

1  
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

3 **Wednesday, June 10, 2015**

4 **7:00 p.m.**

5  
6 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville,  
7 Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.  
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

10 Cheylynn Hayman  
11 David Hirschi, Chair  
12 Gina Hirst  
13 William Ince  
14 Logan Johnson  
15 Scott Kjar  
16 Kevin Merrill  
17

18 **COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT**

19 Ken Averett  
20 Tamilyn Fillmore  
21 Stephanie Ivie  
22

23 **STAFF PRESENT**

24 Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director  
25 Lisa Romney, City Attorney  
26 Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary  
27

28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29  
30 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Merrill

31  
32 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

33  
34 The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held May 27, 2015 were reviewed and  
35 amended. Commissioner Ince made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion  
36 was seconded by Commissioner Hirst and passed by unanimous vote (6-0). Commissioner  
37 Merrill abstained from voting as he was not present at this meeting.  
38

39 **PUBLIC HEARING | ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, CHAPTER 12-36,**  
40 **TABLE OF USES ALLOWED - Consider proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment for**  
41 **Chapter 12-36-Table of Uses Allowed, to allow flag lots in the R-M (Residential-Medium)**  
42 **Zone. Todd Huffaker, Liahona One, LLC, Applicant**  
43

1        Brandon Toponce, Assistant Planner, reported the Planning Commission previously  
2        accepted a conceptual site plan for a duplex on a remaining parcel of the Huffaker Dental Office  
3        property. After further review it appears the best option for development of this property would  
4        be a flag lot scenario, as it would be more harmonious with surrounding uses. Currently, flag lots  
5        are not allowed in the R-M Zone. The proposed application requests approval of flag lots within  
6        the R-M Zone. The applicant is not requesting any changes to the flag lot ordinance itself, all  
7        flag lot requirements would be applicable as currently stated. Flag lots are used as a last resort  
8        for development on a parcel that is not otherwise buildable or where other conventional zoning  
9        would not work on the lot. All proposed flag lots within existing R-M Zones, or future R-M  
10       Zones, would be reviewed by the Planning Commission for compliance to all applicable City  
11       codes. Mr. Toponce explained the proposed application is consistent with the General Plan as it  
12       provides additional housing options and provides development opportunity for underutilized  
13       property. If approved the applicant will apply for a rezone of the remaining parcel from  
14       commercial to R-M and will also be required to apply for a small subdivision waiver.

15  
16       Chair Hirschi questioned why flag lots were not allowed in the R-M Zone when the flag  
17       lot ordinance was originally passed. Commissioner Hayman asked how other cities treat flag  
18       lots. She also questioned if flag lots could be dealt with on a case by case basis. Commissioner  
19       Johnson questioned how it is determined that the flag lot scenario is a last resort option.

20  
21       Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, explained the flag lot ordinance is  
22       fairly new and the City felt a cautious approach was best. Therefore, it was approved in the  
23       Residential-Low Zone only with the thinking that it could be expanded as future needs dictated.  
24       He said most cities allow some type of flag lot ordinances but explained flag lot ordinances are  
25       generally customized to fit a particular city's own unique circumstances. He said if the flag lot  
26       ordinance is expanded to the R-M Zone then all properties within that zone will be allowed to  
27       use the ordinance. It would be discriminatory to only allow on a case by case basis. Mr. Snyder  
28       explained a property is studied during the application process to determine if the flag lot is the  
29       best and last resort for development. A flag lot application is reviewed by both staff and the  
30       Planning Commission. He also explained there are currently very few properties within the R-M  
31       Zone that would fit the possibility of a flag lot.

32  
33       Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to comment; he closed  
34       the public hearing.

Commissioner Merrill made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council, the amendments to Chapter 12-36, Table of Uses Allowed, as follows:

| Residential Uses                 | A-L | A-M | R-L | R-M | R-H | All PF Zones | C-M | C-H | C-VH | I-M | I-H |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Flag Lot Subdivision Development | N   | N   | P   | P   | N   | N            | N   | N   | N    | N   | N   |

***Reasons for the Action (Findings):***

1. The change is consistent to the General Plan, Section 12-420-3(2), identifying optimum locations for residential development and Section 12-490(6-D), which supports flag lots on un-utilized properties.
2. Under review by the Planning Commission, a property owner would be allowed to maximize the use of their property.
3. All flag lots within an R-M Zone would be required to adhere to all applicable guidelines found in Chapter 12-36, and 12-32 of the Zoning Ordinance and Sections 15-5-102(9) and 15-2-107 of the Subdivision Ordinance.
4. Through previous approvals, the Flag Lot Ordinance has been proven efficient in developing un-utilized land and addressing negative impacts on surrounding properties.
5. It does not appear that amending the Ordinance will have a significant negative impact on the community.

The motion as seconded by Chair Hirschi and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (7-0).

**PUBLIC HEARING | ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS, SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR OVERLAY ORDINANCE AND SECTION 12-41-040-MINIMUM AREA OF ZONE - Consider proposed Zoning Code Text Amendments as follows: 1. Amending various Zoning Code Text Amendments in the South Main Street Corridor Overlay Ordinance, including placing density cap for the City Center and Traditional Main Street Districts; and 2. Amending Section 12-41-040-Minimum Area of Zone, reducing or eliminating minimum area requirements. Centerville City Council, Applicant**

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported the City Council recently adopted a "Temporary Zoning Regulation Ordinance" (TZRO) restricting any further development within the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Zone in order to allow time for the City to review and make changes to the SMSC Plan. The Council is requesting amendments to the Zoning Code including a residential density cap and a reduction/elimination of the five (5) acre minimum parcel requirement for a Planned Development Overlay (PDO).

1           ***Density Cap***  
2

3           Mr. Snyder explained the density cap proposed is eight (8) dwellings per acre in the  
4 Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone for the City Center and Traditional Main Street Districts of the  
5 SMSC. These two districts are primarily commercial and not considered “residential.” However,  
6 the SMSC Plan does allow and encourage residential uses within these districts through mixed-  
7 use development and/or through use of medium and high densities. The Moderate Income  
8 Housing plan encourages housing variety for all income needs. The General Plan also  
9 encourages a variety of infill development and neither promotes nor discourages a density cap.  
10 Mr. Snyder explained the SMSC Plan uses form base codes to allow 2-story mixed-use buildings  
11 with main floor commercial and 2<sup>nd</sup> story residential. It is possible a density cap could stifle the  
12 usability of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor thus hindering marketability and redevelopment. It could prove to be too  
13 expensive to purchase, demolish, and redevelop a site with the proposed density cap. However, it  
14 may be possible to tuck residential uses behind commercial uses along the SMSC which could  
15 provide variety. In addition, a density cap could bring clarity to SMSC Plan for the developers,  
16 City staff, elected officials, property owners, and residents within the area.  
17

18           Mr. Snyder responded to questions from the Commission. He discussed the densities of  
19 several existing subdivisions which range from 8-10 units per acre. He further explained the City  
20 Center and the Traditional Main Street districts are zoned commercial with a residential-medium  
21 option as part of the SMSC Overlay Zone. The proposed density cap would only be applied to  
22 these two districts as part of the SMSC Overlay Zone. Residential uses are only allowed  
23 secondary to the underlying commercial zone/uses.  
24

25           Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing.  
26

27           Tim Hawkes said the SMSC Plan uses form base code to incentivize redevelopment and  
28 high density. He said the developers that are showing interest are proposing 12-21 units per acre  
29 developments. He said this is too high for Centerville’s Main Street. He said he is in favor of the  
30 density cap at 8-units per acre. He said if the cap proves to hinder redevelopment then it can be  
31 changed in the future, but for now low density is appropriate and desired by Centerville’s  
32 citizens.  
33

34           Robyn Mecham said there is a lot of potential property for redevelopment along the  
35 SMSC. If the City allows high density it will devastate the already congested traffic on Main  
36 Street. She said the Wasatch Community Council claims on average a car makes 13 trips per day.  
37 She said under the current SMSC Plan there is potential for 600+ units. This would generate too  
38 much traffic for Main Street causing it to become too dangerous to safely travel or cross. She  
39 agrees with capping the density as suggested. She said there are plenty of existing homes,  
40 apartment, and townhomes in Centerville, there is no need for additional housing types. She said

1 single-family homes are desired and should be permitted. She believes the SMSC should be  
2 Residential-Low (R-L) or commercial only. She said R-L is the only designation that will restore  
3 and maintain the "historic" Main Street that is desired. She also believes zoning should be by  
4 acreage and not form based standards.

5  
6 Jennifer Turnbloom said she would like the zoning for Main Street to go back to R-L.  
7 She said her family has owned property in this area for 60 years and they never asked for  
8 commercial zoning, it was changed without their knowledge or consent. She said the current  
9 commercial uses on Main Street are constantly turning over or stagnant, perhaps that is because  
10 Main Street is just not a viable commercial location. She said Main Street is suited for single-  
11 family homes which should be allowed and encouraged.

12  
13 Alice Roberts said Main Street should be preserved. She said the SMSC Overlay and  
14 form based zone is too intense for Main Street. She said one of the proposed redevelopments on  
15 Main Street puts a fence on Main Streets frontage. She said this is like turning your back to Main  
16 Street. She would like to preserve Main Street by allowing single-family residential lots. She is  
17 also okay with R-L behind commercial that fronts Main Street. However, she suggested a  
18 feasibility study be conducted to determine if commercial is even viable on Main Street. Perhaps,  
19 residential only would be the best fit with garages and driveways at the back. She expressed  
20 concern with the traffic on Main Street and said the current speed limit is too high. She said if  
21 Main Street were more pedestrian friendly perhaps the State would consider lowering the speed  
22 limit.

23  
24 Alan Arbuckle said Main Street in Bountiful is a strip of "hobby shops" and not real  
25 commercial development. He said the SMSC Overlay Zone will create the same "hobby shop"  
26 concept along Main Street and Pages Lane. He said this is not ideal redevelopment for Main  
27 Street in Centerville. He believes the SMSC Plan is too intense for Main Street and agrees that a  
28 density cap is appropriate.

29  
30 Kenny Mecham said commercial uses on Main Street are rarely utilized and that Main  
31 Street is better suited for single-family homes.

32  
33 Jamison Pexton asked if there is a maximum building height for Main Street.

34  
35 Ralph Sorenson questioned if there are enough services to provide for this type of  
36 intensive development. He asked if there is any land available for additional schools or cemetery  
37 plots. He said too much growth, too fast, cannot be supported. He said it is a tragedy to throw up  
38 buildings and not be able to lay our dead to rest.

39  
40 Seeing no one else wishing to comment, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.

1 Councilwoman Fillmore and Councilwoman Ivie expressed concern with the application  
2 of the proposed density cap. They agreed the City Council's intent was to extend the density cap  
3 through the entire SMSC including all districts.  
4

5 Mr. Snyder said it was his understanding the density cap application was for the City  
6 Center and Traditional Districts only. If the Council intended to extend the density cap  
7 throughout the entire SMSC, then a new application can be submitted. He explained the South  
8 Gateway District of the SMSC Overlay Zone does extend along Pages Lane from Main Street to  
9 400 East, but the density cap is not being applied to that area with this application. Mr. Snyder  
10 responded to questions raised by the public. He said the maximum building height for Main  
11 Street is 25 feet on the east side and 35 feet on the west side. He said the Davis County School  
12 District has stated there is sufficient capacity to handle additional students. He agreed the  
13 cemetery issues are a problem which the City Council is currently discussing.  
14

15 The Commission agreed the City Center and Traditional Districts are the most pressing at  
16 this time with regard to density and agreed to move forward with the application as presented. If  
17 the Council would like to extend the density cap a new application may be submitted in the  
18 future.  
19

20 Chair Hirschi said he agrees with much of the public comment and agrees with the  
21 density cap, but does not agree with a total of 8-units per acre. He suggested a residential cap of  
22 4-units per acre with a conditional use allowance of up to 8-units an acre total. This will provide  
23 an opportunity for the City to review development applications requesting the 8-units.  
24

25 Commissioner Kjar said he is accepting of the density cap as suggested by Chair Hirschi.  
26 Commissioner Hirst also agreed as she is concerned with traffic impacts. Commissioner Johnson  
27 believes the density cap will help reinforce the General Plan by promoting the underlying  
28 commercial zone. Commissioner Merrill said the Police Chief has stated the police department is  
29 able to handle added traffic. He said he is not opposed to a density cap but is also mindful of the  
30 need for growth.  
31

32 Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend to the City  
33 Council approval of a residential-medium cap, as follows:  
34

35 *Amend the text of the SMSC Overlay Zone for the City Center and Traditional Main*  
36 *Street Districts to cap the allowable residential density at a maximum of four (4) units*  
37 *per acre as a permitted use and up to eight (8) units per acre as a conditional use.*

38 *Reasons for Action (Findings):*  
39

- a. The Planning Commission finds that the SMSC Plan does allow for residential uses to be considered in this particular commercial area.
- b. The Planning Commission finds that both the Moderate Income Housing and SMSC Plans desire that such residential uses be encouraged through mixed-use development and/or through use of medium and high densities.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that the use of medium residential densities as part of a mixed-use would facilitate the desires of the SMSC Plan and provide a definable maximum cap that is not currently in the related Ordinances of these districts.
- d. The Planning Commission finds that a maximum density cap helps to bring greater clarity to SMSC Plan for the developers, City staff, elected officials, and for the property owners and residents of the immediate area.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kjar and passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

***Reduce/Eliminate five (5) Acre Planned Development Overlay Minimum***

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) is a flexible use tool that can be applied to any residential, commercial, or industrial zoned property. The PDO allows up to a 20% density bonus provided the development provides additional enhancements. A PDO is reviewed by the Planning Commission and ultimately approved by the City Council. Current ordinances allow a PDO with no minimum acreage requirement within the Residential-Low Zone but requires a five (5) acre minimum in Residential-Medium, Residential-High, and all commercial and industrial zones. The City Council's application requests a reduction or possible elimination of the 5-acre minimum in all zones.

Mr. Snyder said there are no specific General Plan policies related to minimums or maximums for a PDO. The concept of setting a minimum acreage is related to providing enough land area for the expected enhancements of a master planned project. In addition, too little property can render a PDO financially unachievable which leads to frustration and contention. He said the 5-acre minimum is a typical requirement for most cities. Staff is accepting of lowering the minimum to three (3) acres because Centerville has limited parcels left for development but does not recommend eliminating the acreage requirement.

Mr. Snyder responded to questions from the Commission. He said the City could consider eliminating the minimum requirement once Centerville comes closer to build out but staff does not recommend elimination at this time. He explained a PDO could also be expanded but would require an additional application and approval. He explained the 5-acre minimum is a bigger issue for the SMSC because the form based zone already requires a higher development standard. If there is not enough acreage then it makes redevelopment less likely.

1 Chair Hirschi asked the City Council members present if they would like to address this  
2 application. Stephanie Ivie, City Councilwoman, said the City Council had a split vote on this  
3 issue. She said she is not in favor of lowering the 5-acre minimum. She said the PDO allows for  
4 increased density and for this reason she is opposed. Tamilyn Fillmore, City Councilwoman, said  
5 she is not comfortable representing the City Council on this issue because of the split vote.

6  
7 Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing.  
8

9 Tim Hawkes urged the Commission to reject this application because there is not a clear  
10 reason as to why the Council is requesting the change. He is also opposed because a PDO  
11 incentivizes higher density and allowing this possibility on a smaller parcel will only increase  
12 that intensity. He said Centerville's residents have been consistent and clear in their desire for  
13 lower density.  
14

15 Robyn Mecham said residents are against high density. She is not in favor of lowering the  
16 5 acre minimum. She said lowering the acreage will give developers a message that Centerville  
17 wants higher density, which is not correct.  
18

19 Alan Arbuckle said the 5-acre minimum is adequate. He agrees lowering the minimum  
20 acreage will only increase density which he is opposed to.  
21

22 Nancy Smith agreed that a PDO incentivizes high density and sees no reason to allow any  
23 PDO east of I-15. She said the underlying residential zones already provide sufficient controls to  
24 create compatible developments. In addition, the conditional use permit allowance provides for  
25 increased density, there is no reason for the PDO tool. She said the SMSC is already appropriate  
26 and the PDO only adds confusion and unrest for surrounding residents.  
27

28 Seeing no one else wishing to comment; Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.  
29

30 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, said the benefit of the PDO is that it is a legislative decision  
31 which is reviewed under the reasonably debatable standard and provides the City Council  
32 increased discretion and ultimate approval authority regarding any proposed PDO. Whereas a  
33 conditional use permit or site plan approval is an administrative decision which is reviewed  
34 under the substantial evidence standard. Such administrative matters must generally be approved  
35 if the application meets the requirements of the ordinances.  
36

37 Chair Hirschi agreed Centerville has limited land available for future development which  
38 makes it difficult to secure 5-acres. He said it may be beneficial to reduce the minimum acreage  
39 requirement in order to keep the PDO as an affective tool.  
40

Commissioner Hayman clarified the PDO gives the City an extra layer of flexibility with developments. It not only provides the option for increased density but it also provides greater standards for development including landscaping, buffers, parking, etc. She also clarified that the City Council has a reasonably debatable standard with a PDO, meaning they can consider public comment and response accordingly.

Commissioner Johnson said his least favorite tool is the traditional zoning standard. He prefers the City and developers have options to produce a desirable product. He is in favor of reducing the minimum acreage requirement.

Commissioner Kjar said he agrees with both sides. He is not in favor of increased density but he understands the need for a flexible tool.

Commissioner Ince said he is not in favor of allowing a higher density on a smaller parcel.

Commissioner Ince made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend **denial** to the City Council of a reduction in the minimum acreage for a PDO as there is no particular reason to lower the acreage. Motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend approval to the City Council of a reduction in the minimum parcel size in a PDO, as follows:

***Amend the text of the Planned Development Overlay Zone to reduce the minimum parcel size to three (3) acres.***

***Reasons for Action (Findings):***

- a. The Planning Commission finds there are no specific General Plan policies related to expectation to minimums or maximums for Planned Overlay Developments.
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the concept of setting a minimum is related to providing enough land area for allowing flexible development patterns to establish open areas and amenities to improve the design and layout of parcels.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that when parcels become too small, it is much more difficult to create needed buffers to surrounding properties or to internally create the desired common spaces and related amenities to improve a development beyond the traditional zoning regulations.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Merrill and passed by roll-call vote (6-1). Commissioner Ince opposed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT | SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR (SMSC) PLAN  
OVERLAY ZONE - Receive public comments about the South Main Street Corridor  
(SMSC) Plan and related Zoning Ordinance (Overlay Zone)**

Chair Hirschi opened the floor for public comment regarding the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Plan.

Patty Kennington requested the City consider expanding the density cap to the southern and east ends of the SMSC. She said the old Dicks Market site (Pages Lane between Main Street and 400 East) is surrounded by residential uses and a residential density cap of 8 units per acre would be consistent and compatible with the area. In addition, Pages Lane is not a high traffic road and could not accommodate high density.

Dale McIntyre said the J.A. Taylor Elementary and old Dicks Market areas are not suited for high density. This is a residential neighborhood area. He said all the residents that have been coming to these meetings are against high density. He will be deeply disappointed if the City does not cap the density as it is clearly the community's desire.

Ryan Archibald said he is against high density in Centerville. He only supports low density. He said high density will bring too much traffic which will negatively impact schools and endanger students crossing the street.

Lisa Malmstrom said she is a crossing guard on Main Street and said current traffic is too intense and dangerous for students. She said adding additional high density to the area will only compound the situation.

Jennifer Turnbloom said she too is against high density and agreed that more density will negatively impact the area. She said most of the housing for sale in Centerville are townhomes and apartments with a wide range of prices. She said there are already plenty of housing options in Centerville, additional high density options are not necessary.

Tim Hawkes urged the Commission to listen to the public and advocate for their desires for low density. He said it is clear citizens do not want high density.

Kenny Mecham said he is against high density. He said high density brings higher crime.

Carol Bake said it sounded as though the lowering of the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) minimum acreage would allow the Commission and City Council more control and discretion of those types of developments. She said this is an advantage for the City. She also agreed low density is the best option for the old Dick's Market area. She said high density will bring too much traffic and negatively impact schools.

1        Bruce Roberts said he is concerned with density. He agreed traffic is already an issue in  
2 the city and more density will not help this problem. He said it takes him longer to navigate  
3 Centerville's roads than it does to drive to another city and back. He said the old Dick's Market  
4 site is large and could bring a large development. He said low density is a better option. He said  
5 high density will bring additional traffic problems and safety concerns for children.

6  
7        Stephanie Ivie, City Councilwoman, said she avoids driving Main Street because traffic is  
8 already too intense. She said the best long-range benefit for Centerville would be to keep the  
9 SMSC at Residential-Low. She is also not convinced that high density will stimulate  
10 redevelopment.

11  
12        Nancy Smith said the best solution may be to throw out the SMSC Plan and revert Main  
13 Street back to commercial only. She said if the City is going to keep SMSC Plan then a few  
14 amendments to the plan may be needed such as clarifying the half block designation, and  
15 clarifying the form base regulations or reverting back to zone based regulations. She believes the  
16 zone base format is simpler and doesn't create expectations. She said most of the cities that she  
17 has researched allow the mixed-use option but under the zone base format, not form based. She  
18 said R-L should be the only allowance at the half block distance and beyond. She agreed traffic  
19 is an issue and said the off-set intersections on Main Street only compound the problem. She said  
20 high density will only intensify these problems. She said the traffic issues may even hinder the  
21 amount of patrons that could access commercial uses on Main thus sending patrons to other  
22 cities. She said perhaps the SMSC Plan is not the best concept for Main Street as originally  
23 thought.

24  
25        Melissa Thomas said there is a not a high density shortage in Centerville. There is already  
26 a great deal of apartments and townhomes, there is no need for more. She said there are very few  
27 single-family homes for sale and there are many people that want to live in Centerville in a  
28 single-family home. She said R-L is a great option for Centerville, particularly within the SMSC.  
29 She explained she recently purchased a home in Centerville but faced many challenges securing  
30 a loan because there are too many rentals and not enough single-family owned homes. She said  
31 single-family will stabilize the community and increase property values. She said high density  
32 will only continue the decline of the area.

33  
34        Alan Arbuckle said he has heard a lot of pleading for lower density. He said he is curious  
35 how passionate property owners and developers really are for high density. He questioned who is  
36 really pushing for high density, is it the City or property owners because it is clear it is not the  
37 residents.

38  
39        Seeing no one else wishing to comment; Chair Hirschi closed the public comment and  
40 thanked the public for their time and comments.

1 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, said the City Council will hold another  
2 public hearing for public comment re the SMSC Plan on June 16, 2015 and will hold a joint City  
3 Council and Planning Commission meeting for the property owners and businesses to give them  
4 the opportunity to comment on the SMSC Plan on June 17, 2015. The public is welcome and  
5 encouraged to attend both meetings.

6  
7 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**  
8

- 9 1. The next Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday, June 24, 2015.  
10 2. Upcoming Agenda Items  
11 • Conceptual Site Plan & Conditional Use Permit, Porter Lane Townhomes  
12

13  
14 The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

15  
16   
17  
18 David Hirschi, Chair

6-24-2015  
Date Approved

19  
20   
21  
22 Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary



# CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, June 10, 2015  
7:00 p.m.

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS\*\*

JEFF Cook  
 Maureen Hu Haker  
 Dale McIntyre  
 Chad Anderson  
 Patty Kennington  
 Ineo Baltars  
 Carol Smith  
 Helen Roberts  
 Bruce Roberts  
 Ann Fader  
 Keri Averett  
 Cindy Averett  
 Lamar Hanson  
 Shauna Chumakov  
 Yonnie Brabant  
 Jane Lipton  
 Robin & Dan Neville  
 Nancy Carmack  
 CRAIG PEXTON  
 Rahon Meek  
 Lisa Malmstrom  
 JAMISON PEXTON  
 Ed W Harrison

582 N. PHEASANT WAY  
~~84220~~ 577 N 100 E  
 258<sup>15</sup> 200 S  
 560 S. 350 E  
 560 E. Pages Lane  
 237 Venzio Lane  
 288 W 400 S.  
 595 S. 400 E.  
 595 S. 400 E.  
 224 So Main  
 356 W. 880 N.  
 356 W 850 N  
 83 Canyon Breeze Dr.  
 405 S. 150 W.  
 238 No 100 West  
 184 E. Canyon Breeze Dr.  
 415 S. Main St  
 446 S 400 E  
 68 N. 285 WEST  
 502 NO 100 E  
 390 N 400 E  
 430 E PAGES LANE  
 245 S 160 W

\*\* 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.

| NAME                       | ADDRESS          |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| KUED ALICE ROBERTS         | 535 N 100 E      |
| GLADE + DIANE HANSEN       | 405 So 700 E     |
| BOB + Pam Sorensen         | 40 E 400 So      |
| Paul & Stephanie Froehlich | 45 W. 700 S.     |
| Ryan Archibald             | "                |
| Alan ARBUCKLE              | 1/10 E. Pages    |
| Korlynn Arbuckle           | " "              |
| Melissa Thomas             | 16 S. 200 E.     |
| Charlie Bradley            | 204 E. 735 S Cen |
| Blair & Cynthia Parnish    | 124 N 200 E      |
| Stephanne Irre             | 595 S. 700 E.    |
| Carol Beke                 | 521 So. 300 E    |
| BRIANNE B                  | 561 S. 300 E.    |
| Jennifer Whitworth         | 295-955 2        |
| Bob & Linda BAUSTING       | 265 E. 300 S.    |
| Jennifer Turnblom          | 249 S. Main      |