

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, September 11, 2024
7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at 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

Shawn Hoth
Amanda Jorgensen
Matt Larsen
Mason Kjar, Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT

Layne Jenkins
Tyler Moss
LaRae Patterson, Vice Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Mike Eggett, Community Development Director
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Sydney DeWees, Planner

VISITORS

Glen Girsberger

LEGISLATIVE THOUGHT/PRAYER Commissioner Jorgensen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING CODE AMENDMENT PROPOSAL – 12.41.070, VARIATIONS FROM DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND 12.41.074, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONES (LEGISLATIVE ACTION)

City Attorney Lisa Romney gave a thorough explanation of the amendment, highlighting changes such as separating provisions and creating a new section for the development agreement provision to clarify requirements, and reinforcing the need for development agreements only being approved in specific instances.

Glenn Girsberger, representing JF Legacy Partners LLC, provided input, explaining that the amendments offered greater flexibility for developers, especially those bound by long-term commitments.

Commissioner Kjar opened a public hearing for this item. No comments were made, so Chair Kjar closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Larsen made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council approval of the submitted Planned Development Overlay Zone code amendments, per the request from Mitch Vance, representing JF Legacy Partners LLC, for a Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding CZC 12.41.070 “Variations From Development Standards” and 12.41.074 “Development Agreements for Planned Development Overlay Zones,” with the language amendment to the request (as provided by the Planning Commission) as follows, to add the sentence, “the decision to amend or enter a development agreement is also within the City’s sole

discretion”, based on the following reasons for action (findings). Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote (4-0).

Reasons for Action (Findings):

1. The Planning Commission finds that the application is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan.
2. The Planning Commission finds that the request is in the best interests of maintaining the operations and growth of the Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane commercial planned development.
3. The Planning Commission finds that the request is in the best interests of the commercial and residential growth of the Legacy Crossing at Parrish Lane commercial planned development.
4. The Planning Commission finds that the request is a benefit to enhancing the regulations and standards of the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) Zone to provide future development flexibility.
5. The Planning Commission finds that the request is compliant with Utah Code §10-9a-532 for development agreement regulations.
6. The Planning Commission finds the request is in the best interests of the commercial and residential growth of Centerville City.
7. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the request for a Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding CZC 12.41.070 “Variations From Development Standards” and 12.41.074 “Development Agreements for Planned Development Overlay Zones” should be positively recommended to the City Council.

PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING CODE AMENDMENT PROPOSAL – 12.54.120 AND 12.54.130, SIGNS IN PARRISH LANE GATEWAY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND SIGNS IN COMMERCIAL ZONES (LEGISLATIVE ACTION)

Community Development Director Mike Eggett and Planner Sydney DeWees provided detailed background on signage standards from neighboring municipalities and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Differences in zoning requirements in adjacent cities were highlighted, with emphasis on competitive balance for businesses wanting visibility from major highways. It was clarified how current restrictions potentially limited businesses' flexibility in advertising their properties, and the framework amendments were proposed to align Centerville's standards with nearby cities. Staff emphasized that allowing a planned increase in sign height and area would help retain business interest within Centerville, offering fairer conditions relative to neighboring areas.

Chair Kjar opened a public hearing for this item. No comments were made, so Chair Kjar closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jorgensen made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council approval of the request from the Centerville Community Development Department for a Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding CZC 12.54.120 “Signs in Parrish Lane Gateway Commercial District” & CZC 12.54.130 “Signs in Commercial Zones”, with the following reasons for action (findings). Commissioner Larsen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (4-0).

Reasons for Action (Findings):

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan.
2. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are in the best

- 1 interests of maintaining the operations and growth of the commercial business
2 community along the south end of Frontage Road.
- 3 3. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments will provide new
4 signage tools for commercial growth opportunities along the south end of Frontage
5 Road.
- 6 4. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed text amendments are in the best
7 interests of commercial growth opportunities within Centerville City.
- 8 5. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the request for a Zoning Code Text
9 Amendment regarding CZC 12.54.120 "Signs in Parrish Lane Gateway Commercial
10 District" & CZC 12.54.130 "Signs in Commercial Zones" should be positively
11 recommended to the City Council.

12
13 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
14

15 Mr. Eggett informed the commission about initiatives on upcoming legislation regarding
16 fencing standards, pointing to recent resident inputs needing resolution. A survey, similar to the
17 one conducted for signage comparisons, would be forthcoming to guide decisions. Mr. Eggett
18 reinforced a continuous focus on aligning municipal standards with realistic and equitable
19 community outcomes. Possible future discussions including a commercial subdivision proposal
20 were briefly mentioned.

21
22 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**
23

24 Minutes of the August 28, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting were reviewed.
25 Commissioner Hoth **moved** to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Jorgensen
26 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (4-0).

27
28 **ADJOURNMENT**
29

30 At 8:04 p.m., Commissioner Larsen **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Kjar
31 seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote (4-0).
32
33

34
35 Jennifer Robison
36 Jennifer Robison, City Recorder

9/26/2024 | 10:52 AM MDT

Date Approved

