

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

3 **7:00 p.m.**

4
5 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville,
6 Utah, the meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Cheylynn Hayman, Vice Chair

10 Gina Hirst

11 Kevin Daly

12 Logan Johnson

13 Kathy Helgesen

14
15 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

16 David Hirschi, Chair

17 Becki Wright

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

21 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

22 Cassie Younger, City Planner

23 Luanne Hudson, Recording Secretary

24
25 **VISITORS**

26 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

27
28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29
30 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Helgesen

31
32 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

33
34 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held February 22, 2017 were reviewed
35 and amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The
36 motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hayman and passed unanimously (5-0).

37
38 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held March 8, 2017 were reviewed,
39 amended, and found incomplete. Commissioner Hirst requested Recording Secretary Hudson to
40 compare the minutes with the audio recording and provide a revision. Vice Chair Hayman made
41 a **motion** to table the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daly and passed
42 unanimously (5-0).

43
44 **PUBLIC HEARING - FINAL SITE PLAN & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, 347 North**
45 **400 East, Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Final Site Plan and Conditional**
46 **Use Permit for Canyon Point, a multi-family residential project consisting of one single**
47 **family home, one duplex, and one triplex. Chad Morris, Applicant**

48
49 City Planner Cassie Younger gave a staff report on Canyon Point, a multi-family
50 residential development seeking approval of a Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit. The

1 development includes one existing home, a duplex and a triplex. Ms. Younger said the Planning
2 Commission previously approved the Conceptual Site Plan in December 2016 and provided the
3 applicant with a clear list of conditions. She said the road has been widened to meet concerns
4 from the Fire Marshal. Staff reminded the applicant that he qualifies for incentives because the
5 site is located in the Deuel Creek Historic District. Staff said the landscaping plan, especially the
6 trees to buffer the existing single-family homes to the south, is adequate. Staff reminded the
7 applicant that the City's code requires plant materials be drought tolerant and low maintenance,
8 and specifically noted that Kentucky Bluegrass does not meet code.

9
10 Staff said the biggest concern with this site plan is with drainage and utilities that will
11 require a sign-off by the City Engineer. Staff noted the plans include a detention pond, berms
12 and bio-swales along the west side. Staff said a new sewer line is required at the south end of the
13 property and expressed a final concern about overhead telephone lines that must be addressed as
14 a condition of the conceptual plan. Staff noted the applicant has addressed buffering on the north
15 side by the use of a six-foot privacy fence and landscaping. Staff noted there does not appear to
16 be an issue with the retaining wall in the new plan and recommends this application be approved
17 with conditions.

18
19 Vice Chair Hayman invited the applicant to speak. Chad Morris addressed the issue with
20 the retaining wall and received clarification from Director Snyder that any retaining wall shorter
21 than four feet does not need to be structurally engineered. He said he did not realize Kentucky
22 Bluegrass was not allowed and said he is willing to look into an alternative grass that is drought
23 tolerant. He said he accepts the City's suggestions on the height and type of trees. He said he
24 acted on the Commission's recommendation to speak with the adjacent homeowners and what he
25 heard is a concern about tree overhang, and they will be responsive to that concern. Responding
26 to a question from Commissioner Daly regarding the sewer line, Mr. Morris said he talked with
27 the Sewer District representative and their plans to discontinue use of the shared line with the
28 property to the south are reflected in the revised drawings provided to the Commission.

29
30 At 7:35 p.m. Vice Chair Hayman opened the public hearing.

31
32 Tim Wilson lives west of the proposed development and asked for clarification regarding
33 the addition of a fence or trees along that side, adding his wife asked him to plant trees for
34 privacy if the developer does not. Staff said the the west edge contains the detention pond. Mr.
35 Wilson again asked if that included any kind of privacy fencing. Staff said the plan does not
36 show any proposed fence and asked the applicant to address that. Vice Chair Hayman asked the
37 applicant to again come to the microphone to address that question and Chad Morris said, in
38 summary, he did not think a fence or trees were necessary, but he would do what the
39 Commission recommended.

40
41 Linda Martin lives to the south of the proposed development. She asked for the City's
42 assistance is resolving fence line disputes that have gone on for decades. She asked how far
43 from the property line trees would be planted, noting Building One is only ten feet from her
44 property. She specifically stated she did not want branches overhanging her property, but she
45 did want the developer to provide privacy trees to block her rear windows. She also expressed a
46 concern about trees being placed in the parking strip along 400 East that would block visibility.
47 She asked that the applicant address the issue of the existing driveway and dirt mound on the
48 south side of the existing single-family home because it drains onto her property. She expressed
49 a concern that the existing single family zone would be exposed to rental tenants. Ms. Martin

1 expressed additional concerns about the sewer line, wildlife, construction noise and hours, and
2 the installation of a temporary construction fence.

3
4 Charles Madsen, a homeowner on the north, thanked the City for requiring the developer
5 to put up a six-foot fence along the northern edge of the development to address their concerns
6 about privacy and noise. He asked for clarification on whether the fence goes all the way to the
7 sidewalk, saying if not, school children may cut across his property to get to school. Staff
8 reviewed the parameters for the use of fencing and said the six-foot fence stops 25 feet from 400
9 East.

10
11 Director Snyder responded to many of the issues and questions raised in the public
12 hearing. In answer to the question about the placement of the trees, he said there is a ten-foot
13 separation between the property line and the structure. Trees will be planted in the middle (five
14 feet) and this complies with the City's requirements for buffer landscaping. He said the
15 developer has agreed to put in a type of tree that will have limited overhang. Regarding tree
16 placement between the sidewalk and the road, Mr. Snyder said that is a controversial issue for
17 the City because of the concern for visibility and clearance to see on-coming traffic. The current
18 ordinance allows trees in the parking strip with a permit from the Public Works Director. Mr
19 Snyder predicted that the Public Works Director would advise the developer to put the trees
20 behind the sidewalk.

21
22 In answer to the question about the existing driveway on the north side of the existing
23 home, Mr. Snyder said the developer will relocate the driveway but is not required to remove the
24 mound of dirt. The City Engineer will sign-off on the drainage plan. He said the City's Best
25 Management Practices (BMPs) will address the issue of the temporary construction fence. In
26 answer to the question about the existing retaining wall, Mr. Snyder said he consulted with the
27 Public Works Director and the City Engineer and determined it is a non-structural, ornamental,
28 decorative wall that is not required to carry load weights under the City's ordinances. He added
29 that since the utilities will be located in that area, there are still some design considerations that
30 need to be finalized. He said the questions regarding the sewer line have been adequately
31 addressed by working with the Sewer District. He said the City's current ordinances regarding
32 construction activities and noise are adequate to address the concerns.

33
34 Vice Chair Hayman asked Staff about Ms. Martin's desire for a buffer between single-
35 family homes and rentals. Mr. Snyder said that may run afoul of the Federal Fair Housing Act,
36 but the developer is using elements like trees and fences to provide a transition.

37
38 Vice Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 7:54 p.m.

39
40 Vice Chair Hayman invited the applicant to respond to the public comments. Chad
41 Morris said they have presented a good plan with nice, new homes that will look good and be an
42 upgrade to the neighborhood. He plans to request subdivision approval in the future in order to
43 facilitate selling the units to homeowners rather than renting. He said they are willing to work
44 with the City in terms of architectural design and the façade of the homes. He described their
45 extra efforts in terms of landscaping to meet the concerns of adjacent homeowners and the City
46 and to make it appealing to the eye.

47
48 Vice Chair Hayman asked for other questions or discussion. Hearing none, the Vice
49 Chair entertained a motion, noting the application had two parts: a Final Site Plan and a CUP.

Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the Final Site Plan for Canyon Point in Centerville, located at 347 North 400 East, with the Conditions as amended (1-14) and the Reasons for the Action (a-c). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Helgesen and passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide evidence of lot line adjustment for acquisition of additional property from Parcel No. 02-099-0033 prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
2. Provide evidence of combining all parcels and acquired acreage into one parcel prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
3. Must obtain CUP for density prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
4. Applicant shall have a ground water assessment prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
5. Applicant shall provide the legal description and signed PUEs for all required front, side and rear yard PUEs prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
6. Applicant shall provide legal description and signed waterline easement for City culinary waterline prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
7. Access to the existing house and the new driveway pad behind the house shall be provided or shown on the plans in accordance with applicable building and zoning codes prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
8. Landscaping area percentages needs to be recalculated to portray the accurate calculation. Planting materials should be reconsidered to address the needs of the code, and be approved by Staff at the time of Building Permit review.
9. The City Engineer needs to give final approval on issues regarding drainage, structural and retaining walls on the property.
10. The overhead telephone line needs to be addressed or relocated.
11. An amended letter from the South Davis Sewer District with respect to the new sewer line hookups and the existing line connected to the single family home shall be provided prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
12. Parking and road widths shall be subject to the conditions of the Fire Marshal: The fire apparatus Turn-Around Lane must be marked with "No Parking Fire Lane" signs. The access road shall be at 29' of width where there is side parking – 24' feet where there is no parking. The Fire Turn-Around Lane shall have a minimum of 20' clearance.
13. Remove existing sheds located on the property prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
14. Submit further details and design of proposed fencing to be approved by Staff prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

- a) The Final site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [CZC 12.21.110(e)(2)].
- b) The development appears to satisfy the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan [CZC 12.480.2(1)(b)].
- c) The proposed final site plan, with the directives given, appears to be capable of meeting applicable Development Standards for the R-M Zone.

Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 6 residential units for Canyon Point in Centerville, located at 347

North 400 East, with the Conditions (1-4) and Reasons for the Action (a-d). Vice Chair Hayman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:

1. This Conditional Use Permit shall allow for the density of 8 units per acre on the property located at 347 North 400 East, which consists of .78 acres and is limited to 6 residential units, divided between 3 buildings: a single family home, one duplex, and one triplex.
2. The Conditional Use Permit is dependent on the acceptance of the Final Site Plan layout and design as approved.
3. A solid fence shall be constructed on the south property line along with increased vegetation shown on the site plan, consisting of trees which shall mitigate a multi-family use adjacent to a single-family residential use.
4. Proper drainage shall be identified and approved by the City Engineer, which shall consist of a berm and drainage swell along the south and west property lines and a storm drain outlet within the drainage swell.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

- a) A Conditional Use Permit is required for a single-family dwelling and any multi-family above four units per acre (CZC 12.36 (Table of Uses))
- b) The applicant has provided sufficient evidence for a conditional use permit to be reviewed by the Planning Commission (CZC 12.21.100).
- c) The project was found to have somewhat of a negative impact on the property to the south, yet may be mitigated through proper screening (CZC 12.21.100(e)(5)(C)(E)).
- d) The Zoning Ordinance allows up to 8 units per acre with a conditional use permit within the R-M Zone (CZC 12.32 (Residential Zones)).

PUBLIC HEARING CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN - 149 WEST 1850 NORTH, Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for an accessory building and driveway access. Terry and Selene Bleak, Applicant

Director Snyder explained the Bleak's application to construct a new garage at their residence and use an adjacent dead-end street stub to install a driveway. The Bleaks acquired an un-platted parcel of land adjacent to their subdivision lot and combined the land into a single parcel, as allowed by State law. However, the added parcel remains outside of the platted subdivision boundary. According to CZC 12.21.110(c)(2), "any residential development outside a platted subdivision" is required to obtain a Site Plan Review from the Planning Commission. Staff recommended this application be approved with conditions.

The property owners who live on the other side of the street stub want to join with the Bleaks in constructing the driveway in order to provide access for possible future use. Mr. Snyder said this project would require minimal services as the applicant is not extending water or sewer lines.

Staff is concerned about water runoff, drainage and the associated storm drain impact of the proposed hard surface driveway. Director Snyder said the City is reviewing the application to confirm that typical utility easements are in place and to assess applicable development impact fees. He explained the big issue is access to the parcel because no temporary turn around for the stub street was provided or installed during the construction of the original subdivision. He

1 explained this application requires more than one approval and permitting. The Planning
2 Commission will make the decision regarding the site plan. The Public Works Director and the
3 City Council will make the decision on the proposed access from the stub street, including an
4 encroachment agreement. An excavation permit will also be required for improvements within
5 the public right-of-way. Mr. Snyder said that, although the applicant could use a seven-foot side
6 yard setback, he recommended the new eight-foot setback, as approved in a recent code update.

7
8 Vice Chair Hayman asked for questions on the staff report and hearing none, invited the
9 applicant to speak.

10
11 Terry Bleak said he appreciates and will comply with the City's suggestion for an eight-
12 foot side yard setback. The applicant said their plans also take into consideration the fact that, in
13 the future, the stub road to the back may be extended to facilitate further development. Their
14 plans show a 40' setback from the rear of the property.

15
16 At 8:20 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

17
18 Vice Chair Hayman said this application is a good example of the type of administrative
19 decision that could be shifted to the City's very capable staff rather than coming before the
20 Planning Commission. She asked for a motion.

21
22 Commissioner Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the
23 conceptual site plan for the proposed residential development for an un-platted parcel that has
24 been combined with the home located at 149 West 1850 North, with the Conditions as amended
25 (1-8) and the Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion and it
26 passed unanimously (5-0).

27
28 **CONDITIONS:**

- 29 1. The applicant must submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in
30 CZC 12-21-110(e).
31 2. As part of Final Site Plan submittal, the owners are to prepare the required legal
32 descriptions for one 7' side yard and one 7' rear yard public utility easement(s). Such
33 easement descriptions are to be reviewed by the City Engineer and deemed acceptable.
34 Such easements must be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis
35 County Recorder's Office prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory
36 structure.
37 3. The final site plan must show all utilities being provided to the site and the accessory
38 structure and owners must obtain and submit to the City the necessary "will serve" letters
39 from any of the applicable utility providers.
40 4. As part of the Final Site Plan submittal, a grading and drainage plan is to be prepared and
41 submitted with the application. Such plan is to be deemed acceptable by the City
42 Engineer.
43 5. The owners will also be required to pay any development fees that may be applicable for
44 the development of this lot prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory
45 structure.
46 6. As part of any Final Site Plan approval, the owners desiring to use the end of the street
47 for access will be required to obtain City approval for such access, enter into any required
48 agreement for access, dedicate the required temporary turn-around easement, and prepare

plans for the constructing any access drive. The temporary turn-around easement must be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis County Recorder's Office prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory structure.

7. The owners shall submit with Final Site Plan submittal revised plans showing the proposed temporary turn-around and access plans for use of the public right-of-way.

8. The applicant is encouraged to consider compliance with the new minimum setback of 8 feet on the west side to avoid future non-conforming issues due to the newly adopted accessory building setbacks standards of March 2017.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

a. The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [CZC 12.21.110(d)(2)].

b. Applicable utility services and easements are required for residential development [CZC 12.21.110(e)(2)(iii)(d) and CMC 15-5-106(8)].

c. A final site plan application is required for completing the process to obtain approval to construct an accessory dwelling on un-platted parcels [CZC 12.21.110(e)].

PUBLIC HEARING - CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN, 25 W PARRISH LANE, Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for a drive-thru style Pizza Hut. Richard Hill, Applicant

City Planner Cassie Younger provided the staff report on the Conceptual Site Plan for a Pizza Hut Express Drive-Thru. She said the site is at the corner of Parrish and Main Street and has been vacant for just under a year. Because of the change of use from a specialty shop (Galaxy Frozen Yogurt) to fast food (Pizza Hut Express Drive Thru), UDOT required a site study to reevaluate access to the site and adjusting entrances and exits. The applicant has made changes to the access of the site and is awaiting an approval from UDOT. Ms. Younger said the applicant will also need a Conditional Use Permit because of the categorical use change. She said although the site falls within the Parrish Lane Gateway Area and the South Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone, the site itself is a nonconforming site. She said the biggest diversion from the design guidelines is the nonconforming setbacks. She wants to amend the existing conditions to require a new traffic study using the new access points instead of the old ones. Staff recommended this application be approved with conditions.

Staff said the proposed new architecture is an improvement, featuring brick, gables, and big windows. Staff recommended upgrading the look of the drive-thru portico. Staff also recommends improved landscaping due to the site's high visibility on the corner of Main and Parrish. She emphasized the need for buffering and screening on the west adjacent to Grease Monkey and on the south adjacent to an apartment complex.

Commissioner Daly asked for clarification on the requirements for the previous user classified as specialty retail (yogurt) and the new user classified as fast food (pizza), saying it appeared to be a change of use from food to food. Director Snyder responded that, as Zoning Administrator, he wrote an interpretive administrative opinion on how the ordinance applies to the two different types of uses, and he will forward that opinion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification on how a new traffic study would impact approval. Mr. Snyder said in approving a CUP, the City needs to evaluate circulation capacity

1 and traffic flow through the intersection, for example, to see if a median is required for this auto-
2 centric fast food location.

3
4 Vice Chair Hayman asked if the Commission could encourage the applicant to follow
5 some of the Parrish Lane and Main Street design guidelines and invited the applicant to speak.

6
7 Richard Hill is an attorney with the law firm of Durham, Jones & Pinegar and represents
8 Wasatch Valley Pizza, the Utah franchisee for Pizza Hut. He believes UDOT will approve the
9 conceptual site plan. He said the drive-thru portico will be substantially upgraded and there will
10 be only one ingress/egress on Main Street and the other access off of Main Street will be closed
11 to meet UDOT requirements. He said they will be happy to upgrade landscaping and clarified
12 their plan to leave the existing six-foot white vinyl fence to the west.

13
14 At 8:46 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

15
16 Commissioner Johnson asked Director Snyder for options in the event the Commission
17 disagreed with the opinion of the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Snyder said yes. The Commission
18 could request another interpretation and then submit an appeal of that interpretation to the Board
19 of Adjustment within 14 days. Mr. Snyder again stated he would provide a copy of the
20 interpretive administrative opinion to the Commissioners.

21
22 Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to approve the
23 Conceptual Site Plan for Pizza Hut Centerville, located at 25 W Parrish Lane, with the
24 Conditions as amended (1-7) and Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Hirst seconded
25 the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

26
27 **CONDITIONS:**

- 28 1. A Final Site plan application must be submitted in accordance with CZC 12.21.110(e)(2).
29 2. A Conditional Use Permit application must be submitted in accordance with CZC
30 12.21.100.
31 3. Consider how to further utilize the landscaping and screening expectations under CZC
32 12.51 (Landscaping), with consideration of recommendations from staff.
33 4. The applicant must provide written permission from UDOT that their change in access
34 from Parrish and Main is adequate.
35 5. A development schedule must be submitted with the Final Site Plan.
36 6. All proposed drainage and utilities should be reviewed and deemed by a City Engineer
37 for the Final Site Plan.
38 7. A new traffic study must be provided by the applicant updating and re-evaluating the new
39 access points instead of the old ones.

40
41 **SUGGESTED REASONS FOR THE ACTION:**

- 42 a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be
43 developed [CZC 12.21.110(d)(2)].
44 b) The development appears to satisfy, or be able to satisfy, the goals and objectives found
45 within the Centerville City General Plan [Section 12-430-2]
46 c) The proposed site has a nonconforming status, due to the change of tenant but not
47 occupancy status, as established in [CZC 12.22.080(b)]
48

PUBLIC HEARING - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, LEGISLATIVE DECISION,
Consider a proposed amendment to the General Plan, Chapter 12-480-2 Neighborhood 1,
Southwest Centerville, Section 2, to allow residential uses in the Pages Lane Commercial
District. Winegar Brothers and Brighton Homes, LLC, Applicant

Director Snyder presented the staff report on the petitioner's request to amend the General Plan text of the Pages Lane Commercial Area of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan. The petitioner wants to obtain Residential-Medium (R-M) zoning and develop up to eight (8) dwelling units per acre. Mr. Snyder said, unfortunately, this is not a good time to entertain this petition due to planning initiatives already underway. Since late 2016, the City has been reevaluating the specific plan for this neighborhood. He said the Planning Commission will need to decide whether to consider this petition in advance of the City's current reevaluation. Staff recommends this petition be denied.

Vice Chair Hayman invited the petitioner to speak.

Taylor Spendlove of Brighton Homes said their objective is to obtain all the property east of Deseret Industries and request a zoning change to Residential-Medium (R-M). He said they already have three parcels under contract and are close to getting the fourth. He said it has taken over two years to get these parcels under contract and a delay in a decision from the Planning Commission will negatively impact this potential project. He asked the Planning Commission to table their decision to give Brighton Homes time to return with a more complete visual concept of their proposal.

At 8:58 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

Vice Chair Hayman invited discussion, saying she does not think commercial works in the area, but she is interested in the developer's proposal.

Commissioner Daly said he wants fuller discussion about whether this area is right for residential or commercial uses and whether the area should be divided for development as east and west parcels. He said another reason to wait is because there are actually five parcels, and so while the Petitioner has tied up three of the parcels, approval now may result in piecemeal development.

Commissioner Helgesen expressed a desire not to rush but to wait for the City Council's direction and consensus.

Commissioner Hirst said this is an opportunity to take a large parcel of land and plan a great development, and also that the public should be invited into the process. Commissioner Hirst said, based on the discussion at the work session with the City Council on March 21, the decision should not be rushed by market conditions and encouraged public participation before a decision is made. She recalled the planning process for development of the west side and suggested a community survey.

Director Snyder said one option is to hold a charrette or visioning process to discuss design standards and whether the site is best for residential, commercial, or something else entirely. He says the City has talked about this for three or four years and recommends staying true to the larger picture process.

Commissioner Johnson expressed his opinion that he sees land use planning creeping towards property owners being able to do less and have less discretion over their property. He said it is incredible that the developer has these parcels under contract and this opportunity may not come again.

Several Commissioners noted that it may be best to wait until more input could be gathered from the public and a consensus developed between the City Council and the Planning Commission.

Seeing a man who wanted to make a public comment, Vice Chair Hayman asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing at 9:18 p.m. Commissioner Daly made the **motion** and Commissioner Johnson seconded it.

The man introduced himself as Scott from Colonial Ace Hardware located in the Pages Lane Commercial Area. He said he wanted to challenge the notion that the location was not good for commercial use. He said Ace Hardware has a 25 year lease and it is a good retail area. He said he has doubled the profits in the last three years. He speculated that Deseret Industries may not stay at the current location. He agreed with the Commission's plan to get public input and referred to recent public pushback over homeless shelters in Salt Lake City.

Vice Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 9:21 p.m. She said while she is sensitive to Commissioner Johnson's comments, she is inclined to deny the petition until such time as public comment is sought.

Commissioner Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend that the General Plan Amendments to the Pages Lane Commercial Area, as proposed by the Petitioner, be denied based on the Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that a decision to amend the General Plan is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC 12.21.060(a).
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the City is currently underway in a larger effort to reconsider the future land use planning for the Southeast Neighborhood Plan that already includes reevaluating the Pages Lane Commercial Area.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that further evaluation efforts are needed to determine if it's appropriate to allow for a broad neighborhood plan language change, as proposed by the petitioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Upcoming for the April 12th:

- Arcoiris Reception Center CUP
- Ronin Motors CUP
- Chitsoe Johnson Preliminary Subdivision

CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS REPORT

- Accessory Building Setbacks
- SE Neighborhood Residential Plan


- Parrish Creek PDO
- Legacy Commons PDO

Vice Chair Hayman made a **motion** to adjourn. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0). The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.


Vice Chair Cheylynn Hayman

4-12-2017
Date Approved


Luanne Hudson, Recording Secretary



CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, March 22, 2017
7:00 p.m.

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS**

KAREN ASKLE
Terry & Selene Bleak
Kathy Goodfellow / Mary Tullius
Steve & Kathryn Penrose
Tim & Chris Wilson
Chuck & Conni Madsen
Linda Martini
Ernie & Peggy Strong
Fred Hale
Taylor SPENDLOVE
Matt & Holly Reynolds
Shirley Smoot
Loni Bothell

Askle

Centerville

Centerville

Centerville

Centerville

** 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.