

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, September 27, 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 Cheylynn Hayman
11 Kathy Helgesen
12 David Hirschi, Chair
13 Gina Hirst
14 Becki Wright
15 Logan Johnson

16
17 **MEMBER ABSENT**

18 Kevin Daly

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT**

21 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
22 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
23 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner
24 Katie Farnsworth, Recording Secretary

25
26 **VISITORS**

27 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

28
29 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

30
31 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Chair Hirschi

32
33 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT – “CATERING, LIMITED” IN**
34 **C-M ZONES**

35
36 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner reviewed the Staff Report outlining the history
37 of CupBop, the applicant, and their desire to establish a location with an industrial
38 kitchen to provide catering services. Ms. Younger explained that the Zoning Code
39 currently does not contain a definition for catering services.

40
41 Ms. Younger presented the proposed new definition for “Catering, Limited” to be
42 added to the Table of Uses to include both catering and food services contract including
43 a *limited* number of catering transport vehicles. A specific number of permitted catering
44 transport vehicles was intentionally not included due to differences in size and capacity
45 of businesses. By using the term *limited*, the definition should sufficiently prohibit a large

1 fleet of vehicles at any given location. The definition specifically calls out the prohibition
2 of mobile food trucks, food carts, or any other mobile food service uses.

3
4 Ms. Younger noted the location that CupBop is considering at 200 South Main
5 Street does fall in the Main Street Overlay Zone. Staff believes the applicant generally
6 fits the General Plan guidelines of what uses are permitted in commercial zones and
7 recommends a Conditional Use Permit be required for this type of use within
8 commercial zones.

9
10 Nate Hatch, representative of CupBop, addressed the Commission regarding
11 viability of the building and basic operation of the business.

12
13 At 7:21 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to
14 comment, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.

15
16 Commissioners Helgesen and Wright expressed concerns about the
17 appropriateness of an industrial use relating to this type of business along Main Street.
18 Mr. Snyder reminded the Commission that the permitted uses right now are low and it is
19 preventing growth on Main Street. He believes that the City should not limit growth to
20 businesses that will only serve Centerville citizens. Commissioner Johnson believes
21 there is considerable benefit to having a good tenant in the building.

22
23 Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to approve the stated definition of
24 "Catering, Limited" as stated in the Staff Report and the allowed use of a Conditional
25 Use Permit in Commercial-Medium Zone with the following directive in the Staff Report
26 and Reasons for Action (a) through (f). Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. A
27 roll-call vote was taken with Commissioners Johnson, Hirschi, Hirst, and Hayman
28 assenting and Commissioners Wright and Helgesen dissenting. The motion passed by
29 majority vote (4-2).

30
31 Directive:

- 32
33 1. Parking calculations should be established by the zoning administrator at the
34 time the use is approved.

35
36 Reasons for the Action:

- 37
38 (a) *The Planning Commission finds that the "decision to amend the Zoning*
39 *Code is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council" as*
40 *described in [CZC 12.21.060(a)(1)(C)].*
41 (b) *The new definition of "Catering, Limited" while listing it as a Conditional*
42 *Use in Commercial-Medium Zones is consistent with the goals, objectives*
43 *and policies of the General Plan [Section 12-420-2.2].*
44 (c) *The Planning Commission finds that the Main Street commercial area is*
45 *old now and somewhat deteriorating, though a few new buildings have*
46 *been constructed here in recent years.*
47 (d) *The Planning Commission finds that the General Plan objective to*
48 *redevelop or revitalize the Main Street Commercial area may continue to*
49 *be difficult and slow, despite the South Main Street Overlay incentives.*

1 (e) Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that opportunities to encourage
2 restoration or revitalization ought to be permissible.

3 (f) Parking Calculations for uses not provided shall be determined by the
4 Zoning Administrator using the nearest compatible use [CZC 12.52.060].
5

6 Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** that the Planning Commission
7 recommends that Staff further examine the acceptable zones for this use and review
8 amending the Zoning Code accordingly with Reasons for Action (a) through (b) in the
9 Staff Report. Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion. The motion passed by
10 unanimous vote (6-0).
11

12 Reasons for Action:

13 (a) The Planning Commission finds that the “decision to amend the Zoning
14 Code is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council” as
15 described in [CZC 12.21.060(a)(1)(C)].

16 (b) The new definition of “Catering, Limited” may be an acceptable use in All
17 Commercial Zones and Industrial Zones.
18

19 **PUBLIC HEARING – CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION PLAT – MOSS ACRES –**
20 **2026 NORTH MAIN**
21

22 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, reviewed the history of the property being
23 rezoned from Agriculture-Low to Residential-Low as well as the historical home on the
24 site. This property also lies in the Hillside Overlay. Ms. Younger reviewed the
25 requirements for single-family lots on a slope for frontage allowances. Cory Snyder,
26 Community Development Director, explained that because there is no minimum lot size,
27 under Utah law, the Land Use Management Act states that if there is something unclear
28 or that is being debated, the Commission is required to interpret it in favor of the
29 property owner.
30

31 Chad Morris, applicant, addressed the issues regarding access to the property by
32 rerouting the existing driveway or doing some shared driveway access. Mr. Morris
33 would like to see the frontage requirement for slope based on a ratio. Mr. Snyder
34 agreed there needs to be a balance between lots sizes and requirements. The applicant
35 could achieve this by requesting an amendment to the Zoning Code or seeking to
36 qualify for a variance from the Board of Adjustment.
37

38 Chair Hirschi pointed out that one of the conditions (#2) is that the preliminary
39 subdivision plat shall also meet the requirements of the Hillside Overlay for Preliminary
40 Review and that the issue regarding slopes and frontage would be revisited at that
41 point. For now, the Planning Commission is only voting on the conceptual subdivision
42 plan generally.
43

44 At 7:53 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to
45 comment, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.
46

47 Commissioner Wright made a **motion** that the Planning Commission accept the
48 Conceptual Subdivision Plat at 2026 North Main, with Directives (1) – (5) and Reasons

1 for Action (a) through (f) as outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Helgesen
2 seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

3
4 Directives:

- 5
6 1. Preliminary Subdivision Application shall be submitted in accordance of
7 CMC 15.03 of the Subdivision Ordinance.
8 2. Preliminary Subdivision Plat shall also meet the requirements of the
9 Hillside Overlay Preliminary Review, as listed in CZC 12.42.030(c).
10 3. Dimension of lots and building area are amended to meet the standards
11 as outlined in the Hillside Overlay Development Standards in CZC
12 12.42.040.
13 4. A cash bond shall be established for the demolition of the existing
14 accessory building on Lot 3, until a primary use (residential) is established
15 on Lot 3.
16 5. Lot 3 lot lines can be adjusted accordingly in order to preserve the historic
17 home on Lot 4, as depicted in the Conceptual Plat, and as allowed in CMC
18 15.05.020(d). Other lots shall have the required right angles as the side
19 lines of the lots.
20

21 Reasons for Action:

- 22
23 (a) *The conceptual subdivision appears to be consistent with the General*
24 *Plan.*
25 (b) *Adequately meets the Subdivision Ordinance Standards in CMC 15-5.*
26 (c) *With changes, this plan has the potential to meet the Development*
27 *Standards for the Hillside Overlay for a single-family subdivision, as stated*
28 *in CZC 12.42.*
29 (d) *The applicable review standards of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining*
30 *to a Conceptual Subdivision application have been reviewed and*
31 *directives established to allow the proposal to proceed to preliminary*
32 *subdivision plan submittal.*
33 (e) *No accessory use shall be established on the lot until a primary use is*
34 *established [CZC 12.32.040].*
35 (f) *The Planning Commission may recommend exception to the Lot*
36 *Standards regarding the side lines of lots, as stated in CMC 15.05.020(d).*
37

38 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE MAP AMENDMENT AND CONCEPTUAL PLAN –**
39 **LEGACY COMMONS – NW CORNER OF 1250 WEST AND PARRISH LANE**

40
41 Commissioner Johnson excused himself from the meeting for this agenda item
42 due to a conflict of interest.

43
44 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reviewed the history of this
45 property located at the northwest corner of Parrish Lane and 1250 West. Generally, the
46 applicant wishes to use the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan that allows for mixed
47 use with both commercial and residential uses.
48

1 Mr. Snyder outlined a few of the issues with the property including access to the
2 property from Parrish Lane that is owned by the Utah Department of Transportation
3 (UDOT). The applicant and Staff have both met with UDOT separately to discuss the
4 access issues. At a conceptual level, the City Engineer believes this proposal could
5 move forward and reach a consensus as more detailed plans are presented.
6

7 Mr. Snyder next outlined the uses of the property which include a hotel, two
8 commercial pads (such as a restaurant and coffee house), and residential units. As far
9 as the layout of the design, Mr. Snyder reviewed the Parrish Lane Design Guidelines
10 and how they were applied to the project. Part of the discussion with the applicant has
11 been to use concrete instead of asphalt as a better product in the market place and a
12 better way to the trail. Mr. Snyder considers this type of project would create synergy in
13 this neighborhood and that opposition to density on the Westside of Centerville is low.
14 At this time, with the amount of details provided by the applicant, Staff recommends
15 moving forward with the proposed PDO rezone amendment.
16

17 Spencer Wright, applicant, addressed the Commission regarding the property
18 and proposed development. Applicant desires to have this PDO applied to this property
19 with commercial on the southern portion and residential, multi-family, on the northern
20 portion.
21

22 Mr. Wright explained the hotel developer is a local group that owns other hotels
23 in the area. The proposed hotel would be four (4) stories and include about one hundred
24 (100) rooms. Mr. Wright was unsure whether the hotel would include conference and
25 meeting rooms but feels it could be included.
26

27 Commissioner Wright asked for clarification regarding the color palette. The
28 applicant is open to suggestions and would like to use a color scheme that the City
29 approves of and that meet the Design Standards.
30

31 At 8:24 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to
32 comment, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.
33

34 Commissioner Hayman expressed excitement for this use and feels it is a great
35 use of the space.
36

37 Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** that the Planning Commission recommend
38 approval for the PDO Rezone and Conceptual Plan for the Legacy Commons, with the
39 Directives (a) through (f) as outlined in the Staff Report and with the Reasons for Action
40 (a) through (h) outlined in the Staff Report with corrected numbering. Commissioner
41 Hayman seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
42

43 Directives:
44

- 45 a. The **Development Design for the Legacy Commons** shall be
46 substantially consistent with the plan layout received by the City on
47 September 7, 2017.
48
49 b. The Land **Uses** shall consist of the following:

- 1 • **Hotel Use** – 1.73 acres, Max. Four-story Main Building (60 feet in
- 2 height, if a CUP is approved by the City).
- 3 • **Commercial Uses (e.g. restaurant & coffee house)** – 1.25 acres,
- 4 two (2) sites (heights are proposed as 1-story buildings)
- 5 • **Multi-family Residential Uses** - 5.20 acres, consisting of:
- 6 • *Max. 3-story Main Buildings (45 feet in height)*
- 7 • *111 Dwelling Units*
- 8 • *236 Parking Spaces with 92 parking stalls in garages*
- 9 • *1.60 acres Open Space (31% of the Residential Area)*
- 10
- 11 c. The Architecture and Building Design Theme shall consist of the following:
- 12 • A Shorelands Commerce Park color palate or other tones deemed
- 13 compatible with the surrounding development, as approved with a final
- 14 site plan.
- 15 • The design of the Hotel and Commercial Uses shall be subject to the
- 16 Parrish Lane Gateway Design Standards [CZC 12.63].
- 17 • The residential design shall be consistent with the submitted Denver
- 18 based project (*Aster Town Center*) concepts consisting of a low slope-
- 19 roof (*an adapted contemporary prairie style*) building architecture
- 20 meeting the approved PDO color palette.
- 21 • The residential style and layout shall consist of, with the units fronting
- 22 streets and pathways with parking hidden behind the building, as
- 23 depicted on the Conceptual Plan.
- 24 • The primary pedestrian streetscape design and trail system path shall
- 25 be provided along 1250 West, as depicted on the Concept Plan, which
- 26 creates the ability to connect to the 1250 West pedestrian overpass of
- 27 Legacy Parkway located further to the north.
- 28 • A secondary streetscape (non-pedestrian) design shall be provided
- 29 along Parrish Lane, with landscaping and fencing, as depicted on the
- 30 Concept Plan and compatible with the design across the street to the
- 31 south.
- 32 • The Hotel use shall be subject to the “Increased Height” provision of
- 33 [CZC 12.34.080].
- 34
- 35 d. The **Site Layout & Landscaping Theme** shall consist of the following:
- 36 • Site Access will be from 1250 West Street consisting of two (2)
- 37 planned accesses; one primarily for the hotel and commercial uses
- 38 and the other for residential uses, as depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 39 • As part of any related development final development approval, the
- 40 southern access for the commercial uses shall be deemed acceptable
- 41 to the City upon review by a traffic engineer to establish whether it is a
- 42 limited or full turn-movement access point.
- 43 • All interior drive lanes shall be integrated within the entire
- 44 development, as depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 45 • The hotel and commercial uses will be located along Parrish Lane and
- 46 the south corner and southern portion of 1250 West, as depicted on
- 47 the Concept Plan.

- 1 • The residential uses will be located behind (from Parrish Lane) and
- 2 also fronting the northern portion of the property along 1250 West,
- 3 along the proposed trail/pathway, as depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 4 • The Common Area amenities shall be provided in an integrated
- 5 manner and internal pathways shall be provided connecting to the
- 6 residential units, as depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 7 • The proposed landscaping theme, particularly along Parrish Lane and
- 8 1250 West is to be compatible with the drought tolerant style used in
- 9 the Legacy Trails project (*across Parrish Lane to the south*).
- 10 • The fencing and pedestrian style street lighting fixtures shall be used
- 11 along 1250 West, as depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 12 • The fencing and parking lot lighting along Parrish Lane shall be
- 13 consistent with the styles used along 1250 West.
- 14 • Interior project landscaping shall be consistent with the treescaping
- 15 shown on the conceptual plan – a final detailed landscaping plan shall
- 16 be prepared and submitted with any final development application.
- 17 • A screen wall or fence shall be provided along the northern property
- 18 boundary to buffer the residential units from the adjacent I-H zone, as
- 19 depicted on the Concept Plan.
- 20 • The bench and water feature shall be provided at the intersection
- 21 corner of Parrish Lane/1250 West and shall be compatible with the
- 22 design plan concepts implemented for the Parrish-Legacy CDA.
- 23
- 24 e. The **Site Plan/Subdivision and Phased Construction** shall be prepared
- 25 as one development site to support the development in its entirety.
- 26 However, construction activities may be phased as independent lots, as
- 27 follows:
- 28 • *Phase One – Multi-family Residential Buildings & related elements (Lot*
- 29 *1)*
- 30 • *Phase Two – Hotel/Commercial Buildings (Lot 2)d*
- 31
- 32 f. The **Development Variations Allowed** for the Legacy Commons are
- 33 limited to the following:
- 34 • *Parrish Lane Gateway Design Standards [Section 12.63]* - The
- 35 development plan is to relocate the pedestrian oriented amenities that
- 36 normally abut the Parrish Lane Corridor to the 1250 West Corridor.
- 37 • *Lot Side Lines/Right Angles [CZC 15.05.020]* – The side line (north-
- 38 south) between the two lots may have a right-angle jog, which is a
- 39 design consequence of the interior access lanes amongst the various
- 40 uses.

41
42 *Reasons for Action:*

- 43
- 44 (a) *The proposed mixture of commercial and residential uses is consistent*
- 45 *with the West Centerville Neighborhood Plan.*
- 46 (b) *The West Centerville Neighborhood Plan envisioned only medium box*
- 47 *type commercial uses, capped a 125,000-sq. ft.*

- 1 (c) *The market conditions are not ripe now, nor likely in the future for medium*
2 *box commercial uses, as evidence by the following:*
- 3 • *Farmington Station Park was developed after the West Centerville*
4 *Plan adoption*
 - 5 • *Farmington Station Park has likely saturated the market for*
6 *developing medium box type commercial uses*
- 7 (d) *To date, Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane provides space for medium box*
8 *type commercial uses and Legacy Trails provided two (2) smaller*
9 *commercial lots that have not yet come to full fruition.*
- 10 (e) *Limiting the allowance of other types of multi-family development*
11 *negatively impacts the planned allowance of multi-family development at*
12 *this node in the West Centerville Neighborhood.*
- 13 (f) *Not master planning this site creates the potential for limiting the*
14 *developed area and would isolate the excess UDOT property and reduce*
15 *or eliminate any cost recovery by UDOT's ability selling off excess public*
16 *property, which could become a nuisance in the future.*
- 17 (g) *Master Planning the entire area is better suited to address any impacts*
18 *than to piecemeal development under already long list of permitted*
19 *commercial uses.*
- 20 (h) *Lastly, considering a PDO rezone provides an enhanced tool to address*
21 *any development related concerns and maximize the development*
22 *opportunities for the entire site.*

23
24
25 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL**
26 **MEDIUM ZONES**

27
28 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, provided a summary on the
29 matter. The General Plan caps R-L at four (4) units per acre, medium density is four (4)
30 to eight (8) with high density as eight (8) to twelve (12). The issue is with zoning and the
31 General Plan not being congruent. In order to resolve this, Staff proposes creating an R-
32 M global architecture of the multi-family zones and the R-M-4 is the lower base. The
33 goal is not to allow the General Plan to be interpreted as only R-M-4. Staff agrees that
34 the R-L Zone should be revisited in the future regarding single-family at five (5) units per
35 acre versus multi-family that is only at four (4) units per acre. This issue is not
36 addressed in this proposal.

37
38 Commissioner Wright expressed that she is uncomfortable with the idea of four
39 (4) units an acre being termed Medium Density.

40
41 Mr. Snyder explained the General Plan currently does not permit residential
42 density at five (5) units an acre for single-family but it does allow for four (4) units multi-
43 family in a multi-family expected zone. This allows for townhomes that are generally
44 considered more affordable than single-family stand-alone dwellings. This is required
45 under residential medium.

46
47 City Attorney Lisa Romney commented that Section 12-420-2 of the General
48 Plan defines low density residential as 0-4, medium density residential as 5-8, and high
49 density residential as 9-12 units per acre. Staff agreed with Ms. Romney and reiterated

1 that the Council simply wants tools for more variation in the R-M Zone. Mr. Snyder also
2 expressed that the purpose statements are important in the construction of the
3 language due to the fact that in creating R-M-4, R-M-6 and R-M-8 categories, the
4 concern is that the default will be R-M-4. In response to concerns from the Planning
5 Commission about the R-M-4 proposal, Ms. Romney said they could just go with the R-
6 M-6 and R-M-8 zones with four (4) units permitted with five (5) and six (6) conditional in
7 the R-M-6 Zone and four (4) to six (6) units permitted and seven (7) and eight (8) units
8 conditional in the R-M-8. Commissioners Hayman and Wright concurred with Ms.
9 Romney. However, Mr. Snyder reminded the Commission that the Zoning Code for the
10 R-M density zones include four (4) units per acre "permitted" with eight (8) units per
11 acre conditional and that this particular part of the Zoning Code is not being amended at
12 this time.

13
14 Chair Hirschi discussed his concerns regarding developers coming in with a
15 request for a six-plex on a piece of property that would qualify for R-M-6. He questioned
16 if the property was just zoned R-M how a developer would know whether the request
17 was allowed unless they were to ask. Mr. Snyder explained they will look at the map
18 first and then go to the ordinance for the explanation. The purpose statements explain
19 what type of R-M is allowed. Commissioner Johnson questioned if this isn't a backdoor
20 approach to obtaining a conditional use. Mr. Snyder acknowledged that it is a backdoor
21 approach by getting rid of the ranges, and having strict numbers for density. However,
22 parsing density out to strict numbers is dangerous because then the Commission or
23 Council would have to interpret the purpose and decide which one it meets.

24
25 Commissioner Hayman agreed with Commissioner Wright that there is a
26 misconception on what is R-L and R-M. She expressed concern that if this change is
27 adopted as written, future questions regarding density will cause people to insist that
28 medium density is four (4). Mr. Snyder reminded the Commission that multi-family
29 cannot be done in an R-L at any time.

30
31 Commissioner Wright expressed that she cannot support R-M-4 at any time. Mr.
32 Snyder brought up the opportunity to use R-M-4 as an infill tool. Chair Hirschi agreed
33 with Mr. Snyder to have the flexibility it allows. Commissioner Wright wondered whether
34 the designation is playing to fears in the City and it is redefining what is not accurate.
35 Mr. Snyder suggested he is not opposed to Commissioner Wright's concerns. However,
36 he does not feel that making drastic changes in density definitions at this time is wise.
37 This type of change is best made over a period of time.

38
39 Commissioner Johnson shared that in his professional opinion with looking at
40 different city's zoning codes and maps, developers often disregard what is defined as
41 low, medium and high and focus on strict numbers. Commissioner Hayman proposed
42 that in the near future, whether the Council asks for a review or the Commission takes it
43 on themselves, R-L be reviewed because there are several areas in the City where R-L
44 above four (4) units per acre would be appropriate and welcomed in our community. Mr.
45 Snyder agreed.

46
47 Chair Hirschi expressed that his biggest concern is not being definite on the
48 numbers going forward. From a developer's standpoint, it is better to know up front what
49 the numbers are going to be. Mr. Snyder agreed that at some point in the future the

1 Commission will need to go back into neighborhood plans and make adjustments.
2 There are three (3) neighborhood plans that have R-M zoning. Chair Hirschi suggested
3 sending this proposal up to the Council for approval with a statement that a process for
4 rezoning the R-M zones begin immediately.

5
6 Attorney Romney suggested that the implementation of the proposed text
7 amendments may need to have a delayed date because it becomes problematic to
8 have a zone on the map that is no longer defined in the Code. Mr. Snyder explained
9 that R-M-4 is permitted across the board where R-M-6 and R-M-8 remain conditional.
10 The conditional permitted use statements determine whether the applicant qualifies for
11 R-M-6 or R-M-8. Ms. Romney said she believes the ordinance as drafted contemplates
12 actually creating new zones for R-M-4, R-M-6 and R-M-8 and commented that specific
13 properties currently zoned R-M will need to be rezoned to these new zones. Mr. Snyder
14 said that he only intends to have one zone of R-M referenced on the Zoning Map and
15 that the density would be determined by conditional use permit. Mr. Snyder further
16 commented that the intent is not to create new zones. Ms. Romney expressed her
17 concern with this interpretation and commented that this approach takes the legislative
18 decision away from the Council at the rezone level and places the density decision with
19 the Planning Commission as a conditional use permit. Ms. Romney indicated that this
20 is not what is currently drafted in the proposed text.

21
22 Commissioner Hayman agreed that a delayed date be implemented to give time
23 for the maps to be updated. Mr. Snyder said this process would take months to
24 implement given the notice periods and hearings. He isn't sure the Council is interested
25 in opening the neighborhood plans up for amendments. The Council has only requested
26 a tool for now to work with the conditional R-M-6 and R-M-8.

27
28 At 9:07 p.m., Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing.

29
30 James Graham, (residence unidentified) applicant with Dave Bell, property owner
31 at 644 West Porter Lane. Mr. Graham expressed that in his opinion R-M-6 would be
32 property with R-M all around it or 20% of it is R-L around it. He also said he believes R-
33 M-8 or higher, would be something more like 100% surrounded by commercial or other
34 R-H or 50% R-M. He said he believes there are many ways to define density.

35
36 Dave Bell, Bountiful resident and property owner at 644 West Porter Lane. Mr.
37 Bell owns two acres behind his shop that is no longer needed for business purposes
38 and would like to see it zoned R-H because it is surrounded by everything that is C-H.
39 His concern is that people need to be educated regarding density. He commended the
40 Commissioners for trying to do the right thing and fix the density problem.

41
42 Chad Morris, (residence unidentified). Mr. Morris agreed with Mr. Bell's
43 comments. He then counseled the Commission about moving things too quickly in order
44 to please the Council. In his opinion, he feels the Council represents those who are
45 "loud" instead of the "many." As a real estate agent, Mr. Morris knows of a lot of people
46 who grew up in Centerville that would love to move back here but can't afford a home or
47 worse yet, there are not enough homes in Centerville.

48
49 Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.

1 Mr. Snyder requested to make a final comment so that the Commission is clear
2 on the consequences. He understands that at some time in the future the plans will
3 need to be reviewed for specific numbers. However, the Council approves the general
4 definition of R-M but it is the Commission, through the CUP, that approves the R-M-6 or
5 R-M-8 based on the purpose statement. Ms. Romney asked for clarification as to
6 whether or not the intent is to create new zones. If so, she pointed out this is not how
7 the amendment is written. Ms. Romney noted that Section 12.31.010 would need to be
8 amended because, as drafted, the proposed amendments create three (3) new zones.
9 Mr. Snyder apologized that it was written that way because that is not the intent. He
10 pointed out that the table depicts what is intended and that the wording needs to be
11 revised to reflect that.

12
13 Chair Hirschi restated that the two proposed amendments be an approved R-M-6
14 R-M-8 as well as the design standards and criteria. Mr. Snyder clarified that the design
15 standards and criteria would apply to all zones—low, medium, and high. It does not
16 include the location criteria. Commissioner Wright asked for clarification regarding the
17 design standards and if they are consistent with what is currently in place. Mr. Snyder
18 said they are generic standards and neither discourage or encourage R-M.

19
20 Commissioner Wright then asked to review the CZC 12.32.300, Table of Uses
21 Standards in Residential Zones. She proposed that, if appropriate, the table be
22 amended, regarding the gross density permitted does not say “four (4) units per acre.”
23 Commissioner Wright stated she will not vote for a motion for an R-M-4 based on
24 principle. She said she believes it is important to maintain an R-L that is true and an R-
25 M that is consistent with what is standard and appropriate.

26
27 Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to recommend the City Council approve
28 the various R-M Zone amendments, as presented in the “Staff Draft – September 13th
29 Planning Commission Meeting, version 3.0,” with Reasons for Action (a) through (c) in
30 the Staff Report also dated September 13, 2017. Commissioner Johnson seconded the
31 motion.

32
33 Commissioner Wright made a **motion to amend** the motion with regards to the
34 proposed changes to CZC 12.32.300, Table of Development Standards, under the R-M,
35 Gross Density Maximum Permitted Use, to replace “four (4) units per acre” with “five (5)
36 units per acre.” Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

37
38 Commissioner Hirst opposed the amendment because having four (4) there
39 provides space between four (4) and five (5). Chair Hirschi agreed with Commissioner
40 Hirst. Commissioner Wright asked if she would be more comfortable with the language
41 “over four (4).” Commissioner Hirst responded she would be comfortable with that.
42 Chair Hirschi does not see the logic in taking away the flexibility of the R-M-4 for infill.

43
44 A roll-call vote on the **motion to amend** was taken with Commissioners Johnson
45 and Wright assenting and Commissioners Hirst, Helgesen, Hirschi, and Hayman
46 dissenting. The motion to amend failed.

47
48 Chair Hirschi returned to the original motion and asked for any more comments.
49 Commissioner Johnson expressed that he believes this tool is generally used to reduce

1 density and this is not the direction he wants to see the City go. Commissioner Johnson
2 generally feels that the City should be moving away from lower densities and he would
3 like to limit the City's ability to do that.

4
5 In contrast, Chair Hirschi expressed that since the six (6) and eight (8) units are
6 conditional uses that the determination of that density decisions are going to be with the
7 Commission. Chair Hirschi said he does not see this as a tool to reduce density but
8 gives the Commission the flexibility and the ability to create density where it is
9 appropriate.

10
11 Mr. Snyder asked Chair Hirschi for clarification regarding structural changes to
12 the amendment, as part of an administrative review. Chair Hirschi made a **motion** that
13 any changes to the proposed amendment, if the motion passes, that will make the
14 amendment more clear and better reflect the intent before it is sent to the Council, ought
15 to be included. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed by
16 unanimous vote (6-0).

17
18 Chair Hirschi called for a roll-call vote on the motion and invited the
19 Commissioners to make a statement as to why they voted the way they voted in order
20 to make it clear to the Council as they review the vote on this. The motion passed by
21 majority vote (4-2), with Commissioners Wright and Johnson dissenting based on
22 concerns previously discussed.

23
24 **ITEM #5 – PUBLIC MEETING – SOUTH MAIN STREET OVERLAY PLAN**
25 **DISCUSSION**

26
27 Chair Hirschi reviewed the discussion held at the work session on September
28 13th regarding the overlay zone and questioned whether the overlay zone has
29 discouraged development along Main Street. Chair Hirschi said he believes the only
30 way to revitalize Main Street is to let market forces take effect and to adhere to the
31 Public Space Plan that has been adopted. He also said he believes that by developing
32 realistic standards and guidelines that encourage businesses, both old and new, as they
33 remodel or redevelop, that this is the way to make Main Street more beautiful.

34
35 Mr. Snyder indicated that Staff is currently preparing Design Guidelines and
36 anticipates having them ready for the November work session. Chair Hirschi expressed
37 a desire to review the draft before the next work session. Mr. Snyder acknowledged that
38 it would be possible to have the draft done by the second October meeting so that it can
39 be reviewed collectively by the Planning Commission before the work session.

40
41 Based on consensus of the Commissioners, Chair Hirschi directed Staff to put
42 this item on agenda for the second meeting in October.

43
44 Commissioner Wright was excused at 9:48 pm.

45
46 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

47
48 The minutes of the September 13, 2017 Work Session meeting have already
49 been approved by the City Council. A few amendments were requested which will be

1 made and then presented to the City Council for ratification. Commissioner Hayman
2 made a **motion** to accept the Work Session minutes as amended. Commissioner Hirst
3 seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0).
4

5 The minutes of the September 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting were
6 reviewed and amendments requested. Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to
7 accept the minutes, as amended. Commissioner Helgesen seconded the motion, which
8 passed unanimously (5-0).
9

10 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

11
12 The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for October 11, 2017.
13

14 **ADJOURNMENT**

15
16 At 9:58 p.m., Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting.
17 Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
18
19
20

21 _____
22 David Hirschi, Chair

21 10-11-2017
22 Date Approved

23
24
25
26 _____
27 Katie Farnsworth, Recording Secretary