

1 Minutes of the joint work session of the Centerville **City Council and Planning Commission**
2 held Tuesday, August 18, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street,
3 Centerville, Utah.

4
5 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

6
7 Mayor Paul A. Cutler

8
9 Council Members Ken S. Averett
10 Tamilyn Fillmore
11 John T. Higginson
12 Stephanie Ivie
13 Lawrence Wright

14
15 **PLANNING COMMISSION** Cheylynn Hayman (arrived at 5:58 p.m.)
16 **PRESENT** David Hirschi, Chair

17 Gina Hirst
18 William Ince
19 Logan Johnson
20 Scott Kjar
21 Kevin Merrill, Vice Chair

22
23 **STAFF PRESENT**

24 Steve Thacker, City Manager
25 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
26 Jacob Smith, Management Assistant
27 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
28 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

29 **STAFF ABSENT**

30 Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager

31 **VISITORS**

32 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

33 **SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN/OVERLAY ZONE**

34
35 Councilwoman Ivie asked why density is the last of the five recommended issues for
36 discussion, considering density is the issue the public cares about most. Mayor Cutler, Cory
37 Snyder, Community Development Director, and Lisa Romney, City Attorney, all stated that
38 discussion could begin with any of the issues. The Planning Commission has already made a
39 recommendation to the Council regarding density for the City Center and Traditional Districts.
40 Mayor Cutler added that a number of property owners have asked for flexibility, and the Council
41 needs to consider their request and their property rights.

42
43 Ms. Romney reviewed existing ordinance provisions for permitted uses and conditional
44 uses in both districts (Commercial-Medium) as presented in the staff report. Councilman Wright
45 asked if a convalescent center would be allowed. Mr. Snyder responded that a convalescent
46 center is allowed in the C-M Zone, an assisted living facility is not. However, the market is
47 experiencing a blending of the two types of services, and the City may want to revise its
48 definition to be consistent with the market.

49
50 Mayor Cutler commented that the data presented at the August 4th joint work session
51 showed the two districts to be heavy in commercial uses. Commissioner Johnson stated he
52 likes the idea of allowing more flexibility for property owners, and is not opposed to either full
53 commercial, mixed-use or full residential. Councilmen Wright and Higginson agreed that
54 commercial uses naturally reduce density. Commissioner Kjar stated he believes Main Street
55 commercial uses will be office, not retail, and he would not want to limit property owners with

1 zoning that is not feasible. Councilman Wright said he would like to look at barriers that prevent
2 small business, and help reduce costs to make small business more affordable on Main Street.
3 Councilman Averett agreed with Commissioner Kjar that Main Street will attract office
4 commercial uses such as dentists, lawyers, and other local services, not retail.
5

6 Mayor Cutler stated that the existing ordinance does not include clear definitions of
7 mixed-use, and it might be helpful to clarify what is meant. Councilman Averett commented that
8 with the east side of Main Street backed by single-family residential, and the west side backed
9 by medium density, it would make sense to have commercial fronting the east side and low to
10 medium density or mixed-use on the west side. Chair Hirschi added that, without the
11 commercial component, the area would be vulnerable to high-density residential.
12 Commissioner Kjar stated that "mixed-use" in citizens' minds means high-density residential and
13 said he thinks it would be tough to lease the required commercial spaces in mixed-use.
14 Councilwoman Fillmore responded that it depends on the definition of commercial. The data
15 shows that 20% of the subject area has been developed commercially in the last fifteen years.
16 She said she agrees with everything that has been said, and added that the City needs to be
17 more clear about the amount of commercial versus residential required, and a density cap
18 should be added. Councilman Wright said he agrees with the residents' request of Residential-
19 Low (R-L). Councilwoman Fillmore responded that the reality with single-family development
20 now is smaller yards and homes closer together, with at least eight units per acre. She said she
21 does not want high-density, but if the density cap is unfeasible the area will remain blighted. Mr.
22 Snyder clarified that a single-family development is currently allowed, but an entire block cannot
23 be filled with a single lot-type. Councilwoman Ivie said she does not want the Planning
24 Commission to ever be in the position that they have to vote in favor of something because of
25 the ordinance that they know is a bad development, like happened with the proposed
26 development on the Hafoka property. Mr. Snyder responded that in that situation the issue of
27 residents wanting single-family overrode the possibilities with multi-family. He pointed out that
28 with the Hafoka property there was push for more active open space, but the development is
29 still required to pay Park Impact Fees toward City open space. There needs to be equity.
30 Councilwoman Ivie said she believes the Council is in place to listen to public outcry and
31 respond.
32

33 Councilwoman Ivie said she feels allowing commercial is a good thing, and she likes the
34 idea of having mixed-use only on the west side, but there needs to be a major density cap even
35 if the area stays blighted and takes longer to redevelop. Councilman Averett suggested a low
36 enough density that it feels like residential with commercial allowed. Councilwoman Fillmore
37 added that requiring entry on ground level could be another control. Councilman Averett agreed
38 with the need for patio homes for the aging community. Commissioner Kjar said the concern
39 with the Hafoka property was that the open space was not really active open space.
40 Councilwoman Fillmore said she likes the idea of separating east and west, but feels it would be
41 unreasonable to go lower than six units per acre on the east side and eight units per acre on the
42 west side of Main Street. She also suggested ten units per acre on the west side and eight
43 units per acre on the east side. She said stronger language is necessary clarifying that the
44 commercial element needs to be predominant with residential secondary. Mr. Snyder explained
45 density per acre for several developments within the City for comparison.
46

47 Councilman Wright mentioned that one issue brought up during the public hearings is
48 the impact density will have on the community and the ability to provide services, schools, and
49 traffic impacts. He asked how an acceptable and sustainable threshold of density is
50 determined. Mr. Snyder responded that it is hard to tabulate fairly because a lot of traffic on the
51 roads is made up of people outside the community drawn by the commercial element. Mayor
52 Cutler pointed out that an acceptable level of density is a matter of opinion. Mr. Snyder added
53 that it would be difficult to guess what the market will generate in the future. The possibility of a

1 traffic study is included in the ordinance to review developments as they come up. Councilman
2 Wright said he does not know how to set a density cap without knowing the impacts. He said he
3 thinks the City needs to take a more holistic look at the corridor. Ms. Romney referred to the
4 limited numbers of units that are likely to redevelop as explained at the August 4th joint work
5 session. The largest property in the subject area is the O'Brien Glass property, which is under
6 consideration for redevelopment now. Councilman Wright repeated his suggestion that the City
7 would have more options if it took over responsibility of Main Street from UDOT. Ms. Romney
8 added that residential development has not occurred in the two districts since 2000.
9

10 Councilman Higginson stated he would prefer six units per acre with no conditional use
11 so that it really is a six-unit cap. The Council and Planning Commission discussed whether or
12 not a unit per building cap should be included. Councilwoman Fillmore and Mr. Snyder spoke in
13 favor of a unit per building cap. Mayor Cutler explained that the density cap per acre would be
14 an overlay regardless of the number of buildings. Chair Hirschi agreed that doing away with the
15 building component would be a mistake. Commissioner Hirst said she would like to know how
16 low the cap can be and still have redevelopment possible. Mayor Cutler read aloud a letter
17 submitted by owners of properties between 100 South and 400 South on Main Street requesting
18 medium density rather than low density.
19

20 The recommendation submitted to the Council by the Planning Commission includes a
21 cap of four units per acre permitted and up to eight conditional. Commissioner Johnson stated
22 he feels there was some misunderstanding of conditional use on the part of the Commissioners
23 at the time the recommendation was made. Commissioner Johnson added that Councilman
24 Higginson's suggestion is closer to what he had in mind. Ms. Romney explained that with a
25 conditional use permit the City looks at negative impacts, and it is difficult from a legal
26 standpoint to show negative impact for density. Councilman Wright said he would like to
27 eliminate conditional use and place a cap on density per acre. Councilwoman Fillmore
28 responded that even the limited control provided by conditional use can be beneficial.
29 Councilman Higginson said he would consider four units per building permitted with six
30 conditional. Chair Hirschi pointed out that every project is different and unique, and removing
31 conditional use would take away the Planning Commission's ability to consider and improve a
32 development. Councilman Wright said he feels the focus of the Planning Commission is
33 different from the focus of the Council. He said he feels the Council's focus should be putting a
34 framework in place after considering what the citizens say. The Planning Commission is then to
35 operate within that framework.
36

37 Councilwoman Fillmore said she would prefer to consider the smaller parcels and put a
38 caveat in place to make development of smaller parcels possible. Councilman Averett agreed
39 that it does not make sense to try to put all properties in the same box. He said conditional use
40 may be necessary, but the Council needs to be comfortable with the maximum conditional use
41 allowed. Council members Ivie and Wright agreed that if permitted use is limited to what the
42 City is comfortable with, the level of review with conditional use is not necessary. Mr. Snyder
43 pointed out that without conditional use public input cannot be considered. If requirements of
44 permitted use are met, approval is guaranteed. Any problems that arise along the way cannot
45 be mitigated. Conditional use allows more discretion for the Planning Commission to improve a
46 situation.
47

48 Councilmen Wright and Higginson agreed with setting the maximum they are
49 comfortable with per building as the conditional use level, with something lower set as
50 permitted. Chair Hirschi added that a density cap adds a level of control. Councilman Wright
51 said he believes allowing six on the east is appropriate. Mr. Snyder responded to a question
52 from Councilwoman Fillmore stating that the Council could choose to make the decision, or
53 could remand the issue back to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Ince agreed with

1 Councilwoman Fillmore, and stated that one or two units per parcel should be allowed
2 regardless of parcel size. Councilwoman Ivie said she prefers four units permitted on the east
3 and six units permitted on the west, not less than one unit per parcel. Commissioner Johnson
4 stated he is comfortable with a minimum of eight units. He said he is not opposed to high-
5 density, and does not think 12-15 units per acre would be a bad addition to Main Street. Chair
6 Hirschi stated that developers need some flexibility, and he feels the City should be encouraging
7 business development along Main Street.
8

9 Councilwoman Fillmore repeated that she would like to see the commercial element
10 strengthened. Councilwoman Ivie said she would like to see an option for single-family
11 development by itself. Councilman Wright stated he is comfortable with one-four units per acre
12 permitted on the east side with up to six units conditional use, and one-four units per acre
13 permitted on the west side with up to eight conditional. Councilman Higginson agreed.
14 Commissioner Ince said he is comfortable with four and six. Commissioner Hayman pointed out
15 that there has been no discussion of per building limits, and said she is uncomfortable with the
16 six units per building currently allowed. She suggested allowing 1-3 units per building permitted
17 and up to four units per building conditional. Councilwoman Fillmore added that she would like
18 to require street-level entry for stand-alone residential.
19

20 Regarding building height, Mayor Cutler pointed out current restrictions. Councilman
21 Wright stated that the impact of shadows on surrounding residences needs to be considered.
22 The Council and Planning Commission discussed height restrictions and setbacks. Mr. Snyder
23 added that placing parking behind a building creates a buffer, but if the ordinance is too
24 definitive there will be scenarios where it does not work. Commissioner Kjar said the issue is
25 not so much how high a building is off the street, but how it affects the homes behind it.
26 Councilman Averett stated he prefers pitched roofs over flat roofs. Commissioner Hirst agreed.
27

28 **ADJOURNMENT**

29
30 The work session was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.
31
32
33
34

35 _____
36 Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

_____ Date Approved

37
38
39
40
41 _____
42 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary