

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **Wednesday, January 10, 2018**

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

4  
5 A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville,  
6 Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 6:55 p.m.

7  
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Kathy Helgesen

10 Kevin Daly, Vice Chair

11 Logan Johnson

12 David Hirschi

13 Gina Hirst

14 Becki Wright

15  
16 **MEMBERS ABSENT**

17 Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

18  
19 **STAFF PRESENT**

20 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director

21 Lisa Romney, City Attorney

22 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner

23 Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

24  
25 **VISITORS**

26 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

27  
28 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

29  
30 **OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

31  
32 **ELECT A NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2018**

33  
34 Chair Hirschi disbursed ballots for position of Chair; explained that votes would be  
35 counted by Lisa Romney, City Attorney; and opened the floor for nominations.

36  
37 Commissioner Johnson nominated Vice Chair Hayman for the position of Chair of the  
38 Planning Commission for 2018. Commissioner Becki Wright seconded the nomination.

39  
40 Hearing no other nominations, the Commissioners cast their ballots. Vice Chair Hayman  
41 was elected Chair by unanimous vote (6-0).

42  
43 Commissioner Hirschi opened the floor for nominations for the positions of Vice Chair.

44  
45 Commissioner Johnson nominated Commissioner Wright for the position of Vice Chair of  
46 the Planning Commission for 2018. Commissioner Hirst seconded the nomination.

47  
48 Commissioner Wright nominated Commissioner Daly for the position of Vice Chair of the  
49 Planning Commission for 2018. Commissioner Johnson seconded the nomination.

50

1 Hearing no other nominations, the Commissioners cast their ballots. Commissioner Daly  
2 was elected Vice Chair of the Planning Commission by majority vote (4-2).

3  
4 **PUBLIC HEARING—TEXT AMENDMENT—HOME OCCUPATIONS**  
5

6 Cory Snyder introduced the proposed text amendment. He explained that in the 2017  
7 General Session, the Utah legislature adopted S.B. 81 restricting a municipality's authority to  
8 charge a business license fee for home based businesses, unless the combined offsite impact  
9 of the home-based business and the primary residential use materially exceeds the offsite  
10 impact of the primary residential use alone.

11  
12 Mr. Snyder explained that staff reviewed this new law and discussed whether home  
13 based businesses should still be issued licenses, though they would now be free; or whether  
14 licenses should not be required for home based business. Staff is recommending that the City  
15 continue to issue licenses, with no fee, to home based businesses, as this would allow business  
16 owners to have an official license that they could use in proving that they are a valid business  
17 entity.

18  
19 Staff also discussed how to ensure that home based businesses meet zoning  
20 compliance before business licenses are issued. Staff recommends that Permitted Use home  
21 occupations go through a one-time review for zoning compliance. The Zoning Administrator  
22 would approve Permitted Use permits, and a business license would then be issued.  
23 Conditional Use permits would still be subject to Planning Commission review.

24  
25 Vice Chair Daly questioned whether Commercial Use permits and business licenses  
26 would change, and Mr. Snyder confirmed that they would not.

27  
28 Commissioner Hirschi asked whether people who ran home based businesses had  
29 previously paid a fee for a use permit and a business license. Mr. Snyder responded that there  
30 used to be one fee for both, but, per staff recommendations, there would now only be a one-  
31 time \$75 zoning review fee and no business license fee, or annual review fee. Commissioner  
32 Hirschi questioned Ms. Romney if this change is in keeping with the spirit of S.B. 81. Ms.  
33 Romney responded that in her opinion it is.

34  
35 Vice Chair Daly opened the matter for public hearing at 7:16 p.m. and closed the public  
36 hearing seeing that no one wished to comment.

37  
38 A member of the public, requested to ask a question of the Commission. Chair Daly  
39 asked him to come forward.

40  
41 Karl Taylor - Mr. Taylor questioned whether his sister-in-law, who runs a hair stylist  
42 business from her home in Lehi, would be affected by the change in state law and whether each  
43 municipality is choosing to do a different thing.

44  
45 Lisa Romney responded to Mr. Taylor that each city is dealing with the legislation  
46 differently and Mr. Taylor's sister would want to look into what changes Lehi is making in  
47 response to the new legislation.

48  
49 Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** for the Planning Commission to recommend to  
50 the City Council approval of the proposed amendments for "Home Occupations," as presented  
51 by the staff to the Planning Commission with reasons for the action (a)-(c). Commissioner  
52 Wright seconded the motion.

1 Commissioner Wright requested an amendment to change the wording in suggested  
2 reason for action (b) from "ARE NOT INCONSISTENT" to "ARE CONSISTENT." Commissioner  
3 Helgesen seconded the amendment, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

4  
5 Commissioner Johnson expressed that he would prefer that the City move in the  
6 direction of not requiring any fee or licensure. Commissioner Wright asked if Commissioner  
7 Johnson foresaw that moving in the direction of having no fee and no business licensure for  
8 home based businesses would create more or less work for City employees. Commissioner  
9 Johnson responded that he believes it will be less work for City employees. Commissioner  
10 Wright asked Commissioner Johnson what owners of home-based businesses would need to  
11 do if they needed a license to provide to a mortgage company or other entity. Commissioner  
12 Johnson responded that they would need to take care of that requirement in some other  
13 fashion. Commissioner Johnson did point out that a rebuttal to his argument would be that the  
14 City does have the authority to regulate the uses in the homes, and licensure would provide  
15 recourse should there be any kind of complaint against a home based business.

16  
17 The Commission voted to pass the motion as amended by majority vote (5-1), with  
18 Commissioner Johnson dissenting.

19  
20 Reasons for the Action

- 21 a. The Planning Commission find that the "decision to amend the . . . zoning ordinance  
22 is a matter of within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC  
23 12.21.060.a.1.B.  
24 b. The Planning Commission finds that amendments *ARE CONSISTENT* with the  
25 goals, objectives and policies of the City's General Plan.  
26 c. The Planning Commission finds that the amendments are needed to comply with  
27 S.B. 81, in the 2017 General Session of the Utah State Legislature.

28  
29 **PUBLIC HEARING—ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT— "CATERING, GENERAL" AND**  
30 **"CATERING, LIMITED" DEFINITIONS AND TABLE USES**

31  
32 Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, explained that after the Planning Commission and  
33 City Council voted in November of 2017 to approve the new definition of the use "Catering,  
34 Limited" and allow the use as a Conditional Use Permit in Commercial-Medium Zones at an  
35 applicant's request, staff examined Catering use beyond the scope of the original request to  
36 create a broader definition to incorporate into the Table of Uses in other zones. Staff believes  
37 that the inclusion of a "Catering, General" definition into the Table of Uses and the permission of  
38 this definition in Industrial zones, along with permission of "Catering, Limited" operations in  
39 Commercial zones, is compatible and consistent with the General Plan.

40  
41 Commissioner Wright asked how a "Catering, Limited" business that wanted to be  
42 located in an Industrial zone would be permitted. Ms. Younger explained that in an Industrial  
43 zone a business that would otherwise be classified as "Catering, Limited" would just be  
44 classified as Catering, General because, in an Industrial Zone, there is no limit on food odors or  
45 the number of catering vehicles allowed.

46  
47 Commissioner Wright stated that she is concerned about changing the definition of the  
48 business operation's use, based on the zone it is to be located in. She further explained that  
49 she would prefer to have the business permitted so that it remains the same defined type of  
50 use. Mr. Snyder responded that it would not be desirable to make a catering business located in  
51 an Industrial zone be subject to enforcement of rules on odors and limitations on the number of  
52 trucks parked outside, when that is not a concern for other businesses in industrial zones.

1 Commissioner Hirschi and Commissioner Wright asked a question about why  
2 Commercial-Very Heavy zones can't have Catering, General businesses in them, at least as a  
3 Conditional Use. Cory Snyder said this is because of all of the trucks that are associated with  
4 that business being located so close to other businesses that have heavy truck trafficking.  
5

6 Vice Chair Daly asked whether there are currently restrictions on food odors for  
7 restaurants that do not have catering operations. Mr. Snyder replied that there are not any food  
8 odor restrictions on restaurants.  
9

10 Vice Chair Daly opened the matter for public hearing at 7:36 p.m.  
11

12 Robert Love – Mr. Love inquired of the Commissioners whether this amendment would  
13 just impact food trucks. He asked about residential areas where catering trucks might show up  
14 for games and other events. He said that he has had many events that were catered by  
15 companies that do not have trucks and wondered if this is impacting those companies.  
16

17 Kyler James – Mr. James pointed out that the staff report for item 2, which was being  
18 displayed on a projector screen, had a 2017 date in the footer.  
19

20 Seeing no one else wished to make a comment, the public hearing was closed at 7:38  
21 p.m. by Vice Chair Daly.  
22

23 Cory Snyder responded to Mr. Love that delivery of services is not where the use is  
24 being regulated. He explained that what is being regulated with the zone text amendment is the  
25 operation of the base place where the use occurs. If a catering company does not involve  
26 trucks, they would still be considered a catering company. Catering-Limited use would be when  
27 a catering company wants to grow their business by having a few trucks. Catering- General use  
28 would then be applied when a catering company grows even beyond the limited use. The  
29 question has been in what zone a Catering, General company should be located. Staff has  
30 taken the position that a large Catering, General operation should be located in Industrial zones,  
31 and the Commission is debating in what Commercial Zones Catering, Limited operations should  
32 be located.  
33

34 Vice Chair Daly asked about parking for Catering, General businesses. Mr. Snyder says  
35 at this time parking has not been considered in the Catering, General definition. If  
36 Commissioners do not describe parking amount required in the definition of use then parking  
37 studies will be required when a person applies for that kind of use.  
38

39 Commissioner Wright referenced a zoning map of Centerville that Cassie Younger was  
40 displaying. She questioned the use classification a business where a catering and restaurant  
41 operation are together. Mr. Snyder explained that the business would be considered a "Multi-  
42 Use" facility, and would need to be located in a zone that allows restaurants and catering, but  
43 that it would need to be determined whether the catering is primary and the restaurant is  
44 accessory. He further confirmed that restaurants are not allowed in industrial zones, so  
45 Catering, General companies or other catering companies located in Industrial zones could not  
46 open a restaurant operation.  
47

48 Commissioner Wright raised again her previous concerns about classifying business  
49 uses differently for catering operations based on the zone they are in. Vice Chair Daly  
50 questioned what the benefit would be of requiring a Catering, Limited use business that moved  
51 to an Industrial Zone to remain classified as Catering, Limited. Commissioner Wright states that  
52 she feels it would send a message about where the City prefers various types of catering  
53 businesses to be located.

1 Commissioner Helgesen commented that she does not see it as a problem that a  
 2 Catering, Limited company that chooses to move to an Industrial Zone can be reclassified as  
 3 Catering, General and thereby expand their business. She feels that the parameters as they are  
 4 set already send a clear message that certain size catering businesses belong in Industrial  
 5 Zones.  
 6

7 Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** that the Planning Commission recommend  
 8 acceptance to the City Council of the Definition of "Catering, General", as shown below, and that  
 9 the Table of Uses regarding "Catering, General" and "Catering, Limited" be amended as shown  
 10 in Table 1 below, with Reasons for Action (a)-(c). Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.  
 11

12 "Catering- General": An establishment in which the principal use is the preparation of  
 13 food and meals on the premises, and where such food and meals are delivered to another  
 14 location for consumption. Includes catering for food for single event-based food services and  
 15 contractual agreements for a specified period of time. This may include the storage of mobile  
 16 food trucks, and catering transport vehicles. *(Does not include subordinate catering to a food*  
 17 *establishment).*  
 18

**Table 1**

<b>Zones</b>															
<b>Use</b>	<b>A- L</b>	<b>A- M</b>	<b>R- L</b>	<b>R- M</b>	<b>R- H</b>	<b>PF- L</b>	<b>PF- M</b>	<b>PF- H</b>	<b>PF- VH</b>	<b>C- M</b>	<b>C- H</b>	<b>C- VH</b>	<b>I- M</b>	<b>I-H</b>	<b>I- VH</b>
<b>Catering, General</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	P	P	P
<b>Catering, Limited</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	C	P	P	P	P

- 19 Reasons for Action  
 20  
 21 a. The Planning Commission finds that the "decision to amend the . . . zoning ordinance  
 22 is a matter of within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC  
 23 12.21.060.a.1.C.  
 24 b. The definition of "Catering, limited" as permitted in all Commercial Zones and the  
 25 new definition of "Catering, General", as permitted in all Industrial Zone is consistent  
 26 with the goals objections and policies of the General Plan [12-430-1]  
 27 c. The uses are consistent with the zone purposes as stated in CZC 12.30.020.  
 28

29 Commissioner Hirst commented that she does not agree with the Conditional Use for  
 30 Catering, General in C-VH zones, as she does not feel catering should be brought into a zone  
 31 which is primarily used for services that are used by residents on a daily basis. She also stated  
 32 that she does not feel Catering, Limited needs to be permitted in Industrial Zones.  
 33

34 Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to amend the Table of Uses regarding "Catering,  
 35 General" and "Catering, Limited" such that Catering, Limited not be permitted in Industrial  
 36 Zones, as shown in Table 2 below. Commissioner Johnson seconded the amendment, which  
 37 failed (3-3), with Vice Chair Daly, Commissioner Hirst, and Commissioner Helgesen in favor,  
 38 and Commissioners Johnson, Hirschi, and Wright dissenting.  
 39

**Table 2**

<b>Zones</b>															
<b>Use</b>	<b>A- L</b>	<b>A- M</b>	<b>R- L</b>	<b>R- M</b>	<b>R- H</b>	<b>PF- L</b>	<b>PF- M</b>	<b>PF- H</b>	<b>PF- VH</b>	<b>C- M</b>	<b>C- H</b>	<b>C- VH</b>	<b>I- M</b>	<b>I-H</b>	<b>I- VH</b>
<b>Catering, General</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	P	P	P
<b>Catering, Limited</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	C	P	N	N	N

1 Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to amend the Table of Uses regarding  
 2 "Catering, General" and "Catering, Limited" such that Catering, General not be permitted in C-  
 3 VH Zones and Catering, Limited not be permitted in Industrial Zones, as shown in Table 3  
 4 below. Commissioner Hirst seconded motion to amend, which failed (2-4), with Commissioners  
 5 Helgesen and Hirst in favor.

6 **Table 3**

<b>Zones</b>															
<b>Use</b>	<b>A- L</b>	<b>A- M</b>	<b>R- L</b>	<b>R- M</b>	<b>R- H</b>	<b>PF- L</b>	<b>PF- M</b>	<b>PF- H</b>	<b>PF- VH</b>	<b>C- M</b>	<b>C- H</b>	<b>C- VH</b>	<b>I- M</b>	<b>I-H</b>	<b>I- VH</b>
<b>Catering, General</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	P
<b>Catering, Limited</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	C	P	N	N	N

7  
 8 A vote was taken on Commissioner Hirschi's original motion, and the motion passed (4-  
 9 2) with Commissioners Hirst and Helgesen dissenting.

10  
 11 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT – CHICKEN AND RABBIT**  
 12 **PERMITS**

13  
 14 Ms. Younger explained that residents living in Residential-Low Zones who are raising  
 15 chickens or rabbits currently pay \$10 for their initial permit fee, and \$5 for an annual permit  
 16 review fee. Requiring that chicken and rabbit owners obtain a permit has allowed the City to  
 17 maintain a database of names and addresses of owners in case of disease outbreak or  
 18 neighborhood complaint, and ensured that the owners were aware of the regulations regarding  
 19 keeping chickens and rabbits in the City. However, it has recently been brought to staff's  
 20 attention that the annual permit review fee is burdensome. The proposed zoning text  
 21 amendment would remove the renewal fee, but maintain the initial permitting process and fee.

22  
 23 Vice Chair Daly asked how often residents apply for an initial permit and then do not  
 24 renew the permit the following year. Ms. Younger responded that there are 30 active permits,  
 25 and 15 permits that have been closed out over the past 7 years.

26  
 27 Commissioner Wright asked if there are any permits in the City that renew bi-annually.  
 28 Mr. Snyder responded that there are not. Commissioner Wright asked if there is any way that  
 29 chicken & rabbit owners could still be required to obtain a permit annually, perhaps online,  
 30 without having to pay a fee. She is concerned that not having this annual permit renewal would  
 31 mean that the City does not have a record of chicken and rabbit owners in case of disease  
 32 outbreak. Mr. Snyder responded that it would not be possible for renewals to be done online as  
 33 it stands currently.

34  
 35 Vice Chair Daly questioned how chickens and rabbits are permitted in agricultural zones.  
 36 Mr. Snyder replied that Agricultural Zones have an assigned point value for each type of animal,  
 37 and a point allowance per acre of land. He also explained that there is no permit required for  
 38 chickens or rabbits in Agricultural Zones.

39  
 40 Vice Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 8:16 p.m. and closed the public hearing at  
 41 8:16 p.m. seeing that no one wished to comment.

42  
 43 Commissioner Helgesen made a **motion** to recommend approval of the amendments to  
 44 Zoning Code CZC 12.55.240 as shown below, with reasons for action (1)-(2). Commissioner  
 45 Johnson seconded the motion.

1 (a)(2) ~~An annual~~ A permit shall be obtained from the City as described in CZC  
2 12.21.090. In addition to the permit application forms, the City shall provide with all  
3 initial permit application packets, ~~as opposed to annual renewal permit applications,~~  
4 educational information as deemed necessary and appropriate by the City, including, but  
5 not limited to, information regarding the raising of chickens or rabbits, poultry and rabbit  
6 health care, and maintenance issues. All permit applications shall also include the  
7 following:

8  
9 (E) ~~For initial permits, an~~ An acknowledgement and consent form requiring  
10 signature from the applicant that he or she has read the supplemental educational  
11 information and agrees to abide by the terms and conditions of applicable  
12 ordinances.

13  
14 Reasons for Action

- 15 1. The proposed zoning text changes are neither against nor inconsistent with the goals  
16 and objectives of the General Plan [12-21-080(e)1].  
17 2. The one-time permit allows residents in applicable zones to raise chickens and  
18 rabbits for family food production. [12.55.140]  
19

20 Vice Chair Daly raised a concern that people who live in Agricultural zones don't need  
21 permits for their chickens or rabbits. He stated that he is of the opinion that permits should  
22 either be required everywhere, or not required at all. In response, Commissioner Johnson  
23 pointed out that based on the size of the agricultural property, there are natural barriers to  
24 complaints from neighbors; whereas, Residential-Low Zone properties do not have those land  
25 barriers and owners are not trained in farming procedures. The permitting process allows the  
26 City to provide education to owners of chickens and rabbits in the Residential-Low Zone.  
27

28 Commissioner Hirschi commented that he believes it would be a mistake not to have an  
29 annual or periodic review of chicken and rabbit owners in the Residential-Low Zone, as he  
30 believes the City has a responsibility to monitor who has these animals for the health and  
31 welfare of the population.  
32

33 Ms. Younger suggested that she could send out an annual "Chicken and Rabbit Survey"  
34 to see who still has chickens for purposes of maintaining a database.  
35

36 Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to amend the proposed zoning text changes to  
37 include an annual survey to see who still has chickens or rabbits (text to be prepared by staff).  
38 Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.  
39

40 Commissioner Hirschi made a **motion** to table the issue to allow staff time to prepare  
41 additional language regarding the proposed annual survey to be added to Zoning Code CZC  
42 12.55.240. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion and rescinded her previous motion.  
43

44 The motion to table passed unanimously (6-0).  
45

46 **TABLED – RIGBY COURT FINAL SUBDIVISION, 150 E JENNINGS LANE**  
47

48 Because City Council tabled the amendment that was requested by the owner, the Rigby  
49 Court Final Subdivision approval will need to be tabled until the next regularly scheduled  
50 Planning Commission meeting.  
51

1 Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to table the Rigby Court Final Subdivision to the next  
2 regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Johnson seconded the  
3 motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

4  
5 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

6  
7 Cory Snyder reported on upcoming issues that will be coming before the Planning  
8 Commission.

9  
10 Lisa Romney asked the Commissioners on behalf of the City Manager, who would be  
11 available for a work session at 6:30 p.m. on January 17, 2018. Four Commissioners expressed  
12 that they have prior commitments on that evening. Ms. Romney and Mr. Snyder said they will  
13 communicate to the City Manager that the work session will need to be postponed.

14  
15 The next Planning Commission meeting will be January 24, 2018, and the first Planning  
16 Commission meeting in February is scheduled for Tuesday, February 13, 2018.

17  
18 **CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

19  
20 Cory Snyder reviewed recent decisions made by the City Council.

21  
22 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

23  
24 The minutes of the December 13, 2017 meeting were reviewed and amendments  
25 suggested. Commissioner Hirst made a **motion** to accept the minutes as amended.  
26 Commissioner Hirschi seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

27  
28 **ADJOURNMENT**

29  
30 At 8:36 p.m., Vice Chair Daly made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner  
31 Hirschi seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

32  
33  
34   
35 \_\_\_\_\_  
36 Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

37  
38  
39  
40  
41 2-4-18  
Date Approved

38  
39  
40   
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

