



CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Public meetings will be held electronically via Zoom and live streamed on the Centerville City YouTube channel in accordance with Executive Order 2020-5 Suspending the Enforcement of Provisions of Utah Code 52-4-202 and 52-4-207 due to Infectious Disease COVID-19, issued by Governor Herbert on March 18, 2020. Centerville City Utah YouTube Channel link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/centervillecityutah/videos>. *Public meetings conducted via Zoom may be terminated at any time due to hackers or inappropriate content*

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON JULY 22, 2020 AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

Meetings of the Planning Commission of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Jacob Smith, Administrative Services Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

The full packet of backups can be found at <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>.

A. ROLL CALL

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PRAYER OR THOUGHT

Kevin Daly, Commissioner

Join Zoom Meeting

[https://zoom.us/j/99199433717?](https://zoom.us/j/99199433717?pwd=d1RITmRuYy8rK0xRRHdlcUx4UHlZUT09)

[pwd=d1RITmRuYy8rK0xRRHdlcUx4UHlZUT09](https://zoom.us/j/99199433717?pwd=d1RITmRuYy8rK0xRRHdlcUx4UHlZUT09)

Meeting ID: 991 9943 3717

Password: 447087

Dial by your location

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

D. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Tree Board Discussion
The Tree Board will discuss their purpose and goals, as well as recommendations to the Planning Commission.
2. South Main Street Corridor Discussion & Planning Commission 2020/2021 Goals
Discuss Planning Commission Goals and Review Status of the South Main Street Corridor Plan Update
3. Community Development Director's Report
City Council Update:
 - Outcome of Bell Rezone on 07/21/2020***Next Planning Commission Meeting of 08/12/2020:***
 - SMSC Plan Commission Debate and Discussion
 - Residential Buffering Standards of 12.51 Landscaping & Screening
 - Other Items: Extreme Auto Site Conceptual Site Plan & Grazie Rezone from A-L to R-L, Parrish Creek PDO Amendment***2020 Commission Goals:***
 - See Meeting Agenda Item for 2020/21 Goals Discussion

E. MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE

July 8, 2020

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mackenzie Wood
Centerville Assistant Planner

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

7/22/2020

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Tree Board Discussion

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

The Tree Board will discuss their purpose and goals, as well as recommendations to the Planning Commission.

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

In October 2018, the City Council amended the Municipal Code to create the Tree Board. The creation ordinance (Ord. No. 2018-23) is attached.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

▯ Ordinance No. 2019-23

ORDINANCE NO. 2018-23

AN ORDINANCE ENACTING SECTION 3.03.080 OF THE CENTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING THE CREATION, ORGANIZATION AND DUTIES OF THE TREE BOARD

WHEREAS, the City desires to create a Tree Board for the purpose of providing guidance to the City on the planting, maintaining and removing trees on public property and within the public park strips; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to enact a new Section 3.03.080 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding the creation, organization and duties of the Tree Board as more particularly set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE CITY, STATE OF UTAH:

Section 1. **Enactment.** Section 3.03.080 of the Centerville City Municipal Code regarding the Tree Board is hereby enacted to read in its entirety as set forth as follows.

3.03.080 Tree Board

- (a) Creation. There is hereby created a Tree Board for Centerville City which acts as an advisory board to the City Council and other departments for the purpose of providing guidance to the City on the planting, maintaining and removing of trees on public property and within the public park strips.
- (b) Members.
 - (1) Number. The Tree Board shall be comprised of not more than seven but no less than five regular members who shall be appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the Council.
 - (2) Term. Tree Board members shall be appointed to staggered terms of three years, provided that members may be appointed to terms shorter than three years when necessary to provide staggered terms. These terms are renewable. Tree Board members may be removed from office at any time with or without cause by action of the City Council.
 - (3) Compensation. Tree Board members shall receive no compensation for their services but may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of their duties or for training.
- (c) Organization and Procedure.
 - (1) Chairperson. The members of the Tree Board shall appoint one member as chairperson. The chairperson shall serve for a term of one year, which term may be renewed. The chairperson shall oversee the proceedings and activities of the Tree Board.

