

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, March 27, 2019**

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

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

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

10 Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

11 Kai Hintze

12 Thomas Hunt

13 Gina Hirst

14 Logan Johnson

15
16 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

17 Becki Wright

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Brant Hanson, City Manager

21 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

22 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

23 Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary

24
25 **VISITORS**

26 Interested citizens

27
28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29
30 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

31 Chair Hayman introduced Centerville's new City Manager Brant Hanson. Mr. Hanson explained
32 that he formerly worked in Yuma, Arizona but was more recently the City Manager of Ephraim City. He
33 grew up in Davis County and received a bachelor's degree from Weber State as well as two master's
34 degrees from the University of Southern California (including an MPA). He said the Planning
35 Commission was one of the most critical boards a city could have, and he thanked the Commission for its
36 service.

37
38 Cory Snyder announced that Assistant Planner Cassie Young would be leaving Centerville City
39 for the private sector. Chair Hayman responded that Ms. Younger had been an incredible asset to the City
40 and would be sorely missed.

41
42 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER** Commissioner Daly

43
44 **DISCUSSION – RECAP OF WORK SESSION ON MAIN STREET OVERLAY**
45 **AMENDMENTS**

46
47 Mr. Snyder explained that he had attempted to assimilate the information that came from the
48 recent joint work session between the City Council and Planning Commission. He took the ideas that

1 came from the session and blended them into some statements as a basepoint for discussion. In his
2 memorandum he highlighted some critical questions that were raised in an attempted to establish a
3 roadmap for the City. He also wished to point out some areas where further direction from the Council
4 was still needed.

5
6 Mr. Snyder explained that when approaching a General Plan, it was important to encapsulate the
7 starting point as well as the future direction. Staff was prepared to begin crafting language but was aware
8 that the Planning Commission had agreed to present their written conclusions to the City Council to
9 ensure that both bodies were on the same page. One thing he had failed to include in the memo was that
10 there was a difference between the east side and the west side of Main Street. The old General Plan
11 acknowledged a need for revitalization on Main Street and was the impetus for the 2008 Corridor Plan
12 which lead to further development of zoning ordinances. The City Council had indicated that while Main
13 Street was part of Centerville's history, it was not a traditional "down town" and was unlikely as a
14 commercial hub. He described his understanding of what "soft commercial" really meant. Questions yet
15 to be answered were:

- 16 ▪ What was the City attempting to do?
- 17 ▪ What was it aiming for?
- 18 ▪ Was the City tackling soft commercial as an existing use? Would it be expanded?

19 Staff could keep it simple and rescind everything since the 2008 plan. However, he
20 recommended preserving the Corridor Plan because Main Street is a legitimate corridor—not simply a
21 neighborhood.

22
23 The next step was the zoning ordinance. It could either be reconfigured, or the overlay could be
24 rescinded. The base zoning of Main Street is Commercial Medium. The overlay is a system where we
25 can maintain base zoning but use it to enhance certain attributes. A decision needed to be made regarding
26 whether or not to keep the Corridor Plan. He also wished for some preliminary zoning ideas.

27
28 Chair Hayman recalled that during the joint work session there was some discussion of at least
29 *some* high-end residential development—perhaps 6 units per acre on the eastside and 8 units per acre on
30 the west side. It was certainly something for the City to consider. She likes the idea of redefining the
31 corridor and limiting it to being between Porter and Parrish rather than going all the way to Pages.

32
33 Commissioner Hunt inquired if the overlay was opened up to residential, would it apply to the
34 entire corridor? Or could the residential portion be limited? Mr. Snyder responded that it could work
35 either way.

36
37 Chair Hayman stated that her takeaways from the joint work session were that several city
38 councilmembers did not like the overlay as it currently stands. They feel it is too restrictive. They wish to
39 change the overlay and most likely add some design guidelines meant to maintain a certain amount of
40 flexibility. They might allow some higher-end residential and do not love the 10 to 15-foot limitation
41 between buildings. In short, she gathered that they wish to loosen the reins on property owners. She
42 asked if those were the impressions the other commissioners were left with as well.

43
44 Commissioner Hunt agreed with her assessment. Commissioner Daly pointed out that the City
45 needs to relax the design standards because although certain property owners had followed them, there
46 were some unintended consequences. Commissioner Johnson agrees with Commissioner Daly but feels
47 that relaxing the standards will likely require *more* restrictions rather than fewer. He also pointed out that
48 Councilmember Fillmore was not present at the work session and it was unlikely she would have
49 supported the general consensus of the remaining councilmembers. Commissioner Daly feels that fewer
50 guidelines will allow property owners increased freedom. Commissioner Johnson feels that more
51 flexibility will result in a much less pedestrian-friendly environment on Main Street.

52

1 Chair Hayman is under the impression that the City encouraged buildings to be built close to the
2 street to facilitate the construction of a Trax line down Main Street, but rather to disincentivize UDOT to
3 widen the roadway.
4

5 Mr. Snyder's perspective was that while the light rail discussion was going on, the City had
6 wanted to do something with Main Street either way. The redevelopment of Main Street had not been
7 entirely dependent upon light rail coming to Centerville.
8

9 Commissioner Johnson and Mr. Snyder agreed that the citizens spoke clearly against light rail as
10 well as high-density residential development. Chair Hayman pointed out that all the councilmembers
11 present at the work session had agreed Main Street was deteriorating to one degree or another. The
12 Planning Commission's job is to plan independently from the City Council but she does not believe a
13 sweeping change on Main Street is very likely to be approved by the City Council. She likes the
14 discussion between the overlay and the performance standards and hopes that the result will be a
15 cohesiveness that has thus far been lacking.
16

17 Commissioner Hintze asked Mr. Snyder if City restrictions cause developers to avoid Centerville.
18 Mr. Snyder responded that most developers look for bigger projects. Brighton Homes had wanted to be in
19 the South Davis area and O'Brien's was able to attract Brighton because they had already been looking in
20 the area for residential development. Brighton had not grown into a commercial builder. Developers are
21 looking for opportunities in the City, but Main Street is a very unique niche.
22

23 Commissioner Hintze asked if the City or County has targeted any specific area for a specific
24 purpose. Mr. Snyder indicated they have not, other than the move of City Hall over where Iggy's was.
25 Early on, Councilmember Fillmore had explored the idea of the area potentially qualifying as an RDA but
26 there were not yet any targeted economic tools to Main Street.
27

28 Chair Hayman asked for the best way to move forward to ensure that the Planning Commission
29 was on the same page as the City Council. Mr. Snyder responded by asking what further additions the
30 Commissioners wished to make the statements in his memo. He feels it comes down to the General Plan.
31 He recommends the City maintain an independent Corridor Plan within the General Plan. There are no
32 cohesive neighborhood plans addressing Main Street although the two neighborhood plans mimic each
33 other. Look for a *different* corridor plan and maintain it. Next, determine if a different overlay should be
34 created in order to customize the base zoning. Or instead, should the design guidelines be written. Where
35 is the threshold to bring existing development to a new design standard? A typical threshold was when a
36 property owner wished to add 30% or more to a building. Change to a new use was another standard
37 marker. Most ordinances would allow a re-configuration of the interior of an office building if it remained
38 an office. Centerville's ordinance had some weak language in that it that leaves *change of use* somewhat
39 up to interpretation. Commissioner Hintze asked if a dental office would be changing its use if it becomes
40 an accounting office. Mr. Snyder indicated that was the unclear area he was referencing in the example.
41 But from a building code standpoint, both offices should fall into the same category.
42

43 Chair Hayman said it sounded like the first step is to upgrade the Corridor Plan. She reiterated
44 that it should be kept from Porter to Parrish rather than Pages to Parrish. Mr. Snyder agreed.
45 Commissioner Johnson stated that the design guidelines will be peeled back and that the Commission
46 needed to be prepared to argue the importance of some of some of them, as well as *why* they are
47 important.
48

49 Mr. Snyder summarized: there were a couple policy statement changes-- following up on the
50 differences between the east and west sides and also adding a residential component; a Corridor Plan
51 should be maintained within the General Plan; and everyone is leaning towards performance design
52 standards and the Commercial-Medium based zone. The commissioners agreed with Mr. Snyder's
53 summary.

1
2
3 **LAND USE TRAINING #1 – WHAT HAT DO YOU WEAR?**
4

5 The Planning Commission viewed a brief video created by the Land Use Academy of Utah
6 (LUAU). It explained the different types of land use decisions—legislative, administrative and quasi-
7 judicial. It also addressed the three branches of government, the roles each plays and provided some
8 examples

- 9 ▪ The role of the legislative branch of government is to make laws. Some examples at the
10 municipal level are changing the General Plan, adopting/amending ordinances (laws), and
11 annexation of property
- 12 ▪ The executive/administrative branch is to enforce the laws. Some examples are subdivision
13 plans, conditional use permits and building permits
- 14 ▪ The judicial branch is charged with interpreting those laws. Every City is required to have an
15 individual or body fill this role and is referred to as a local Appeal Authority

16
17 The final thought expressed in the video was that every time one makes a land-use decision, one must
18 consider what *type* of decision it is. Doing so greatly increases the likelihood of making the best decision
19 possible for the city.

20
21 Mr. Snyder described some of the challenges governmental bodies are faced with and he pointed out that
22 at times, there is a difference between doing what one should do and doing what one wanted to do.

23
24 Chair Hayman indicated she learned a lot when she was appointed to the Planning Commission as far as
25 what role the commission fills. The general public often did not understand that role, which led to feeling
26 sometimes as though their comments are not heard by the Commission. Educating the public prior to
27 public hearings is important—explaining that although the public’s comments are certainly welcome, the
28 Planning Commission is quite limited on what it can consider.

29
30 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT**
31

32 Mr. Snyder asked Ms. Younger to list the four items scheduled for the next Planning Commission
33 meeting—a conditional use permit, the Barrus Cove final plat, a review of Subdivisions Chapter 5, and a
34 continuation of the Main Street discussion.

35
36 **CITY COUNCIL REPORT**
37

38 Mr. Snyder pointed out that there had been no Planning Commission recommendations presented
39 at the most recent City Council.

40
41 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**
42

43 The minutes of February 27, 2019 were reviewed and amendments suggested. Commissioner
44 Daly **moved** to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson and
45 passed unanimously (6-0).

46
47 The minutes of March 13, 2019 were reviewed and an amendment suggested. Commissioner
48 Hirst **moved** to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson and
49 passed unanimously (6-0).

50
51 **ADJOURNMENT**
52

1 Commissioner Daly moved to adjourn. Chair Hayman seconded the motion which passed
2 unanimously (6-0). The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.
3
4

5 _____
6 Cheyllynn Hayman, Chair

_____ Date Approved

7
8
9
10 
11 Jamie Brooks, Recording Secretary