

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, January 25, 2017**

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 Kevin Daly  
10 Logan Johnson  
11 Cheylynn Hayman, Vice Chair  
12 Kathy Helgesen  
13 Gina Hirst  
14 Becki Wright

15  
16 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

17 David Hirschi, Chair

18  
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Emily Hatch, Recording Secretary  
21 Lisa Romney, City Attorney  
22 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director  
23 Cassie Younger, City Planner

24  
25 **VISITORS**

26 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

27  
28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29  
30 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Logan Johnson

31  
32 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

33  
34 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held January 11, 2017 were reviewed  
35 and amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The  
36 motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

37  
38 **PUBLIC HEARING – GENERAL PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT SOUTHEAST**  
39 **NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN- Consider a proposed General Plan Text Amendment**  
40 **regarding the future residential density allowances in the Southeast Neighborhood**  
41 **[Neighborhood 1] – Centerville City Council, c/o Mayor Paul Cutler, Applicant.**

42  
43 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, gave some context for the draft edits of  
44 the Southeast Plan made by Staff. The plan under discussion today is for the residential

1 component. The commercial areas will be addressed in the future, as the second phase of this  
2 project. The written recommendations were an attempt by Mr. Snyder to capture the essence of  
3 past discussions in relation to amending the Southeast Neighborhood Plan, including the concern  
4 over allowing more multi-family developments and the potential change of Residential-Medium  
5 Zones. The drafted edits also include suggested changes to some phrases used in the Plan. Mr.  
6 Snyder emphasized that these discussions about the future and expectations of the City are  
7 necessary parts of the function of the Planning Commission. Mr. Snyder noted there is no intent  
8 on the part of Staff for a final decision on the Plan to be made tonight, unless the Commission  
9 feels that the edits made so far are sufficient. Staff, however, does not feel that the Plan is solid,  
10 as of yet.

11  
12 Mr. Snyder stated that the Southeast Neighborhood Plan covers the portion of the City  
13 east of Main Street and south of Parrish Lane (400 North) to city limits, either in the foothills or  
14 to Bountiful. In Section 12-480-1 of the General Plan, a map is referenced which should show  
15 the City divided into individual neighborhoods; however, the location of this map is unknown  
16 and should be prepared and attached or the reference deleted. Currently, the city is broken up  
17 into neighborhoods, which are broken up into sub-districts. Some clarification is needed to  
18 differentiate between the two in the Plan.

19  
20 Mr. Snyder said that the most significant change to the introduction of Section 12-480-2  
21 is Staff's attempt to explain the purpose, justifications, and expectations for the Plan. Due to the  
22 area's geographic location along commercial corridors, Southeast Centerville has been a place  
23 where multi-family developments naturally occur, which has caused tension for the existing  
24 neighborhoods. The edits made to the Plan are an attempt to balance the desires of the existing  
25 neighborhoods while also looking to the future.

26  
27 Mr. Snyder presented the option of replacing the term "Old Townsite" with "Centerville  
28 Deuel Creek Historic District". There is a Residential-Medium area that falls within this  
29 boundary that provides a buffer around the Centerville Elementary Area and City Hall Area,  
30 separating the Elementary School, City Hall, and Founders Park from an interior neighborhood.  
31 In the Deuel Creek District, the preference is for single-family homes that preserve the historic  
32 nature of the area, the decision must be made whether the streets are the necessary buffer rather  
33 than the homes. Mr. Snyder referenced Parrish Lane (400 North) as an example, where there are  
34 many duplexes along the road, yet 100 North and 100 East have only single-family homes, yet is  
35 labeled as a Residential-Medium buffer between City Hall and the residential neighborhood. A  
36 decision is needed with regards to the balance between maintaining the Historic District while  
37 also achieving this buffer around City Hall. There was some discussion about changing the name  
38 of the subdistrict back to "Old Townsite" to avoid confusion with the Deuel Creek Historic  
39 District Overlay Zone in the Zoning Code (which has a different boundary description than this  
40 neighborhood in the General Plan).

41

1           Within each section of the plan detailing a sub-area, Mr. Snyder made efforts to maintain  
2 clarity, as requested by the City Council, by specifying that no high-density developments shall  
3 be allowed, rather than simply excluding it from the list of allowed developments.

4  
5           Mr. Snyder reformatted the area discussing Centerville Junior High to include  
6 information on The Courtyard at Pages Lane, which didn't exist when the Plan was written.

7  
8           The last two sub-areas discussed by Mr. Snyder were the Extreme South Main Street  
9 Area (Centerville/Bountiful border), a Residential-Medium and Residential-Low area that  
10 includes the duplexes along 1200 South, the west side of which is in Centerville and the east side  
11 of which is in Bountiful, and the Southeast Residential Area, which is predominantly a single-  
12 family area. It is specified that high-density developments will not be allowed in these areas in  
13 the future.

14  
15           Mr. Snyder discussed Pages Lane and how it relates to the areas discussed previously. He  
16 referenced the Balling Engineering property that came before the Commission recently, which  
17 borders on Pages Lane. The applicant originally requested that this be re-zoned as Residential-  
18 High but the area ended up as Residential-Medium. Mr. Snyder explained that it is necessary to  
19 think about corridors, such as Pages Lane, as part of the community identity.

20  
21           Commissioner Hayman referenced the Utah Code that requires the Commission to  
22 regularly review moderate income housing needs and identify opportunities to encourage these  
23 housing needs. The Staff Report states that Mr. Snyder asked the GIS (Geographical Information  
24 Systems) Division to run an analysis on this matter. Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder if  
25 this analysis fulfills the Utah Code requirement and, if not, how often this should be done and  
26 how recently it was last done. Mr. Snyder answered that while this is a neighborhood plan, it's  
27 best to also keep in mind the existing General Policies as well. The moderate income housing  
28 plan was adopted in 2002 and updated in 2012. The most recent report was to be provided to  
29 Workforce Services in 2016, but that deadline has been extended to 2017. The City Council will  
30 be completing a survey with regards to plans and actions taken. The plan completed in 2012 used  
31 data from county valuations, which, while data rich, are not necessarily reflective of the market.  
32 However, it did conclude that Centerville met the suggested target of market number of units for  
33 residents with 80% of the median income for the metropolitan statistical area. There are also  
34 provisions in state law to consider those at 50% of the median income or lower; if this was the  
35 standard, then Centerville City would fall short of the target for moderate income housing.  
36 Centerville City selected a strategy provided by Wasatch Front Regional Council planning tools  
37 to look at open market yields in comparison to those of our city, to use as a method of  
38 determining what actions the City should take in the future. Centerville City does have a shortage  
39 of multi-family housing, which are typically rental residences. It should be kept in mind that the  
40 current changes to the Southeast Neighborhood Plan specify that no high-density developments  
41 shall be allowed, which includes multi-family housing. Mr. Snyder asked the Commission to

1 consider whether other areas of the city should be investigated as options for multi-family  
2 housing.

3  
4 Commissioner Daly asked Mr. Snyder how the suggested edits for Section 12-480-2  
5 came about. Mr. Snyder responded that the suggested edits were a distillation of various  
6 discussions regarding the matter, including the preservation of the Deuel Creek Historic District  
7 and the burden of multi-family housing in the south area of the city. The suggested edits made by  
8 Mr. Snyder were done so as an interpretation of information heard from the City Council in  
9 conjunction with the information he has regarding the balance of the plan as a whole.

10  
11 Commissioner Johnson read the end of the suggested added paragraph in Section 12-  
12 480-2, where it states, "...encourage higher-density housing development to other less  
13 concentrated locations in other parts of the City and/or region," and asked Mr. Snyder what  
14 these other areas are and how higher-density housing is being encouraged there. Mr. Snyder  
15 responded that the idea of this Plan is to have a protectionist view of density in the Southeast  
16 area, which does not translate to city-wide policy. Commissioner Hayman discussed the fact that  
17 there are two considerations for multi-family housing: either to push this housing to less-  
18 concentrated areas or to push all of this type of housing to the same area (the southwest side of  
19 the city). The phrasing used by Mr. Snyder would not support this second approach. Mr. Snyder  
20 explained that this type of housing could be pushed to the north, the southwest, or the west – but,  
21 when discussed in correlation with the moderate income housing plan, the City does need to look  
22 at other locations, since the southeast is not an option in the current Plan.

23  
24 Commissioner Hayman asked if the phrase "other part of the city and/or region," meant  
25 that the City could attempt to limit multi-family housing within city limits, and instead attempt to  
26 move it to surrounding cities. Mr. Snyder responded that there is a statement earlier in the  
27 General Plan that states that it is not necessary to provide a cross-section of housing, which  
28 makes him uncomfortable. The use of the phrase "and/or region" is an acknowledgment of the  
29 possibility that future planning may limit multi-family housing. There is currently a high-  
30 demand for multi-family housing in the South Davis area. Whatever regulations are in place, the  
31 current market drives the prices of homes. Regardless, the City should consider state statute  
32 requirements and regulations regarding moderate income housing and the city's obligation to  
33 provide a plan for such housing.

34  
35 Commissioner Wright agreed that it is necessary to protect against market, but also  
36 questioned the benefits of legislating against market with regards to the health of the city and its  
37 housing market. Commission Johnson referenced analyses by Strong Towns with regards to  
38 exclusionary zoning against multi-family housing and how these practices damage the financial  
39 sustainability of a city. The tax revenue from single-family housing does not balance the cost of  
40 maintaining that infrastructure, so other means of income are necessary. Commissioner Johnson  
41 said he hesitates to agree with the general premise of the Plan due to concerns about financial  
42 stability for the City.

1 Commissioner Wright discussed the strong sentiment from the general public against  
2 high-density housing in Centerville. She suggested some clarification on the definition of high-  
3 density and also referenced the Balling Engineering property, which was able to change from  
4 high-density to medium-density just by purchasing a very small area of land from the  
5 neighboring church. Citizens seem to be more accepting of medium-density as opposed to high-  
6 density, without really understanding the difference between the two. She said she is  
7 uncomfortable limiting the plan to such a degree that it is exclusionary of medium-density areas.  
8 Medium density is appropriate for many areas, and Commissioner Wright questioned the need to  
9 specify that there shall be no medium-density residential developments, as listed in section a.2.  
10 of the Residential Policies of the Plan, when there are already several medium-density  
11 developments in this area.

12  
13 Commissioner Hayman said she had the same concern with regards to the Southeast  
14 Residential Area, section e.2., which also specifies no medium-density developments. She  
15 explained she also feels like the public has an immediate dislike for high-density housing based  
16 on the name, rather than on an understanding of what high-density really means. She described  
17 her own property as an example of a home that could not be on a single-family lot, yet would not  
18 likely be considered as high-density by the public. She expressed her discomfort at excluding  
19 medium-density developments from the Southeast Residential Neighborhood.

20  
21 Commissioner Wright restated the importance of clearly defining the meaning of high-  
22 density.

23  
24 Mr. Snyder also agreed that the public has a preconception of what high-density housing  
25 is. He gave the example of a home on a 9,000 square foot lot, which would be a single-family  
26 home, versus a 6-plex, which is likely to be seen as high-density regardless of the plot size. He  
27 explained that several homes in the historic divisions are single-family by definition, but not  
28 necessarily low-density.

29  
30 Commissioner Wright discussed the many areas of multi-family housing that exist in  
31 northwest Centerville. In the northern area of the city, these seem more accepted by the public  
32 as they're not replacing anything. However, the southern area of the city the historic old town, so  
33 change is more difficult to accept. Commissioner Daly agreed that density is a matter of  
34 perception. He also referenced the Balling Engineering project, which has the perception of  
35 being high-density since it isn't the same as the rest of the neighborhood. However, in northern  
36 Centerville, the areas of multi-family housing are their own neighborhood, and so don't differ  
37 from the surrounding area. In the southern area of Centerville, there is the desire to maintain the  
38 neighborhoods as they are, rather than changing them by introducing high-density developments.  
39 Commissioner Daly said that he, in general, agrees with the suggested edits to the Plan for this  
40 reason.

41

1 Commissioner Hayman was surprised by the amount of multi-family housing in northern  
2 Centerville. She discussed the data included in the Staff Report, showing that the percentage of  
3 multi-family residences in southern Centerville (-17%) is close to the percentage of multi-family  
4 residences city-wide (-18%), and wondered which area of the city has the most multi-family  
5 residences. Mr. Snyder responded that the northwest area has the most high-density accrual, and  
6 the northeast area has the least amount of differences across housing types. Commissioner  
7 Wright asked what the area surrounding the Balling Engineering property was zoned.  
8 Commissioner Daly responded that the area to the east is high-density and the area to the south is  
9 commercial. Commissioner Wright explained that she felt that medium-density for the Balling  
10 Engineering property actually made sense, due to the surrounding area. The citizens are more  
11 likely unhappy with the change to the neighborhood rather than the zoning of the area. Mr. Daly  
12 agreed that it is the perception of density that causes concern for the citizens, and referenced  
13 flag-lots as an example of this.

