PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, January 11, 2017
7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kevin Daly
David Hirschi, Chair
Logan Johnson
Cheylynn Hayman, Vice Chair
Kathy Helgesen
Gina Hirst
Becki Wright

STAFF PRESENT

Emily Hatch, Recording Secretary
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Cassie Younger, City Planner

VISITORS

Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER Chair Hirschi

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held December 14, 2016 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Elections were held for the positions of Planning Commission Chair and Planning Commission Vice Chair for 2017. Commissioner Johnson nominated David Hirschi for the position of Chair, and Chair Hirschi nominated Commissioner Hayman for the position of Chair.

Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to close nominations, seconded by Commissioner Helgesen. The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Chair Hirschi was elected to the position of 2017 Chair of the Planning Commission with 4 votes.

Commissioner Wright nominated Commissioner Hayman for the position of Vice Chair. Commissioner Hayman nominated Commissioner Johnson for the position of Vice Chair. Commissioner Johnson nominated Commissioner Daly for the position of Vice Chair.

Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to close nominations, seconded by Commissioner Daly. The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Commissioner Hayman was elected to the position of 2017 Vice Chair of the Planning Commission with 5 votes.

PUBLIC HEARING – YORK AUTOMOTIVE, 825 SOUTH FRONTAGE ROAD - Consider approving a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed auto sales facility on property located at 825 South Frontage Road - Jacob York, Applicant

York Automotive currently operates a facility at 875 South Frontage Road, which is located on a large piece of property along with one other building. The applicant currently has a Conditional Use Permit specific to its use of the south building. However, the applicant has been given the opportunity to lease the north building at 825 South Frontage Road. The north building is larger and so would require more parking than the current building: a change from 8 spaces to 12 spaces. Staff has reviewed the current CUP and has concluded that, since this CUP was granted by the Commission in the past, it is likely the applicant will qualify for the new CUP, with some specific conditions.

The site does not conform to today's landscaping standards. According to City Ordinances, as long as there are no specific site changes being made, the applicant is in compliance, until such time as new elements are introduced.

In 2015, the owner of the field to the north of the property approached the Board of Adjustment for a determination on whether the property had any development rights attached to it, specifically with regards to curb, gutter, paving, etc. The family argued before the BOA that they had used the property in the past for equipment storage and sales, as well as parking for the businesses in the two buildings. The BOA voted to grant them this use, on the conditions that the use and area not change.

Mr. Snyder, Community Development Director, reported that Staff's analysis is generally supportive of the issuance of this new CUP. However, the Fire Marshall is currently looking at the fire access and needs for the new location. If the current state of the location is unacceptable, then any changes made to address this issue would violate the conditions of the decision made by the BOA, which would result in an inability to simply transfer the CUP to the new location of York Automotive.

Staff recommends approval of the CUP. However, this CUP is just for the use of the building, and could not be approved if any changes were determined to be necessary. If the Fire Marshall determines that changes to the north site are necessary to allow for access of fire equipment, then the applicant would need to return to the Commission with a Site Plan to include these changes. It is Staff's opinion that the transfer of the CUP is compatible with the previous approval by the BOA, so Staff recommends approval with the caveat that the Fire Marshall does not require any changes.

Chair Hirschi asked for clarification on the seventh condition of the Staff Report, inquiring as to why one of the conditions of the CUP would be to fulfill any changes required by the Fire Marshall, when any changes would negate the CUP. Mr. Snyder clarified that this means that changes would be required in the form of a Site Plan, which would be reviewed by the Planning Commission, in order to maintain the validity of the CUP. Commissioner Helgesen asked if any of the circumstances mentioned in condition 7 would then require a Site Plan. Mr. Snyder explained that changes to the existing site would not constitute a need for an amended Site Plan, but changes to the field to the north would.

Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder if the Commission's consideration of this issue is premature, due to the pending decision from the Fire Marshall. Mr. Snyder stated that the decision is up to the Commission. Staff has made efforts to include both possible outcomes in the CUP. If no changes are needed to the site, then approval of the CUP at this time would expedite the transfer process for York Automotive.

<u>Jacob York,</u> applicant and part-owner of York Automotive, had no comments for the Commission. Chair Hirschi asked the applicant if he was aware of the concerns regarding the Fire Marshall's approval. Mr. York answered that he only knew this based on the agenda he was provided for the Planning Commission meeting, and that he has not taken steps to discuss the proposed use of the site with the Fire Marshall.

Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing at 7:30 pm. As there was no one with any questions or comments, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:30 pm.

Chair Hirschi stated that he is uncomfortable with the knowledge that this decision is being made with a forfeiture clause included; he would prefer to table the decision until they have received the necessary information from the Fire Marshall. Commissioner Johnson asked Lisa Romney, City Attorney, if the Commission should be viewing the CUP as completely separate from the Site Plan. Ms. Romney answered that the Fire Marshall approval is part of the CUP. While this is a complicated situation due to the non-conforming status of the vacant lot, Staff has framed the CUP so that it is possible to move forward if the Fire Marshall's approval is received without having to wait for another meeting.

Commissioner Daly asked if a review by the Fire Marshall is a requirement for all Conditional Use Permits, or just this specific one. Mr. Snyder answered that the Fire Marshall must approve all Site Plans and Conditional Use Permits. Commissioner Daly asked if this property had been reviewed previously. Mr. Snyder answered that no, it had not, due to the decision by the BOA to allow limited use on the vacant property. York Automotive currently operates on this site with a CUP, which was approved previously by the Fire Marshall. If the Fire Marshall returns with the same decision as was made previously, then the applicant can proceed. If the Fire Marshalls need to access and stage equipment on the north side of the building, in that vacant lot, then that would go against the allowed usage decided by the BOA, and the vacant lot would need to be brought to meet current City Codes. The CUP does state that if there are concerns from the Fire Marshall, the CUP is on hold until an Amended Site Plan is approved.

Chair Hirschi again stated that he is concerned with the phrasing of condition 7, as it does not speak to the fact that the CUP would be void if the Fire Marshall requires changes to the property to allow access by the Fire Department. Mr. Snyder clarified that it is not void if the applicant addresses any required changes with an Amended Site Plan.

Commissioner Daly said he is inclined not to table the decision on the CUP so as not to hold up the process for the applicant. Commissioners Wright and Helgesen agreed. Commissioner Helgesen suggested a change to the phrasing of condition 7 to address Chair Hirschi's concerns. Chair Hirschi proposed that the following be added to the condition: "including, if necessary, a Site Plan Amendment to comply with City Ordinances."

Mr. York asked Mr. Snyder if the process with the Fire Marshall had been started, and if everything was on hold until a decision had been made. Mr. Snyder suggested that Mr. York contact the Fire Marshall to obtain an estimated time frame.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the Conditional Use Permit for York Automotive, to be located at 825 South Frontage Road, with the following conditions. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. All applicable fees shall be paid
2. This Conditional Use Permit shall only apply to the space for York Automotive, located at 825 South Frontage Road, and terminates the use for 875 South Frontage Road (i.e. south building).
3. The display area shall be limited to the 12 parking stalls located west of the building.

4. York Automotive shall not occupy any parking stalls required for all other businesses located on site.
5. In addition to the 12 parking stalls for a display area, the use shall be required to have to provide and maintain a minimum of 21 stalls for the auto sales use.
6. The applicant shall verify with the City Engineer and the Public Works Director to create a BMP (Best Management Practice) to ensure EPA requirements for drainage of water from the washing of vehicles have been met, prior to issuance of a City Business License.
7. The applicant shall obtain approval of the South Davis Fire Marshall and address or fulfill any circumstances that are deemed necessary to comply with the applicable Fire Code, including, if necessary, a Site Plan Amendment to comply with City Ordinances.
8. If the applicant is required to change or modify the site in order to comply with other applicable regulations, such as the Fire Code, then the applicant shall submit an Amended Site Plan Application for review and approval by the Planning Commission.
9. All deliveries and transporting of vehicles shall occur during the listed regular business hours of the application, which is Monday thru Saturday, from 9:00 am to 6:00 pm.
10. As stated in the submittal, all cars shall be driven to the site individually and no transport truck shall be used.
11. All desired business signs shall obtain a sign permit approval from the City.

Reasons for the Action:

a) The Planning Commission finds that the applicant has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit [12.21.100(d)(1)].
b) The Planning Commission finds that the use of vehicle and equipment rental or sales is an allowed use within the commercial-very high zone upon issuance of a conditional use permit [12.36]
c) The Planning Commission finds that the use is consistent with the General Plan of Centerville City [12-430-1]
d) The Planning Commission finds that the request is a relocation of the same use on the site from the south to the north building.
e) The Planning Commission finds that the site continues to be a suitable candidate site for relocating the vehicle sales and repair from the south to the north building.
f) The Planning Commission finds that according to Section 12.22.080, Non-conforming Development that is consistent with the originally approved plan shall be deemed compliant with the current zoning ordinance.
g) The Planning Commissions finds that the Board of Adjustment's recognition of the use allowed for the north area of the property were narrowly defined to machinery and licensed vehicle parking.

h) The Planning Commission finds that in its review of the site plan submittal, that is required as part of the CUP application, York Automotive is not proposing any changes to the site that triggers correcting any site plan related non-conformities.

i) Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that approving with the CUP request conditioned upon using comparable conditions of the previous approval will not create additional issues that need to be mitigated and sufficient evidence has been shown to meet the review criteria for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

PUBLIC HEARING – MOTO UNITED POWERSPORTS, 940 & 950 NORTH 960 WEST - Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for a power-sports dealership and repair facility - Cameron Eggertz, Applicant

Staff reported that the Conceptual Site Plan is for automotive and power-sports sales and would include a dealership, display, office, and repair shop. This space is not currently owned by the applicant; it is an open site of two lots, which would need to be combined. There are no current occupants to the north or south of the lot. The applicant is interested in the space because of high visibility and ease of access from the freeway.

So far, the Conceptual Site Plan adequately addresses development standards: the proposed site is within required setbacks and the planned layout looks good. The applicant will need a more detailed landscaping plan that includes the required 1 tree every 25 feet along the frontage, which is a significant distance. Currently, up to 18% of the plan is landscaped, and only 10% is required. Zoning Code recommends xeriscaping or drought tolerant landscaping when possible, by a xeriscape experienced architect. Staff recommends that the applicant consider this for the east side of the property.

Most of the west side of the property has 20-feet deep landscaping in place and has building frontage. There is a potential parking lot on the southern half of the property, and the applicant has proposed a 6-foot fence on this half of the property. Staff recommends that the applicant consider something more aesthetically pleasing than the proposed block wall, and that the applicant maintain the sidewalks and landscaping to their current depth.

The parking was miscalculated on the Site Plan, so the applicant must resubmit the square footage by the area of use, rather than combined as it is currently. Currently, they have 10 spots more than their estimated need.

Special regulations for the zone require that buildings share an attractive visual quality with regards to elements such as material, color, screening, etc. Full architectural plans with detailed architectural renderings have not yet been submitted in order for Staff to judge that the visual qualities meet the requirements.

A CUP will be necessary for the sale of vehicles, but has not been included in the current application and will need to be considered in the future.

With regards to the economic impact on the area, which is an industrial zone, there are no neighbors to the north or south right now, and the freeway is to the east, so noise and circulation are not issues at this time. Concerns about these issues can be mitigated on the Final Site Plan.

Sufficient landscaping, ideally xeriscaping, attractive street frontage, sufficient screening for vehicles, and parking are the biggest concerns for this CUP.

Commissioner Hayman asked if the site being discussed was near the movie theater, and originally planned to be a restaurant or retail site. Cassie Younger, City Planner, explained that the applicant had looked at two sites, and this CUP is for the alternative site in a High-Industrial Zone, not the one in the Commercial-Very-High area, near the movie theater, that had been discussed previously.

Chair Hirschi asked what exists to the west of the site. Mr. Snyder answered that a software company occupies the lot to the west, as well as sales for Bluebird Bus Repair.

Camron Eggertz, applicant, informed the Commission that Moto United is open to discussing xeriscaping, and has used that style for landscaping at their headquarters located in St. George. With regards to the aesthetics of the building, Moto United is a high-end retailer, and plans to build high-end buildings.

Chair Hirschi inquired if sales would include ATVs, motorcycles, 4x4s. The applicant responded that all of these would be sold, including those by Honda, Suzuki, BRP, and one other brand that is still pending.

Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Eggertz what had caused the applicant to pursue this new site. Mr. Eggertz explained that they had secured a better deal on this site, and will also avoid the issues that the other site had presented, including the lack of gutters and hydrants, which will enable them to proceed with fewer delays.

Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. Seeing no one with any questions or comments, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the Commission had spent a good amount of time discussing the previous CUP for the applicant, and this new site seems like a much better fit for the company. Commissioner Wright agreed.

Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to accept the Conceptual Site Plan for Moto United Powersports, located at 940 & 950 North 950 West, with the following conditions. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. A final site plan application shall be submitted following the criteria found in Section 12.21.110(e)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. A Conditional Use Permit shall be submitted following the criteria found in Section 12.21.100 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. Architectural drawings shall be submitted with the final site plan indicating the exact material and color of the storage units. These plans must be prepared and stamped by a licensed architect and meet the Architectural Design Standards as found in Chapter 12.35 of the Zoning Ordinance
4. A complete landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect and follow the criteria found in Chapter 12.51 of the Zoning Ordinance. This plan shall be submitted with the final site plan and indicate the following: type and location of all vegetation, total calculations and percentages of landscaping vegetation, and irrigation plan. Preference is given to designs and plans with xeriscaping and drought tolerant species.
5. The final plans shall indicate the location and types of all signage, which follow the codes in 12.54.
6. Ensure all utility lines are noted on the Final Plan. All applicable Utility Provider Sheets shall be submitted as part of the final site plan application.
7. Applicant will need to provide a stand-alone storm drain easement for the Northeast corner of the lot; the developer will need to provide a legal description for easement with final site plan application
8. Public Utility Easements are to be vacated in the middle of the site.
9. Area (in square footage) per use of the property must be provided in order to specify parking calculations set out in Chapter 12.52.
10. Adequate fire safety measures and protections have been checked by South Davis Fire Department.

Reasons for the Action:

a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [Section 12.21.110(d) (2)].
b) The development appears to be consistent with the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan [12-480-3].
c) The Conceptual Site Plan that has been submitted depicts how the site could be appropriately developed and with some alteration could be designed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Industrial-High Zone and other relevant regulations, including a Conditional Use Permit, as discussed in the Planning Staff Report.

PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – ACCESSORY SETBACKS - The City Council has directed City Staff and the Planning Commission to consider amending the current zoning text to increase accessory building setbacks in R-L, R-M, and R-H Zones

Staff reported that this proposal is solely for residential zones, but may be revisited later for agricultural zones. Mr. Snyder explained that each lot is required to have a minimum 2000 square foot build pad for the home. The main use building is eligible for 35-feet heights, typically allowed in residential areas. Typical setbacks in an R-L Zone are 8 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other, 25 feet for the front, and 20 feet for the rear. Accessory buildings are required to be at least 6 feet behind the home, have a lower height requirement, and must be a minimum of 3 feet from the side and rear lot lines. Accessory buildings over 200 square feet and less than 5 feet from the lot line require a 1-hour firewall.

The current standard for measuring the height of accessory buildings is to measure from the mid-point of the roof, which is halfway between the eave and the peak, then down to the grade. The maximum allowed height for accessory buildings is 20 feet. Staff is hesitant to pursue changes to this requirement, so as to not limit design options with regards to roof pitch of an accessory building.

Mr. Snyder discussed an accessory building that started the discussion of setbacks, at Porter Lane and Main Street, which was in compliance with required setbacks, being 14 feet from the south property and 6 feet from the west property line. However, the owner of the neighboring property is unhappy with the height of this structure, even though it is just under the allowed 20-foot height.

The proposed change for required setbacks is to increase the required distance from the property line to 5 feet for structures over 200 square feet and up to 400 square feet, and increase the required distance to 8 feet for structures over 400 square feet. The Building Code does exclude buildings under 200 square feet, so the required setback for these structures will remain at 3 feet.

Mr. Snyder expressed his desire to maintain simplicity of Building Codes, so as to keep from overwhelming citizens with too many and too complicated requirements.

Chair Hirschi expressed his concern that owners of older structures, which may be closer to the property line than currently allowed, would hesitate to improve or rehabilitate these older buildings, as they would then have to conform to these new standards. Mr. Snyder agreed, and said this would also cause problems for those wanting to build additions to their current accessory buildings. Chair Hirschi explained that the two choices for these situations would be to go to the Board of Adjustment to seek an exception or to comply with the new Ordinance, which would cause additional burdens on the members of the BOA. His biggest concern is that, rather than seeking one of these options, the owners would simply decide not to take action and let their building decline.

Mr. Snyder explained that the goal of implementing these new Ordinances is to eventually have all structures in conformance of this new rule. Current code states that non-conforming structures can go to the BOA and must meet three requirements in order to be allowable:

- Must be compatible with the adjoining property
- Must not be detrimental to the community
- Must not have an effect on traffic, value of adjacent property, adequate utility and services

Mr. Snyder's concern is that almost all expansions to non-conforming structures will meet these three requirements, so the City will not meet the goal of eventually having all structures in conformance with this new Ordinance, but only new structures.

Commissioner Hayman said that it seems as if the suggested changes are based on the assumption that everyone will build their accessory buildings to their maximum allowed height, and asked if it is possible to instead determine the setback using a sliding scale based on the height of the structure, to allow buildings with a lower height to be closer to the property line and require structures with a taller height to be further from the property line. Mr. Snyder acknowledged that this is a creative solution, and it is possible to investigate this option. However, the downside of this suggestion is the difficulty of implementation and the complexity involved. Commissioner Hayman agreed that simplicity is ideal, but stated that, if the main concern is the height of the building, then perhaps a compromise can be reached. Mr. Snyder expressed the willingness of Staff to revisit the issue and brainstorm other possibilities, if the Commission wishes it.

Commissioner Wright stated that she is hesitant to support the suggested changes when one of the biggest contributors for the requested change is the shadow created by tall buildings, and would like to give property owners the choice to avoid this issue and avoid impacting the neighbor by building a shorter building with a smaller required setback. Mr. Snyder explained that this would be ineffectual for homes with smaller lots, on which the homes are built to the minimum setbacks, which could result in a structure with a height of 35 feet right at the 8-foot setback on the side yard. However, the area on the rear could benefit from the suggestion of a sliding scale. Chair Hirschi stated that most people have differing expectations for backyards as opposed to side-yards, and expect to be able to make their own decisions as to what is allowed.

Commissioner Johnson suggested another alternative, similar to that of Commissioner Hayman, where, instead of setting a minimum setback, the City instead sets an allowed angle from the property line to the roof, whether it be the peak or mid-point or another feature. Commissioner Hayman added that this would also address Mr. Snyder's concern and still allow for flexibility of design for the building, including pitch. Mr. Snyder said this is an option, though it is more complicated. Commissioner Wright argued that this would be more complicated to start with, but would simplify the Code itself. Commissioner Johnson agreed, since this would eliminate the need for a table and instead replace the requirement with a simple value.

Mr. Snyder stated Staff's willingness to investigate this option, but said this would likely only address new buildings, and would potentially still cause issues for existing buildings, as Chair Hirschi mentioned earlier. Chair Hirschi believes that this alternative approach would cover many of the older, existing buildings and allow them to remain. Commissioner Hayman suggested that Staff investigate existing buildings to determine what measurements they have, as more evidence of this being an appropriate approach.

If this matter is tabled by the Commission with the foregoing directives, Mr. Snyder will conduct further investigations, and will be doing so with the intent of preserving the option to maximize the opportunity for accessory buildings in the build area.

Ms. Romney added that, since the Commission seems inclined to table the decision, she would like to add Public Utility Easements to the considerations for this change. Currently, City Code requires Public Utility Easements on three sides of the lot: 10 feet in the front, and 7 feet on two sides or one side and the rear, and buildings are not allowed in the PUE. She would like to add a statement to this proposed change to reinforce that buildings cannot be placed in a PUE without approval, and any buildings that are placed in a PUE must be moved at the owner's expense, should the utility company ever require access.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to table the decision regarding the current zoning text to increase accessory building setbacks in R-L, R-M, and R-H Zones, pending further investigation into determining required setbacks based on the angle of the building to the property line, as well as adding a disclaimer with regards to Public Utility Easements. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Items scheduled for January 25, 2017:
   - C. Johnson Conceptual Subdivision & Southeast Neighborhood Plan Amendments
   - Southeast Neighborhood Plan Amendments

Commissioner Hayman asked Mr. Snyder about the work session at the start of 2016, in which the Commission set several goals for the year, and the status of the goal to move some of the administrative decisions to Staff to enable the Commission to plan more effectively. Mr. Snyder explained that it was first necessary to rewrite the Subdivision Ordinance, which is being worked on by Ms. Romney. These changes will partially address some of these concerns. However, Staff has not yet addressed the changes to Site Plan and Conditional Use processes, and whether or not these can be handled by the Development Review Committee.

Chair Hirschi would like to investigate whether the process for Public Hearings, such as those for administrative decisions, could be improved. Mr. Snyder suggested a work session to discuss the circumstances in which a public hearing is necessary or unnecessary. Commissioner Wright added that some public hearings for administrative decisions seem unnecessary, as the Commission is limited in how it can use public input in the decision-making process. Mr. Snyder agreed and explained that, between the APA (American Planning Association, Utah Chapter) and Utah League of Cities and Towns, most are moving away from public hearings for administrative decisions. Commissioner Hayman expressed that public hearings can be valuable, and referenced by way of example the December Planning Commission Meeting, in which a neighbor spoke during a public hearing and provided many helpful and relevant comments and suggestions.

Mr. Snyder committed to meeting with the DRC to determine how to handle some administrative issues without putting them before the Planning Commission.

Chair Hirschi inquired about the new fence on the west side of the cemetery. Mr. Snyder explained that the City Council is currently investigating how to maximize use of the existing cemetery, which would require some retaining and filling of the west side, to add some additional burial plots. Ms. Romney added that the issue was discussed briefly at the last City Council meeting, and the engineer is working on some calculations to make sure the process is financially feasible.

Ms. Romney informed the Commission that, at an upcoming meeting, she will be bringing suggested edits for the Subdivision Ordinance for approval by the Commission in order to make it available online. However, the Subdivision Ordinance is currently being completely redrafted by a consultant and these major changes will not be included in the interim amendments.

CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS REPORT

Mr. Snyder reported to the Commissioners recent actions taken by the City Council:

- **January 3, 2017:** Final Plans for the Ray Subdivision
  Motion: Approved

Commissioner Helgesen informed the Commission that she will not be present for the March 8 meeting. Commissioner Wright reminded the Commission that she will be absent for all meetings in March. Commissioner Daly informed the Commission that he will be absent for the February 22 meeting.

Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** to adjourn. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

David Hirschi, Chair

1-25-2017
Date Approved

Emily Hatch, Recording Secretary

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

7:00 p.m.

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS**
Ben & Jake York	875 S. Frontage Road Centerville
Curtis Bingham	

** Your address will be used only in the event the City staff needs to contact you pertaining to an issue discussed in the Planning Commission meeting.