

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, August 23, 2017**

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

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

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

10 Kevin Daly
11 Cheylynn Hayman
12 David Hirschi, Chair
13 Gina Hirst
14 Logan Johnson
15 Becki Wright

16
17 **MEMBER ABSENT**

18 Kathy Helgesen

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT**

21 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
22 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
23 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner
24 Randy Randall, Public Works Director
25 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

26
27 **VISITORS**

28 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

29
30 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

31
32 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Johnson

33
34 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

35
36 The minutes of the August 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed
37 and amendments requested. Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to accept the
38 minutes as amended. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion, which passed by
39 unanimous voted (6-0).

40
41 **PUBLIC MEETING – FINAL SITE PLAN – GOODFELLOW/TULLIUS GARAGE**
42 **– 215 WEST 1825 NORTH**

43
44 Kathy Goodfellow and Mary Tullius desire to construct a new accessory garage
45 located at their place of residence. They recently acquired an un-platted parcel of land

1 adjacent to their original subdivision lot and combined the land together into a single
2 parcel. However, the added parcel remains outside of the platted subdivision boundary.
3 Staff explained the request for Final Site Plan approval. Mary Tullius, applicant,
4 expressed appreciation to staff for their help working through the process.

5
6 At 7:18 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing, and closed the public
7 hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Commissioner Wright made a **motion**
8 to approve the Final Site Plan for the proposed residential development of an un-platted
9 parcel that has been combined with the home located at 215 West 1850 North, with
10 Conditions 1-4 and Reasons for the Action 1-3. Commissioner Daly seconded the
11 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

12
13 Conditions:

- 14
15 1. The owner will be required to pay any development fees that may be
16 applicable for the development of this lot.
17 2. Approval is subject to the Conceptual Site Plan accepted by the Planning
18 Commission on July 26, 2017.
19 3. The accessory building shall comply with the development standards as
20 required and stated in CZC 12.32.300.
21 4. Applicant shall provide a signed public utility easement to the City for
22 recording prior to the building permit.

23
24 Reasons for Action:

- 25
26 1. *The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [Section*
27 *12.21.110(e)].*
28 2. *Applicable utility services and easements are required for residential*
29 *development [Section 12.21.110(e)(2)(ii)(d) & Section 15-5-106(8)].*
30 3. *A final site plan application has been submitted to obtain approval to*
31 *construct an accessory dwelling on un-platted parcels [Section 12.21.110(3)].*

32
33 **PUBLIC MEETING – FINAL SITE PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT –**
34 **THE BRIDGE COMMUNITY CHURCH – 1284 WEST 75 NORTH**

35
36 The petitioner, The Bridge Community Church, desires to move their place of
37 worship to a location in the West Centerville area, currently Zoned Industrial-High. On
38 May 24, 2017, the Planning Commission first reviewed the Conditional Use Permit
39 (CUP) request, and tabled action with directives to the petitioner. Cory Snyder,
40 Community Development Director, reported that The Bridge Community has secured
41 parking permission rights from adjacent properties. It is anticipated peak use for The
42 Bridge Community will occur on Sundays, typically an off-time in the Industrial area. Mr.
43 Snyder stated the Public Works Director has indicated any on-street parking on 1250
44 West would interrupt travel lanes. The conditions of approval prepared by staff include
45 direction that 1250 West would not be used for parking. Staff is confident onsite
46 parking, neighbor parking, and the local road will provide sufficient parking. If overflow
47 parking available at neighboring lots were to significantly change, the situation would be
48 subject to further Planning Commission review. Mr. Snyder stated staff recommends
49 approval of both the Final Site Plan and the CUP.

1 Responding to a question from Commissioner Johnson, Mr. Snyder stated there
2 is a risk to the user that off-site parking may change significantly in the future. He
3 added there is always risk involved with conditional use. Loren Pankratz, representing
4 The Bridge Community, said he understands the parking concerns, and is confident in
5 The Bridge Community's ability to creatively mitigate any future parking concerns. Mr.
6 Pankratz said he believes their biggest issue will be making sure people are aware of
7 where to park. He confirmed that neighboring property owners have indicated they are
8 comfortable with The Bridge Community removing snow from parking lots on Saturday
9 night or early Sunday morning to facilitate parking.

10
11 At 7:33 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing, and closed the public
12 hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Commissioner Hayman made a
13 **motion** to approve the Final Site Plan – Amended for The Bridge Community Church
14 Use, subject to Conditions 1-3 and Reasons for Action (a) – (c). Commissioner Wright
15 seconded the motion.