14  
15 Commissioner Hayman referenced the first sentence in the new paragraph in Section 12-  
16 480-2, which states that “multi-family development has become a dominant form of newer  
17 housing development,” and inquired as to the accuracy of this statement. Mr. Snyder said that the  
18 term “dominant,” is debatable; he was addressing the matter from an infill, teardown perspective,  
19 for which multi-family is the dominant form. In this paragraph, he attempted to justify the slow-  
20 down of multi-family residence development. Commissioner Daly said he wasn’t bothered by  
21 the term “dominant,” which seemed to speak to the current trend of getting as many units on a  
22 plot of land as possible, and referenced several examples seen by the Commission recently, all of  
23 which were in the southeastern area of Centerville. Commissioner Wright agreed with  
24 Commissioner Hayman that, while there have been significant increases in the number of multi-  
25 family residences, it is not the dominant form of development in the South Davis area. Mr.  
26 Snyder expressed his willingness to readdress the wording in this section.

27  
28 Commissioner Hayman discussed the market pressure to put in the maximum number of  
29 housing units possible, which suggests that there is a lot of interest in multi-family housing. She  
30 expressed concern with the City trying to be exclusionary, regardless of the market trend, and  
31 force multi-family housing to other cities to protect the single-family homes. She said she prefers  
32 the idea of spreading the multi-family housing throughout the city, rather than concentrating it in  
33 one area, and said that the arteries of the city seem like a logical place for this type of residence  
34 as a transition from medium- to low-density.

35  
36 Mr. Snyder presented an alternative perspective, giving the Cove at Deuel Creek  
37 Subdivision as an example. Zoning should be used to preserve values, health, safety, and welfare  
38 of a community. However, there is also the issue of property rights: the concept that when you  
39 buy a piece of land, you are also purchasing a set of rights associated with that piece of land.  
40 Current zoning allows four units per acre; however, there is a distinction between the zoning of  
41 an area and the tools to implement the zoning of an area, such as flag lot ordinances or infill

1 opportunities. These tools should be available to allow property owners to reach the full  
2 potential of their property.

3  
4 Commissioner Wright agreed with Mr. Snyder, explaining that one of the reasons she is  
5 uncomfortable limiting medium-density developments is because of property rights. The  
6 Planning Commission has a mission to maintain a healthy, viable city, but also has a  
7 responsibility to respect property rights. Commissioner Daly said he believes the Plan does  
8 support this, and it discusses that there are various zones throughout this area and these zones  
9 would not be changed, unless the issue is brought before the Commission by the owner.  
10 Commissioner Wright referenced section 1.a.2, which states that medium-density developments  
11 will not be allowed, even though there are medium-density developments already in existence in  
12 this area. Commissioner Daly responded that there are no medium-density developments in the  
13 area detailed in section 1.a. Commissioner Wright asked for clarification on what is considered  
14 Centerville Deuel Creek Historic District. Mr. Snyder responded that there is a mismatch of  
15 terms between Deuel Creek and Old Town; the area and label descriptions do not align.  
16 Commissioner Hayman said there is too much confusion if the Deuel Creek Zoning does not  
17 match up with the Deuel Creek Historic District, and she would be inclined to call it something  
18 else to avoid confusion. Mr. Snyder said he is hoping that the Commission can provide some  
19 clarification on the issue by selecting an appropriate term for the area.

20  
21 Commissioner Daly asked if multi-family residences are allowed in commercial areas.  
22 Mr. Snyder replied that the South Centerville Main Street Plan allows an option for a certain  
23 number of units, generally within medium-density zones.

24  
25 Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder if he'd ever seen cities or municipalities with  
26 zoning codes that are segmented more than just low, medium, and high densities. Mr. Snyder  
27 replied that there are three ways to approach this issue: adjust the ranges used while keeping the  
28 terms used, segment the zones into more than three categories, or to relabel the zones to be  
29 specific to the area. Commissioner Daly suggested another alternative approach of redefining the  
30 zones – for example, low density meaning up to three units – then requiring conditional use for  
31 more units than allowed in that zone yet less than what is allowed in the next level of zoning.  
32 Commissioner Wright stated that City Council prefers not to have conditions such as these.

33  
34 Commissioner Hayman opened the public hearing at 8:31 pm. Seeing no one with any  
35 questions or comments, Commissioner Hayman closed the public hearing at 8:31 pm.

36 Commissioner Wright referenced Centerville Commons which, though it is not low-  
37 density, is a desirable area of housing for various family types. She expressed her concern for the  
38 vitality of the city if medium-density housing is not allowed, and worries this policy does not  
39 look to the future of the city. Commissioner Daly stated that Centerville Commons seems to  
40 work because it is the whole neighborhood, and did not replace a different style of neighborhood  
41 that was there previously. However, there don't seem to be any large, vacant pieces of land left  
42 in southeast Centerville that could be developed into new residential neighborhoods.

1 Commissioner Hayman asked about the far east of Centerville with regards to open areas  
2 for potentially high-density areas. Commissioner Daly mentioned that the potential development  
3 of this area of Centerville, which would fall into the boundaries of the Southeast neighborhood,  
4 should be discussed. Mr. Snyder agreed, and said this could be something discussed in the  
5 second portion of the discussion of this Plan. Commissioner Daly said he thought it was  
6 appropriate for the residential discussion, as it is unlikely that this area will have any commercial  
7 development. However, he suggests that it not be developed for residential. Mr. Snyder said it is  
8 an option to add a new sub-district for this area. Commissioner Wright expressed her reluctance  
9 to begin addressing this matter due to the potential consequences of opening the matter up for  
10 discussion. Commissioner Daly suggested adding another point to section 1.e of the Plan, stating  
11 that no new residential developments shall be allowed east of existing residential zones. Mr.  
12 Snyder acknowledged that this is something that could be added to the Plan, which could prevent  
13 adding a new zone or sub-district. Ms. Romney, City Attorney, asked if the Foothills Master  
14 Plan governed the area under discussion, to which Mr. Snyder replied in the affirmative.  
15 Commissioner Wright again stated her reluctance to address this matter, worrying that opening  
16 the matter up for discussion would create the possibility of this area being developed at some  
17 point in the future.

18  
19 Mr. Snyder said that, if the Commission requests, he can create a second draft of the  
20 Southeast Neighborhood Plan based on the current discussion taking place in the Planning  
21 Commission meeting, as well as make recommended changes to the first draft. Commissioner  
22 Hayman expressed her support of this suggestion, and said she would like to see the various  
23 options presented side-by-side in this second draft.

24  
25 Commissioner Wright asked if the Townsite definitely does not align with what is zoned.  
26 Mr. Snyder replied that the Townsite Directives in the Plan were not edited, so the boundary  
27 lines listed are the original boundary lines. Commissioner Wright suggested adding the  
28 consideration of accurately aligning these with what is currently in place. Ms. Romney reminded  
29 the Commission that there is a General Plan, which details the vision of the future, and the  
30 zoning district, and warned about having a General Plan Area with the same name as the zoning  
31 overlay. In addition, an attempt to align these would result in an overlap between the Historic  
32 District and the Centerville Elementary Area. She suggested that a better approach may be to  
33 choose a new name or revert back to the old name, and reference that this new area is within an  
34 existing area. Mr. Snyder expressed his willingness to reformat the plan appropriately.

35  
36 Commissioner Daly proposed an addition to the sections for the Centerville Elementary  
37 Area and the Southeast Residential Area (since there is no Taylor Elementary Area), to specify  
38 that any development in these areas shall be designed and developed for minimal impact upon  
39 the schools. Uses that may have detrimental impact upon the school shall not be allowed. Similar  
40 instructions are currently included in the commercial plan, and should be specifically stated in  
41 the residential plan as well.



1 Commissioner Wright asked for more information on section 1.c.2, which has been  
2 suggested for removal in the edits. Mr. Snyder said that the area south of the Riviera  
3 Townhouses has since been developed into the Courtyard at Pages Lane, so this item no longer  
4 applies.

5  
6 Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to table the issue of  
7 the General Plan Amendments of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan and direct Staff to make  
8 revisions consistent with their discussion. Commissioner Helgesen seconded the motion, which  
9 passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

10  
11 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

12 1. Items scheduled for February 8, 2017:

- 13 • Accessory Building Setbacks, Continued Discussion (PC Tabled Item on January  
14 11, 2017)  
15 • Chitose Johnson Tentative Rezone Application and Conceptual Subdivision  
16 (rescheduled from January 25, 2017)  
17 • A Conditional Use Permit, just recently submitted  
18 • Amendments to the Subdivision Ordinance

19  
20 Commissioner Daly followed up with Mr. Snyder on a Conditional Use Permit  
21 application from the previous meeting, and asked if the Fire Marshall had performed their review  
22 for York Automotive. Mr. Snyder replied that the Fire Marshall had not yet done so, but the  
23 applicant had followed up and scheduled a site visit for the following week.

24  
25 Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn. Commissioner Johnson seconded the  
26 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

27  
28 The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

29  
30  
31 \_\_\_\_\_  
32 David Hirschi, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_

33  
34  
35 \_\_\_\_\_  
36 Emily Hatch, Recording Secretary