

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, February 8, 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 (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)

12 Kathy Helgesen

13 David Hirschi, Chair

14 Gina Hirst

15 Logan Johnson

16 Becki Wright

17
18 **STAFF PRESENT**

19 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

20 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

21 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

22 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

23
24 **VISITORS**

25 Interested citizens

26
27 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

28
29 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Hirst

30
31 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

32
33 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held January 25, 2017 were
34 reviewed. Amendments were requested. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to
35 accept the minutes as amended. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which
36 passed by unanimous vote (6-0). Commissioner Hayman arrived after approval of the
37 minutes.

38
39 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, 1150 SOUTH 240 EAST**

40
41 Ronn Marshall submitted a Zoning Map Amendment application for the property
42 at 1150 South 240 East. Based on his current Conceptual Subdivision Plans, a
43 Residential-Low (R-L) Zoning would fit best with his design, and perhaps the
44 surrounding properties. Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, explained the request to

1 rezone from Residential-Medium (R-M) to Residential-Low (R-L). Staff considers the
2 proposed rezone to be consistent with the goals of the General Plan. The two existing
3 single-family homes on or next to this lot set the precedent for R-L. Considering the
4 housing to the south, it is not unreasonable to believe that single-family would be
5 accepted there. R-M or R-L would be acceptable at this location as long as there would
6 be sufficient buffering on the north and west ends of the property. Existing facilities and
7 services either exist or will be provided in the subdivision regardless of the zone.

8
9 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, stated that the driving factor of
10 the request is the subtle difference between frontage requirements. If the property
11 remains R-M, a single Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be issued for the entire
12 subdivision, or individual CUPs would have to be issued for each house built. Ms.
13 Younger clarified that, although the southeast neighborhood is under the market yield
14 for town homes and duplexes, the City as a whole is over the market yield for town
15 homes and duplexes.

16
17 Ronn Marshall, applicant, stated that what he wants to accomplish will be much
18 easier with the R-L Zone. Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 7:26 p.m.

19
20 Craig Adams – Mr. Adams said he has been a neighbor of the subject property
21 for 27 years. He agreed that the two existing homes are nice, and agreed that R-L
22 would be a good fit for the property and the neighborhood. Mr. Marshall confirmed that
23 seven additional homes would be built on the property.

24
25 Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:27 p.m. Chair Hirschi commented
26 that the City may be looking in the future at something happening in the neighboring
27 commercial zone. He expressed concern about creating a precedent that could be
28 problematic going forward. Commissioner Johnson responded that he does not see R-
29 L and R-H in that context as being incompatible. Commissioner Hayman pointed out
30 the surrounding R-M Zones, and said she does not think R-L on the subject property
31 would inhibit or dissuade the City from doing something different with the commercial
32 area. Commissioner Wright said that, as a property rights issue, the zone change
33 allows the owner to do more of what he wants to do. She added that what he wants to
34 do would not detrimentally affect the area. Commissioner Daly commented that it is
35 refreshing to have a developer not trying to cram as many units as possible on the
36 property. He said he thinks R-L and R-M are compatible uses, and he is generally in
37 favor. Commissioner Hayman said single-family homes seem like a compatible fit
38 considering the surrounding homes. Commissioner Wright made a **motion** to accept
39 the Zone Map Amendment for 1150 South 240 East from a Residential-Medium District
40 into a Residential-Low District, with the following two reasons for the action.
41 Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

1 Reasons for the Action:

- 2
- 3 1. The Zoning Map Amendment would still be consistent with the General Plan.
 - 4 2. The proposed zoning change and subsequent development standards on this
 - 5 lot would be consistent with already existing single-family properties within
 - 6 this subdivision.

7

8 **PUBLIC HEARING – CHITOSE JOHNSON CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION,**

9 **1150 SOUTH 240 EAST**

10

11 Ms. Younger explained the proposed Conceptual Subdivision Plan, which

12 consists of a nine-lot single-family residential subdivision (seven additional homes). Mr.

13 Snyder explained that the two existing homes would be incorporated into the

14 subdivision with boundary adjustments.

15

16 Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 7:42 p.m., and closed the public hearing

17 seeing that no one wished to comment. The Planning Commission discussed setbacks

18 in the development. Commissioner Daly made a **motion** to accept the Conceptual

19 Subdivision Plat for the Chitose Johnson Subdivision, located at 1150 South 240 East,

20 subject to the following conditions and findings, and subject to City Council approval of

21 the R-L Zone change. Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion, which passed by

22 unanimous vote (7-0).

23

24 Conditions:

- 25
- 26 • Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plats will have to be submitted in
 - 27 accordance with Title 15.
 - 28 • Drainage would need to be addressed due to differing elevations on the lot
 - 29 and approved by the City Engineer.

30

31 Findings:

- 32
- 33 a) The conceptual subdivision appears to be consistent with the General Plan
 - 34 b) It follows the Municipal Code Subdivision Ordinance in Chapter 15.5
 - 35 c) Adequately meets the Development Standards laid out for an R-L Zone in
 - 36 CZC 12.32.300
 - 37 d) The applicable review standards of the Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to a
 - 38 Conceptual Subdivision application have been reviewed and directives
 - 39 established to allow the proposal to proceed to preliminary subdivision plan
 - 40 submittal.

1 **PUBLIC HEARING – SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS,**
2 **MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 15**

3
4 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, presented proposed amendments to Title 15 of the
5 Centerville Municipal Code regarding Subdivisions, and answered questions from the
6 Commission. Ms. Romney noted that these changes to Title 15 are not the major edits
7 and rewrite to the subdivision ordinance that the City and consultant are currently
8 preparing. Those edits will be brought to the Planning Commission when ready. The
9 edits currently proposed to Title 15 are formatting, numbering and text changes
10 necessary to transition the Municipal Code to an online format and other necessary
11 edits to bring Title 15 into compliance with State law. The Planning Commission went
12 through each page of the proposed edits to Title 15 and asked questions as applicable.
13 Ms. Romney noted more substantive changes to the Planning Commission. Chair
14 Hirschi and Commissioner Hayman suggested minor punctuation changes.

15
16 Chair Hirschi opened a public hearing at 8:25 p.m., and closed the public hearing
17 seeing that no one wished to comment. Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to recommend
18 approval of the proposed amendments to Title 15 of the Centerville Municipal Code
19 regarding Subdivisions as amended, based on the following findings. Commissioner
20 Hirst seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

21
22 Findings:

- 23
24 1. The proposed Subdivision Ordinance amendments are consistent with the
25 goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan;
26 2. The proposed Subdivision Ordinance amendments are in the best interest of
27 the public health, safety and welfare by providing more accessible online
28 codes and updating provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance consistent with
29 State law; and
30 3. The City is authorized to enact and amend land use ordinances consistent
31 with the purposes set forth in the Utah Land Use Development and
32 Management Act as set forth in Utah Code 10-9a-101, et seq.

33
34 **PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – ACCESSORY SETBACKS**

35
36 On January 11, 2017, the Planning Commission directed staff to review
37 additional information regarding accessory building setbacks, specifically the use of a
38 roof slope or building setback ratio. Mr. Snyder explained that staff has reviewed the
39 idea of using a ratio system and has determined that it would be complicated or “not
40 user friendly” given the current minimum lot frontage standards and buildable area
41 expectations set by the Zoning Ordinance. Staff did modify its original version of the
42 edits to assist with recognizing that there are differing building sizes versus building
43 codes (portable/permanent) and that a two-story building creates a different mass size

1 versus a single-story building. The building terms of the industry generally reference “a
2 story” as 10 feet from floor to ceiling of the structure. Therefore, staff used the 10-foot
3 height as a target for establishing some of the setback expectations. Mr. Snyder
4 presented the following table:
5

Setback Standards – Rear Yard	R-L	R-M	R-H
Accessory building (portable, one-story) – less than 200 square feet ⁴	3 feet	3 feet	3 feet
Accessory building (one-story) – 200 square feet or greater ⁴	5 feet	5 feet	5 feet
Accessory building (two-story or greater than 10 feet in height) – All Sizes ⁴	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet

6 ⁴Setback is measured from any interior and/or rear lot line
7

8 Mr. Snyder answered questions regarding the definition and use of “portable”.
9 Commissioner Wright pointed out that the term may cause confusion. Chair Hirschi
10 asked about the ability to improve existing large accessory buildings that do not meet
11 the new eight-foot setback requirement. Mr. Snyder responded that the Board of
12 Adjustments can approve an expansion if the degree of nonconformity is not increased.
13 Commissioner Wright said she would like things to be as easy to understand as
14 possible, and pointed out that not everyone would understand that the numbers are
15 averages. Mr. Snyder responded that more explanation is included in the ordinance.
16 Commissioner Johnson commented that a ratio seems simpler to him, but he can see
17 that a table can also be clear. Commissioner Hayman said she feels the proposal is a
18 good compromise that addresses the concern expressed by the City Council. Chair
19 Hirschi and Commissioner Helgesen agreed.
20

21 Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to recommend approval of the
22 proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments regarding “accessory buildings”. Chair
23 Hirschi seconded the motion. Commissioner Hayman stated she would prefer to
24 remove the word “portable”. Commissioner Helgesen and Chair Hirschi accepted
25 removal of “portable” from the table as an amendment to the motion. The motion as
26 amended passed by unanimous vote (7-0).
27

1 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

2
3 The Planning Commission will meet next on February 22, 2017.

4
5 **ADJOURNMENT**

6
7 Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 p.m. Commissioner
8 Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

9
10
11
12
13 _____
14 David Hirschi, Chair

15
16
17
18
19 _____
20 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary