

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 MAY 9, 2018 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

Kathy Helgesen, Commissioner

D. COMMISSION BUSINESS

- 7:10 1. Public Hearing - Zoning Text Amendment - CZC 12.55.110 Fences and Walls
 LEGISLATIVE DECISION
 Consider the proposed zoning text amendment to CZC 12.55.110, regarding the regulation of fence heights in various zones.
2. Discussion: Administrative Decisions - Permitted and Conditional Use Permits
 Discuss the administrative decisions at the Staff level between Permitted and Conditional Use Permits for Home Occupations, Temporary Uses, and Site Plans and discuss possible amendments to streamline these applications.
3. Community Development Director's Report
 Upcoming :
 Bell Rezone
 Renatus Site Plan
 Temporary CUP Avalanche Snow Cone
4. City Council Report
 Pages Lane

Hillside Text Amendment

E. MINUTES REVIEW and ACCEPTANCE

April 11th and April 25th, 2018

F. ADJOURNMENT

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
5/9/2018**

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Public Hearing - Zoning Text Amendment - CZC 12.55.110 Fences and Walls

Initiated By: City Council

Scheduled Time: 7:10

SUBJECT

LEGISLATIVE DECISION

Consider the proposed zoning text amendment to CZC 12.55.110, regarding the regulation of fence heights in various zones.

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▣ 05-09-18 Staff Report - Council Request For Amending Fencing Heights

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

PLANNING STAFF REPORT

**APPLICANT: CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 c/o MAYOR CLARK WILKINSON
 250 NORTH MAIN STREET
 CENTERVILLE CITY, UT 84014**

APPLICATION: ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT

**APPLICANT REQUEST: AMEND THE ZONING CODE TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL
 FENCING HEIGHTS – CZC 12.55 SUPPLEMENTARY
 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION FOR THE
 CITY COUNCIL**

BACKGROUND

As part of an “Open Session” during a recent Council Meeting, the Council heard comments from an owner living next to another property owner with a horse. The owner shared concerns about having the pens and corrals too close to the property line and that the horse can lean over the fence, which not only can damage the fence, but seemingly is an invasion of the privacy of the adjoining neighbor’s backyard. Consequently, the Council then directed staff and the Planning Commission to discuss this scenario and consider amending the fencing heights for mitigating or buffering these situations. The Council expressed not only concerns regarding property in the Agricultural Districts, but also for R-L Districts that abut property zoned for agricultural uses.

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

Zone Text/Map Amendments - Pursuant to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the “decision to amend the...zoning ordinance is a matter of within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC 12.21.060.a.1.B. Additionally, CZC 12.21.80.e. lists one (1) criterion for considering a text amendment petition.

- 1. Is the proposed text or map amendment consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City’s General Plan?**

CGP 12-435-1. LOCATION OF BUFFERS.

1. Incompatible Use Areas Buffers should be used between incompatible land uses including, but not limited to, industrial, commercial, residential, and high density

or low density uses. It is not desired that these uses occur in close proximity, but if they do, the adverse impacts of one use on the other shall be mitigated with distance, visual screening, access control, sound control, and other mitigation and buffering techniques.

CGP 12-435-2. KINDS OF BUFFERS

1. *Visual Barriers* Visual barriers such as fences, dense landscape, earthforms (berms or mounds), or some combination of these may be used as a means of controlling views that may be undesirable and incompatible with adjacent uses.

2. *Sound Barriers* Sound barriers such as block or concrete walls or dense landscaping may be used as a means of controlling the impact of sound on adjacent uses. Generally, barriers such as block and concrete walls are the most effective and can be used in the smallest amount of space. Such barriers should be constructed of graffiti resistant materials or surfaces. Dense landscaping and berms can also be used as sound barriers, but they must be of considerable depth and height in order to be effective.

CGP 12-435-3. MATERIALS

2. *Fences and Walls* Visually obstructing materials such as fences constructed of wood, composite materials, concrete or masonry are typically used. In determining the appropriate choice, maintainability and vulnerability to the elements, graffiti and other forms of vandalism, should be considered. Wood and composite materials are more vulnerable to vandalism and destruction and are more difficult to clean. Concrete and masonry construction is much more vandal resistant and may be constructed of graffiti-resistant surfaces which make removal of graffiti or resurfacing easier. Smooth, clean, lightly colored surfaces are more attractive to vandals and should be avoided. Textured surfaces, combined with landscape materials and plants which restrict access to the barrier, have a deterrent effect on vandalism and graffiti and should be used appropriate. In any event, walls and fences should be compatible with the design of the structures.

CGP 12-435-5. MAINTENANCE. Buffered areas should be maintained by the developer or property owner, unless otherwise agreed to by the City.

POTENTIAL ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT PROPOSALS

Alternative #1 (Keep existing regulations): Leave the existing ordinance in place, which limits fencing to 6 feet in height (*except within the front yard and site tri-angles fences are limited to 4 feet and 2 feet respectively*).

Alternative #2 (add A-L and R-L to the 10 foot allowance for other Zones):

[Amendments in Red] 12.55.110 Fences and Walls

(a) Height of Fences and Walls. No fence, wall or other similar structure exceeding six feet in height shall be erected in any rear or side yard except for accessory buildings and structures permitted by this Title, except as provided below.

1. When a difference in grade exists on either side of a fence or wall, the height of the fence or wall shall be measured from:

(A) The average elevation of the finished grade of adjoining properties at the fence line; or

(B) If excavated or filled, the native elevation.

2. No fence need be less than 48 inches in height.
3. The Planning Commission may approve a fence, wall or similar structure not to exceed 10 feet in a rear area or side yard in the A-M, (A-L, R-L) R-M, R-H, C-M, C-H, C-VH, I-H, I-VH, PF-L, PF-M, PF-H, or PF-VH zones as part of a site plan review, or amended site plan, with the findings by the Planning Commission that is to be a benefit to the surrounding properties and/or help to buffer the use, and is in the City's best interest.
4. South side of Porter Lane, from 400 West to Main Street. For all legally approved rear yard fronting lots along the creek channel, the fence height shall not exceed eight feet in height along the rear yard lot line.

(b) Fences in Front Yard and Street Side Yard. No fence or wall or other similar structure exceeding 48 inches in height shall be erected within a front yard or a street side yard.

Alternative #3 (add new section just for A-L and R-L and limit height to 8-feet):

[Amendments in Red] 12.55.110 Fences and Walls

(c) Height of Fences and Walls. No fence, wall or other similar structure exceeding six feet in height shall be erected in any rear or side yard except for accessory buildings and structures permitted by this Title, except as provided below.

1. When a difference in grade exists on either side of a fence or wall, the height of the fence or wall shall be measured from:

(C) The average elevation of the finished grade of adjoining properties at the fence line; or

(D) If excavated or filled, the native elevation.

2. No fence need be less than 48 inches in height.
3. The Planning Commission may approve a fence, wall or similar structure not to exceed 10 feet in a rear area or side yard in the A-M, R-M, R-H, C-M, C-H, C-

VH, I-H, I-VH, PF-L, PF-M, PF-H, or PF-VH zones as part of a site plan review, or amended site plan, with the findings by the Planning Commission that is to be a benefit to the surrounding properties and/or help to buffer the use, and is in the City's best interest.

4. The Zoning Administrator may approve a fence, wall or similar structure not to exceed a height of 8-feet encompassing the rear yard area of lot, parcel, or tract for any A-L or R-L zone, defined as follows:
 - (A) A "permitted use" application shall be submitted to the City for any fence higher than 6 feet.
 - (B) The increased height may be placed along the Rear Lot Line, and/or
 - (C) The increased height may be placed along an interior side lot line from the Rear Lot Line to the Rear Building Line, or
 - (D) The increased fence height may be placed along an interior side lot line to a point where it meets a parallel line drawn along the rear side of the Main Building (i.e. primary use), extending from interior side lot line to interior side lot line.
 - (E) In no case shall the increased height be located along the side lot line running alongside the Main Building or extend into any front or street side yard setback requirement.
 - (F) All fencing above 6-feet in height shall comply with any or all applicable building code regulations and/or shall meet the adopted applicable wind loading regulations.
 5. South side of Porter Lane, from 400 West to Main Street. For all legally approved rear yard fronting lots along the creek channel, the fence height shall not exceed eight feet in height along the rear yard lot line.
- (d) Fences in Front Yard and Street Side Yard. No fence or wall or other similar structure exceeding 48 inches in height shall be erected within a front yard or a street side yard.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

The Planning Commission and the City Council will need to consider the need and value of allowing increased fencing heights. The norm for residential style fencing is typically 6 feet, it is not only a social norm, it is a material manufacturing norm and also an exempt construction permit norm (*no building permit is required until a 7-foot fence is installed*). However, there are times when higher fencing may be desired or needed for additional privacy or buffering. Here are some pros and cons from a staff perspective:

Pro's:

- Increases privacy for rear yard areas
- Improved buffering from adjacent intrusive uses (e.g. large farm animals, noise, visual esthetics, etc.)
- A boundary/buffer between types of zoning districts or uses
- A visual and noise buffer from adjacent busy roadways
- Improved screening capacity to replace vegetation and plantings that can be more intrusive (e.g. *tree limbs hanging over property lines*).

Con's:

- Will require a fencing permit from the city and public education (property owners & fencing companies) will be required and ongoing. Generally, it is common knowledge that fencing 6 feet or less do not require a City permit.
- Additional heights may require structural engineering to withstand the load weights on the soil or high winds.
- High winds are a particular problem for Centerville.
- Can block/screen adjacent property owners gardens and plantings from needed sunlight and air circulation
- Taller fencing has a visual fortress type of appearance, which may have a negative visual/social quality.
- Future damage repair may be costly (e.g. *block/pre-cast*) and may impact an adjoining neighbor, if a failure occurs and threatens adjacent owners' property or possessions. Who requires or enforces repairs, when the expense is problematic for an owner or future owner?

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

The Planning Staff takes no position in this matter but encourages a bit of caution for making a policy change. It's a general welfare and esthetics value that does not have a definitive demarcation line, other than the typical industry standard of 6 feet. Staff is providing findings for both a negative and positive recommendation. Here are the suggested finding sets that the Commission may choose:

DENIAL - Suggested findings to DENY the Request for Consideration:

- Generally, it is common knowledge that fencing 6 feet or less do not require a City permit, adding a requirement for a higher fencing will lead to confusion with the general public.
- Additional heights may require structural engineering to withstand the load weights on the soil or high winds.
- High winds are a particular problem for Centerville.
- Higher fencing can potentially and will block/screen adjacent property owners gardens and plantings from needed sunlight and air circulation
- Taller fencing has a visual fortress type of appearance, which may have a negative visual/social quality to single-family style development.

RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL - Suggested findings to recommend APPROVAL the Request for Consideration:

- Increases privacy for rear yard areas
- Improved buffering from adjacent intrusive uses (e.g. large farm animals, noise, visual esthetics, etc.)
- A boundary/buffer between types of zoning districts or uses
- A visual and noise buffer from adjacent busy roadways
- Improved screening capacity to replace vegetation and plantings that can be more intrusive (e.g. *tree limbs hanging over property lines*).

**CENTERVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Backup Report
5/9/2018**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Discussion: Administrative Decisions - Permitted and Conditional Use Permits

Initiated By: Planning Commission

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Discuss the administrative decisions at the Staff level between Permitted and Conditional Use Permits for Home Occupations, Temporary Uses, and Site Plans and discuss possible amendments to streamline these applications.

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to Staff Report

BACKGROUND

Refer to Staff Report

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Flow Chart of Admin Staff Decisions
- 05-09-18 Staff Report Admin Reviews at Staff Level

Conditional use permit:

- Anything not on the "Permitted list."
- Including any business conducted in an Accessory Building

PLANNING COMMISSION

Development Standards
CZC 12.62.050 &
CZC 12.62.070

• The Occupation CUP administrator, planning

Permitted Uses:

1. Auction
2. Christmas Tree Sales
3. Farmers Market
4. Fireworks stand
5. Model home
6. Motor Vehicles sales by licensed dealer
7. Produce stand
8. Temporary Construction office
9. Temporary retail sales not exceeding 200 SF

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Development Standards
CZC 12.56.050
Including Time Limits

Conditional use permit:

- Use in previous list that does not conform to dev. Standards, (ex. Longer time period)
- Festivals, show, exhibit, circus, carnival, outdoor dance, community fair, concert, other similar activity

PLANNING COMMISSION

- Development Standards CZC 12.56.050
- Large events Dev. Standards 12.56.080

♦ Alternatives ♦

- Extend time limits
- All CUP approved by ZA
- Festivals, events, to remain at PC

PLANNING COMMISSION

♦ Alternative ♦

Residential development outside a platting go to ZO OR am process.

