed the public hearing.

29
30 The Planning Commission and Staff discussed the verbiage for proposed condition #8.

31
32 Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to recommend approval for the Final Subdivision Plat and
33 Plans for the Legacy Lands Subdivision, subject to conditions 1-8, with #8 being that the wetlands
34 boundary shall be depicted on the final plat matching the construction drawings, with suggested reasons
35 for action a and b as noted. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion.

36
37 Conditions

38 1. The Final Recordable Subdivision Plat shall reflect the lot layout and engineering as submitted
39 and also compliance with these conditions of approval, or as may be amended by the City in
40 preparation of its recording

41
42 2. The subdivision construction plans shall be deemed acceptable to the City Engineer prior to
43 recordation of the subdivision plat.

44
45 3. A Final Paper Plat shall be submitted to the City Recorder's office to be reviewed by the City
46 staff to ensure plat compliance with City's approved format, approval of final layout, survey
47 standards, and owner dedications. Such paper plat shall be deemed acceptable by the City
48 Attorney and City Engineer prior to preparation and submittal of the final recordable lien plat to
49 the City.

50
51 4. A current Title Report (i.e. within 30days of recording) for all properties shall be submitted to
52 the City with the Final Paper Plat Submittal to the City Recorder.

53

5. The required improvement bond and associated fees shall be prepared, reviewed, and paid prior to the recordation of the subdivision plat.

6. The “Affidavit of Correction “requesting that the Zoning Map be adjusted to meet the 2009 SCP Map Revision Exhibits shall be accepted by the City Recorder, prior to recording the plat.

7. After the plat recording, a preconstruction meeting shall be held with the City that includes all parties that are installing the public and utility service infrastructure.

8. The wetlands boundary shall be depicted on the final plat, matching the construction drawings.

Suggested Reasons for the Action:

a) The Planning Commission finds that Final Plat and Plans are consistent with the previous Conceptual Plan Acceptance directives and Preliminary Subdivision Plan Approval.

b) The Planning Commission finds that the final subdivision complies with the applicable Regulations of the subdivision, non-residential subdivision, and SCP Zone lot regulations and requirements.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

The applicant expressed his appreciation to Staff.

DISCUSSION – SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE UPDATES – CHAPTER 4 (EXISTING CONDITIONS INVENTORY)

Ms. Romney introduced the next Subdivision Ordinance chapter for review by the Planning Commission. Chapter 4 involves the requirement for an existing conditions inventory to be submitted with every new subdivision application. Ms. Romney explained that the City’s Zoning Code contains a chapter requiring an existing conditions inventory (“ECI”). Chapter 4 of the Subdivision Ordinance is intended to provide similar provisions. She indicated that it might be worth having the Commission revisit Chapter 50 of the Zoning Code to add some of the improvements or additional provisions provided in Chapter 4 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Commissioner Daly wished to clarify whether the Zoning Code would continue to contain information about ECI or if that language would be moved from the Zoning Code to the Subdivision Ordinance. Ms. Romney explained that since the Zoning Code was separate from the Subdivision Ordinance in the municipal code, the ECI language and information is intended to be provided in both places. Ms. Romney noted that the ECI should be required at the initial stage of subdivision development to specifically identify existing conditions on the property. It might require more work of the developer up front, but this process will ensure that any complex or challenging issues are identified sooner rather than later.

Commissioner Daly inquired if a hand-drawn conceptual plan would be acceptable. Mr. Snyder explained that there were applicants who were reasonably experienced in the development process who would conduct their own environmental assessments initially but that there were also those individuals who might still come in with a very rudimentary, hand-drawn sketch. He indicated that Staff was fairly flexible and moved things forward whenever possible.

Ms. Romney indicated that her recommendation was to require the ECI document with the submittal of all initial applications, regardless of type. She pointed out that CMC 15.04.030 addressed what was to be included in the ECI. The General section specified that the information was to be submitted on 24” x 36” sheets so that it could be easily viewed and understood by City Staff. It also was

1 to be overlaid on the subject property. There were to be three hard copies and one electronic copy
2 submitted.

3
4 Chair Hayman mentioned that ECI was defined in CMC 15.04.010 and then again in CMC
5 15.04.020. She felt once was sufficient. Also, she suggested that the heading of 15.04.030 could simply
6 be *ECI Requirements*. Ms. Romney thought perhaps spelling it out would provide for an easier hit on an
7 electronic search of the document. Chair Hayman did not have a strong opinion on the matter.

8
9 Regarding steep slopes, any property with a grade beyond 30% grade was considered
10 undevelopable in Centerville. Ms. Romney stated the verbiage in CMC 15.04.030(d) was simplified, and
11 that while it did not require that a soil study take place, it stated that if a study *had* been conducted, the
12 results were to be provided to the City. Mr. Snyder thought perhaps Davis County had some older soil
13 data available but Commissioner Hunt indicated it was quite general and vague. Commissioner Hirst
14 suggested that there might be data available from the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Ms.
15 Romney said she would add the language “*including but not limited to...*” in order to give the applicant at
16 least a suggestion of where to begin a search for the pertinent information.

17
18 Councilmember Wright asked about requiring a geotechnical report for hillside property. Ms.
19 Romney indicated that was addressed in CMC 15.04.040.

20
21 Regarding special protection areas such as wetlands, the ordinance said they “*shall be shown by a*
22 *line denoting the boundaries.*” Commissioner Hunt cautioned against confusing an approximate boundary
23 with an exact one. Ms. Romney felt that was a helpful suggestion and agreed that the actual boundary
24 should be required at preliminary plat rather than concept plan. Ms. Romney then requested Mr. Snyder’s
25 input regarding wetlands assessments. He responded that they were quite costly and would involve hiring
26 a professional to identify what was present, test the water, etc.

27
28 Commissioner Daly hesitated to leave it up to the applicant to determine whether or not wetlands
29 were present, as they might be inclined to claim they were outside their property line when in fact they
30 were not. Commissioner Wright stated that the ECI was not intended to take the place of other
31 requirements that would indicate the presence of wetlands later in the development process. Mr. Snyder
32 agreed.

33
34 Ms. Romney then addressed CMC 15.04.030(f) regarding shrubs and trees and asked Mr. Snyder
35 for his input regarding the draft language in the ordinance. He pointed out that current City ordinances do
36 not include a strong landscape preservation goal regarding trees on privately owned land. Ms. Romney
37 indicated that although no ordinances *required* the retention of trees during development, there were
38 several ordinance provisions that encourage such preservation. The Planning Commission and Staff
39 discussed potential verbiage for that section of the ordinance and debated whether the tree assessment
40 should be required as part of the ECI, and if so, if it should include trees and shrubs or just trees. Chair
41 Hayman advocated for removing reference to shrubs but retaining the reference to “mature” trees.
42 Commissioner Hunt agreed that trees were important, adding value to property but that the same was not
43 necessarily true of shrubbery, particularly in an industrial area. Commissioner Wright stated she would
44 like to see trees and shrubs included in the assessment. Mr. Snyder indicated the matter was subjective,
45 particularly depending on the type of property involved.

46
47 Commissioner Daly saw no reason the ordinance could not include both shrubs and trees and
48 Commissioner Hintze agreed. Ms. Romney indicated that for now, the verbiage would simply read, “*The*
49 *ECI shall show shrub and tree stands as indicated by recent aerial photos*”. She said the Commission can
50 debate this further when the entire Subdivision Ordinance is brought back to them for approval and
51 recommendation.

Chair Hayman expressed concern that the currently proposed language was more stringent than what was being verbally described in the meeting. She was hearing things like “approximate” and “preliminary” and “do your best” when none of that language was contained in the ordinance.

Commissioner Hirst agreed with Chair Hayman. She pointed out that the ECI mentioned a wetlands assessment requirement although it wasn’t actually required until the preliminary plat stage of development.

Ms. Romney indicated she was comfortable moving paragraph (3) of CMC 15.040.030(e) to the preliminary plat phase. Commissioner Hirst felt the language should be very specific so that applicants had a clear understanding of what was required of them.

Regarding paragraph (g) pertaining to Utility Lines, Ms. Romney pointed out that this information was often not submitted to the City as required and she wondered how readily available the information was to obtain. Mr. Snyder responded that while City lines were plotted on the GIS system, the sewer district’s information was not. Still, he felt it was a reasonable requirement. The Commission and Staff agreed that if there was an available reference for members of the public to use in order to obtain the required information, it would be helpful to reference it in the ordinance and require it as part of the ECI.

Returning to paragraph (c) which pertained to Steep Slopes, Chair Hayman and Ms. Romney discussed the fact that there was some overlap in slope percentages. Ms. Romney said she would amend the language to provide mutually exclusive categories to read,

- (1) Less than 10%;
- (2) More than 10% to 20%;
- (3) More than 20% to 30%;
- (4) Over 30%.

Ms. Romney moved to paragraph (i) which pertained to Special Protection Areas and stated that it was meant to encourage the applicant to begin considering restrictions or special regulations applicable to the subject property regarding things like the Hillside Overlay Zone, wellhead protection sites, etc.

As far as CMC 15.04.040 (Geotechnical Assessment) was concerned, it had been added by the Design Review Committee, but Ms. Romney now wondered if it should be moved to the preliminary plat development phase given the feedback from the Commission. Ms. Romney noted that somewhere in the new Subdivision Ordinance, the City should retain the language provided in subsection (b) in order to make it clear that if at any point the City wanted to require a geotechnical report, it could do so. She had no preference between leaving the language where it was or moving it to the General Subdivision Provisions. The Commission agreed it should be moved to the preliminary plat phase. Ms. Romney would adjust the verbiage in subsection (a) so that it read, *“When a subdivision is proposed, the ECI shall include relevant reports and maps published by the Utah Geological Survey affecting the subject property. ~~along with a geotechnical assessment written by a Utah licensed professional engineering geologist or a Utah licensed professional engineer who is trained and experienced the practice of geotechnical engineering...~~”*

Ms. Romney stated that she would revise Chapter 4 with the suggestions provided by the Commission. In summary, she noted the intent of this Chapter is to identify any red-flag issues associated with the property, to help the developer understand some key points regarding development of the property, and to provide Staff with more information earlier in the process.

DISCUSSION – FINISH DISCUSSION ON 2019 GOALS

Cassie Younger reminded everyone that there would be a joint work session with the City Council on March 13 at 5:30 p.m. Dinner would be provided and the regular meeting would not start until 7:30 p.m.

Ms. Younger wished to confirm that her understanding of the Commission's 2019 priorities as presented in the staff report was accurate. Chair Hayman indicated it was, and agreed that the highest priority was completing the Main Street Overlay Zone updates. Councilmember Daly agreed and felt the Commission should make every effort to stick to the *Main Street General Plan & Zoning Ordinance Amendments Timeline* as presented in the report. Mr. Snyder explained that by scheduling a couple of joint work sessions, he was attempting to ensure that the City Council remained apprised of the Planning Commission's activities instead of being surprised as they apparently had been at the Commission's recent attempt to overhaul the Table of Uses. Chair Hayman wished to express to the councilmembers that they were welcome to attend any Commission meeting and provide feedback. Commissioners Hayman and Wright indicated that they would not be available to attend the meeting on April 24.

Ms. Romney reminded the Commissioners they had expressed interest in land use training for themselves as well as for the City Council. In response to their request, she reached out to the Utah League of Cities and Towns and learned that the Land Use 101 training calendar was already in place for the year and that it would not be possible to add Centerville as a training location. However, she indicated that training sessions would be presented in Kaysville on both May 18 and June 8. She suggested the City target these dates for mandatory attendance by members of the City Council, Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment. The Commission agreed. Commissioner Hintze said he recently attended the Land Use 101 training and thought it was very informative. He stated there were four speakers at the session he attended and he was very impressed by each of them, finding the training to be very worthwhile. Ms. Romney pointed out that the ULCT recommended each body receive annual land use training and the City's insurance company required it. Several of the Commissioners spoke in favor of attending one session or the other. Chair Hayman hoped that the City Council members and Planning Commissioners could attend together. Ms. Romney mentioned that she could provide training on specific pertinent topics and that the ULCT had several very good, short training videos available as well. It was agreed that the Commission would plan to view videos when agendas were light so they could take advantage of the helpful and concise information available in them. Additionally, Ms. Romney would ask all members of both bodies as well as the Board of Adjustment to attend either the May 18th or the June 8th session of Land Use 101.

Chair Hayman asked that after the Planning Commission finished addressing the Main Street Overlay, they return to the list of other 2019 goals.

Commissioners Wright and Hintze both expressed concern about delaying the West Centerville Update for long. Mr. Snyder would provide the Commissioners with a copy of the last proposed West Centerville General Plan amendment that they could study in the meantime.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Mr. Snyder explained that the City Council did not pass any of the edits to the Table of Uses as recommended by the Planning Commission. The Councilmembers indicated they were not ready to take action on the proposed amendments until they knew in which direction they wished to proceed on the Main Street Overlay. Mr. Snyder said that he can appreciate the Council's position, he said it would be very difficult to draft any specific regulations for the Main Street Overlay without understanding the permitted uses.

Commissioner Daly disagreed with that perspective. He felt there were plenty of buildings on Main Street that could be repurposed for a new use without changing the design of the building.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

The Cottage on the Corner final subdivision plat received final Council approval. At the next Planning Commission meeting, there will be an agenda item pertaining to a conditional use permit for Sydnee's Pet Grooming. The Deuel Creek final plat will also be addressed and possibly one other agenda item.

MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE

Ms. Romney pointed out that the February 13, 2019 Work Session minutes that were originally posted did not include some suggested Staff edits. She thanked Jamie Brooks for highlighting this issue. Ms. Romney noted that the corrected minutes have been reposted on Novus. The Planning Commission then discussed additional edits to the Work Session as well as the regular meeting minutes of February 13, 2019.

Commissioner Wright **moved** to approve the minutes of the February 13, 2019 Planning Commission meeting as amended. The motion was seconded by Chair Hayman which passed unanimously (6-0).

Commissioner Daly **moved** to approve the minutes of the February 13, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session as amended. Commissioner Hintze seconded the motion which passed unanimously (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hayman moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (6-0) and the meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Cheyllynn Hayman, Chair

Date Approved

Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

7:30 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 7:32 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

Thomas Hunt

Logan Johnson

Becki Wright (participated electronically)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kai Hintze

Kevin Daly

STAFF PRESENT

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary

VISITORS

Interested citizens

Chair Hayman explained that Commissioner Wright would participate telephonically, that those gathered would be able to hear any comment she made and that she would in turn hear those commenting in the meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER Commissioner Logan Johnson

PUBLIC HEARING – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – SYDNEE’S PET GROOMING

Cory Snyder explained that the applicant had requested a conditional use permit for a pet grooming business which was defined as a kennel in the City ordinances. The concept of the conditional use was to look at potential impacts and see what might be needed to mitigate those impacts. This particular business intended to operate strictly as a groomer and would not be offering boarding services or other uses that were contained within the *kennel* designation. He felt that grooming was a compatible use in the area and would fit well. The applicant had been proactive by erecting a type of sound wall in order to mitigate potential noise. Staff recommended approval of the application for the space to be used for grooming. If the applicant wished to take part in other types of related businesses contained within the kennel designation, she would need to return to the City and request an amendment to the conditional use permit.

Chair Hayman invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission. Kimberly Srisack stepped to the lectern and explained that her business was essentially a hair salon for pets. There would be no day care, bordering or kenneling of animals.

Chair Hayman asked if there was an outdoor area for the animals to relieve themselves. Ms. Srisack responded that there was a large grass area on the side of the building to use in that case. She intended that the area would be kept clean and without unpleasant odors.

Chair Hayman opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m. There was no one who wished to speak and Chair Hayman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Johnson **moved** to approve the conditional use permit for an accessory kennel use for Sydnee's Pet Grooming located at 663 West Market Place Drive with conditions 1-4 as outlined in the staff report and suggested reasons for action a-d.

Conditions

1. The CUP approval consists of allowing a kennel use, in a limited manner for the purpose of a "pet grooming salon"

2. The Kennel (i.e. pet grooming) use shall be limited to the temporary care and services associated with the grooming of pets. The daycare, overnight and outside kenneling of dogs or other animals is expressly prohibited, unless otherwise approved by the City.

3. All grooming operations and accessory type activities shall be conducted entirely inside the store.

4. The applicant shall install sound proofing along the wall space of the adjacent tenant, as indicated in the application for this Conditional Use.

Suggested Reasons for the Action

(a) The grooming or salon care of three (3) or more dogs constitute a "kennel," which is a "conditional use" in the C-VH Zone.

(b) The application meets the required established evidence for an approval of a conditional use permit [12-21-100(e)(3) (A-D)].

(c) The request for a conditional use permit meets the factors to be reviewed and considered for an approval [12-21-100(e) (5) (A-K)].

(d) The proposed limited kennel use does not appear to be detrimental to the surrounding community and there are adequate facilities and services for the proposed use [12-21- 100(e) (5) (D-E, G, I-K)]."

Commissioner Hunt seconded the motion which passed unanimously (4-0).

PUBLIC HEARING – DEUEL CREEK FINAL PLAT SUBDIVISION – 641 EAST 200 SOUTH

Cassie Younger pointed out that she had made some changes to the original version of the staff report but indicated they were not significant. The updated version said *Corrected PC Staff Report* on the cover sheet.

She explained that the property was owned by Davis County and that there was a nearby detention pond that the City owned as well as some property to the east which was also city-owned. The City intended to maintain its property as open space but the County property was to be subdivided into

single family lots. The groundwater on the property was still being monitored and would continue to be so into the spring. There would need to be some very minor revisions made to the plat prior to recordation.

Chair Hayman invited the applicant to step forward and address the Planning Commission.

Tony Thompson of Davis County Property Management, introduced himself and indicated that he appreciated the time and assistance provided by the City Attorney throughout the application process. He wished to clarify the situation with the ground water. It was his understanding that while staff recommended continued monitoring, it was not necessarily a requirement of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Snyder responded that the matter was a concern of staff. The City Engineer had been working with the applicant to get a pipe into the ground but wished to ensure that the applicant understood that the monitoring was part of the Engineer's review in the approval process. Mr. Thompson stated that he had been told by the Public Works Director that a pipe was in place and he assumed that was correct.

The applicant said there was a great deal of interest in the property, asking when it would receive final plat approval. Mr. Snyder indicating that would be a good question for the engineer as the property moved forward to the City Council. The applicant asked how much time was involved in a "wet cycle." Commissioner Hunt did not wish to speak for the engineer but stated that it typically lasted through the end of spring, when the ground water had reached its peak.

Chair Hayman opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. There was no one who wished to speak and Chair Hayman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hunt **moved** to recommend approval to the City Council of the Final Subdivision Plat for the Deuel Creek Place Subdivision, with conditions 1-8 and suggested reasons for action a-c.

Conditions

1. The Final Recordable Subdivision shall reflect the lot layout and engineering dated March 2019, as submitted Feb 29, 2019.

2. An updated current Title report shall be submitted with the submission of mylar a. Legal description of property to be confirmed with updated Title Report

3. The subdivision construction plans shall be deemed acceptable to the City Engineer prior to recordation of the subdivision plat with Davis County

a. The applicant shall remove contours and existing features on the plat

b. Width of 200 South and sidewalks to the end of the property shall be shown on the Plat

4. The required improvement bond and associated fees shall be prepared, reviewed, and paid prior to the recordation of the subdivision plat with Davis County

5. The subdivision construction plans shall be deemed acceptable to the City Engineer prior to recordation of the subdivision plat with Davis County

6. The subdivision construction plans shall be deemed acceptable to the City Engineer prior to recordation of the subdivision plat with Davis County Centerville City Planning Commission March 13, 2019 Page 3 of 3

7. The Final Plat shall be recorded at the County no later than six months after final approval from the City Council

8. Any remaining “utility provider” sheets shall be submitted

Suggested Reasons for the Action

a) The Planning Commission finds that Final Subdivision Plans are substantially consistent with the previous Conceptual and Preliminary Plat Acceptance.

b) The Planning Commission finds that the Final Subdivision Submittal, with the conditions imposed, complies with the applicable regulations of the Subdivision Ordinance.

c) The Planning Commission finds that the Final Subdivision Submittal, with the conditions imposed, complies with the applicable regulations of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, regarding lot development within the R-L Zone.

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. Commissioner Wright expressed her appreciation for the extra work and was in favor of the motion.

The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

Chair Hayman **moved** to table the remaining items until the next meeting except for the ordinance review which will be postponed until the first meeting in April. Becki Wright seconded the motion which passed unanimously (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hayman moved to adjourn. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously (4-0). The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

Date Approved

Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary