

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, November 12, 2025
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

Mason Kjar, Chair
Shawn Hoth
Tyler Moss
LaRae Patterson
Gary Woodward

MEMBERS ABSENT

Amanda Jorgensen
Layne Jenkins

STAFF PRESENT

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

VISITORS

Interested citizens

LEGISLATIVE THOUGHT/PRAYER Commissioner Patterson

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING – (CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 22, 2025) - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – LEGISLATIVE DECISION

Chair Kjar opened the continued public hearing for this item.

Richard Layton, Centerville resident, urged the commission not to rush the general plan review, noting that neighbors were unaware of proposed changes and commissioners needed more time with the lengthy document. He also pointed out what he saw as inconsistencies between the citizen survey and the plan, arguing that while residents preferred housing west of I-15, the plan instead emphasized increased intensity at already busy locations.

Tami Bryson, Centerville resident, said she had read every word of proposed general plan but felt it required more careful consideration. She questioned whether it reflected the community's vision given only 418 survey responses, noted wording inaccuracies and discrepancies, and urged the commission to table the plan until these issues were addressed.

Craig Preston, Centerville resident, criticized the plan as more of an action plan than a guiding vision, objecting to specific language, images, and boundaries that he felt were limiting or prescriptive. He questioned the limited survey participation, the use of "will be" mandates, and urged the commission to postpone action and remove certain visuals and references.

David Layton, Centerville resident, emphasized that citizens are engaged when informed, sharing that five neighbors he spoke with attended the meeting. He questioned the housing deficit numbers, highlighted that Centerville's single-family housing percentage is below peer city

1 averages. He urged the commission to take time reviewing the plan and heed the city attorney's
2 guidance on public comments.

3
4 Cami Layton, Centerville resident, stressed that reading the plan isn't the same as
5 thoroughly reviewing it. She raised concerns about vague language that could favor developers,
6 discrepancies in population figures, repeated use of "will" implying mandates, problematic images
7 and density proposals, and insufficient senior housing zoning, while offering to assist with
8 revisions.

9
10 Debbie Dunn, Centerville resident, emphasized that she is not apathetic but only recently
11 learned about the general plan. She requested the plan be set aside to allow more residents to
12 review it and provide input, stressing the importance of community involvement.

13
14 Nancy Preston, Centerville resident, expressed concern that transportation details and
15 references to regional plans were too specific for the general plan, recommended moving them
16 to the transportation section with clarifying language, and urged that costly community decisions
17 not be rushed.

18
19 Desi Dunn, Centerville resident, emphasized that people moved to the city for space and
20 appreciated its current character, including occasional farm animals. Having only recently learned
21 of the general plan, he cautioned against high-density development based on experiences in other
22 cities and urged the commission to table the plan until more residents were informed and able to
23 provide feedback.

24
25 Nancy Smith, Centerville resident, urged that all city boards, commissions, and
26 committees read the general plan from their areas of expertise. She challenged the plan's
27 emphasis on Deuel Creek as the top historic preservation priority, suggested creating a separate
28 historic preservation section, and criticized language implying the state mandates specific actions
29 when it actually provides options, asking for clarification and more public input during deliberation.

30
31 Grover Marsh, Centerville resident, shared an experience as a professional civil engineer
32 where public input led to scaling back a road project from five lanes to a more community-friendly
33 design. Drawing on this, he recommended tabling Centerville's general plan so more residents
34 could learn about it and provide feedback.

35
36 Brian Plummer, Centerville resident and City Councilmember, acknowledged that the City
37 Attorney and Planning Commission Chair had discouraged him from commenting due to his role
38 on the City Council, but recognized his right as a citizen to do so. He criticized the general plan as
39 flawed and overly influenced by state mandates rather than residents' input. He warned that
40 transit planning could drive unwanted density, opposed west-side development due to flooding
41 risks, and urged the commission to prioritize Centerville residents' interests and carefully address
42 concerns before moving forward.

43
44 Marshall Maughn, Centerville resident, argued that the city's limited land makes it unable
45 to solve the housing shortage and that increasing density would disproportionately impact renters,
46 many of whom are already cost-burdened. He emphasized that new developments are rarely truly
47 affordable and appreciated Centerville's built-out character, noting Legacy Highway limits western
48 expansion.

49
50 Chair Kjar closed the public hearing.

51
52 Chair Kjar led the commission discussion by identifying several "easy fixes," including
53 duplicate paragraphs, incorrect housing deficit figures, population inconsistencies, and
54 reconciling references to three versus five housing strategies. Commissioners discussed how to
55 proceed, weighing the public's desire for more review time against the need to move forward.

Commissioner Patterson recognized resident concerns that they didn't know about the General Plan, but highlighted the efforts that have been made to get the word out. Chair Kjar suggested forwarding the draft to the City Council for review, noting the survey's 418 responses exceeded statistical reliability requirements.

The commission discussed language adjustments, with Community Development Director Mike Eggett confirming the consultant was softening mandatory wording based on feedback. Commissioners decided to review past meeting minutes and compile a list of priorities and revisions before making a recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Patterson **moved** to continue receiving public comment through December 4th, have commissioners review minutes and the general plan to bring back lists of redlines and comments for the December 10th meeting, and table the general plan until that meeting. Commissioner Hoth seconded the motion which passed (4-1) with Chair Kjar dissenting.

PUBLIC HEARING – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS – WATER USE AND PRESERVATION ELEMENT SECTION ADDITION TO THE PLAN – LEGISLATIVE DECISION

Mr. Eggett presented the required Water Use and Preservation Element for the city's General Plan, mandated by Senate Bill 110 (2022) to be adopted by December 31st. The amendment addresses four core areas: water demand assessment, reducing water demand, encouraging conservation, and operational efficiency.

Mr. Eggett noted that the proposed language had been reviewed and approved by the city's Assistant Public Works Director/Water Program Supervisor and the Utah State Department of Natural Resources. He emphasized the connection to ongoing landscaping ordinance work and highlighted the urgency of adopting the element before the deadline, warning that non-compliance could risk funding and invite stricter future legislation.

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

Commissioner Woodward asked about the 2,500 gallon rainwater collection limit, which Mr. Eggett explained was a state DNR restriction.

Chair Kjar **moved** to forward a positive recommendation to the proposed general plan amendment regarding the addition of a water conservation element to the current general plan. Commissioner Woodward seconded the motion which passed unanimously (5-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Eggett reported positive news that on October 27, 2025, Centerville received a letter confirming full compliance with state moderate income housing reporting requirements for 2025. He noted this achievement required extensive consultation with state representative employees and represented a significant effort by the City.

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Minutes of the October 22, 2025 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Chair Kjar **moved** to approve the minutes with suggested changes. Commissioner Woodward seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

ADJOURNMENT

1 At 9:02 p.m., Commissioner Patterson **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Hoth
2 seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
3

4 *Jennifer Robison*
5 Jennifer Robison, City Recorder
6

12/10/2025
Date Approved

