

1
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

3 **Wednesday, April 13, 2016**

4 **7:00 p.m.**

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

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

10 Kevin Daly

11 Becki Wright

12 Cheylynn Hayman

13 David Hirschi, Chair

14 Gina Hirst

15 Logan Johnson

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

18 Scott Kjar

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT**

21 Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director

22 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

23 Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner

24 Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

25
26 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

27
28 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Kevin Daly

29
30 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

31
32 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held March 23, 2016 were reviewed
33 and amended. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The
34 motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

35
36 **PUBLIC HEARING | CENTERVILLE DEUEL CREEK HISTORIC DISTRICT**

37 **[Postponed from March 23, 2016 meeting] - Consider the proposed Zone Map and Code**
38 **Text Amendment for the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District (Chapter 12-49), which**
39 **includes boundary modifications (400 East from Parrish Lane to Porter Lane, east side**
40 **only) and addressing commercial building incentives. Centerville City, Applicant.**

41
42 Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner, reviewed the number of homes within the Deuel
43 Creek Historic District explaining how many homes are contributing, non-contributing, and
44 currently on the National Historic Register. He also reviewed how many of these homes are on

1 Main Street. He reviewed the financial impact the incentives program would have on Centerville
2 City, which is insignificant. Mr. Toponce explained participation in the Deuel Creek Historic
3 District is completely voluntary. If a property owner chooses to participate then the historic
4 district standards would be followed, if not then the South Main Street Corridor Overlay (SMSC)
5 standards would be followed. Both options are equally important. At a previous meeting, the
6 Commission expressed concern with the "gaps" that could potentially be created along the Main
7 Street public space if some neighboring homes chose different options. Mr. Toponce said this is
8 true, but explained this will create variety and allow the passerby to recognize the historical
9 property as unique and important. As long as the property owner keeps their structure as
10 contributing, they would not be required to add the public space amenities of the SMSC. This
11 same concept holds true for non-contributing structures. If a non-contributing property desires to
12 maintain their site as it currently exists, they would also not be required to upgrade to the SMSC.
13 Upgrades to the new SMSC are only applicable when a property owner is redeveloping their site.
14 So, the gaps that are spoken of are inevitable all along Main Street and could remain that way
15 well into the future. However, Mr. Toponce said the City could choose to put in the public space
16 amenities at anytime at their own expense and desire.

17
18 Mr. Toponce reviewed the proposed changes to the Deuel Creek Historic District
19 ordinance. Lisa Romney, City Attorney, suggested some minor language changes for
20 consistency. The Commission suggested some minor language changes as well. Overall, staff
21 recommends approval of the proposed zone text amendments.

22
23 The Commission asked who is responsible for making the judgment call on what is
24 considered appropriate to maintain a contributing status. Mr. Toponce explained the Landmarks
25 Commission reviews each permit individually and determines its status according to the
26 Secretary of the Interior standards. If a permit does not meet those standards then the property
27 owner can choose to follow the SMSC standards or choose to alter their plans in order to remain
28 as a contributing property.

29
30 Several Commission members expressed their appreciation for the additional information
31 provided. Commission members expressed that this information was helpful in clarifying that the
32 gaps are likely to happen because of redevelopment and construction timing and not necessarily
33 because of the historic district option. In addition, there are other options for installing public
34 amenities within the public easement.

35
36 Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to comment, he closed
37 the public hearing.

38
39 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the Zone
40 Text Amendment for Section 12-49-100, and the creation of Section 12-49-110, as stated within

the Staff Report dated March 23, 2016 as amended this evening and to recommend approval to the City Council.

Reasons for the Action (findings):

1. The proposed amendments meet the requirements found in Section 12-21-080(4)(e).
2. The proposed Zoning Text Amendments meet the goals and objectives of the General Plan concerning a historic district [Section 12-480-8(3)].
3. Proposed amendments to Chapter 12-49, Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District, will be consistent with other objectives found in this Section.
4. The proposed amendments will not have a negative impact on the surrounding community.
5. Through research, site visits, three public work sessions and several meetings, the Landmarks Commission believes they have covered important aspects of location, guidelines and incentives.
6. The Landmarks Commission believes the proposed district and subsequent created documents will be beneficial to the neighborhood.
7. The proposed amendments meet the requested clarification by the City Council, which was stated at the January 2016 Council Meeting.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daly and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (6-0).

Commissioner Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the Zone Map Amendment to extend the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District to the east side of 400 East, as shown in the Staff Report dated March 23, 2016, and to recommend approval to the City Council.

Reasons for the Action (findings):

1. The proposed amendment meets the requirements found in Section 12-21-080(4)(e).
2. The proposed Zone Map Amendment meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan concerning a historic district [Section 12-480-8(3)].
3. Expanding the Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District to include the east side of 400 East will not have a negative impact on the surrounding community.
4. The Landmarks Commission believes the proposed amendment to the overlay zone and will be beneficial to the neighborhood by encouraging further preservation within Centerville.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hirst and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (6-0).

PUBLIC HEARING | CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR THE SOUTH MAINSTREET CORRIDOR (SMSC) OVERLAY ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 12-48)
[Postponed from March 23, 2016 meeting] - Consider the Code Text Amendments for the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Overlay Ordinance, which includes the City Council

directives and changes to the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Public Space Plan.
Centerville City, Applicant.

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported the Planning Commission tabled action on this item and requested additional information, data, and clarification at their February 24, 2016 meeting. This information was provided to the Commission at their March 23, 2016 meeting, but again the item was tabled due to time constraints. Mr. Snyder reviewed the additional information provided. He reminded the Commission the specific directive from the City Council was to consider pushing the placement of the light poles and planter boxes back onto private property behind the sidewalk, and to consider alternate planting materials (i.e., lower growing height). Mr. Snyder distributed several emails that he has received from the public regarding this issue. These emails were submitted into the official record. Mr. Snyder also reference the "Staff Alternate Vision" included with the staff reports. He explained this is his idea formulated from previous discussions and simply includes options to consider. If there is a desire to shift away from the current public space plan then perhaps this alternative vision may serve as a tool.

Commissioner Wright said she did not see any information regarding bicycle usage on Main Street. She asked if UDOT keeps any type of cycling information. Mr. Snyder said UDOT does not track cycling data. He said they have contacted cycling clubs in the past, but they too keep no such data. He said it may be possible that UTA and or the Wasatch Regional Council has some type of cycling information. Mr. Snyder will contact both UTA and the Wasatch Regional Council.

Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing.

Lisa Astling said she understands that the planter boxes and trees may be considered a liability. She does not believe these would be any more of a liability than the movie in the park events. However, she does believe moving the planter boxes, trees, and light poles to the private space would be a liability for those using the sidewalk, especially bikers. She hopes a bike path is still planned for Main Street. She said it is important to keep a demarcation for bike lanes. She also suggested a decrease in the speed limit on Main Street. She said a decreased speed limit will decrease liability. She said if these improvements are intended to create a greater public presence on Main Street then a reduced speed limit may be a good option.

Jeff Cook said he owns property on Main Street and has not received any notice or other information on these proposed amendments. This is very frustrating. He said he was part of the original committee who created the SMSC standards. He said the original committee spent many hours and created what they believed was a sound document. Since that time it has been under constant change. He said it is hard to know what is or is not allowed anymore thus making it difficult for property owners to seriously consider redevelopment. He said it feels like the

1 original committees' work has been discounted completely. He expressed concern with pushing
2 the elements back into the private space. He said any elements or plantings pushed into the
3 private space will not be cohesively maintained. He said when trees or other plantings die,
4 property owners may choose not to replace them. He said putting this installation and subsequent
5 maintenance onto individual property owners will diminish the uniformity of the Main Street
6 corridor. However, if the City will maintain these elements then he believes it could work. He
7 said if the public space elements must be pushed onto private property he suggests it be benches
8 and planter boxes as these are easier to maintain. He also suggested the public hearing remain
9 open so any additional comments can continue to take place as this process moves forward.

10
11 Chair Hirschi formally accepted all public comment emails into the public record. He
12 requested that Commission members submit all public comment emails they have received
13 personally to the City Recorder to be included in the public record as well.

14
15 Chair Hirschi turned the discussion to the Commission for their comments. He said the
16 Commission has an opportunity to review the public space and plan accordingly. As planners, he
17 encouraged the Commission to look at what is feasible and not necessarily what is practical.

18
19 Commissioner Daly said some residents feel that Main Street is not the true main road in
20 Centerville. The true main road in Centerville is Parrish Lane. He said Main Street is a
21 hodgepodge of homes, businesses, parks, and a school. He said Centerville City's Main Street
22 will never be like Bountiful City's Main Street. He said Centerville's Main Street is simply a road
23 that gets people from point A to point B. He said Main Street is not going to be a main business
24 center with walkable shops. He said to create such an area requires density and it has been made
25 clear that residents do not desire density on Main Street which eliminates the incentive for
26 redevelopment. Since Main Street is transitional, he is not in favor of reducing the speed limit.
27 He said it also seems ironic to reduce the speed limit when the City exercised their right to widen
28 the intersection at Parrish Lane and Main Street in order to increase traffic flow. He is in favor of
29 striping for bike lanes on Main Street. He also said he likes many of the ideas presented in the
30 Staff Alternate Vision document and thinks it may a good middle option between the SMSC
31 public space plan and the existing state of Main Street.

32
33 Commissioner Hayman said she was surprised that the City Council was concerned with
34 the placement of the planter boxes and light poles. She believes these are critical elements of the
35 public space plan and she did not see any solid data to suggest that the current placement of the
36 planter boxes and light poles are a significant liability. She strongly suggest these elements
37 remain in their current position. She believes the park strip is the best place to create a visual
38 boundary between the street and the sidewalk. She is not overly concerned with the elimination
39 of tall grasses and is willing to explore other plant material options.

Commissioner Wright said Main Street signifies the heart of our city. She agreed Parrish Lane is the main business hub of Centerville and agrees that Main Street is different from Parrish Lane. She believes Main Street is walkable. She said there are always pedestrians on the sidewalks of Main Street and this will always be the case as long as there is a school on Main Street. In addition, she believes Founders Park, City Hall, and the Whitaker Museum also contribute to the walkability of Main Street. She is an advocate for Main Street and believes the Commission should create the vision that has been foreseen and keep the planter boxes and poles as planned. She does not believe these elements are a liability concern but rather that these elements create a safety barrier from traffic for those pedestrians on the sidewalk. She believes the pedestrian lighting is also important for safety. She too is amenable to alternate planting materials and mentioned that she likes flowering trees. She agrees these elements are critical for framing the street and believes this framing of the street is what will adjust traffic flow. She said the benches could be pushed back from the curb, but strongly agrees the planter boxes and light poles should remain. She said the Commission needs to be clear as to why these items are important and site specific evidence to show these elements are acceptable. She also mentioned that she has heard that trees reduce crime within a city and she is looking for this study and information to share with the Commission and City Council.

Mr. Snyder reminded the Commission that Main Street is a UDOT owned road. He said UDOT has specific standards for Main Street and the public clear zone. He agreed the Commission should plan as they see fit, but cautioned the Commission that some of the placement may not be allowed. He said UDOT does not negotiate these standards regardless of past practices or existing conditions. He also cautioned the Commission to keep property owners in mind with regard to the cost of improvements. He said the cost for many of these elements could be burdensome to private property owners and could affect redevelopment.

The Commission discussed the option for break-away elements and wondered if they may be acceptable to UDOT. They also wondered how bike lanes might affect UDOT's clear zone. The Commission agreed having a representative from UDOT come and present UDOT's standards to the Commission before any decisions are made would be useful. The Commission also agreed a presentation from the Wasatch Regional Council on complete street designs would also be helpful. The Commission would also like to meet with the City Council in a work session following these presentations before any decisions are made.

Chair Hirschi said continuity is an issue. He agreed that if these elements are pushed back into the private space then gaps and maintenance could become a greater issue. He believes if this public space is improved it will in turn encourage redevelopment as it brings more people to the area. He said every citizen in Centerville will benefit from these improvements. In that regard, he mentioned a special improvement district could be an option to fund these public space improvements.

Commissioner Hirst said walkers, runners and bikers are not going away. She said Main Street should be planned in a way to promote and encourage usability.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to continue this item, including the public hearing to a future Planning Commission meeting to be held following a work session with UDOT and WFRM. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (6-0).

OPEN SPACE/SENSITIVE LANDS PRESENTATION BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR [Postponed from March 23, 2016 meeting]

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, used this time to educate the Commission on density calculations, parks and open space, and park impact fees. He explained how density was traditionally calculated (prior to 2003) and how it is currently calculated (gross density) and the pros and cons of both methods. He reviewed the difference between passive open space and active open space and the difference between impervious and pervious open space for each development zone. He also discussed tot lots and pocket parks explaining they typically become obsolete within a few years because they are isolated from the rest of the community. He suggested that it may be better to require impact fees for open space rather than giving a break for pocket parks or tot lots. Mr. Snyder explained he presented this same material to the City Council, at their request, who expressed a desire to establish some open space regulations for sensitive lands, specifically the hillside area. The City Council has asked for the Commission's opinion on this matter. The Commission agreed it would be beneficial to look at open space options and subsequent density calculations for the hillside. Staff will draft an ordinance for review at a future meeting.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday, April 27, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
2. Upcoming Agenda Items:
 - Rohletter, Small Subdivision Waiver & Rezone
 - The Cove Creek Estates, Small Subdivision Waiver

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.


David Hirschi, Chair


Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary



4-27-16
Date Approved

Wednesday, April 13, 2016
7:00 p.m.

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS**

Lee Anthony

104 W 280 S

** 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.