16
17 Conditions:

- 18
19 1. The Final Site Plan approval is limited to a single land use of a Church or
20 place of worship, subject to the issuance of a CUP for such use. Any desire
21 to create a multiple use or multi-tenant use shall be subject to a different
22 approval in accordance with any applicable development standard or
23 regulation.
24 2. The Final Site Plan approval is limited to the reconfiguration of the Parking
25 Lot Layout, as provided and shown on the site plan submittal.
26 3. All other elements of the site are deemed consistent with the Zoning
27 Ordinance in accordance with the nonconformities provisions of 12.22
28 Nonconformities, and are subject to such provisions.

29
30 Reasons for Action:

- 31
32 a. *The Planning Commission finds that according to Section 12.22.080, any*
33 *Non-conforming Development that is consistent with the originally approved*
34 *plan shall be deemed compliant with the current zoning ordinance.*
35 b. *In this nonconforming case, the Planning Commission finds the site plan*
36 *amendment is limited to meeting or satisfying the parking and loading*
37 *requirements (see CZC 12.52.050) for the proposed change of use to a*
38 *“Church or Place of Worship.”*
39 c. *The Planning Commission finds that the amendment to the parking is*
40 *rightfully subject to a City review to determine if the parking and loading areas*
41 *provided satisfies the parking and loading requirements, as part of an*
42 *amended site plan approval, see CZC 12.52.050.*

43 Commissioner Johnson said he believes parking ratios in the Ordinance are
44 weak and should be examined and improved at some point. Commissioner Wright
45 agreed, adding that overflow parking is an issue at church buildings city-wide. The
46 motion passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

47
48 Referring to one of the suggested conditions for CUP approval, Mr. Pankratz
49 asked if an expiration date could be specified for the prohibition of on-street parking on

1 1250 West when the street is finished. Mr. Snyder said he understands the suggestion,
2 but is hesitant to lose the ability to evaluate and mitigate potential problems. The needs
3 of all uses in the area would need to be evaluated. Responding to a question from
4 Commissioner Daly, Mr. Snyder stated it is the responsibility of the applicant to make
5 sure users are aware of parking restrictions. Ms. Romney agreed with Mr. Snyder that
6 the City should retain the ability to look at this particular user and determine as part of
7 the CUP if parking on 1250 West is appropriate if and when 1250 West is fully
8 improved. Under the CUP, The Bridge Community must provide all parking required by
9 the Zoning Code onsite.

10
11 Randy Randall, Public Works Director, informed the Commission that West
12 Bountiful City has requested Centerville City participate in a joint venture to widen 1250
13 West and provide pedestrian/bicycle access from the City boundary to Parrish Lane. It
14 is not yet determined if on-street parking will be desired. Chair Hirschi expressed a
15 preference for taking a conservative approach on parking at this point in order to allow
16 for future development options in the area.

17
18 Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the
19 Conditional Use Permit for The Bridge Community Church Use, subject to Conditions 1-
20 5 and Reasons for Action (a) – (g). Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion.
21 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion to amend** the motion to change Condition 5
22 from approval “in the future by the City”, to approval “in the future by the Community
23 Development Director and Public Works Director”. Commissioner Daly seconded the
24 motion to amend, which failed (3-3), with Chair Hirschi and Commissioners Hayman
25 and Hirst dissenting. The original motion to approve the CUP passed by unanimous
26 vote (6-0).

27
28 Conditions:

- 29
30 1. The CUP is limited to a single land use of a Church or place of worship. Any
31 desire to create a multiple use or multi-tenant use shall be subject to a
32 different approval in accordance with any applicable development standard or
33 regulation.
34 2. The CUP approval is subject to the reconfiguration of the existing parking lot
35 as approved with the related Final Site Plan.
36 3. The CUP approval is subject to the accommodation of off-site overflow
37 parking, as outlined in the applicant’s request.
38 4. If the overflow parking allowances, as outlined in the petitioners’ submittal,
39 are rescinded by any owner, the CUP approval is subject to further re-
40 consideration by the City.
41 5. On-street parking for the use is prohibited on 1250 West, unless otherwise
42 approved in the future by the City.
43

44 Reasons for Action:

- 45
46 a. *The Planning Commission finds that a “Church or Place of Worship,” is*
47 *allowed in the Industrial-High (I-H) Zone with an approval of a conditional use*
48 *permit (see 12.12.040).*

- 1 b. *The Planning Commission finds that the City previously reviewed and*
2 *subsequently approved a zoning text amendment to allow churches or places*
3 *of worship in the I-H Zone, as also proposed previously by the applicant.*
4 *Therefore, the request to allow the proposed church use has been deemed*
5 *consistent with the City's General Plan.*
6 c. *The Planning Commission finds that the reuse of the building for a church is a*
7 *different use than office/warehouse, the needed assembly space is likely*
8 *feasible for the existing building with mitigating conditions of approval for the*
9 *use.*
10 d. *Although there is sufficient onsite parking, as deemed required by Zoning*
11 *Code, the Planning Commission finds that in the petitioner's submittal, it*
12 *indicates that there may at times be a need to accommodate overflow*
13 *parking.*
14 e. *The Planning Commission finds that petitioner has secured agreements from*
15 *surrounding development to utilize the parking areas on adjacent properties*
16 *to meet the demand for overflow parking.*
17 f. *The Planning Commission finds that it is the Public Works Director's position*
18 *at this time that until the east side of 1250 West is completed, there is*
19 *inadequate space to allow any on-street parking for that roadway.*
20 g. *Therefore, given the findings above, the Planning Commission finds that the*
21 *conditions imposed adequately mitigate impacts of the proposed use to meet*
22 *the CUP approval criteria of Section 12.21.100 of the Zoning Code.*

23
24 **PUBLIC HEARING – PDO AMENDMENT AND CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN**
25 **AMENDMENT TO LEGACY CROSSING – 1222 LEGACY CROSSING BLD**
26

27 The applicants desire to amend the approved project's overall parking plan by
28 seeking a "Parking Modification" to modify the number of parking stalls related to this
29 mixed use development. Mr. Snyder explained the request to exclude Lots 2 and 3
30 from the project's parking plan, and change from a "flat rate" count to a "cross-use"
31 count (i.e. sharing of office day use with theater evening use). This modification would
32 allow for development of the other lots, particularly Lot 4, without the need to await the
33 installation of the needed "flat rate" parking stalls that are to be constructed as part of
34 Lots 2 and 3.

35
36 A traffic study done by Reeve & Associates showed the highest demand for
37 parking to be at 9:00 p.m., and that the development, without Lots 2 and 3, would still
38 have over 200 stalls available in a cross-hour use. Mr. Snyder pointed out that,
39 although sufficient parking is provided, it is not necessarily provided in the places
40 people prefer to park. Mr. Snyder said he has confidence in the ability of Reeve &
41 Associates to provide a professional, reliable analysis. Staff recommends approval of
42 the proposed amendment. Glenn Girsberger, applicant, commented that everyone
43 would benefit from determining cross-parking by use versus peak demand.

44
45 At 8:04 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing, and closed the public
46 hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Responding to a question from
47 Commissioner Wright, Mr. Snyder explained that office uses in the development have
48 changed from the original configuration. Commissioner Hayman asked if staff is
49 concerned about on-street parking. Mr. Snyder responded that the apartment units

1 were marketed as having a second parking stall. The intended site for the second stalls
2 has become preferred parking for theater patrons, causing conflict. He stated on-street
3 parking on Legacy Boulevard is not problematic from a planning perspective since
4 congestion helps control traffic speeds. Problems arise with parking in winter when
5 snow removal is necessary. Mr. Snyder commented that the development was
6 originally designed with transit-oriented development in mind. He said that, in his
7 opinion, a Front-Runner stop may be a possibility at that location in 20 years or more
8 with further development.

9
10 Commissioner Daly made a **motion** to recommend the City Council approve the
11 petition to amend the Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane Development's PDO Approval,
12 as follows:

- 13
- 14 1. Approval of the amended Exhibit "C", as submitted to the City.
- 15 2. Approval of the Parking Modification, as prepared by Reeves and Associate,
16 Inc.
- 17 3. The final parking counts for Lots 2 and 3 shall be subject to their applicable
18 site plan approvals.
- 19 4. The preparation and recording of the necessary Development Agreement
20 amendments, as deemed acceptable by the City Attorney.
- 21 5. All other related or associated conditions of the Legacy Crossing at Parrish
22 Lane Development PDO Approval remain in effect with this amendment.

23
24 Reasons for the Action (Findings):

- 25
- 26 a) The Planning Commission finds that amendments to a PDO approval are
27 subject to the original procedure used for obtaining a preliminary approval.
- 28 b) The Planning Commission finds that amendments are consistent and
29 compatible with the originally approved expectations of the PDO Plan for the
30 Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane, as a mixed use development project.

31
32 Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote
33 (6-0).

34
35 **PUBLIC MEETING - FINAL SITE PLAN – QUICK QUACK CAR WASH – 518**
36 **NORTH 400 WEST**

37
38 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, explained the proposed Final Site Plan for
39 Quick Quack Car Wash at 518 North 400 West. Quick Quack has accommodated the
40 planned UDOT expansion and widening of 400 West into their plans – a change from
41 the original Conceptual Site Plan. In addition, it was established at the Conceptual Site
42 Plan that due to the significant visual presence from Parrish Lane, Quick Quack would
43 be subject to the Parrish Lane Design Guidelines, which required further changes to
44 their original plan.

45
46 Ms. Younger explained that Parrish Lane Design Guidelines suggest 30 feet of
47 landscaping, although not all sites on Parrish Lane have the full 30 feet. She explained
48 that 400 West is considered a collector street with regular development standards that
49 require a 15-foot landscaping buffer from the back of curb, a six-foot sidewalk, and

1 another 8-10 feet of landscaping buffer. The plan submitted by Quick Quack at this time
2 includes a 12-foot landscaping strip. Staff recommends pushing the landscaping buffer
3 to 15 feet to provide sufficient space for pedestrian lighting and trees. Parrish Lane
4 Design Guidelines typically incorporate muted colors, and some type of rock or stone.
5 Ms. Younger showed photographs of Quick Quack's proposed colors and building
6 materials.

7
8 Joseph Earnest, on behalf of Quick Quack, explained that the consistent look
9 and feel of their different locations is an important part of their marketing strategy. Mr.
10 Earnest said Quick Quack makes an effort to be involved in the community and create a
11 loyal following. He said it was his understanding at the beginning of the process the
12 property would most likely not fall within Parrish Lane Design Guidelines. He stated
13 proximity of the building to the street is important to their marketing strategy. He said
14 they moved the building back to accommodate future UDOT expansion of 400 West,
15 and they believe moving the building back another three feet to accommodate more
16 landscaping than proposed would be damaging to the business. Mr. Earnest referred to
17 use of the words "shall" and "should" in the Parrish Lane Design Guidelines. He
18 showed photographs and pointed out use of color on surrounding businesses, and
19 emphasized that visual presence from Parrish Lane is crucial. He asked the Planning
20 Commission to not require muted colors and different building materials. Mr. Earnest
21 also asked the Planning Commission to allow the proposed 12 feet of landscaping. If
22 15 feet of landscaping is required, he said they may not be able to accommodate all of
23 the taking for expansion of 400 West. Mr. Snyder clarified that, while accommodating
24 the future taking at this time is an example of negotiation and teamwork, Quick Quack
25 will be financially compensated for the property taken when 400 West is expanded. Mr.
26 Earnest responded it is unknown how much and when Quick Quack would be
27 compensated for the taking.

28
29 Chair Hirschi said he understands the marketing desire for locations to look
30 similar, but said he believes improving the appearance of the building would help and
31 enhance rather than hurt Quick Quack. Mr. Earnest responded it would be difficult to
32 incorporate rock or stone with the desired yellow and green. Commissioner Wright
33 showed a photograph of the Quick Quack Highland location as evidence that Quick
34 Quack has accommodated design standards of areas in which they have built. She
35 said she believes the appearance of the Highland location would fit into the Parrish
36 Lane Gateway area. Mr. Earnest responded Quick Quack can accommodate design
37 standards, but considering the use of the word "should" in the Parrish Lane Design
38 Guidelines, he does not think requiring the standards would be appropriate use of
39 government. Ms. Younger said the City is trying to be flexible, but there are many
40 "shalls" in addition to the "shoulds" in the landscape and streetscape standards, and not
41 all of them can be ignored.

42
43 At 8:51 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing, and closed the public
44 hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Commissioner Wright pointed out the
45 need to provide sufficient space in the park strip for trees to grow and be healthy without
46 interfering with infrastructure. Ms. Younger commented that reducing the
47 recommended 15 feet of landscaping buffer to 14 feet would still provide an 8-foot park
48 strip with a 6-foot sidewalk.

1 Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to approve an alteration of the
2 Landscaping requirements within the Parrish Lane Design Guidelines for the Quick
3 Quack Car Wash at 518 North 400 West with Conditions 1 and 2. Commissioner
4 Wright seconded the motion.

5
6 Conditions:

- 7
8 1. The public street landscaping area shall be at least 15', as stated in
9 12.51.070(f)(1)(A)(ii), measured from back of curb, which shall include a
10 sidewalk and at least an eight-foot park strip, to accommodate street trees,
11 pedestrian lighting, and buffering from the public right of way.
12 2. This alteration is subject to the approval of the Final Site Plan that is
13 associated with the Quick Quack development; future changes to the site are
14 subject to the Zoning Code provisions at the time of application for
15 amendment or redevelopment.
16

17 Commissioner Daly said he does not feel as strongly about the 15 feet, and is
18 inclined to figure out if it could be reduced. Commissioner Hayman agreed, stating she
19 believes much more strongly about the aesthetic aspect and would prefer to give a little
20 on the landscaping. Commissioner Wright pointed out that the 15-foot requirement is
21 already less than required under Parrish Lane Design Guidelines. Chair Hirschi said he
22 is not sure changing from 15 to 13 or 14 would make a lot of difference. The property
23 does not front on Parrish Lane, and as long as the space is sufficient for the longevity of
24 trees, Chair Hirschi said he is inclined to be less stringent.
25

26 Commissioner Wright made a **motion to amend** the motion, altering Condition 1
27 to read: "The public street landscaping area shall be at least 14'. . ." Commissioner
28 Daly seconded the motion to amend the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).
29 The amended motion passed by unanimous vote (6-0).
30

31 Commissioner Daly made a **motion** to approve the Final Site Plan of Quick
32 Quack Car Wash, with Directives 1-5 and Reasons for the Action 1-3. Commissioner
33 Wright seconded the motion.

34 Directives:

- 35
36 1. A Boundary Line Adjustment with Colonial Lumber shall be recorded before
37 Building Permit is issued.
38 2. Amended Site Plans for Dairy Queen and Colonial Lumber shall be approved
39 by the City before issuance of Building Permit.
40 3. The landscaping plan shall be altered to accommodate the minimum required
41 trees along 400 West. Additionally, the landscaping plan be altered to meet
42 the 5% internal parking lot landscaping requirement. Staff shall verify
43 compliance as part of the building permit approval process.
44 4. Colors and materiality of architecture are to be harmonious with surrounding
45 development, and the elevation plans shall be amended, as follows:
46 a. The use of primary colors shall be changed to muted tones or utilize
47 earth-toned colors.
48 b. Plans shall incorporate rock or stone into the architectural design of the
49 building and/or pillars.

- 1 c. Staff shall verify compliance as part of the building permit approval
2 process, any disputes between parties shall be resubmitted to the
3 Planning Commission for determination.
4 5. Except where amended above, the Final Site Plan approved shall comply with
5 the plans reviewed by the Planning Commission on August 23, 2017.
6

7 Commissioner Daly said he believes Quick Quack will have a significant visual
8 presence from Parrish Lane, and he believes the requirements can be accommodated.
9 Chair Hirschi said he believes the muted colors and building material requirements will
10 contribute to Centerville having the nicest Quick Quack Car Wash in Davis County.
11 Commissioner Wright stated the Planning Commission does not want to place undue
12 restrictions or requirements on property owners, but the community has standards in
13 place, and it is the Commission's job to think through those standards. Commissioner
14 Johnson stated he is not opposed to the bright yellow, and he does not think the Code
15 has to be interpreted to mean muted colors. He said he is firm, however, on the rock
16 requirement.
17

18 The Planning Commissioners discussed the color choices submitted by Quick
19 Quack. Commissioner Wright made a **motion to amend** the motion, adding to
20 Directive 4 direction to include that the building elevations shall be harmonious with the
21 fashion and manner applied to the Highland location. Commissioner Daly seconded the
22 motion to amend. Ms. Romney raised concerns with the breadth of the proposed
23 amendment noting that the amendment as stated implies the entire building materials
24 and design need to be like the Highland building. Ms. Romney suggested changing the
25 condition to reference the use of exterior "colors and materials" of the Highland building
26 to avoid the implication that the building must look exactly like the Highland building.
27 Chair Hirschi expressed confidence that staff is more than capable of working with
28 Quick Quack to come up with something that achieves the goals of the Parrish Lane
29 Design Guidelines. Commissioners Hayman and Wright stated they feel "Cheerful"
30 yellow is not acceptable. Mr. Earnest stated he would be comfortable working with staff
31 to come up with something beautiful. Commissioner Hayman added she does not feel
32 the colors "Cheerful", "Daisy", or "Lemon Twist" are harmonious with the Parrish Lane
33 Design Guidelines. The motion to amend failed by unanimous vote (0-6).
34

35 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion to amend** the motion to specify
36 "Daffodil" yellow in Directive 4(a). The motion to amend died for lack of second. The
37 original motion passed by majority vote (5-1), with Commissioner Johnson dissenting.
38

39 **PUBLIC MEETING – FINAL SITE PLAN – DON YOUNGBLOOD – 650 NORTH**
40 **1250 WEST**

41
42 Ms. Younger explained the request for Final Site Plan approval for an
43 office/warehouse at 650 North 1250 West. At 9:35 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened a public
44 hearing, and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment.
45

46 Ms. Romney suggested adding a condition that if the property does not already
47 have public utility easements that the applicant shall submit public utility easements
48 prior to the building permit. Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to approve Final
49 Site Plan for the Youngblood Office/Warehouse, to be located at 650 North 1250 West,

1 with Directives 1-6 and staff's in staff's updated recommendation and staff's
2 recommendation for directive #7 as of August 23, 2017 and Reason for the Action.
3 Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).
4

5 Directives:

- 6 1. The final site plan approval shall comply with the submitted site plan to the
7 Planning Commission, dated August 22, 2017, and as amended with this
8 approval.
- 9 2. As required in CZC 12.52.100, the drive aisles and parking stall areas shall
10 be paved with an all-weather surface as approved by the City Engineer.
- 11 3. A Cross access easement shall be reviewed and deemed acceptable by the
12 City Attorney and recorded with the County, prior to issuance of a building
13 permit.
- 14 4. Fire protection for the site shall be adequately reviewed by the South Davis
15 Metro Fire Marshal, as part of the issuance of a Building Permit.
- 16 5. Office space shall be limited 2,600 square feet unless additional parking is
17 provided, calculated as stated in CZC 12.52.
- 18 6. Final construction plans for improvements shall be deemed acceptable by the
19 City Engineer prior to the issuance of Building Permit.
- 20 7. If property does not already have public utility easements as required by City
21 Code, the applicant shall submit legal descriptions for the public utility
22 easements to be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis
23 County Recorder's Office prior to building permit.

24
25 Reasons for the Action:

- 26
27 1. The final site plan submittal does not adequately show the planned
28 development of the entire site and how it will be used and built according
29 to our standards. [Section 12.21.110(f)(3)].
30

31 **PUBLIC MEETING – DISCUSSION – GENERAL PLAN LANGUAGE FOR**
32 **PAGES LANE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT**

33
34 Mr. Snyder presented three scenarios for possible amendment to the General
35 Plan regarding the Pages Lane Commercial District area.
36

37 Scenario 1: Commercial (1.5 acres), Residential (3.5 acres), and City Park or
38 private/public open space (3 acres)

39 Scenario 2: Residential (5 acres) with City Park (3 acres)

40 Scenario 3: Residential (7 acres) with private/public open space (1 acre)
41

42 Chair Hirschi suggested minor technical corrections to the scenarios.
43 Commissioner Hirst commented that a three acre park at this location would increase
44 City park space by only about 2%, at a cost of \$1.7 million for the land. She referred to
45 City-owned property on the hillside and available space on the west side of the City, and
46 suggested there are other places the City could use \$1.7 million. Commissioner Hirst
47 suggested the Commission consider another scenario without a park element. Chair
48 Hirschi responded that public/private participation for a park or public space makes a lot
49 of sense. Commissioner Wright stated that, although she likes the idea of a park, she

1 does not want to continue discussing a park at that location if the City cannot afford it, if
2 it would devalue the land, or if residents are not willing to support a park financially.

3
4 Commissioner Daly suggested the possibility of a park was a popular response
5 from the public because a park would be the opposite of density, and the community
6 definitely does not want density. He commented that, in his opinion, allowing a
7 development of single-family detached homes at around six units per acre would not
8 feel like density. Commissioner Hayman responded that his suggestion would be
9 difficult with existing ordinances. Mr. Snyder reported that the City Council has directed
10 staff to draft and present granulated R-M Zone provisions. Commissioner Hayman
11 stated Centerville is running out of space in the built-out areas, and she believes this is
12 one of the last opportunities the City will have to look at a large continuous piece of
13 property and consider the possibility of a park. She said she would like to see the
14 maximum amount of park space, and repeated her desire to know if the public would be
15 willing to financially support a park at that location. Commissioner Hirst commented that
16 purchasing property on Pages Lane for a park would financially postpone other options.
17 Commissioner Daly said he believes part of the appeal of the hillside property is that it is
18 undeveloped. Any improvement on the hillside would cost more.

19
20 Chair Hirschi commented Scenario 3 contemplates that over time there may be
21 changes in the commercial aspect of the area. Scenario 3 would allow commercial to
22 remain, with the idea that residential will eventually grow into the space. With a buffer
23 park on the west side, Chair Hirschi said he believes Scenario 3 would offer the most
24 opportunity for landowners, the City, and the developer. Commissioner Daly expressed
25 a preference for Scenario 2 because of the larger park space, but stated he would want
26 to specify six units per acre and single-family detached under Objective #2.
27 Commissioner Wright stated Scenario 2 is the most palatable to her because it
28 assumes residential redevelopment for a majority of the eastern area, and provides
29 enough park space to be usable. Commissioner Hayman said she likes Scenario 2,
30 and likes the suggested six-units-per-acre limit, although she is not opposed to twin
31 homes or town homes. Responding to a question from Commissioner Wright, Mr.
32 Snyder explained that green space in single-family development is not regulated.
33 Commissioner Wright asked if the City could require the green space in a multi-family
34 development to be placed on the west side as a buffer, reducing the amount of the
35 desired green space the City would need to purchase on the west side of the property.

36
37 Chair Hirschi said he would be comfortable sending Scenarios 2 and 3 for
38 consideration of the public. He said he believes the City would need to allow the
39 developer more flexibility for the residential component if park space of any size is
40 required. Chair Hirschi said he believes there is a possibility of other parties
41 participating financially in the buffer space, but he does not feel the full three acres
42 would be possible unless the City comes up with a lot of money.

43
44 At 10:19 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened the meeting for public comment.

45
46 Loren Pankratz – Mr. Pankratz stated he knows the Parks and Recreation
47 Committee has a prioritized list of park projects, including a major redevelopment of
48 Island View Park. He asked if the Parks and Recreation Committee has been involved
49 in this discussion, and where the proposed park space would fall on their prioritized list.

1 Mr. Pankratz said he believes a significant portion of RAP Tax revenues are allocated
2 for the Community Park Expansion Project for the next several years.

3
4 Rock Winegar – As the property owner, Mr. Winegar said he would love to see
5 the City purchase three acres for a park. In the mean time, however, he said he has
6 had a purchase offer for the old Zions Bank property. Mr. Winegar said he believes
7 Scenario 3 would be possible, but he does not feel either of the other two scenarios
8 could happen unless the City is ready to write a check now. Brighton Homes is ready to
9 write a check now and meet existing green space requirements.

10
11 Taylor Spendlove – Mr. Spendlove with Brighton Homes said the public/private
12 partnership works for Brighton Homes. He emphasized that density has to be a factor
13 in the redevelopment of existing commercial buildings. He agreed with Commissioner
14 Hirst’s comments, and said the only way four or six units per acre would work is if the
15 property is devalued.

16
17 Chair Hirschi closed the public comment period at 10:31 p.m. Chair Hirschi said
18 Scenario 3 appears most feasible, but he is not opposed to presenting more than one
19 scenario for the public hearing. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to include the
20 green and blue options (Scenarios 2 and 3) presented by staff for consideration at the
21 public hearing. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Commissioner Johnson
22 said he believes if the City wants a park, the City should purchase the full six or seven
23 acres for a park. Alternatively, if the City were to allow residential development, he said
24 it makes most sense to give a developer tools to develop the whole site. Commissioner
25 Wright agreed that a one-acre park does not make sense. Mr. Snyder reminded the
26 Commission the advantage of the one-acre buffer space is the partnership situation.
27 The motion passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

28
29 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

30
31 The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2017.

32
33 **ADJOURNMENT**

34
35 At 10:41 p.m., Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting.
36 Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

37
38
39
40
41 _____
42 David Hirschi, Chair

40 09-13-2017
41 Date Approved

43
44
45 _____
46 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary