

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**
2 **Wednesday, April 12, 2023**
3 **7:00 p.m.**
4

5 A quorum being present at 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 Kevin Daly
10 Mason Kjar
11 Matt Larsen, Vice Chair
12 Tyler Moss
13 Heidi Shegrud, Chair
14

15 **MEMBER ABSENT**

16 Shawn Hoth
17

18 **STAFF PRESENT**

19 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
20 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
21 Whittney Black, Assistant Planner
22

23 **VISITORS**

24 Sam Nelson, Stokes Stevenson
25 Chad Morris, South Davis Home Rentals, LLC
26 Phil Landerton
27 Elden Marshal
28 Connie Madsen
29

30 **LEGISLATIVE PRAYER OR THOUGHT** Chair Shegrud
31

32 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
33

34 **PUBLIC HEARING – CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION ACCEPTANCE – STOKES**
35 **STEVENSON INDUSTRIAL FLEX SITE (AKA TRINITY)**
36

37 Community Development Director Cory Snyder summarized that the developer desired
38 to develop a significant underutilized portion of property (16.35 acres) as an industrial flex use
39 project consisting of multiple buildings and related improvements. Mr. Snyder said staff
40 recommended approval of the requested conceptual subdivision, and answered questions from
41 the Planning Commission.
42

43 Sam Nelson with Stokes Stevenson explained the desire to develop the three parcels
44 purchased by Stokes Stevenson from Trinity, and the plan to help Trinity upgrade and bring up
45 to Code the remaining Trinity site. Mr. Nelson said Stokes Stevenson intended to be a long-time
46 owner of the three parcels to be developed. Responding to a question from the Commission, he
47 said landscape maintenance responsibility would be addressed with CC&Rs (Covenants,
48 Conditions, and Restrictions).
49

50 Chair Shegrud opened a public hearing at 7:14 p.m.
51

52 Phil Landerton, Centerville resident, asked if the planned units would be rental units or
53 individually sold, and asked if there were any environmental clean-up concerns on the property.
54

55 Chair Shegrud closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

1 Mr. Nelson said Stokes Stevenson would sell an entire building at one time rather than
2 individual units. He said a lot of testing had been done to identify environmental issues, and
3 Stokes Stevenson planned to remediate the entire site with guidance from the Department of
4 Environmental Quality (DEQ).

5
6 Commissioner Larsen commented that the site was complicated, but the process
7 seemed fairly straightforward. The Planning Commission discussed the fact that a portion of the
8 development property in question was in West Bountiful City boundaries. Responding to a
9 question from the Commission, Mr. Snyder said Centerville would most likely provide a majority
10 of utility services. Commissioner Daly said he looked forward to seeing how the project
11 progressed.

12
13 Commissioner Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the
14 Conceptual Subdivision Plan for the Centerville Industrial Flex development (aka Trinity site),
15 subject to the following conditions, and for the following reasons for action. Commissioner Kjar
16 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

17
18 Conditions:

- 19
20 1) The applicant shall prepare and submit a Preliminary Subdivision Plan that conforms
21 to the requirements of CMC 15.03.030.
22 2) The preliminary subdivision plans shall depict the required easements for overall
23 parcel frontage, side, and rear property lines of the subdivision.
24 3) The applicant shall prepare and submit draft versions of the required documents to
25 establish an Owners Association and related CC&Rs meeting the expectations of
26 CMC 15.06.010.
27 4) The preliminary subdivision plans and subdivision layout shall be subject to the
28 applicable Final Site Plan Approval for the proposed development.
29 5) This conceptual subdivision plan review is not intended to permit actual development
30 of the property pursuant to such plan but was reviewed merely to represent how the
31 property could be developed in manner consistent with the planned development
32 provisions.
33 6) A portion of this conceptual subdivision acceptance and proposed development is
34 outside of City limits (West Bountiful) and has been deemed to be reviewed utilizing
35 the subdivision standards in accordance with the MOU between the Cities and the
36 developer. However, such review is not a guarantee, sanction, and/or an approval by
37 West Bountiful.

38
39 Reasons for action:

- 40
41 a) The Planning Commission finds that a Conceptual Subdivision Plan is a planned
42 development request and is dependent upon approval of the related Final Site Plan,
43 thereby guaranteeing that any subsequent owner of the lots would not be in
44 possession of a non-conforming situation or dependent upon another lot owner for
45 compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.
46 b) The Planning Commission finds that, with the conditions imposed, the proposed
47 conceptual subdivision plan likely will meet the requirements of CMC 15.06.010
48 Planned Unit Development.

49
50 **PUBLIC HEARING – PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION – CANYON POINT IN**
51 **CENTERVILLE DEVELOPMENT**

52
53 Mr. Snyder explained that the applicant joined several properties together in order to
54 build a multi-family and single-family mixed-residential development at approximately 347 North

1 400 East (Canyon Point in Centerville), and had already gone through the Conceptual Site Plan
2 and Final Site Plan process. The property was currently zoned Residential-Medium (R-M), and
3 the plan was to develop with a private lane. Construction on the Final Site Plan was underway
4 with approval for rental units. It was proposed that the dwellings in the development be platted
5 as a planned unit development (PUD) subdivision to allow for dwellings to be individually
6 owned. Mr. Snyder answered questions about limited common area, and said staff
7 recommended approval.

8
9 Chad Morris, applicant, said the reason for limited common area was to have some
10 control over what was placed in individual yards. He said fences may be an option, and no
11 accessory buildings would be allowed. Chair Shegrud expressed the opinion that the detention
12 area at the northwest corner could turn into an "alley", and might be problematic. She asked if
13 the area could be designed to be more functional. City Attorney Lisa Romney suggested
14 following up with the City Engineer and Drainage Supervisor to fully understand the design. The
15 Planning Commission discussed possibilities and made suggestions.

16
17 At 7:45 p.m., Chair Shegrud opened a public hearing.

18
19 Elden Marshal, Centerville resident, expressed concern with the proposed retaining
20 pond considering his property was adjacent to the development and downhill of the pond. He
21 expressed the opinion that the proposed development would be a benefit to the neighborhood
22 and community, and said his only concern was with drainage.

23
24 Connie Madsen, Centerville resident, commented that the existing bus stop would need
25 to be moved. She asked how many stories the proposed units would have, and asked about
26 planned perimeter fencing.

27
28 Chair Shegrud closed the public hearing at 8:50 p.m. Mr. Snyder showed the designed
29 drainage/detention plans on a map. He said the detention area was designed for a 25-year
30 event.

31
32 Mr. Morris said his current plan was to install a vinyl perimeter fence. He said he had not
33 yet reached out to UTA about the bus stop conflict. Mr. Morris said the residential units would be
34 a rambler design with basements and no second stories.

35
36 City Attorney Lisa Romney commented that the development was already engineered,
37 with Final Site Plan approval, and could be constructed as planned without the requested action
38 that evening. Commissioner Daly said the requested subdivision did not vary from the site plans
39 reviewed by the Planning Commission previously, and was in line with what he expected for the
40 site.

41
42 Commissioner Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the
43 Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Canyon Point in Centerville Development, located at
44 approximately 347 North 400 East, subject to the following conditions, and with the following
45 reasons for action. Commissioner Moss seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote
46 (5-0).

47
48 Conditions:

- 49
50 1) The next step is the subdivider shall submit a Final Subdivision Plat that conforms to
51 the requirements of CMC 15.04.030.
52 2) The Final Subdivision Plat shall be prepared in accordance with the City's
53 Subdivision Plat Format, as deemed acceptable by the City Engineer.

- 1 3) The Final Subdivision Plat shall depict the subdivision layout that conforms to the
2 City approved Final Site Plan of July 13, 2022.
3 4) The Final Subdivision Plat shall address the following:
4 a. Provide the required utility easements, as required by ordinance.
5 b. Note the required "open space" easement for the common areas.
6 c. Prepare and submit the final draft documents establishing a Homeowners
7 Association and the relevant Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions.
8 d. Provide an updated Preliminary Title Report for review by applicable City
9 staff.
10 5) Final Construction Plans may consist of the Construction Drawings for the related
11 Final Site Plan Approval, provided the plans are deemed acceptable by the City
12 Engineer. If not, the applicant shall prepare any needed amendments that are
13 deemed necessary.
14

15 Reasons for action:

- 16
17 a) The Planning Commission finds that a Preliminary Subdivision Plan is consistent with
18 the City Approved Final Site Plan of July 13, 2022.
19 b) The Planning Commission finds that the Planned Unit Development (PUD)
20 implements the existing Final Site Plan Approval granted by the City in September of
21 2022.
22 c) Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that, with the conditions imposed, the
23 Preliminary Subdivision Plan likely will meet requirements of CMC 15.06.010
24 Planned Unit Development.
25

26 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

27
28 The Planning Commission was scheduled to meet next on April 26, 2023. The Council
29 chose to cancel the April 26 meeting due to lack of agenda items.
30

31 MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

32
33 Minutes of the March 22, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting were reviewed.
34 Commissioner Kjar **moved** to approve the minutes. Chair Shegrud seconded the motion, which
35 passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
36

37 ADJOURNMENT

38
39 At 8:11 p.m., Chair Shegrud **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Daly
40 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
41
42

43 
44 _____
45 Jennifer Robison, City Recorder

5-24-2023

Date Approved