- (2) Rules. The Tree Board may adopt reasonable rules and regulations in accordance with this Section for governing the conduct of its business.
 - (3) Meetings. The Tree Board may hold meetings at such times as the Board determines is necessary and as properly called with notice given to each Board member.
- (d) Duties. The Tree Board acts in an advisory and voluntary capacity to the City Council and other departments in providing guidance on the planting, maintaining and removing of trees on public property and within the public park strips. The Tree Board shall:
- (1) Recommend to the City Council and other departments standards for the care, preservation, pruning and planting of trees on public property and in the park strips;
 - (2) Review and recommend appropriate changes and updates to City Ordinances or master plans regarding trees on public property or in the park strips;
 - (3) Recommend projects, policies, funding allocations, and other measures, programs, or activities for the maintenance and management of trees within the City;
 - (4) Carry out projects, programs, or activities regarding trees, as directed by the City Council, including Arbor Day activities; and
 - (5) Initiate and promote involvement, activities and contributions by the private sector for the development of trees within the City, including Arbor Day activities.

Section 2. Severability Clause. If any section, part or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all provisions, clauses and words of this Ordinance shall be severable. This Section shall become effective without codification.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective upon publication or posting, or thirty (30) days after passage, whichever occurs first. In addition, pursuant to *Utah Code Ann.* § 10-3-705, as amended, all ordinances must be recorded by the City Recorder in a book used exclusively for that purpose before taking effect.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CENTERVILLE,
STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 16th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2018.**

CENTERVILLE CITY

ATTEST:

Mackenzie Wood, City Recorder

By: _____
Mayor Clark A. Wilkinson

Voting by the City Council:

	"AYE"	"NAY"
Councilmember Fillmore	_____	_____
Councilmember Ince	_____	_____
Councilmember Ivie	_____	_____
Councilmember McEwan	_____	_____
Councilmember Mecham	_____	_____

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING

According to the provisions of the U.C.A. § 10-3-713, as amended, I, the municipal recorder of Centerville City, hereby certify that foregoing ordinance was duly passed by the City Council, recorded by me in a book used exclusively for that purpose, and published, or posted at: (1) 250 North Main; (2) 655 North 1250 West; and (3) RB's Gas Station, on the below referenced dates.

MACKENZIE WOOD, City Recorder

DATE: _____

RECORDED on ____ day of _____, 2018.

PUBLISHED OR POSTED on ____ of _____, 2018.

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

7/22/2020

Item No. 2.

Short Title: South Main Street Corridor Discussion & Planning Commission 2020/2021 Goals

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

Discuss Planning Commission Goals and Review Status of the South Main Street Corridor Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▯ 07-22-2020 PC Staff Memo 2020-2021 Goals & South Main Street Corridor Status

**CENTERVILLE CITY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
655 North 1250 West, Centerville, Utah 84014
(801) 292-8232**

STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: JULY 22, 2020

TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: PLANNING STAFF

SUBJECT: PLANNING COMMISSION GOALS AND SUGGESTED TENTATIVE WORKING TIMEFRAMES

As previously discussed with the Planning Commission, staff would be providing a list of the Commission's decided 2020/21 Planning Goals and provide an associated estimated working timeframe. Additionally, the staff is providing the latest status regarding the South Main Street Corridor Plan Amendments. We are seeking Commission direction regarding moving forward to achieve a recommendation for the City Council.

2020/21 PLANNING COMMISSION SELECTED GOALS

- I. **South Main Street Corridor Plan Update** – This update is currently “*in progress*.” After many months of research and discussion, the Planning Commission initiated the process for a General Plan Amendment on February 13, 2020 and held the first public hearing and debate on March 11, 2020. At the March Meeting, the Commission informed that the process would likely be three-fold; Phase 1 – General Plan Revisions; Phase 2 – Zone Code Revisions; and Phase 3 – Re-review of the Allowable Land Uses.

Staff Suggested Tentative Timeline Goals *(Workload Significant)*

- ✓ *Phase 1 – July through September 2020 and will require an additional hearing at Council*
- ✓ *Phase 2 – October 2020 through February 2021 and will require 2 hearings: Commission/Council*
- ✓ *Phase 3 – March/April 2021 and will require 2 hearings: Commission/Council*

- II. **Residential Buffering Regulations** – This objective was received by the Commission from the City Council. Council desires to create buffers between types of residential zoning districts. Staff believes this a simple amendment that should not take much time.

Staff Suggested Tentative Timeline Goal *(Workload Light)*

- ✓ *July/August 2020 – it has been initially scheduled for review by the Commission on August 12th, will require an additional hearing at Council*

- III. **Transportation Plan Element Update** – This amendment is needed to comply with the State’s Moderate-Income Housing statutes. The City is required to coordinate the adopted Moderate-Income Housing Element with the adopted Transportation Element. The deadline for completing and submitting the necessary amendments is December 01, 2020.

Staff Suggested Tentative Timeline Goal (*Workload Moderate*)

- ✓ *July through October 2020 and will require an Intent to Amend Notice along with 2 required hearings: Commission/Council*

- IV. **West Centerville Neighborhood Plan Update** – There has been discussion to consider the elimination of the SCP mixed-residential option depicted in the NW corner area of this neighborhood. The Commission was briefed on the current language on February 12, 2020.

Staff Suggested Tentative Timeline Goal (*Workload Moderate*)

- ✓ *May through July 2021 and will require an Intent to Amend Notice along with 2 required hearings: Commission/Council*

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report 7/22/2020

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Community Development Director's Report

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

City Council Update:

- Outcome of Bell Rezone on 07/21/2020

Next Planning Commission Meeting of 08/12/2020:

- SMSC Plan Commission Debate and Discussion
- Residential Buffering Standards of 12.51 Landscaping & Screening
- Other Items: Extreme Auto Site Conceptual Site Plan & Grazie Rezone from A-L to R-L, Parrish Creek PDO Amendment

2020 Commission Goals:

- See Meeting Agenda Item for 2020/21 Goals Discussion

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

CENTERVILLE

**Staff Backup Report
7/22/2020**

Item No.

Short Title: July 8, 2020

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

▣ July 8, 2020 PC Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**Wednesday, July 8, 2020****7:00 p.m.**

A quorum being present electronically via Zoom and live streamed on the Centerville City YouTube channel due to Infectious Disease COVID-19, the meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair
Mason Kjar
Spencer Summerhays
Christina Wilcox
Becki Wright

MEMBER ABSENT

Kevin Daly

STAFF PRESENT

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Mackenzie Wood, Assistant Planner
Leah Romero, City Recorder

VISITORS

Russell Wilson, Symphony Homes
Bruce Robinson, Symphony Homes
Dave Bell, Dave's Complete Auto

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – SUMMERHILL LANE DEVELOPMENT**

Mackenzie Wood, Assistant Planner, explained the requested Zoning Map Amendment for Summerhill Lane Development at approximately 2125 North Main Street. The applicant applied for a Residential-Low (R-L) Planned Development Overlay (PDO) Zone for the parcels previously tabled for a rezone from Agricultural-Low (A-L) to R-L. The PDO requires a Conceptual Site Plan to be approved in conjunction with the rezone.

Ms. Wood commented that a subsurface drain was not provided in the application. She explained that lots adjacent to R-L lots outside of the development would be required to match the zoning setbacks of the adjacent lots. She pointed out that a portion of the planned detention basin along Frontage Road would likely be taken by UDOT for construction of the West Davis Corridor, and said the development would still be required to provide detention. Common area is not required with a PDO, and was not included in the Conceptual Site Plan. The applicant did not request a density bonus.

Russell Wilson with Symphony Homes explained the plan for different product-types within the development. He explained the request to approve the 1,330-foot block length

1 between 400 West and Main Street, and said Symphony Homes would be willing to work with
2 the school district to provide a walkway connection to school property at mid-block. He said the
3 detention basin would be owned and maintained by the HOA, and stated Symphony Homes had
4 discussed the planned West Davis Corridor with UDOT. Responding to a question from
5 Commissioner Kjar, Mr. Wilson said he did not believe it would make sense to create a stub
6 road to the north that would break up the long block, but said Symphony Homes would be
7 willing to discuss the possibility of including a pedestrian trail.

8
9 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

10
11 Abraham Millet – Mr. Millet said he lived adjacent to the subject property on the
12 northwest corner. He said the current access from his property directly onto Frontage Road
13 could be dangerous, and said he would like a secondary access to his property, potentially from
14 the proposed development. He said he had agricultural animals on his property, and suggested
15 some type of barrier between his agricultural land and the R-L.

16
17 Dave Newton – Mr. Newton asked what would happen with the HOA if UDOT did
18 eventually assume the detention basin area, and asked if the larger lots (.5 acre and larger)
19 would have animal rights.

20
21 Abraham Millet – Mr. Millet asked if there would be future opportunity for public
22 comment.

23
24 Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 7:27 p.m. Ms. Wood explained that the
25 matter would go next to the City Council, with a public hearing at the Council level. She stated
26 that with a base zone of R-L in the PDO, no agricultural animal rights would be included. Cory
27 Snyder, Community Development Director, emphasized that the Council and members of the
28 public had expressed considerable concern regarding drainage on the property. He explained
29 that, in his opinion, if the drainage at buildout was sufficient for the development, UDOT would
30 be responsible for providing sufficient drainage upon UDOT acquisition of the property.
31 Responding to Mr. Millet's question, Mr. Snyder said there was no requirement for a fence
32 barrier between zoning types, and commented that the area did not allow open grazing. He said
33 owners of agricultural animals were required to secure their animals on their own lots.

34
35 Mr. Wilson said Symphony Homes planned to install boundary fencing, and said he
36 would be willing to work with Mr. Millet to provide barrier fencing that would be adequate for the
37 animals on Mr. Millet's property. Chair Hayman referred to concerns submitted to the
38 Commission by email regarding potential blocked access to a neighboring property. Mr. Wilson
39 said Symphony Homes had been working with the owner of property neighboring to the north.
40 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, confirmed there did not appear to be a recorded easement for the
41 neighboring property to the north, and suggested the easement question was a private matter
42 between property owners.

43
44 Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Snyder spoke of the established
45 pattern of long block lengths in the area, and spoke of remaining undeveloped land to the north
46 of the subject property. He explained that the sound barrier wall between the freeway and
47 Frontage Road was a UDOT barrier, and said UDOT would reevaluate placement of sound
48 barriers with the upcoming West Davis Corridor Project. Staff explained landscaping
49 expectations, and land drain systems.

50
51 Mr. Snyder stated that the Woods Park Development and the Sheffield Downs
52 Development were built with the same five-foot side setback proposed for the Summerhill Lane
53 Development. Mr. Snyder commented that maintenance of walking paths could become

1 problematic. Commissioner Kjar asked about maintenance responsibility of proposed park strip
2 neighboring the elementary school not assigned to a specific house lot.
3

4 Bruce Robinson with Symphony Homes said it was his understanding that property
5 owners to the north of the subject property had an agreement to ensure access to the property
6 immediately neighboring the subject property to the north. He said they had indicated
7 willingness to put the agreement in writing. Mr. Robinson stated every building in the Summerhill
8 Lane Development would have adequate surface drainage.
9

10 Commissioner Kjar expressed concern with the prescriptive easement issue, pointing
11 out that Google Maps dated 1997 showed a dirt road access. He said he did not believe the
12 issue had been resolved enough to advance the application, and said he would prefer some
13 type of resolution in writing. He agreed with Ms. Romney that the prescriptive easement
14 question was a private matter, but suggested there could potentially be related issues for the
15 City in the future, and said he would prefer it be resolved now. The Commission discussed
16 possible walkway connections to the north and to the school property on the south.
17

18 Commissioner Wright **moved** to table the application for Zoning Map Amendment and
19 Planned Development Overlay for Symphony Homes at 2125 North Main Street with the
20 following directives to the applicant. Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion, which passed by
21 unanimous vote (5-0).
22

23 Directives:
24

- 25 1. Provide site plan with tract perimeter setbacks as mentioned in the Staff Report.
- 26 2. Address maintenance responsibility of drainage detention common area and any
27 expectations of the City Engineer.
- 28 3. Address the matters related to the depiction of Parcel A.
- 29 4. Provide overall landscaping design scheme of the development meeting Weber
30 Basin's expectations.
- 31 5. Provide street lengths and suggestions regarding mid-block dedicated public
32 walkway.
- 33 6. Address concerns about prescriptive easement to the Packer property, for example,
34 a documented method of access outside the subdivision, a proposed access point
35 within the subdivision, or reasonably reliable evidence indicating the prescriptive
36 easement is moot.
- 37 7. Address areas that might not be maintained by adjacent owners, such as the park
38 strip below lots 25-29.
39

40 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – DAVE'S COMPLETE AUTO**
41

42 Mr. Snyder explained that the petitioner desired to assimilate a portion of the subject
43 property and add it to the west commercial property, known as Dave's Auto, with the purpose to
44 expand the business use and add parking and another building/shop. Currently, the desired
45 tract of land was zoned Residential Medium (R-M), and the business use was zoned
46 Commercial Very High (C-VH). The petitioner desired to have a portion of the residential
47 property rezoned to C-VH. Mr. Snyder showed a sketch provided by the petitioner that
48 demonstrated townhome development would be possible with the remaining R-M land. He
49 explained that the subject property was included in the General Plan as a transition area
50 between residential and commercial. Staff recommended allowing the rezone of a portion of the
51 R-M to C-VH.
52

1 Responding to a question from Commissioner Wright, Mr. Snyder provided history of
2 zoning changes and lot-line adjustments in the subject area. He said he believed it would be
3 possible for the remaining residential property to be developed in compliance with fire access
4 requirements.

5
6 David Bell, petitioner, stated the proposed addition to the commercial property would
7 meet the needs of his commercial business, and would provide beautiful landscaping on the
8 outside of the boundary wall for residents in the area to enjoy.

9
10 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 9:21 p.m.

11
12 Steven Jay – Mr. Jay said he lived on the agricultural land adjacent to the subject
13 property. He said he appreciated Mr. Bell's work to improve the area. He asked if the proposed
14 wall around the property would be similar to the existing wall, and asked if the portion of the
15 subject property directly east of his property would remain fallow for long.

16
17 David Doty – Mr. Doty said he had lived in the Porter Walton Townhomes Development
18 for one month. He expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission. He said he lived directly
19 east of the area proposed for rezone to C-VH, and stated that the existing zoning of the subject
20 property was a factor in his moving decision. Mr. Doty expressed concern that more of the
21 subject property would be proposed for rezone to commercial in the future. He said he moved to
22 Centerville from Sandy, where most auto-related business was located in a specific area away
23 from residential.

24
25 Chair Hayman closed the public hearing, and reopened the public hearing seeing that
26 more members of the public wished to comment.

27
28 Janiel Green – Ms. Green said she lived in the Porter Walton Development. She
29 expressed concern that the proposed rezone would decrease the value of her home, and
30 suggested more of a buffer between the R-M and the C-VH.

31
32 Chair Hayman closed the public hearing, and reopened the public hearing seeing that
33 more members of the public wished to comment.

34
35 Bill Jeppson – Mr. Jeppson said he lived in the Porter Walton Development. He said he
36 shared the property value concern expressed. He asked who would be responsible for
37 maintaining the landscaping in the possible future townhome development, and asked about the
38 size of the long drive to the possible future townhomes. Mr. Jeppson said he wondered why Mr.
39 Bell did not use his other residential property fronting Porter Lane for his business expansion,
40 instead of the proposed portion of property.

41
42 Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 9:36 p.m.

43
44 Mr. Bell explained that with a previous application a landscaping buffer on the east
45 portion of the C-VH property would have been required on the west side (inside) of the
46 boundary wall. He said he believed landscaping on the outside of the wall would be more
47 beneficial to area residents. He said the new fence/wall would be the same type of wall currently
48 on the C-VH property.

49
50 Commissioner Summerhays said he was torn on the issue, and said he preferred
51 symmetry in zoning. Commissioner Kjar said he felt the proposal was a fair solution, and
52 pointed out that there was no site plan for the possible future townhome development. He said
53 he was comfortable approving the requested rezone, and said he believed concerns raised

1 about buffering could be addressed at a later time with possible development of the R-M
2 property.

3
4 Commissioner Wright said she felt rezoning the property from Agricultural to R-M in the
5 past was consistent with the General Plan, but said she was not sure the request to move the
6 C-VH further east was consistent with the General Plan.

7
8 Chair Hayman commented that the existing Agricultural parcel would transition at some
9 point. She said she was empathetic to the argument about existing zoning when homes were
10 purchased. However, she said she did not believe the requested rezone would be incongruent
11 with the Porter Lane area, and would improve an already awkward property situation.

12
13 Commissioner Wilcox said she believed landscaping on the outside of the wall to be
14 enjoyed by the neighborhood was preferable to landscaping on the inside of the wall at the back
15 of a commercial lot. She said she thought Mr. Bell had come up with a good solution to an
16 awkward land arrangement.

17
18 Chair Hayman **moved** for the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the Zone
19 Map Amendment for a northernly portion of Parcel 03-001-0178, as depicted in the submittal
20 dated June 16, 2020 and as presented to the City, from Residential Medium to Commercial
21 Very High, subject to the following requirement and findings. Lisa Romney, City Attorney, said a
22 landscape waiver, previously granted to the applicant with a prior application, would need to be
23 obtained independently for this situation. Chair Hayman **amended the motion** to add a
24 Requirement (b) regarding landscape buffering. The motion was seconded by Commissioner
25 Kjar. Commissioner Wright repeated that she did not believe the proposal was consistent with
26 the General Plan, did not agree with pushing the C-VH further east, and believed the rezone
27 may affect existing property values. The motion passed by majority vote (3-2), with
28 Commissioners Kjar, Wilcox, and Chair Hayman in favor, and Commissioners Summerhays and
29 Wright dissenting.

30
31 Requirement:

- 32
33 a) Any rezone of the partial area cannot become effective until lot boundary is
34 sanctioned or approved by the City allowing the proposed area for commercial use to
35 be absorbed into the applicable business lot to the west.
36 b) Any rezone shall require a new site plan approval and any landscape buffer variance
37 or waiver shall be re-evaluated.

38
39 Findings:

- 40
41 1. The Planning Commission finds that there has been a sufficient review and
42 consideration of the criteria found in Section CZC 12.21.080.e of the Zoning
43 Ordinance.
44 2. The Planning Commission finds that the rezone is substantially consistent with the
45 goals of the General Plan, as described in the staff report.
46 3. The Planning Commission finds that given the 500-foot allowance for commercial
47 uses along the Frontage Road, as described in the Southwest Neighborhood Plan,
48 the commercial rezoning request does not encroach unreasonably to the east into
49 the neighborhood.
50 4. The Planning Commission finds the remaining large portion parcel in the R-M Zone
51 appears to be of sufficient size to develop the expected low to medium residential
52 use buffering, as per the Porter area policy expectations.

- 1 5. The Planning Commission finds that the requirement condition of the rezone for lot
2 line boundary changes are directly related to ensure that the rezone action complies
3 with applicable zoning and subdivision regulations adopted by the City.
4 6. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the request for C-VH Zoning
5 designation is appropriate.
6

7 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS – CHAPTER 12.69 (MEDICAL**
8 **CANNABIS FACILITIES)**
9

10 On December 11, 2019, the Planning Commission reviewed and held a public hearing
11 on proposed amendments to the Zoning Code regarding Medical Cannabis Facilities. The
12 Planning Commission recommended a number of changes to the proposed amendments and
13 directed Staff to prepare a revised draft. Ms. Romney presented changes to the proposed new
14 Chapter 12.69 regarding Medical Cannabis Facilities.
15

16 Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 10:06 p.m. and closed the public hearing
17 seeing that no one indicated a desire to comment. Chair Hayman **moved** to recommend
18 approval of Ordinance No. 2020-03 enacting Chapter 12.69 of the Centerville Zoning Code
19 regarding Medical Cannabis Facilities. Commissioner Summerhays seconded the motion, which
20 passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
21

22 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT AND COUNCIL UPDATE**
23

24 The Planning Commission was scheduled to meet next on July 22, 2020. Commissioner
25 Wright said she would like the Planning Commission to consistently spend time on the
26 Commission's 2020 goals.
27

28 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**
29

30 The minutes of the June 24, 2020 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Chair
31 Hayman **moved** to accept the unamended minutes. Commissioner Summerhays seconded the
32 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
33

34 **ADJOURNMENT**
35

36 At 10:17 p.m., Chair Hayman **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright
37 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
38
39
40

41 _____
42 Leah Romero, City Recorder
43
44

_____ Date Approved

45 _____
46 _____
47 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary