

The following are the approved minutes of Centerfield City's work meeting with Planning & Zoning and City Council, held October 30, 2025 in the Centerfield City Hall and site visit to 100 North 400 East. Those in attendance: Jon Hansen, Brandon Childs, Jaden Sorenson, Collin Edwards, Christi Garff, Brittney Fisher, Bart Hammond, Jonah Christensen and Ryan Stewart. Absent Mayor Travis Leatherwood.

Commissioner Childs called the meeting to order at 5:37 PM.

1- Roll Call

Site visit 100 North 400 East- Sean Nielsen- road and sewer discussion

The group met onsite to discuss issues regarding the properties owned by Sean Nelson and Weston Barney, including:

1. Verification of the property line between the two parcels.
2. Responsibility for road construction and how costs are divided if development occurs on both sides.
3. Whether a cul-de-sac is permitted under the current city code, given that references to cul-de-sacs were removed in the most recent ordinance revision.
4. Clarification of previous agreements, including sewer installation, property slivers, and potential easements.

Measurements were taken from the existing sidewalk, fence line, and a T-post previously set as a reference point. Measurement recorded: 103.39 feet (various participants confirmed approximate consistency). It was noted that:

- The T-posts currently in place are not confirmed survey markers.
 - A previous survey marker was removed during sewer installation, complicating verification.
 - One T-post near the roller is believed to be close to accurate because its original survey point was still visible during measurement.
-
- According to title information, one boundary should measure approximately 183.46 feet.
 - Roadway width should be 66 feet, including sidewalk, creating further questions about where the centerline and ownership split fall.
 - There is a narrow sliver of land previously quit-claimed by Weston to an LLC; its purpose and effect on the roadway location needs review.

A sewer line was installed on what appears to be Sean's property, but no easement is shown on record. Discussion included whether a sewer line placed on the edge of a property may create a prescriptive or implied easement.

- Need to confirm:
- Whether the settlement agreement requires Weston (or the city) to deed any portion of the roadway area or easement to the city.

- Whether the sewer placement impacts ownership or required contributions to road costs.

Questions raised:

- If the road is split down the middle, would each adjoining property owner be responsible for half of the roadway improvements?
- Weston previously received relief from some road-building requirements; it was unclear why or how that was determined.
- Sean expressed concerns that he has been told he is responsible for the entire roadway, which conflicts with the measurements taken and current discussions.
- The city needs to review:
 - The settlement agreement and any related development contracts.
 - Whether responsibility falls on the developer, the city, or both.
 - Whether the city intended the road to continue through from the existing stub street.

Key points:

- The previous code allowed cul-de-sacs, but the current ordinance revision removed them.
- Sean was previously told he would be required to build a cul-de-sac because the city would not allow a dead-end road.
- However, extending the road through would cause it to run into existing houses. The north-south streets appear to be the designated “adjustable” roads, while east-west routes are treated as fixed, affecting how connections must align.
- The city needs to determine:
 - Whether a cul-de-sac can be permitted under state code or local flexibility.
 - Whether a future connection to an existing road is required or feasible.
 - Maximum cul-de-sac length and allowed number of lots.

Sean outlined several possible development approaches:

Option A – No Road Construction Immediately

- Build a home facing the main road on the front portion of his property.
- Install only a private gravel driveway.
- Treat the remainder as a single large lot for now.
- Would still develop the back portion later, once issues are resolved.

Option B – Cul-de-Sac

- Install a cul-de-sac at the back of the property if allowed by state code and local ordinance.
- Line both sides with buildable lots.

- This option is only feasible if cul-de-sacs are reinstated or allowed as an exception.

Option C – Future Stub-Road Only

- End Sean’s roadway as a future stub (similar to Weston’s half-roads).
- Later development by adjacent property owners would complete the connection.
- Would require city approval and possibly alignment with existing or planned roads.

Sean noted financial urgency due to planning to withdraw retirement funds before potential market downturn. He would like clarity by spring in order to begin building or developing.

The group agreed the following items require further review before decisions can be made:

1. Review the settlement agreement between the city and Weston to determine obligations regarding:
 - Road construction
 - Easements
 - Deeded property slivers
2. Verify property boundaries using official survey documents and/or obtain a new survey.
3. Verify sewer line location and whether any easement (recorded or implied) exists.
4. Review state code regarding cul-de-sac length, usage, and subdivision standards.
5. Determine road connection requirements and whether a stub-road or no-road option is permissible.
6. Confirm development requirements for lot splits, frontage, driveway access, and road width.

The site meeting concluded as participants returned to their vehicles. Adjourned at 6:07 PM

Commissioner Childs called the meeting to order at 6:21 PM.

Work Session- Discussion with city council members on a xeriscape ordinance and a zeroscape ordinance, both for commercial and residential properties

The City intends to create two separate ordinances:

- Commercial Xeriscape Ordinance
 - Residential Xeriscape Ordinance
- Definitions between the two may overlap, but standards and requirements will differ.
 - The preference is NOT to combine them into a single ordinance to avoid confusion and conflicting standards.

Xeriscape

- Landscaping that reduces or minimizes supplemental irrigation.
- Allows some vegetation, drought-tolerant plants, possibly limited turf.

- Fits developments like the care center example.

Zeroscape

- Zero irrigation and zero turf.
- Primarily rock/hardscape; may include minimal shrubs or trees if desired.
- Intended for projects with no irrigation connection (e.g., storage units).

Commercial Ordinance Discussion

Applicability

- Focused on commercial lots of various sizes, including large parcels (5–10 acres or more).
- Residential standards will be addressed later in a separate ordinance.

Key Issues Discussed

1. Turf / Grass Limits

- Concern about using culinary water on large commercial properties.
- Consensus:
Turf should be strictly limited.
May set a maximum square footage, not just a percentage.
Avoid allowing large commercial users to water big turf areas with culinary water while residents face restrictions.

2. Percentage of Landscaping on Street Frontage

- Preference to require a percentage of street frontage to be landscaped (xeriscape), not just a token strip.
- Care Center used as a positive example of consistent frontage landscaping.

3. Lot-Size Scaling

- Large lots (5–10+ acres) need scaled rules, so a huge property doesn't automatically get huge turf allowances.
- Ideas included:
Tiered limits (ex: up to 1 acre = X sq ft max turf; 1–5 acres = lower percentage; 5+ acres = even lower).
- OR a fixed square-foot maximum before irrigation shares are required.

4. Irrigation Shares

- Zeroscape = no irrigation shares required.

- Xeriscape = small amounts of turf/planting may require ONE irrigation share above a defined threshold.
- Example idea:
 - Allow up to ~2,000 sq ft of irrigated area before requiring a share.
 - Larger irrigated areas = must bring irrigation water shares.

5. Water Impact, ERCs & Fees

- Concern that commercial projects using culinary water for landscaping strain the system.
- Impact fees cannot simply be increased without a study.
- A possible approach:
 - Limit turf unless irrigation shares are provided.
 - Keep zeroscape “true zeroscape” to preserve low-impact standards.

6. Trees / Shade

- Desire to allow a few trees for aesthetics and usability.
Even some zeroscape discussions included the possibility of 1–2 trees (but no turf).
- The city wants to avoid barren commercial corridors.

7. Tax-Generating vs Non-Tax-Generating Uses

- Some members suggested applying incentives only to tax-generating businesses.
- Others cautioned that:
 - May not be legally enforceable.
 - Some non-sales-tax businesses still provide jobs, services, or other community benefits.
- No final direction given.

Emerging Consensus Points

1. Keep commercial and residential ordinances separate.
2. Zeroscape = zero irrigation, zero turf.
3. Xeriscape = limited turf + drought-tolerant plants.
4. Use frontage percentages OR maximum turf square footage to keep landscaping consistent.
5. Large lots need scaling rules so they don't get huge turf allowances.
6. Set a square-foot threshold that triggers the requirement for an irrigation share (possibly around 2,000 sq ft).
7. Allow some landscaping to maintain aesthetics, but avoid heavy culinary water use.

The council continued discussion on updates to the commercial landscaping ordinance, focusing on frontage requirements, irrigation rules, enforcement, and the potential removal of the separate “zeroscaping” section.

Key Decisions & Agreements

1. Street Frontage Landscaping

- Minimum 60% of street frontage must be landscaped.
- First 10 feet from the sidewalk or curb must be landscaped (zeroscaped or planted—no turf requirement at this distance).
- Turf grass allowed, but no more than 50% of the landscaped frontage may be turf. The group agreed turf should not be outright prohibited, as some commercial sites (e.g., City Hall, care center) look appropriate with grass.

2. Trees

- After extensive discussion, council settled on a minimum of two trees per 100 feet of street frontage.
- Trees must be appropriately sized and compatible with overhead utilities.
- Property owners may add more trees at their discretion.

3. Parking Lot Landscaping

- Parking lot islands and buffer areas must include either hardscape or xeriscape elements.
- If landscaping is included, it must follow zero-scape/native plant guidelines.
- Concrete-only islands are allowed for traffic flow, but landscaped options must follow standards.

4. Irrigation Requirements

- Low-flow irrigation required for all landscaped areas.
- Spray irrigation cannot be used within 24 inches of curbs/sidewalks, unless watering turf (to avoid wind drift problems).
- Xeriscaped areas must use drip irrigation.

5. Materials

- Native, drought-tolerant plants encouraged.
A reference appendix of approved materials will be added.

6. Weed Barrier

- Weed barrier required in all xeriscaped areas.
- Must be permeable and maintained (rock must be pulled back and barrier replaced when needed).
-

7. Enforcement & Compliance

- Landscaping must be completed before occupancy or at final inspection.
- Discussion on requiring the county to withhold occupancy until the city confirms landscaping completion.
- Lacey will follow up with the county to ensure a mandatory city sign-off before occupancy certificates are issued.
- The group discussed possible enforcement tools, including fines or potential service restrictions (legal review needed).

8. Variances

- Variances allowed only where strictly necessary (soil conditions, slope, utility constraints).
Variances may require letters of credit to guarantee completion after construction.

9. Removal of Zero-Scape-Only Section

- Council agreed the dedicated “Zero-Scape Commercial Section” is not needed and should be stricken.
- The main commercial landscaping section already sets the standards needed for properties without secondary water shares.

Next Steps

- Mayor Leatherwood will revise the ordinance draft incorporating the new decisions.
- A final draft will be circulated after his vacation.
- Public hearing targeted for November 20.

Board Member Sorenson moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:44 PM. Seconded by Board Member Hansen. Carries 9-0.

Lacey Belnap Lacey Belnap, City Recorder

Travis Leatherwood Travis Leatherwood, Mayor

November 20, 2025 Approval Date