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

The Planning Commission has requested a review of some minor permitted uses to be reviewed in order to speed up efficiency in the permitting process. These uses fall either in the hands of the Zoning Administrator or the Planning Commission, and some potential revisions could be made in order to streamline the process that could benefit both the Commission and the applicant.

These mostly fall into three categories: Temporary Uses, Home Occupations, and Site Plan reviews.

HOME OCCUPATIONS

Permitted Uses for Home Occupations:

1. Family child care facility;
2. Medical service;
3. Personal care service;
4. Personal instruction service; and
5. Office, general.

If the business is on this list, it can be approved by a **Zoning Administrator**.

Development standards – CZC 12.62.050

Development standards for home occupations includes a list that considers hours of operation, nuisance, employees, parking etc, and other factors that may affect the surrounding development and neighborhood.

Conditional Use Permits:

A use not listed above and then must go to the **Planning Commission**.

Development Standards for CUP Home Occupations – CZC 12.42.070

CUP Home Occupations also have to comply with 12.62.050 unless specifically modified within the CUP. This list of **exceptions** to modifications of this list are **employees, neighborhood disturbance, promotional meetings and utility demand**. [12.62.070]

Staff Response: Because the CUP for Home Occupations already has a list of development standards with a list of exceptions specifically outlined for CUP, the application is easy to assess from an administrative standpoint. These CUP Home Occupations could easily be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator under these parameters. If the applicant does not like the assessment and conditions the ZA places on the businesses, the applicant could *appeal* to the Planning

Commission, who would review these standards and perhaps come to a different conclusion and conditions.

Ex. Moon LLC was not on the pre-approved “permitted” use list, still follows the same development standards as other uses already Permitted without going to the Planning Commission.

TEMPORARY USES

The Following Uses are required to have a Temporary Use Permit:

1. Auction;
2. Christmas tree sales;
3. Farmers market;
4. Fireworks stand;
5. Model home;
6. Motor vehicle sales by a licensed dealer;
7. Produce stand, located on premises other than where the produce is grown;
8. Temporary construction office; and
9. Temporary retail sales, not exceeding 200 square feet, and not associated with retail sales activities of the owner or lessee of the property where the temporary retail sales are conducted.

This is set, definite list. No other uses may qualify for a Temporary Use Permit. If they follow the Development Standards below, they can be approved by the **Zoning Administrator**. But if these businesses would like to modify any of the following development standards, they need to ask for a Conditional Use Permit and therefore get bumped to the **Planning Commission**.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR TEMPORARY USE PERMIT:

1. Access
2. Inspection
3. Insurance
4. Location Except as otherwise provided in this Subsection, a temporary use shall be allowed in any zone. The following uses shall be located only in a public facility, commercial, or industrial zone as set forth in CZC 12.30.010:
 1. Christmas tree sales;
 2. Festival, show, exhibit, circus, carnival, outdoor dance, community fair, concert, or other activity of a similar nature;
 3. Fireworks stand ; and
 4. Motor vehicle sales by a licensed dealer.
5. Owner Approval
6. Parking
7. Time Limit:
 - ♦ Auctions: Three days per event and not more than four events per year.
 - ♦ Christmas tree sales and motor vehicle sales by a licensed dealer: 45 days once per year.
 - ♦ Farmers market and produce stand: 90 days once per year.
 - ♦ Festival, show, exhibit, circus, carnival, outdoor dance, community fair, concert, or other enterprise of a similar nature: 10 days per event and not more than two events per year.

- ✦ Fireworks stand: 30 days once per year.
- ✦ Model home and temporary construction office: For the duration of construction activity so long as construction is diligently pursued and the office and/or model home are located on property under construction or development.
- ✦ Temporary retail sales: 10 days per event and not more than four events per year.

8. Trash Removal and Restoration

Staff Response: All of the above listed uses are reviewed on the basis of these standards. If they would like to modify any of these standards, it requires a Conditional Use Permit. Usually it is the time limits that businesses want to extend or adjust, which bumps them to a Conditional Use Permit. For example, the Snow Cone business is considered a “temporary retail sales”, and therefore does not allow more than 10 days per event/ four events per year = 40 days of sales per year without going to the Planning Commission. Having a Snow Cone stand for the summer then requires a CUP.

Also it should be noted there is no time limit for motor vehicles sales.

Alternative Scenario: The Planning Commission could consider extending the time limit for some or all of these uses in order to prevent some businesses from going to the Planning Commission for a CUP. This would eliminate the majority of the Temporary Use Permits that go to the Planning Commission.

Large festivals and events would still always have to go through the Planning Commission.

Fees are also increased when a temporary use is a Conditional Use Permit. For some of these smaller businesses, this fee makes an impact to their startup costs and profit margin that makes a financial difference to some of these smaller produce stands, snow-cone shops, etc. Planning Commission could consider readjusting the Temporary Use fee structure for Permitted and Conditional Use.

SITE PLANS 12.21.110

The Planning Commission is authorized to approve site plans.

Conceptual and final site plan review and approval shall be required for any of the following uses unless expressly exempted from such requirement by another provision of this Title:

1. Any multiple-family residential use;
2. Any public or civic use;
3. Any commercial use;
4. Any industrial use;
5. Any residential development outside a platted subdivision; or
6. Any planned development within a PDO zone.

Alternative Scenario: Allow residential development outside a platted subdivision to be approved by a Zoning Administrator, OR combine Conceptual + Final into a one step process for the Planning Commission. Usually these applications are *fairly* straightforward and could be accomplished through one meeting instead of two. Ex. Tullius Barn, Samuelson Barn.

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report 5/9/2018

Item No.

Short Title: April 11th and April 25th, 2018

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▢ PC Preliminary minutes 4-11-18
- ▢ PC Preliminary minutes 4-25-18

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, April 11, 2018**

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

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

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

10 Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

11 Kathy Helgesen

12 Kai Hintze

13 Gina Hirst

14 Logan Johnson

15 Becki Wright

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

21 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

22 Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

23
24 **STAFF ABSENT**

25 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

26
27 **VISITORS**

28 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

29
30 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

31
32 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Chair Hayman

33
34
35 **WELCOMING AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONER**

36
37 The Commissioners offered a word of appreciation for David Hirschi's work on the
38 Planning Commission and welcomed the new Commissioner, Kai Hintze.

39
40 **PUBLIC HEARING – CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION - DEUEL CREEK PLACE**

41
42 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, reminded the Commissioners of the background of
43 the property. In November of 2017 the City Council voted to rezone this piece of property from
44 Public Facility to Residential Low. The proposed Conceptual Plat subdivides the property into
45 three single family lots, each at around one-third of an acre. Ownership of the northern half of
46 the property has been transferred to Centerville City and will remain open space, along with the
47 public trail to the east. Ms. Younger explained that Staff's biggest concern with the property is
48 that slopes average over 10% and there is potential significant fill on the property, so a
49 Geotechnical and Soils Report will need to be completed and deemed compliant and acceptable

1 by the City Engineer before a Preliminary Plat application is made. This, however, should not
2 impact the approval of the Conceptual Plan for this property.

3
4 Tony Thompson, property manager for Davis County and representative for the
5 applicant, confirmed he is aware of the requirement to complete a Geotechnical Report and said
6 he thinks that it will be better for future lot owners to have that information anyway. He also
7 explained to the Commissioners that the County reduced the frontage of their property by eight
8 feet on the east side and deeded this eight feet to the City. The eight-foot piece of property that
9 was deeded is intended to be used as a public trail for the neighborhood.

10
11 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

12
13 Marilee Brio- Ms. Brio asked who the developer of the lots would be, whether the land on
14 100 South would remain permanently undeveloped, and what quality of home would be built on
15 the lots.

16
17 Seeing no one else wished to comment, the public hearing was closed at 7:03 p.m.

18
19 Mr. Thompson responded that the County is planning to develop the property through a
20 process known as a "Paper Plat." The County will then sell the lots and allow builders to build
21 the homes on the lots. Mr. Thompson hopes the quality of home will enhance the neighborhood,
22 especially because of the size of the lot, and references that the homes will be built to existing
23 building codes and standards. Commissioner Wright asked if the lots would be sold separately
24 or together. Mr. Thompson said that the County will accept the highest bid. Ms. Younger
25 addressed the question regarding the future development of the land on 100 South that is now
26 owned by the City. From her understanding, the City has no intention to develop that land now
27 or in the foreseeable future.

28
29 Commissioner Wright requested that Lisa Romney, City Attorney, review how the City
30 came to own the acre of land that formerly belonged to the County. Ms. Romney explained that
31 the City entered into an agreement with the County in which an acre or so of property was
32 deeded to the City in exchange for a waiver of certain development fees. The waiver only
33 applies to the paper plat process and after that development and impact fees will apply.

34
35 Mr. Daly further clarified that there would be significant engineering required to develop
36 the north side of the property on 100 South, which makes the likelihood of it being developed in
37 the near future very low.

38
39 Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the
40 Conceptual Plan for the Deuel Creek Place Subdivision, at 641 East 200 South, with the
41 following directives and reasons for the action. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion,
42 which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

43
44 Directives:

- 45
46 1. A Preliminary Subdivision Application shall be submitted in accordance with CMC
47 15.03 of the Subdivision Ordinance, including but not limited to:
48 a. Utility Provider sheets need to be signed and returned
49 b. Description of water rights, irrigation systems, water shares shall be provided
50 by the applicant
51 c. Description, size, and location of sanitary sewer and storm drains shall be
52 provided by the applicant
53 d. A description of those portions of property included in FEMA flood maps

- e. Addresses of lots to be confirmed with the Public Works Director
2. As part of the preliminary subdivision plans, a Geotechnical and Soils Report and study needs to be submitted and deemed compliant and acceptable by the City Engineer.

Reasons for the Action:

- a) The conceptual subdivision appears to be consistent with the General Plan
- b) It follows the Municipal Code Subdivision Ordinance in 15.05
- c) Adequately meets the Development Standards laid out for an R-L Zone in CZC 12.32.300
- d) The applicable review standards of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to a Conceptual Subdivision application have been reviewed and directives established to allow the proposal to proceed to preliminary subdivision plan submittal.

MAIN STREET SURVEY RESULTS AND TIMELINE

Ms. Younger explained the results of the Main Street Table of Use survey that was given to Planning Commissioners and City Council members. She referenced a chart that was attached to the staff backup report and explained that the uses highlighted in yellow on the chart are items that have the largest discrepancy between the current use and the desired use per the survey.

Ms. Younger also reviewed the chart of essential planning questions for revising the South Main Street Corridor Plan that was attached to the staff backup report, and reviewed timelines for pursuing various options to edit the Main Street Corridor Plan.

Chair Hayman thanked Ms. Younger for conducting the survey and collating the survey results. She said, based on the survey results, it appears the Table of Uses for Main Street definitely needs to be revised and she perceived that there was an openness to make such changes in the last Work Session that the Planning Commission had with the City Council. Vice Chair Daly agreed that it is absolutely necessary to change the Table of Uses. Commissioner Wright stated that she felt it would be good for the Commissioners to begin discussing whether the Table of Uses could be changed in a way that would support the current South Main Street Corridor Plan before deciding whether that Plan needs to be changed.

Commissioner Wright asked if it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to suggest additional uses from the Survey to be added to the Table of Uses and send these to the City Council to vote upon once a public hearing has been held. Commissioner Johnson pointed out that there are many additional uses from the survey that a large majority agreed upon, and suggested that the Commissioners start by sending the additional uses with a vote of eight (8) or higher to the City Council to vote upon. Vice Chair Daly agreed with Commissioner Johnson's suggestion. Ms. Younger stated that she was under the impression from other staff members that another Work Session should be held to discuss the survey findings before additional uses were sent to the City Council. As such, Chair Hayman asked if a Work Session could be scheduled to discuss these additional uses with the City Council and asked that the City Manager be consulted to find a date that would work.

Commissioner Wright reiterated that she prefers to discuss amongst the Commissioners what uses should be added, hold a public hearing, and send the additional uses to the City Council to vote upon, rather than first holding a work session. Vice Chair Johnson stated that he agreed with Commissioner Wright. The Commissioners discussed the number of respondents to the survey and Chair Hayman expressed concerns that the Planning Commissioners and City

Council members still may have voted differently on the survey. She did agree, however, that if the Commissioners sent recommended additional uses to the City Council and they were not in agreement, they would not have to adopt the recommendations. Commissioner Johnson agreed with Chair Hayman. Commissioner Helgesen asked whether it would be faster to make recommendations to the City Council right away, or to have a work session. Ms. Romney explained the process and options available to the Planning Commission. The Commissioners concluded that it would be more expeditious to make a recommendation to the City Council without a work session. Chair Hayman directed staff to prepare an ordinance that would amend the Table of Uses based upon the majority votes from the survey, and clarified that a work session will not be needed at this time to discuss the Main Street Corridor Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION GOALS 2018-19

Chair Hayman reviewed Planning Commission Goals, shown below, and reinforced that she would like to discuss goal one (1) with the City Council at the next work session that is held, to see if there are decisions that could be made at a staff level, thereby freeing the Commissioners to focus on proactive planning. Commissioner Wright inquired of the other Commissioners what they see as the priority order for the goals. Commissioner Johnson stated that item 1 is the top goal, but if it is not possible to change administrative procedures, that he is prepared to move forward with the other goals, of which he feels that goal three (3) should be the second highest priority. Commissioner Hirst agreed with Commissioner Johnson that West Centerville Neighborhood is a higher priority than South Main Street at this time.

Commissioner Wright asked Commissioner Hayman if she was comfortable having five (5) goals to work on, as she remembered Commissioner Hayman previously saying that she would rather have one or two goals to work on. Commissioner Hayman responded that it does not hurt to have all of the goals on the list, but said it is helpful to prioritize which goals to focus on. She expressed that both the South Main Street Corridor Plan and the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan should be the top priorities of the Planning Commission at this time.

Commissioner Wright suggested the Commissioners set timelines for moving forward on the goals, to ensure each are addressed. She also stated that she feels if goal one (1) is not addressed, the Commissioners will never be able to get to the other goals. Commissioner Johnson agreed and suggested that Planning Commission meetings with few items on the agenda should be used to do proactive planning. Chair Hayman asked that staff look at how other cities delegate administrative decisions, which she feels would help in discussions with the City Council about changing administrative procedures. Commissioner Wright inquired of Ms. Younger how long she felt it would take for staff to report back on how other cities deal with administrative decisions. Ms. Younger assured the Commissioners that Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, is planning to work on goal one (1) but is currently occupied on goal 4b. Chair Hayman asked that staff prepare timeline suggestions for goal one (1) and provide that to the Commissioners at the next meeting.

The Commissioners reviewed timelines and action items for each of the goals as follows:

1. Per Chair Hayman's request, Staff will prepare timeline suggestions for how long it will take to gather information on how other cities deal with administrative decisions and will present that at the next Planning Commission meeting on April 25, 2018. Ms. Romney also offered to do an analysis of all the different types of procedures and applications that are currently in place so the Commissioners will be able to address these. She will include public hearing requirements as well, per Commissioner Johnson's request. This analysis could be complete by the May 9, 2018 meeting.

2. In two (2) meetings, on May 9, 2018, the Commissioners will address the Table of Uses for South Main Street Corridor, following survey results, and will hold a public hearing about proposed changes. Changes to the Table of Uses will then be sent to the City Council to vote upon.

Bike Lanes will be addressed when UDOT completes striping.

The Pages Lanes Area General Plan is being revised and a public hearing on the revisions are to be held at the City Council meeting on May 1, 2018.

3. Per Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner Hirst's suggestions staff will put together a summary of the last process undertaken by the Planning Commission several years ago to change the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan, and why no changes were ultimately made. Ms. Younger added that this summary will include changes that have taken place in West Centerville over the last five (5) years. The Commissioners requested that the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan summary be presented by the Planning Commission meeting on June 13, 2018.
4. a. Commissioner Wright requested a summer deadline on having a work session with the Trails Committee. Chair Hayman asked Ms. Younger to check with the Trails Committee to find a date that would work with them for this work session.
4. b. Ms. Younger reports that Mr. Snyder is actively working on the Foothills Plan and will be presenting his work to the Planning Commission within the next few months.

Commissioner Hayman asked that a list of goals and their respective timelines are reviewed at each Planning Commission meeting going forward.

Planning Commission Goal & Objectives:

1. Greater Proactive Planning- review Administrative decisions and procedures to better define the Planning Commissions role in order to allow more time for proactive planning.
2. South Main Street Corridor Plan- including bike lanes & Pages Lane area
3. West Centerville Neighborhood Plan- revisiting the area and determine the future of the area with specific focus on the area South of Parrish Lane.
- 4a. City Trails & Pathways- Comprehensive look at future needs and opportunities
- 4b. Foothills Plan- a focused effort towards future recreational needs and opportunities.
5. Planning Already Underway- Subdivision Ordinance & Open Space/Sensitive Land Matters that are in progress.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for April 25, 2018.

Ms. Younger discussed items that will be on the next agenda.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Ms. Younger reviewed recent decisions made by the City Council.

MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE

The minutes of the March 14, 2018 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed and accepted as amended. Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to accept the minutes. Commissioner Helgesen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:05 p.m., Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

Date Approved

Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**Wednesday, April 25, 2018****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

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

Kathy Helgesen

Kai Hintze

Logan Johnson

Becki Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT

Gina Hirst

STAFF PRESENT

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

STAFF ABSENT**VISITORS**

Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Commissioner Johnson**PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – 640 WESTER PORTER LANE**

Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, reviewed the history of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment. The petitioner came to the City Council in June of 2017 to rezone the property from Agricultural-Low to Residential-Medium so that the buyer could further develop the land into townhomes. This was denied by the City Council at that time. However, the City Council has since changed the maximum density allowed in Residential Medium zones with a permitted density of six units per acre. This would mean that if the property is developed the property could have as many as 12 units on the site. Ms. Younger reviewed the factors to be considered in making Zoning Map Amendments and said that because the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan; is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property; does not adversely affect adjacent properties; and has adequate facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, staff recommends approval of the Zone Map Amendment. Ms. Younger mentioned that there is a slope to the property which, along with the length of the property, will make it difficult to connect to surrounding utilities. However, with private easements and

1 agreements with the surrounding neighbors, and by bringing in proper fill to the site, Ms.
2 Younger said it is certainly possible to connect to surrounding utilities.

3
4 David Bell, property owner, thanked the Planning Commission and said that he thought
5 that he should have gotten the Zoning Map Amendment approved last year. He said that he
6 was shocked that he was treated the way he was by the City Council. He stated that he has
7 plans to do something nice on his property and he addressed the issue with the drainage and
8 confirmed with Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, that there are easements for
9 the property in place. Mr. Snyder explained that there is a private easement on the Les Schwab
10 property which borders Mr. Bell's property, however it appears that the lines on that property
11 would likely need to be upgraded and some engineering questions exist as to how to connect to
12 those lines. This should not, however, impact the Zone Map Amendment.

13
14 Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Bell if the neighbor behind the property who had
15 concerns when the Zoning Map Amendment was before the Planning Commission in 2017 was
16 aware of the proposed development. Mr. Bell said he is no longer a neighbor.

17
18 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:09 p.m., and closed the public hearing
19 seeing that no one wished to comment.

20
21 Vice Chair Daly asked if developing the property in this way, and rezoning two (2) out of
22 the three (3) properties that border each other, leaving one (1) small piece of Agricultural-Low
23 zoned property, would be tying the hands of the property owner of that small piece against
24 future development. Mr. Snyder replied that it has been the policy per Centerville's General
25 Plan to not force rezoning of agricultural land unless owner's request rezoning. Mr. Snyder also
26 stated that even if the property was rezoned, because of its size and the fact that it cannot be
27 coupled with another property, it cannot be developed in its current configuration anyway.
28 Commissioner Wright said that she doesn't feel rezoning the property at 640 Porter Lane would
29 affect the property owner of the small agricultural property at all. The property owner of that
30 small parcel could either leave it's zoning as is, in which case it cannot be developed anyway; or
31 it could be rezoned and it would have to be Residential-Medium anyway. Commissioner Wright
32 said she appreciates the City's policy, because it errs on the side of property rights and allowing
33 property owners to make their own decisions about what to do with their property.

34
35 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to recommend approval of the Zone Map
36 Amendment for land parcels 03-001-0178 & 03-001-0179 from Agricultural-Low to Residential-
37 Medium, with Reasons for the Actions (1)-(5), and provided however, the unapproved division of
38 the parcels shall be combined into a singular parcel, on the County's records, prior to any
39 approval of any future development plan. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which
40 passed by majority vote (5-1) with Commissioner Daly dissenting.

41
42 Reasons for the Action:

- 43 1. The Planning Commission has sufficiently reviewed and considered the criteria found
44 in Section CZC 12.21.080.e of the Zoning Ordinance.
- 45 2. The Planning Commission finds that the rezone is consistent with the goals of the
46 General Plan, as described in Section 12-480-1.a.
- 47 3. The Planning Commission finds that the rezone does not create any additional
48 constraints or adverse effects concerning surrounding properties and development in
49 the immediate vicinity.
- 50 4. The Planning Commission finds that the R-M request functions as an acceptable
51 medium density residential bugger to commercial that is compatible with the
52 characteristic multi-zone land use pattern for the immediate area.

- 1 5. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the R-M Zoning designation ought to
2 be approved.
3

4 Commissioner Wright stated that she appreciates that the City Council has looked at R-
5 M Zones city-wide, and has updated design standards that create a better overall product. She
6 recalled a previous issue in the R-M zone in which residents were concerned about the width of
7 the streets, and she notes that has been addressed, as well as adding sidewalks on both sides
8 of the street. She also appreciated the density cap of six (6) units. With those changes
9 implemented, and concerns addressed from when the petition was previously made, she felt
10 comfortable to grant the request.
11

12 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT – CZC 12.42 – HILLSIDE**
13 **OVERLAY ZONE**
14

15 Mr. Snyder explained that the petitioner desires to amend the Overlay provisions to
16 achieve a greater balance between the differing lot sizes that could occur in the various zones
17 (predominately R-L & A-L) of the Overlay area. The reason for this is that the current overlay
18 limits “impervious coverage” for Lot 4 to 5,000 square feet even though the property is
19 approximately one (1) acre in size. In a comparative scenario, a ¼ acre lot (10,800 square feet)
20 of the R-L Zone, subject to the Overlay provisions, would only be limited to 4,320 square feet,
21 nearly the same allotment as an acre size lot. Mr. Snyder explained the proposed change of
22 language, contained in the staff report, and stated that it is the position of staff that the proposed
23 language changes remain consistent with the policies of the General Plan and the hillslope
24 development provisions in relation to impervious coverage standards between agricultural and
25 residential lots within the Hillside Overlay.
26

27 Commissioner Hintze asked if there were a lot of examples of properties who had been
28 required to detain water on site. Mr. Snyder provided examples. He said there is generally no
29 issue with this, other than getting easements and preventing future development by owner of
30 their backyard.
31

32 Fred Hale, property owner, said he was surprised that he would not be able to build a
33 bigger house on his property. His plan is now in for a permit and this Zoning Text Amendment
34 would be required in order for the plan to be approved. He stated his concerns that because of
35 the 40% requirement for impervious coverage, he would not be able to build a patio or
36 basketball court or other amenities on his site, and would prefer the 60% limit that other zones
37 are allowed.
38

39 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:33 p.m., and closed the public hearing
40 seeing that no one wished to comment.
41

42 Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Snyder to explain why the proposed Zoning Text
43 Amendment would allow for 40% impervious coverage in A-L Zones in the Hillside Overlay, and
44 not 50% or 60% coverage. Mr. Snyder said the 40% figure has been used historically, and the
45 principle is that more impervious surfaces on a slope, means more water flowing downhill, and
46 an increase in erosion and flooding of homes downhill. Staff is not prepared to further
47 categorize properties based on slope height and then make specific requirements for
48 impervious coverage by slope height, until further analysis is done and drainage is studied.
49 Commissioner Johnson agreed that he would not be comfortable changing the 40% number
50 without understanding the ramifications completely.
51

52 Commissioner Wright asked if the amount of impervious surface allowed would be
53 different if the property was to be rezoned to R-L. Lisa Romney, City Attorney, said that on the

1 same size lot in an R-L Zone, the same amount of impervious coverage would be allowed. Mr.
2 Snyder further explained that if the property in the R-L Zone was subdivided into four (4) parts,
3 however, there would be slightly more impervious coverage allowed over the 4 lots.
4

5 Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to recommend to the City Council to approve the
6 proposed Hillside Overlay amendment, CZC 12.42.040(d), as show in blue below, with reasons
7 for findings (a)-(d). Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous
8 vote (6-0).
9

10 CZC 12.42.040(d) Mazimum Impervious Material Coverage:

11 *Except as otherwise provided herein, the maximum allowable coverage of a lot in the*
12 *Hillside Overlay Zone by impervious material shall be 40% of the total lot area, or 5,000 square*
13 *feet, whichever is less. The maximum allowable impervious material coverage of a lot may be*
14 *allowed to exceed 5,000 square feet as an exception upon recommendation of the City*
15 *Engineer and approval of the applicable land use authority for the subject application (i.e.*
16 *subdivision, site plan, or building permit).*
17

18 *Any applicant seeking an exception to exceed 5,000 square feet of impervious material*
19 *coverage per lot shall be required to provide on-site detention and appropriately sized outflow*
20 *orifice plates for the additional impervious area (over 5,000 square feet) in accordance with City*
21 *Engineer recommended detention volume calculations for a 25-year storm event.*
22

23 *The applicant shall be required to provide engineered drawings and specifications for the*
24 *proposed detention and drainage to qualify for the exception. In no event shall the impervious*
25 *material coverage of any lot in the Hillside Overlay Zone exceed 40% of the total lot area.*
26

27 *For purposes of calculating the permissible lot coverage percentage, lot areas that*
28 *exceed 30% slope shall be excluded and shall not be used in calculating the permitted 40%*
29 *coverage area.*
30

31 Reasons for Findings:

- 32 a. The Planning Commission finds that the decision to amend the zoning ordinance is a
33 matter of within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC
34 12.21.060.a.1.B.
35 b. The Planning Commission finds that amendments consistent with the goals,
36 objectives and policies of the City's General Plan, as presented in the staff report.
37 c. The Planning Commission finds that this amendment would serve to treat the
38 residential and agricultural zones fairly as regulated within the Hillside Overlay Zone
39 and remain consistent within the regulations and parameters of the code.
40 d. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the amendments are consistent with
41 the desire to allow hillside development to be contextually developed in relation to
42 topography and slope stability.
43

44 Commissioner Wright commented that given the fact that the City Engineer and
45 Development Review Committee met to look at the Hillside Overlay amendment and address a
46 problem brought up by the property owner, which could also be a problem for others in future;
47 and considered fairness between different zones, while still maintaining the spirit of the Hillside
48 Overlay Zone, she feels this amendment addresses questions and concerns that the property
49 owner and the Planning Commission have had. She commented that perhaps a tiered system
50 could be considered later, but for now she feels comfortable with a flat determination of 40%
51 without further engineering, as this is the number that has been used historically.
52
53

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION MATRIX – ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Lisa Romney, City Attorney, explained that she had created three (3) charts for the Commissioners to review the current administrative procedures in the areas of legislative, zoning, and subdivision matters. These charts were created in response to the Commissioners' stated desire to review administrative processes to see if there were opportunities for simplification or changing of ordinances in order to have more time for proactive planning. In looking at the charts she explained that the Planning Commission is involved in 5 different types of legislative decisions, 12 types of administrative decisions, and 4 types of subdivision decisions. As such, Ms. Romney created a fourth chart, which she had passed out before the meeting started, which showed what kinds of decisions the Planning Commission has made over the last three (3) years so that the Commissioners could understand where their time is spent. She started by reviewing that chart, which illuminated that the Commissioners are spending the majority of time on Zoning Text Amendments and Zoning Map decisions, which are legislative decisions; and a lot of time on Conceptual Site Plan and Final Site Plan reviews.

Ms. Romney then reviewed the Zoning Decision Matrix attached to the meeting minutes. She stated that because Zoning Decisions are legislative, there can be no changes made in those areas.

Ms. Romney then reviewed the Administrative Decision Matrix attached to the meeting minutes, starting with CUP. She pointed out that the Zoning Administrator currently has the final decision on 11 administrative applications, where the Planning Commission makes the final decision in 12 administrative applications. Ms. Romney said that she does not suggest changing the process for Conditional Use Permits, as it did not take that much of the Commissioners' time over the last three (3) years and is a one-step process that is valuable for the Commissioners to be involved in. Commissioner Wright agreed with Ms. Romney and said that reviewing CUP's allows the Commissioners to discuss how to mitigate if needed. Vice Chair Daly agreed the Planning Commission should review Conditional Use Permits, but said not as many items should be required to have Conditional Use Permits. He said he would like the Commissioners to review the Use list to see if there are some items that should be permitted, instead of Conditional Use permitted, and said he would also like to separate major and minor conditional uses and let the Zoning Administrator determine minor use CUP approvals. Chair Hayman stated that the Planning Commission should be cautious about removing too many items from the Conditional Use list, because once something has been changed to a Permitted Use, there is no ability for the Commission to mitigate. She agreed it is worth examining, but wants to be careful.

Ms. Romney then moved to reviewing Site Plan decisions on the Administrative Decision Matrix. Site Plan approvals are broken into Conceptual Site Plan approvals and Final Site Plan Approvals. She suggested that staff handle Conceptual Site Plan Approvals. She pointed out that the problem with this change would be that the only public hearing held on site plans is at the conceptual level. She says this is done because it is better for all parties to know sooner than later if there will be major issues with the site plan, before engineering is complete. Mr. Snyder commented that one of the advantages of letting staff handle approval at conceptual level is that this would allow staff more time to gather all of the documents necessary to thoroughly review a Conceptual Site Plan. However, this could mean that things could get stuck at staff level for much longer than the currently required 21 days, and the application could take longer to approve, which would make the public unhappy. Commissioner Wright asked if it would be possible to change things such that Conceptual Site Plan approval is done at staff level, unless it has not been addressed within a certain time period, and then it would be sent to the Planning Commission to review. Mr. Snyder said that could be looked at. He also commented that while public hearings are good for transparency, having the public take part in

1 public hearings at the conceptual level can sometimes be confusing for them, as they do not
2 understand that the Planning Commission is simply making an administrative decision based on
3 whether or not something meets the code or not. Vice Chair Daly asked if Conceptual Site Plan
4 approval could be handled at staff level, but public notice could be made and public comments
5 gathered that could be submitted to staff and presented to the Planning Commission during
6 Final Site Plan Approval. Ms. Romney suggested that appeals to Conceptual Site Plan
7 approval could be made to the Planning Commission. She also suggested that Conceptual Site
8 Plan applications would need to be submitted to staff in their complete state. Cassie Younger,
9 Assistant Planner, made a comment that it might be more beneficial for staff to approve Final
10 Site Plans, because she feels that it is very valuable for the Planning Commission to comment
11 on and add conditions at Conceptual Site Plan approval, so that the developer knows what
12 direction to move in before he has engineering completed. Ms. Romney suggested that
13 perhaps the Commissioners could review what is required at the Conceptual level and what is
14 required at Final to see what changes to make to the process. Commissioner Helgesen and
15 Chair Hayman expressed they are partial to not changing the administrative procedures for
16 Conceptual or Final Site Plan Approval. Vice Chair Daly suggested public comments be
17 gathered before Conceptual Site Plan reviews, rather than having public hearings. Chair
18 Hayman agreed with this suggestion and suggested that these comments be added to staff
19 reports, and reasons be given if a public comment cannot be addressed legally by the Planning
20 Commission. Commissioner Wright agreed with that suggestion, and also added that additional
21 time should be given for staff to put together a conceptual site plan review. Ms. Romney
22 reminded the Commissioners that in order for people to give legitimate comments, they should
23 be able to read the staff report first. Commissioner Helgesen said that the public wants to be
24 heard, not just from a letter, so she would prefer to continue doing public hearings.
25 Commissioner Wright asked about the Commissioner's feelings on giving Final Site Plan
26 approval to staff, as Ms. Younger had suggested. Commissioner Johnson said that he is
27 worried that issues the Planning Commission finds during Conceptual Site Plan Approval may
28 not be addressed by staff in Final Site Plan Approval the same way the Commissioner's would
29 have addressed the issues. Commissioner Johnson would keep both Conceptual and Final Site
30 Plan approvals at the Planning Commission level and he would lighten the conceptual
31 requirements and put more requirements into Final Site Plan Approval. Ms. Romney suggested
32 that at a future Planning Commission meeting the current requirements for the applicant at the
33 Conceptual level and the Final level could be reviewed. Commissioner Wright would like to see
34 the noticing matrix for each item that is noticed. She would like to know which notices are
35 required by statute and which are discretionary. It was agreed that this would be reviewed at the
36 May 23rd Planning Commission meeting as well.

37
38 Ms. Romney reviewed the Subdivision Decision Matrix and said that Centerville City
39 sees four (4) different subdivision applications: the Planning Commission sees Conceptual,
40 Preliminary, and Final Subdivision applications, and then the City Council sees Final
41 Subdivision applications as well. Ms. Romney suggests Conceptual Subdivision Approval be
42 given to staff and suggests that Final Subdivision Approval be made by the Planning
43 Commission without then sending it to the City Council, as having the Council make that
44 administrative decision is a liability. Commissioner Wright asked about whether it would be
45 possible to eliminate the Preliminary Subdivision Plat, and make the Conceptual Subdivision
46 Plat approval more comprehensive. Mr. Snyder explained that during the Preliminary
47 Subdivision process the City Engineer looks at the construction drawings for the first time.
48 Commissioner Wright asked if the City Engineer could look at construction drawings at the
49 Conceptual level, and Mr. Snyder explained that would be a huge expenditure for the developer
50 at the Conceptual level. Ms. Younger said she agrees Conceptual could be at the staff level.
51 Mr. Snyder asked if Final Approval needs to be done by the Planning Commission, or if the
52 Preliminary process could be enhanced and then Final Approval could be made by the City
53 Council. Vice Chair Daly wants to know why the City Council makes Final Subdivision approval,

1 and not Final Site Plan Approval. Mr. Snyder explained that the Final Subdivision Plat is a
2 document that goes to the County Recorder, and within the document the City accepts
3 easements, streets, bonds and warranties that come with public infrastructure, so that is why
4 the Final Subdivision Plat needs to be approved by the City Council. Commissioner Wright
5 suggested moving Conceptual Subdivision Plat approval to the staff level, enhancing
6 Preliminary Subdivision Plat approval, and moving Final Subdivision Plat Approval to just the
7 City Council. Chair Hayman agreed with this idea. Ms. Romney voiced concern that if the
8 Planning Commission adds conditions at the Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval, they would
9 not then be able to ensure these conditions have been met and addressed at the Final stage if
10 the City Council is the only body that does Final Subdivision Plat Approval. Ms. Romney
11 suggested that the Planning Commission reserve the right to request to see the Final
12 Subdivision Plat before it goes to the City Council. Chair Hayman said she would prefer to keep
13 Final Subdivision Plat Approval at the Planning Commission level and not have the City Council
14 make the final decision. Chair Hayman and Commissioner Wright requested to know what would
15 be required at each step of the proposed Small Subdivision lot split approval process.
16

17 Chair Hayman thanked Lisa for her help in putting together matrices and analyzing
18 Planning Commission Decisions. She stated she is glad to see the Planning Commission being
19 proactive about making changes.
20

21 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

22
23 The minutes of the April 11, 2018 meeting will be reviewed at the next Planning
24 Commission meeting as they were not attached to the agenda.
25

26 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

27
28 The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for May 9, 2018.
29

30 Mr. Snyder discussed recent decisions made by the City Council and items that will be
31 discussed in the next Planning Commission meeting.
32

33 The City Council has requested a work session to discuss Planning Commission goals
34 on May 22, 2018. Mr. Snyder says that Main Street use changes should also be addressed in
35 this work session, as this would help to align the objectives of the Planning Commission and
36 City Council in regards to Main Street Uses. Commissioner Wright asked if Mr. Snyder could
37 bring the specific uses that the Planning Commission had suggested changing on the Main
38 Street Use List, based on the survey performed, to the work session so those could be the items
39 focused on. Chair Hayman pointed out that ultimately it will be the City Council's decision about
40 approving changes to the use list, but is happy to have a work session and to involve the public
41 further in making changes to the use list, if that is what is desired by the City Council.
42

43 **ADJOURNMENT**

44
45 At 8:52 p.m. Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting.
46 Commissioner Wright seconded the motion which passed unanimously (6-0).
47

48
49 _____
Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

_____ Date Approved

50
51 _____
52 Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary