

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING
Wednesday, December 8, 2021
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

Kevin Daly, Chair
Mason Kjar
Matt Larsen
Heidi Shegrud
Spencer Summerhays
Christina Wilcox
Becki Wright

STAFF PRESENT

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Mackenzie Wood, Assistant Planner

VISITORS

Chad Morris
Ron Hale, Center Point Construction
Steve Peterson, Young Automotive Group
Cody Peterson, ESI Engineering, Inc.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENTS/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER Chair Daly

PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Community Development Director Cory Snyder explained that the applicant, Chad Morris, requested the following amendments to the Zoning Code for Residential Zoning District:

- Increase R-M Permitted Density from 6 units per acre to 8 units per acre.
- Reduction in private lane width from 27 feet to 26 feet.
- Alter internal sidewalk rules to allow an exception.

Prior to 2017, R-M density was four units per acre permitted, and up to eight units per acre conditional. In 2017, the City Council modified the R-M density to six units per acre permitted, with no conditional. Mr. Snyder explained the following General Plan density classifications for Centerville's residential areas.

<u>Dwelling Units/Acre</u>	<u>Class</u>
0-4	Low
5-8	Medium
9-12	High

Mr. Snyder explained the applicant had a R-M project in the application process. He shared the opinion that conditional use densities were difficult to manage and impact triggers for mitigation were difficult to define. Mr. Snyder said staff believed implementation of densities

1 should be wholly "permitted", and suggested it may not be the right time to move to 8 units per
2 acre permitted in R-M.

3
4 Regarding the request to reduce the private lane width, Mr. Snyder said staff believed
5 the current 27-foot pavement requirement ensured that on-street parking could be
6 accommodated along one side of the street, and still keep the 20-foot emergency access viable.
7 He said staff were not comfortable narrowing the width to 26 feet. With the road width reduced
8 by 12 inches, curb and gutter specifications would need to be changed to hold the necessary
9 tonnage for emergency access. Regarding the request to allow an exception for internal
10 sidewalks, Mr. Snyder said Mr. Morris' own development project was already conceptually
11 accepted with an alternate sidewalk design, and said the need to specify an exemption seemed
12 a bit unnecessary. He stated staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a
13 recommendation to deny the request to the City Council.

14
15 Mr. Snyder answered questions from the Planning Commission. He explained that any
16 Centerville citizen could petition the City to change an ordinance. The requested amendment
17 would affect the entire City, not just the one development.

18
19 Chad Morris, applicant, said he was a big proponent of affordable housing. He said
20 housing in Centerville was not affordable, and he believed minor adjustments to development
21 standards would help ease the cost of construction and ultimately the cost of new housing. He
22 asked the Planning Commission if they could think of any project constructed prior to 2017 at
23 the conditional 8 units per acre that had tarnished Centerville's image or caused any problems.
24 Mr. Morris said he could not. He said the Fire Code specified 26 feet of drivable surface, and
25 spoke in favor of modified, drivable curb/gutter. He argued in favor of less concrete and asphalt
26 both environmentally and aesthetically. Mr. Morris spoke in favor of not requiring sidewalks on
27 land without homes.

28
29 Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 7:44 p.m. He read aloud a letter from a group of
30 citizens requesting that the Planning Commission deny the proposal to increase R-M permitted
31 density to 8 units per acre.

32
33 Heather Strausser, Centerville resident, commented that the Porter-Walton Townhomes
34 development was built at 8 units per acre when 8 units per acre was a conditional use. She said
35 concerns were expressed by many citizens at the time, resulting in a cap at six units per acre for
36 the R-M Zone. Ms. Strausser asked the Planning Commission to remember lessons learned
37 with the Porter-Walton Townhomes development and not increase the R-M density. She
38 commented that street widths were set for public safety, and asked that the Planning
39 Commission not reduce the required street width. Ms. Strausser said there was a big difference
40 taking a walk on a street with sidewalk versus a street without sidewalk, and asked the Planning
41 Commission to consider safety when considering the request to allow exceptions to the
42 requirement for sidewalks. She thanked the Planning Commission for their service and said it
43 was a blessing to live in Centerville.

44
45 Wendy Bangerter expressed appreciation for the work City planners did to try to comply
46 with the State mandate to have affordable housing in the community. She said she lived directly
47 west of the planned Canyon Point development, and said the previously approved plan for
48 Canyon Point seemed to be fairly compatible with the area. She acknowledged that rising
49 construction costs made development more difficult, but said she did not believe that a sufficient
50 reason to approve zone text amendments for one developer. Ms. Bangerter commented that
51 approving the requested increase to 8 units per acre would set a precedent for future
52 development. She said she appreciated the desire to provide affordable housing, but requested
53 the City keep the 6 units per acre maximum for that area.

1 Marti Money, Centerville resident, said her experiences advocating for neighborhoods in
2 Centerville had led her to believe that 6 units per acre with no conditional use in R-M was
3 appropriate for Centerville. She requested the Planning Commission keep the 6 units per acre
4 maximum in R-M. Ms. Money stated a single proposed project should not be allowed to
5 determine the zoning for an entire city, and commented that the effects would trickle over to
6 future developments that would have greater negative impacts. She requested the Planning
7 Commission not recommend approval.

8
9 Jeremy Greer, Centerville resident, said he lived in a R-L neighborhood near the
10 proposed development, with R-M adjoining his back property line and all around his property.
11 He expressed concern with the proposed increase in density. He questioned whether the units
12 in Canyon Point would be significantly more affordable at 8 units per acre versus 6 units per
13 acre. Mr. Greer stated the proposal was from a developer who happened to live in Centerville.
14 He said street widths and sidewalks were important to public safety.

15
16 Chair Daly closed the public hearing at 7:58 p.m. Mr. Morris clarified that his request was
17 to have sidewalks in front of homes, but not where sidewalks were not needed. He commented
18 that narrower roads naturally slowed traffic, and emphasized that the streets would be private
19 right of ways. Mr. Morris stated that, in general, the more units on a property, the smaller they
20 tended to be. He pointed out that the City placed a limit on the height of residential buildings.
21 Mr. Morris commented that affordable housing usually went along with higher density. He said it
22 would be difficult to build a truly affordable home in Centerville because of the cost of land.

23
24 Responding to a question from Commissioner Kjar, Mr. Snyder said City Code did not
25 distinguish between a city road and a city lane. He said the City had been asked in the past to
26 take over ownership of private roads from HOAs, but the requests had not been accepted. Mr.
27 Snyder briefly described the history of R-M in the City Center area around City Hall.

28
29 Commissioner Larsen commented that road width in City Code was well above and
30 beyond the need for fire access, perhaps unnecessarily. He suggested excessive pavement and
31 less landscaping was not necessarily a good thing, and said people typically did drive faster
32 when roads were wider. Commissioner Larsen said he was open to the idea of a small
33 adjustment to roadway width. Mr. Snyder said the intention of the road width in City Code was to
34 provide a public street designed with right-of-way dedication. Mr. Snyder said he was not aware
35 of any significant safety concerns reported to the City regarding the Porter-Walton Townhomes
36 project.

37
38 Responding to a question from Commissioner Shegrud, Mr. Snyder said the City had
39 committed to an update of the General Plan. The City expected to receive word regarding
40 whether or not a grant was awarded to help fund the General Plan update in March of 2022. He
41 explained where utilities were placed in the absence of a park strip.

42
43 Chair Daly **moved** for the Planning Commission to recommend denial to the City Council
44 regarding various R-M Zone amendments, as presented by the applicant with the following
45 reasons for action. He said he recommended denial because he did not see it as the right time
46 for the actions requested, and referred to the upcoming General Plan update. He said he
47 believed the City had already found the right minimum road widths. Chair Daly said he felt the
48 flow of sidewalks was good. Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion.

49
50 Commissioner Kjar commented that Centerville was bounded on every side, with future
51 development most likely from infill. He expressed the opinion that, regardless of who brought
52 the proposal, the proposed amendments were not a panacea for the attainable housing
53 problem. Commissioner Kjar suggested it was misguided to oppose the proposed change on
54 the basis of liking the way things were at that time because change would happen and it was

important to stay ahead of the change. He stated he opposed the proposed amendments because he was uncomfortable with conditional densities. He commented the reduction in road width would be significantly more than a foot in some situations, and pointed out that problems with private roads due to insufficient funds inevitably became the City's problem. Commissioner Summerhays said he agreed with Commissioner Kjar's comments.

Commissioner Wright said she agreed with the staff recommendation, and agreed that the General Plan update would be a more appropriate time to consider changes. She said she appreciated and respected the need for different densities within the City, but did not believe it was the time to make the requested change in density. Commissioner Wright said she did not believe private roads needed to look like public roads. She expressed the opinion it would be poor judgement to make the decision based on the possibility of a request in the future for the City to take on responsibility of the private roads, when the City had never actually accepted such a request. She said she would not be comfortable moving from a 27-foot to a 21-foot road width, but believed there was room for discussion. Commissioner Wright said she would always advocate in favor of sidewalks.

The motion to recommend denial passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

HAFOKA – FINAL SITE PLAN

Assistant City Planner Mackenzie Wood said the applicants received conceptual site plan approval on May 26, 2021. Ms. Wood explained the applicants intended to demolish the existing home on the property once the proposed dwelling was built. She explained that because the property was larger than one acre, State mandated drainage restrictions would come into play if existing impervious surface were not removed. Ms. Wood said the plans met geotechnical requirements, and staff recommended approval. She answered questions from the Planning Commission regarding demolition bonds to ensure demolition of the existing home.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Wright, Mr. Snyder explained that either the existing home would need to be demolished, or the property would need to be reevaluated for two homes. Mr. Snyder emphasized the staff recommendation would accommodate the applicants living in the existing home during construction of the new home.

Lisa Hafoka, applicant, said she did not have anything to add to what staff had explained. She stated she and her husband intended to demolish the existing home after construction of the new home. Mr. Snyder emphasized that the proposed seven-foot crawl space was one foot short of being a full basement, and asked Ms. Hafoka if she was sure the space would only be used as crawl space. Ms. Hafoka responded she understood, and did not plan to use the crawl space as livable space.

Chair Daly **moved** to approve the Final Site Plan for the Hafoka Residence at approximately 522 West 400 South, parcel 03-001-029 with the following conditions and reason for action: Commissioner Summerhays seconded the motion.

Conditions:

1. Lowest floor elevation shall be two feet above the design water table.
2. If existing structures are not demolished or a demolition bond and accompanying agreement are not entered into prior to building issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall begin the Site Plan process over to ensure State drainage requirements are met.

Reason for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that the conceptual site plan Submittal, with the conditions imposed, complies or will comply with the applicable regulations of the City's Zoning Ordinances as detailed in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Kjar made a **motion to amend** the motion to approve the Final Site Plan with the following three conditions and previously stated reason for action. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion to amend, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Conditions:

1. Lowest floor elevation shall be two feet above the design water table.
2. Enter into a demolition bond and any accompanying agreement as determined by the City to ensure demolition of existing house, garage, and driveway.
3. If existing structures are not demolished and bond is not entered into prior to building issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall begin the Site Plan process over to ensure State drainage requirements are met.

The amended motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

THE PASTURE – PARKING MODIFICATION & FINAL SITE PLAN

On October 27, 2021, the applicant presented the Final Site Plan application for the Pasture Business Park. The Planning Commission tabled the item with the following directives:

1. Provide accurate parking stall counts for current uses in accordance with CZC 12.52.300, and request Parking Modification.
2. Provide a landscape plan in accordance with CZC 12.51.040.
3. Provide a temporary irrigation plan to maintain plantings.
4. Provide a letter from the Army Corps of Engineers clearing the property for wetlands, or a valid delineation of the wetlands.

Ms. Wood said the applicant requested a parking modification for the site. The parking modification request stated that the uses on each business license listed in the table previously prepared did not accurately reflect the parking needs of each tenant. They requested a modification be made to only require 117 stalls. Ms. Wood said she found some discrepancies in the square footage counts on the table, and provided another table (The Pasture Phase 3 Parking Modification Tabulation) to more accurately reflect the situation, with a required estimate of 284.1 parking stalls. The applicant proposed considering the Personal Instruction Services of Kona Karate and Project Move as Family Child Care Group Facilities, which required fewer parking spaces.

Ms. Wood said a landscaping plan, including planting schedule, irrigation notes and drawings, and landscaping versus hardscaping percentages was submitted. The applicant provided a Wetland Delineation prepared by Todd Sherman, SPWS with Wetland Resources. Per Mr. Sherman, if there were no wetlands impacted by development, the delineation did not require coordination with the Army Corps of Engineers. She said City Code did not explicitly require Army Corps of Engineers approval for projects not seeking to impact or alter wetlands; however, precedent had been to require Army Corps of Engineers approval for projects in areas where wetlands were present, including the initial phases of the current project. Mr. Snyder said Mr. Sherman confirmed the proposed development would not encroach on the wetlands present on the property.

1 Responding to a question from the Commission, Ms. Wood said enforcement of the
2 proposed parking modification would be tricky since tenants might come and go without the City
3 being aware.
4

5 Troy Salmon, applicant, commented that classifications represented estimates of parking
6 needed. He said they proposed using the Family Child Care Group Facilities classification for
7 Kona Karate and Project Move because the required parking most closely matched the needs of
8 the tenants. He said the average number of vehicles on the site was 40, with 60 vehicles during
9 peak hours. Mr. Salmon said he believed a requirement of 117 parking stalls was sufficient. He
10 commented that, with the delineation provided, he did not see any risk to the City in not
11 requiring approval from the Army Corps of Engineers.
12

13 Commissioner Wright pointed out the highest parking count listed in the Parking
14 Modification Request was 71. Mr. Salmon clarified that the highest count of 71 vehicles was with
15 the current two buildings, and expressed confidence that the requested 117 parking stalls would
16 be sufficient with the addition of the proposed new building.
17

18 Responding to a question from Commissioner Kjar, Mr. Salmon stated no changes
19 would be made to the existing rock retaining wall. Commissioner Kjar commented that it was the
20 applicant's fault that they had spent time pushing back on the City regarding approval from the
21 Army Corps of Engineers rather than simply obtaining Army Corps of Engineers approval.
22 Commissioner Kjar said he was much more comfortable with the situation with the delineation
23 from Mr. Sherman. Commissioner Shegrud said she agreed with Commissioner Kjar.
24

25 Commissioner Wright said she had personal experience with Project Move, and said she
26 agreed it was a drop-off/pick-up situation with not a lot of parking needed. The Planning
27 Commission discussed the fact that hours of operation and parking needs would change over
28 time with different uses. Commissioner Wright said she would be more comfortable with a
29 parking modification tied to use. Ms. Romney suggested the applicant should be required, for
30 any significant change in uses and/or hours of operation for any uses, to come back to the
31 Planning Commission for an amendment to the parking modification. The Planning Commission
32 discussed what would constitute a significant change in use. Ms. Wood emphasized it had
33 already proven difficult for the City to track tenants and uses in the project. Mr. Snyder
34 suggested using a 20% increase in demand for parking over the entire project as a trigger for
35 parking modification review and amendment.
36

37 Ms. Wood clarified that the required number of parking stalls calculated with the uses
38 requested by the applicant would be 126. Commissioner Larsen commented that if the Planning
39 Commission approved the requested 117 parking stalls as sufficient, the applicant may at some
40 point become trapped and unable to welcome a tenant that would require more than the 20%
41 increase in demand for parking allowed by the trigger suggested by Mr. Snyder. Ms. Romney
42 suggested the parking modification should expire if the needs exceeded 20% of the parking
43 modification assumptions. The existing 117 parking stalls were calculated using requirements
44 for Office/Warehouse use during a previous phase. Commissioner Kjar stated a clear
45 calculation needed to be established for use in the future when uses and needs changed. He
46 spoke of potential backlash to the City in the future. Commissioner Wright said she cautioned
47 against using a remote, obscure hypothetical as a basis for decision making. Commissioner Kjar
48 said he did not think the hypothetical was remote or obscure.
49

50 Commissioner Larsen suggested using the factors in the table presented by Ms. Wood
51 showing 126 parking stalls needed, with clarification that the Planning Commission was willing
52 to accept 117 at the applicant's request, as the baseline. Commissioner Kjar said he was
53 reluctant to make decisions based on future hypotheticals. He said he would be more in favor of
54 an expiration to trigger reassessment. Ms. Romney suggested using a 20% increase on the 126

1 calculation. Commissioner Kjar suggested requiring that the parking modification be evaluated
2 every five years.
3

4 Commissioner Wright commented that the Family Child Care Group Facilities use the
5 applicant wanted to use was very different from the Personal Instruction Services use under
6 which dance studios were listed in the Zoning Code. Commissioner Wright emphasized that
7 parking modifications were granted based on use.
8

9 Commissioner Summerhays suggested using a 10% increase on the 126 calculation.
10 Chair Daly **moved** to approve the Parking Modification for the Pasture Business Park
11 development at approximately 1230 North 1300 West, parcel 06-003-0056, subject to the
12 following conditions and with the following reason for action. Commissioner Wilcox seconded
13 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).
14

15 Conditions:
16

- 17 1. This modification is for the property owned by Pasture LLC at 1230 North 1300 West,
18 and is not transferrable to another location.
- 19 2. The striped parking stalls shall be no less than 117 on site.
- 20 3. If there are any changes in uses and/or hours of operation for any uses in the project
21 that cause the parking demand for the project to exceed 20% of the 126 parking
22 modification assumptions and criteria, as determined by the Zoning Administrator,
23 this parking modification shall expire and the applicant shall be required to obtain a
24 new parking modification with supporting documentation. Any appeal or challenge to
25 the Zoning Administrator's determination regarding the 20% calculation shall be
26 referred to the Planning Commission.
27

28 Reason for Action:
29

- 30 a. The Planning Commission finds that the hours of operation and peak operating times
31 provides ample trade-off in parking demand per CZC 12.52.110(c).
32

33 Chair Daly **moved** to approve the Final Site Plan for the Pasture Phase 3 development
34 at approximately 1230 North 1300 West, parcel 06-003-0056, subject to the following conditions
35 and with the following reasons for action. Commissioner Summerhays seconded the motion,
36 which passed by unanimous vote (7-0). Commissioner Kjar said he had found the delineation
37 report very persuasive.
38

39 Conditions:
40

- 41 1. The Planning Commission approved the Parking Modification that allows a minimum
42 of 117 parking stalls to be on site.
- 43 2. Landscaping and irrigation shall be installed as indicated on the Landscaping Plan
44 dated September 16, 2021.
45

46 Reasons for Action:
47

- 48 a. The Planning Commission finds that the Final Site Plan submittal is substantially
49 consistent with the Conceptual Site Plan Acceptance and its related directives.
- 50 b. The Planning Commission finds that the Final Site Plan submittal complies with the
51 parking modification that was granted.
- 52 c. The Planning Commission finds that conditions may be imposed with a Final Site
53 Plan approval, as necessary to achieve compliance with applicable code
54 requirements.

- 1 d. The Planning Commission finds that, subject also to the conditions of approval; the
2 proposal complies with the requirements founds in the Zoning Ordinance with
3 regards to development standards in the CV-H Zone and Final Site Plan Approval
4 Standards.

5
6 The Planning Commission took a break at 10:02 p.m., and returned at 10:06 p.m.

7
8 **FINAL SITE PLAN – YOUNG POWERSPORTS**
9

10 Mr. Snyder explained the request for Final Site Plan approval for Young Powersports,
11 and said staff recommended approval. Steve Peterson, representing the applicant, and Ron
12 Hale with Center Point Construction answered questions about building and elevation plans,
13 and the combination of parcels.

14
15 Commissioner Kjar expressed discomfort with the number and scope of conditions
16 attached to the proposed Final Site Plan approval. Mr. Snyder explained the timeframe and
17 logistics involved, and said he did not anticipate that any of the conditions would be problematic.
18 Chair Daly said he believed the applicant was motivated to follow through, and expressed
19 confidence that staff would ensure the conditions were met.

20
21 Chair Daly **moved** to approve the Final Site Plan for the redevelopment of property
22 located at 695 West 400 South, subject to the following conditions and with the following
23 reasons for action. Commissioner Wilcox seconded the motion, which passed by majority vote
24 (5-1-1), with Commissioner Kjar dissenting and an abstention from Commissioner Wright.

25
26 Conditions:
27

- 28 1. The Final Site Plan approval is limited to the proposed expansion/redevelopment and
29 site improvements, as depicted in the Final Site Plan submittal to the Commission on
30 December 8, 2021, or as amended by the City.
31 2. The development shall comply with the related rezone approval by combining all of
32 the separate parcels into a single development parcel.
33 3. The proposed recreational vehicle sales use and service related to this Final Site
34 Plan Approval shall obtain a Conditional Use Approval from the City.
35 4. The Final Site Plan shall be adjusted to meet the "internal parking lot landscaping"
36 requirement of 7%, which may also reduce the depicted parking stall count, so long
37 as the stall count meets the approved parking modification requirements.
38 5. All roof or ground mounted utility equipment shall be screened from public view (i.e.,
39 as viewed from a public street).
40 6. All outdoor lighting shall be fully shielded using cut-off type fixtures that will not allow
41 light dispersion or direct glare to shine above a 90-degree horizontal plane from the
42 base of the light fixture.
43 7. The applicant shall obtain secondary water service from the applicable third-party
44 company and construct all necessary improvements and payment of any related
45 fees.
46 8. All Final Site Plan needed alteration/modified approval conditions shall be reviewed
47 deemed in compliance by the Zoning Administrator, as part of the issuance of any
48 related construction permits.
49 9. Any dispute that arises regarding compliance with the Final Site Plan approval by the
50 Zoning Administrator shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission for further
51 review and decision.
52

Reasons for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that the Final Site Plan submittal is substantially consistent with the Conceptual Site Plan Acceptance and its related directives.
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the Final Site Plan submittal complies with the parking modification that was previously granted.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that conditions may be imposed with a Final Site Plan approval, as necessary to achieve compliance with applicable code requirements.
- d. The Planning Commission finds that, subject also to the conditions of approval, the proposal complies with the requirements found in the Zoning Ordinance with regards to development standards in the C-VH Zone and Final Site Plan Approval Standards.

PUBLIC HEARING – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – YOUNG POWERSPORTS

Mr. Snyder described uses on properties neighboring the Young Powersports property, and spoke of a concern expressed by a resident regarding the potential for loud vehicle revving. Mr. Snyder said the noise ordinance would control the potential for loud noises during off hours. He explained the need to ensure the applicant had legal right to use an access on the north side of the property (Porter Lane).

Mr. Hale said the applicant was going through the process to make sure an access easement was in place for access on Porter Lane. He described improvements that would be made to the access, and answered questions from the Commission. Mr. Hale stated the applicant would agree to the hours of operation listed as a proposed condition of approval.

Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 10:46 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Chair Daly expressed the opinion that noise was not something that needed to be mitigated with the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in that situation, and said he would be in favor of removing the hours of operation restriction. Commissioner Summerhays said he viewed the hours of operation restriction as an added buffer of protection for nearby residents, to which the applicant was acceptable. Chair Daly said on principle he would prefer to rely on the noise ordinance. Commissioner Kjar commented that powersports vehicles were generally loud.

Commissioner Summerhays **moved** to approve a CUP for the Young Powersports Complex located at 695 West 400 South, subject to the following conditions and with the following reasons for action. Commissioner Shegrud seconded the motion.

Conditions:

1. The Approved Land Use for the site is for Vehicle Rental or Sale, New Limited and/or Used Limited, and any typical accessory uses associated with the operation of a recreational vehicle sales dealership, as allowed by the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The use of the site is also subject to the associated Final Site Plan approval, as approved by the City.
3. The Business Hours of Operation for vehicle sales and the associated accessory use of repairs shall be limited 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
4. All outdoor lighting shall be fully shielded using cut-off type fixtures that will not allow light dispersion or direct glare to shine above a 90-degree horizontal plane from the base of the light fixture.
5. The Applicant shall submit sufficient evidence establishing a legal access easement from Porter Lane, to be deemed acceptable by the City Attorney.

6. Any future amendments to the CUP and/or Final Site Plan shall be subject to the applicable amendment procedures defined by the Zoning Ordinance.

Reasons for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that both Vehicle Sales, New or Used are conditional uses in the C-VH Zone, as listed in Table of Uses, 12-36-Commercial Uses.
- b. The Planning Commission finds that in reviewing factors of CZC 12.21.100(e)(5) (A-C, F), there is evidence to support the conditional use suitability and harmony with the proposed site and adjacent property.
- c. The Planning Commission finds that in reviewing factors of CZC 12.21.100(e)(5) (D-E, G, I-K), there is evidence to support a minimized impact on the community and the conditions imposed provide any needed safeguards.
- d. The Planning Commission finds that in reviewing factors of CZC 12.21.100(e)(5) (H) that the associated Final Site Plan approval provides adequate access, parking, lighting, fire protection and vehicular circulation.
- e. The Planning Commission finds that in reviewing factors of CZC 12.21.100(e)(5) (H, I and J) regarding the other possible related specific matters reviewed in the staff report, the conditions imposed minimize the impact of the development on the surrounding area.
- f. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that with the conditions imposed and the findings made, the requirements of CZC 12.21.100(e) have been met and the request for a CUP shall then be approved.

Chair Daly **moved to amend** the motion to strike Condition 3 from the CUP approval and renumber accordingly. Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion to amend, which failed (2-3-1), with Commissioners Daly and Kjar in favor, Commissioners Shegrud, Wilcox, and Larsen against, and an abstention from Commissioner Wright.

The original motion passed (6-0-1), with an abstention from Commissioner Wright.

PARKING STUDY

Mr. Snyder stated an off-street parking study was on the list of Planning Commission goals for the year. ESI Engineering, Inc. was contracted to perform an off-street parking study. Cody Peterson, Transportation Engineer with ESI Engineering, said he was asked to look at different land uses in Centerville and compare them to the national ITE Parking Generation Manual. Mr. Peterson presented an Off-Street Parking Comparison Summary. He showed current Centerville Code requirements for off-street parking and explained proposed parking rates for different use types. Commissioner Shegrud said she thought the study was well done, and thanked Mr. Peterson for the information.

The Planning Commission discussed a desire to look closely at industrial wholesale and warehousing/flex-space parking requirements. Mr. Snyder suggested scheduling a work session for further discussion. Commissioner Kjar said he would want to include a discussion of drive-thru queueing at fast-food establishments.

2022 ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

The Planning Commission reviewed a proposed 2022 annual meeting schedule. Commissioner Wright **moved** to accept the 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule. Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion. Commissioner Shegrud asked if more than two meetings could be scheduled in November/December to avoid lengthy meetings like that

evening. Assistant Planner Mackenzie Wood commented the City Council scheduled second meetings in November and December to be held as needed. Chair Daly commented that such long meetings were not usual. The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT


The Planning Commission was scheduled to meet next on January 12, 2022. Mr. Snyder updated the Commission regarding recent actions by the City Council.

MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE


Minutes of the November 10, 2021 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Wright **moved** to accept the minutes. Commissioner Summerhays seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0). Commissioner Summerhays commented that it had been a pleasure serving on the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:21 p.m., Chair Daly **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Kjar seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).


Jennifer Hansen, City Recorder

1-18-2022
Date Approved


Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

