

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, December 10, 2025**

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

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

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Mason Kjar, Chair

10 Gary Woodward

11 LaRae Patterson

12 Layne Jenkins

13 Shawn Hoth

14
15 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

16 Tyler Moss

17 Amanda Jorgensen

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Mike Eggett, Community Development Director

21 Sydney DeWees, Planner

22 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

23
24 **VISITORS**

25 Interested citizens

26
27 **LEGISLATIVE THOUGHT/PRAYER** Commissioner Woodward

28
29 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

30
31 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE –**
32 **LEGISLATIVE DECISION**

33
34 Chair Kjar opened the discussion by clarifying the item was a public meeting, not a public
35 hearing, on general plan amendments as part of the comprehensive general plan update, and
36 emphasized the matter was legislative in nature. Community Development Director Mike Eggett
37 reviewed the process, noting the discussion continued from prior meetings and that public
38 comment was accepted through December 4 per prior direction, with one late comment excluded.
39 He reported receiving an updated draft from the consultant incorporating Planning Commission
40 edits, followed by a revised version correcting population figures. Mr. Eggett explained he was
41 reviewing the document for mechanical and scrivener's errors and identified one substantive
42 issue: the plan references an active transportation plan that has not yet been formally adopted.

43
44 Commissioners discussed whether to forward the plan to City Council or continue refining
45 it. Vice Chair Patterson and Commissioner Woodward emphasized the value of public input and
46 expressed concerns that portions of the document needed further clarification or fine-tuning,
47 particularly to avoid language that appeared to predetermine future zoning decisions.
48 Commissioner Jenkins noted the general plan is a high-level policy guide and not binding on the
49 city. Chair Kjar expressed concern about forwarding a document that might be viewed as
50 unfinished but also noted the risk of over-editing issues that City Council may view differently.
51 After extended discussion, commissioners identified key areas of concern for Council review,
52 including Main Street, Parrish Lane, west side areas, town centers, and the presentation of citizen
53 survey priorities.
54

1 Commissioner Patterson **moved** to table the decision to a date certain, and that in the
2 interim, schedule a public work meeting to fine tune and incorporate the valid and important public
3 comments that have been raised to generate a third version. The motion failed due to a lack of a
4 second.

5
6 Commissioner Hoth **moved** to forward with a positive recommendation to the City Council
7 regarding the proposed General Plan Amendments, specifically for submitting the proposed
8 Centerville City comprehensive general plan update documentation with the noted advice
9 provided by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hoth accepted a friendly amendment to the
10 motion by Chair Kjar to clarify the version of the proposed amendments is the version referred to
11 the Planning Commission most recently from the consultants and adding a delegation, between
12 now and when it appears for consideration by the City Council, that mechanical changes can be
13 made by Staff (including such things as formatting, scrivener's errors, and factual remedying).
14 Commissioner Jenkins seconded the motion.

15
16 Vice Chair Patterson moved to **amend** the motion to modify the recommendation to
17 indicate there are specific categories being called out by the Planning Commission based on
18 written and verbal public comments and that these categories should be emphasized for more
19 detailed review by the City Council, including the following specific categories:

- 20
21 1. Main Street (noting it appeared to encourage modifying rather than preserving Main
22 Street)
23 2. Parrish Lane (needs to be reevaluated based on written and verbal public comments)
24 3. West Side (North and South should be reevaluated based on written and verbal public
25 comments)
26 4. Town centers (needs to be reevaluated based on written and verbal public comments)
27 5. Chart B (make sure it is conforming to fact and accurate organizational structure)
28 6. Housing (both density and affordable housing needs to be reevaluated based on
29 written and verbal public comment)
30 7. Hillside (definition and open space areas need to be reevaluated in more detail)
31 8. Active Transportation Plan (needs to be reevaluated pursuant to Staff
32 recommendations)

33
34 Commissioner Woodward seconded the motion to amend, which passed (4-1) with Chair
35 Kjar dissenting.

36
37 The amended motion passed (4-1) with Chair Kjar dissenting.

38
39 Chair Kjar clarified his nay vote, stating that he is comfortable with the framework given
40 by the professional consultant, and believes the Planning Commission comments to go too far.
41 Vice Chair Patterson responded by saying she tends to agree more with the citizens and wants
42 the document to be something that she and the citizens can love and support.

43
44 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS – LANDSCAPING AND**
45 **SCREENING – CZC 12.51 (LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING) – LEGISLATIVE DECISION**
46

47 Mr. Eggett presented the item as a continuation of the October 22 discussion, noting the
48 Planning Commission had directed staff to draft updates related to water conservation standards.

1 He emphasized the proposed language was not yet refined enough to move forward and should
2 only be advanced to City Council once the Commission agreed it was ready. Mr. Eggett
3 highlighted several unresolved issues, including defining “hardscape” and “redevelopment,”
4 clarifying when new standards would apply, and addressing concerns related to vested rights.
5 City Attorney Lisa Romney cautioned that applying new requirements broadly could create
6 complications with nonconforming uses.

7
8 Commissioners discussed landscaping standards, drought-tolerant plant requirements,
9 park strip plant heights, and enforcement challenges, as well as whether hardscape alone should
10 satisfy conservation goals. Staff clarified Weber Basin Water rebate limitations, noting
11 impermeable surfaces were not eligible.

12
13 Chair Kjar opened the public hearing. No comments were made, so he closed the public
14 hearing.

15
16 Chair Kjar **moved** to table without date certain and directed staff to further refine the
17 ordinance and return with a more developed draft at a future meeting. Commissioner Hoth
18 seconded the motion which passed unanimously (5-0).

19 20 **2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE**

21
22 The Commission reviewed the 2026 annual meeting schedule. Mr. Eggett pointed out
23 November 11th conflicted with Veterans Day, and it was agreed to move that meeting to
24 November 10th rather than November 25th (the day before Thanksgiving).

25
26 Commissioner Woodward **moved** to approve the schedule as outlined with the change of
27 confirming November 10th instead of November 11th. Vice Chair Patterson seconded the motion
28 which passed unanimously (5-0).

29 30 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

31
32 No report.

33 34 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

35
36 Minutes of the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Vice
37 Chair Patterson **moved** to approve the minutes. Commissioner Jenkins seconded the motion,
38 which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

39 40 **ADJOURNMENT**

41
42 At 8:50 p.m., Commissioner Jenkins **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner
43 Woodward seconded the motion which passed unanimously (5-0).

44
45 
46 _____
47 Jennifer Robison, City Recorder

01/28/2026

Date Approved

