PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, March 22, 2017
7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at Centerville 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
Cheylynn Hayman, Vice Chair
Gina Hirst
Kevin Daly
Logan Johnson
Kathy Helgesen

MEMBERS ABSENT
David Hirschi, Chair
Becki Wright

STAFF PRESENT
Lisa Romney, City Attorney
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Cassie Younger, City Planner
Luanne Hudson, Recording Secretary

VISITORS
Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Commissioner Helgesen

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER
Commissioner Helgesen

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held February 22, 2017 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hayman and passed unanimously (5-0).

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held March 8, 2017 were reviewed, amended, and found incomplete. Commissioner Hirst requested Recording Secretary Hudson to compare the minutes with the audio recording and provide a revision. Vice Chair Hayman made a motion to table the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daly and passed unanimously (5-0).

PUBLIC HEARING - FINAL SITE PLAN & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, 347 North 400 East, Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Canyon Point, a multi-family residential project consisting of one single family home, one duplex, and one triplex, Chad Morris, Applicant

City Planner Cassie Younger gave a staff report on Canyon Point, a multi-family residential development seeking approval of a Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit. The
development includes one existing home, a duplex and a triplex. Ms. Younger said the Planning Commission previously approved the Conceptual Site Plan in December 2016 and provided the applicant with a clear list of conditions. She said the road has been widened to meet concerns from the Fire Marshal. Staff reminded the applicant that he qualifies for incentives because the site is located in the Deuel Creek Historic District. Staff said the landscaping plan, especially the trees to buffer the existing single-family homes to the south, is adequate. Staff reminded the applicant that the City’s code requires plant materials be drought tolerant and low maintenance, and specifically noted that Kentucky Bluegrass does not meet code.

Staff said the biggest concern with this site plan is with drainage and utilities that will require a sign-off by the City Engineer. Staff noted the plans include a detention pond, berms and bio-swales along the west side. Staff said a new sewer line is required at the south end of the property and expressed a final concern about overhead telephone lines that must be addressed as a condition of the conceptual plan. Staff noted the applicant has addressed buffering on the north side by the use of a six-foot privacy fence and landscaping. Staff noted there does not appear to be an issue with the retaining wall in the new plan and recommends this application be approved with conditions.

Vice Chair Hayman invited the applicant to speak. Chad Morris addressed the issue with the retaining wall and received clarification from Director Snyder that any retaining wall shorter than four feet does not need to be structurally engineered. He said he did not realize Kentucky Bluegrass was not allowed and said he is willing to look into an alternative grass that is drought tolerant. He said he accepts the City’s suggestions on the height and type of trees. He said he acted on the Commission’s recommendation to speak with the adjacent homeowners and what he heard is a concern about tree overhang, and they will be responsive to that concern. Responding to a question from Commissioner Daly regarding the sewer line, Mr. Morris said he talked with the Sewer District representative and their plans to discontinue use of the shared line with the property to the south are reflected in the revised drawings provided to the Commission.

At 7:35 p.m. Vice Chair Hayman opened the public hearing.

Tim Wilson lives west of the proposed development and asked for clarification regarding the addition of a fence or trees along that side, adding his wife asked him to plant trees for privacy if the developer does not. Staff said the west edge contains the detention pond. Mr. Wilson again asked if that included any kind of privacy fencing. Staff said the plan does not show any proposed fence and asked the applicant to address that. Vice Chair Hayman asked the applicant to again come to the microphone to address that question and Chad Morris said, in summary, he did not think a fence or trees were necessary, but he would do what the Commission recommended.

Linda Martin lives to the south of the proposed development. She asked for the City’s assistance is resolving fence line disputes that have gone on for decades. She asked how far from the property line trees would be planted, noting Building One is only ten feet from her property. She specifically stated she did not want branches overhanging her property, but she did want the developer to provide privacy trees to block her rear windows. She also expressed a concern about trees being placed in the parking strip along 400 East that would block visibility. She asked that the applicant address the issue of the existing driveway and dirt mound on the south side of the existing single-family home because it drains onto her property. She expressed a concern that the existing single family zone would be exposed to rental tenants. Ms. Martin
expressed additional concerns about the sewer line, wildlife, construction noise and hours, and the installation of a temporary construction fence.

Charles Madsen, a homeowner on the north, thanked the City for requiring the developer to put up a six-foot fence along the northern edge of the development to address their concerns about privacy and noise. He asked for clarification on whether the fence goes all the way to the sidewalk, saying if not, school children may cut across his property to get to school. Staff reviewed the parameters for the use of fencing and said the six-foot fence stops 25 feet from 400 East.

Director Snyder responded to many of the issues and questions raised in the public hearing. In answer to the question about the placement of the trees, he said there is a ten-foot separation between the property line and the structure. Trees will be planted in the middle (five feet) and this complies with the City’s requirements for buffer landscaping. He said the developer has agreed to put in a type of tree that will have limited overhang. Regarding tree placement between the sidewalk and the road, Mr. Snyder said that is a controversial issue for the City because of the concern for visibility and clearance to see on-coming traffic. The current ordinance allows trees in the parking strip with a permit from the Public Works Director. Mr. Snyder predicted that the Public Works Director would advise the developer to put the trees behind the sidewalk.

In answer to the question about the existing driveway on the north side of the existing home, Mr. Snyder said the developer will relocate the driveway but is not required to remove the mound of dirt. The City Engineer will sign-off on the drainage plan. He said the City’s Best Management Practices (BMPs) will address the issue of the temporary construction fence. In answer to the question about the existing retaining wall, Mr. Snyder said he consulted with the Public Works Director and the City Engineer and determined it is a non-structural, ornamental, decorative wall that is not required to carry load weights under the City’s ordinances. He added that since the utilities will be located in that area, there are still some design considerations that need to be finalized. He said the questions regarding the sewer line have been adequately addressed by working with the Sewer District. He said the City’s current ordinances regarding construction activities and noise are adequate to address the concerns.

Vice Chair Hayman asked Staff about Ms. Martin’s desire for a buffer between single-family homes and rentals. Mr. Snyder said that may run afoul of the Federal Fair Housing Act, but the developer is using elements like trees and fences to provide a transition.

Vice Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 7:54 p.m.

Vice Chair Hayman invited the applicant to respond to the public comments. Chad Morris said they have presented a good plan with nice, new homes that will look good and be an upgrade to the neighborhood. He plans to request subdivision approval in the future in order to facilitate selling the units to homeowners rather than renting. He said they are willing to work with the City in terms of architectural design and the facade of the homes. He described their extra efforts in terms of landscaping to meet the concerns of adjacent homeowners and the City and to make it appealing to the eye.

Vice Chair Hayman asked for other questions or discussion. Hearing none, the Vice Chair entertained a motion, noting the application had two parts: a Final Site Plan and a CUP.
Commissioner Johnson made a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the Final Site Plan for Canyon Point in Centerville, located at 347 North 400 East, with the Conditions as amended (1-14) and the Reasons for the Action (a-c). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Helgesen and passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:
1. Provide evidence of lot line adjustment for acquisition of additional property from Parcel No. 02-099-0033 prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
2. Provide evidence of combining all parcels and acquired acreage into one parcel prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
3. Must obtain CUP for density prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
4. Applicant shall have a ground water assessment prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
5. Applicant shall provide the legal description and signed PUEs for all required front, side and rear yard PUEs prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
6. Applicant shall provide legal description and signed waterline easement for City culinary waterline prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
7. Access to the existing house and the new driveway pad behind the house shall be provided or shown on the plans in accordance with applicable building and zoning codes prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
8. Landscaping area percentages needs to be recalculated to portray the accurate calculation. Planting materials should be reconsidered to address the needs of the code, and be approved by Staff at the time of Building Permit review.
9. The City Engineer needs to give final approval on issues regarding drainage, structural and retaining walls on the property.
10. The overhead telephone line needs to be addressed or relocated.
11. An amended letter from the South Davis Sewer District with respect to the new sewer line hookups and the existing line connected to the single family home shall be provided prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
12. Parking and road widths shall be subject to the conditions of the Fire Marshal: The fire apparatus Turn-Around Lane must be marked with "No Parking Fire Lane" signs. The access road shall be at 29' of width where there is side parking – 24' feet where there is no parking. The Fire Turn-Around Lane shall have a minimum of 20' clearance.
13. Remove existing sheds located on the property prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.
14. Submit further details and design of proposed fencing to be approved by Staff prior to issuance of building permit for any portion of the property.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:
   a) The Final site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [CZC 12.21.110(e)(2)].
   b) The development appears to satisfy the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan [CZC 12.480.2(1)(b)].
   c) The proposed final site plan, with the directives given, appears to be capable of meeting applicable Development Standards for the R-M Zone.

Commissioner Hirst made a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 6 residential units for Canyon Point in Centerville, located at 347
North 400 East, with the Conditions (1-4) and Reasons for the Action (a-d). Vice Chair Hayman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:

1. This Conditional Use Permit shall allow for the density of 8 units per acre on the property located at 347 North 400 East, which consists of .78 acres and is limited to 6 residential units, divided between 3 buildings: a single family home, one duplex, and one triplex.

2. The Conditional Use Permit is dependent on the acceptance of the Final Site Plan layout and design as approved.

3. A solid fence shall be constructed on the south property line along with increased vegetation shown on the site plan, consisting of trees which shall mitigate a multi-family use adjacent to a single-family residential use.

4. Proper drainage shall be identified and approved by the City Engineer, which shall consist of a berm and drainage swell along the south and west property lines and a storm drain outlet within the drainage swell.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

a) A Conditional Use Permit is required for a single-family dwelling and any multi-family above four units per acre (CZC 12.36 (Table of Uses))

b) The applicant has provided sufficient evidence for a conditional use permit to be reviewed by the Planning Commission (CZC 12.21.100).

c) The project was found to have somewhat of a negative impact on the property to the south, yet may be mitigated through proper screening (CZC 12.21.100(e)(5)(C)(E)).

d) The Zoning Ordinance allows up to 8 units per acre with a conditional use permit within the R-M Zone (CZC 12.32 (Residential Zones)).

PUBLIC HEARING CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN - 149 WEST 1850 NORTH, Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for an accessory building and driveway access. Terry and Selene Bleak, Applicant

Director Snyder explained the Bleak’s application to construct a new garage at their residence and use an adjacent dead-end street stub to install a driveway. The Bleaks acquired an un-platted parcel of land adjacent to their subdivision lot and combined the land into a single parcel, as allowed by State law. However, the added parcel remains outside of the platted subdivision boundary. According to CZC 12.21.110(c)(2), “any residential development outside a platted subdivision” is required to obtain a Site Plan Review from the Planning Commission. Staff recommended this application be approved with conditions.

The property owners who live on the other side of the street stub want to join with the Bleaks in constructing the driveway in order to provide access for possible future use. Mr. Snyder said this project would require minimal services as the applicant is not extending water or sewer lines.

Staff is concerned about water runoff, drainage and the associated storm drain impact of the proposed hard surface driveway. Director Snyder said the City is reviewing the application to confirm that typical utility easements are in place and to assess applicable development impact fees. He explained the big issue is access to the parcel because no temporary turn around for the stub street was provided or installed during the construction of the original subdivision. He
explained this application requires more than one approval and permitting. The Planning
Commission will make the decision regarding the site plan. The Public Works Director and the
City Council will make the decision on the proposed access from the stub street, including an
encroachment agreement. An excavation permit will also be required for improvements within
the public right-of-way. Mr. Snyder said that, although the applicant could use a seven-foot side
yard setback, he recommended the new eight-foot setback, as approved in a recent code update.

Vice Chair Hayman asked for questions on the staff report and hearing none, invited the
applicant to speak.

Terry Bleak said he appreciates and will comply with the City’s suggestion for an eight-
foot side yard setback. The applicant said their plans also take into consideration the fact that, in
the future, the stub road to the back may be extended to facilitate further development. Their
plans show a 40’ setback from the rear of the property.

At 8:20 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

Vice Chair Hayman said this application is a good example of the type of administrative
decision that could be shifted to the City’s very capable staff rather than coming before the
Planning Commission. She asked for a motion.

Commissioner Daly made a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the
conceptual site plan for the proposed residential development for an un-platted parcel that has
been combined with the home located at 149 West 1850 North, with the Conditions as amended
(1-8) and the Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion and it
passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant must submit a final site plan application meeting the standards found in
   CZC 12-21-110(e).
2. As part of Final Site Plan submittal, the owners are to prepare the required legal
descriptions for one 7’ side yard and one 7’ rear yard public utility easement(s). Such
 easement descriptions are to be reviewed by the City Engineer and deemed acceptable.
   Such easements must be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis
   County Recorder’s Office prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory
   structure.
3. The final site plan must show all utilities being provided to the site and the accessory
   structure and owners must obtain and submit to the City the necessary “will serve” letters
   from any of the applicable utility providers.
4. As part of the Final Site Plan submittal, a grading and drainage plan is to be prepared and
   submitted with the application. Such plan is to be deemed acceptable by the City
   Engineer.
5. The owners will also be required to pay any development fees that may be applicable for
   the development of this lot prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory
   structure.
6. As part of any Final Site Plan approval, the owners desiring to use the end of the street
   for access will be required to obtain City approval for such access, enter into any required
   agreement for access, dedicate the required temporary turn-around easement, and prepare
plans for the constructing any access drive. The temporary turn-around easement must be
accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis County Recorder’s Office prior
to issuance of a building permit for the accessory structure.

7. The owners shall submit with Final Site Plan submittal revised plans showing the
proposed temporary turn-around and access plans for use of the public right-of-way.
8. The applicant is encouraged to consider compliance with the new minimum setback of 8
feet on the west side to avoid future non-conforming issues due to the newly adopted
accessory building setbacks standards of March 2017.

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

a. The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [CZC
12.21.110(d)(2)].
b. Applicable utility services and easements are required for residential development [CZC
12.21.110(e)(2)(iii)(d) and CMC 15-5-106(8)].
c. A final site plan application is required for completing the process to obtain approval to
construct an accessory dwelling on un-platted parcels [CZC 12.21.110(e)].

PUBLIC HEARING - CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN, 25 W PARRISH LANE,
Administrative Decision, Consider the proposed Conceptual Site Plan for a drive-thru style
Pizza Hut, Richard Hill, Applicant

City Planner Cassie Younger provided the staff report on the Conceptual Site Plan for a
Pizza Hut Express Drive-Thru. She said the site is at the corner of Parrish and Main Street and
has been vacant for just under a year. Because of the change of use from a specialty shop
(Galaxy Frozen Yogurt) to fast food (Pizza Hut Express Drive Thru), UDOT required a site
study to reevaluate access to the site and adjusting entrances and exits. The applicant has made
changes to the access of the site and is awaiting an approval from UDOT. Ms. Younger said the
applicant will also need a Conditional Use Permit because of the categorical use change. She said
although the site falls within the Parrish Lane Gateway Area and the South Main Street Corridor
Overlay Zone, the site itself is a nonconforming site. She said the biggest diversion from the
design guidelines is the nonconforming setbacks. She wants to amend the existing conditions to
require a new traffic study using the new access points instead of the old ones. Staff
recommended this application be approved with conditions.

Staff said the proposed new architecture is an improvement, featuring brick, gables, and
big windows. Staff recommended upgrading the look of the drive-thru portico. Staff also
recommends improved landscaping due to the site’s high visibility on the corner of Main and
Parrish. She emphasized the need for buffering and screening on the west adjacent to Grease
Monkey and on the south adjacent to an apartment complex.

Commissioner Daly asked for clarification on the requirements for the previous user
classified as specialty retail (yogurt) and the new user classified as fast food (pizza), saying it
appeared to be a change of use from food to food. Director Snyder responded that, as Zoning
Administrator, he wrote an interpretive administrative opinion on how the ordinance applies to
the two different types of uses, and he will forward that opinion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification on how a new traffic study would impact
approval. Mr. Snyder said in approving a CUP, the City needs to evaluate circulation capacity
and traffic flow through the intersection, for example, to see if a median is required for this auto-
centric fast food location.

Vice Chair Hayman asked if the Commission could encourage the applicant to follow
some of the Parrish Lane and Main Street design guidelines and invited the applicant to speak.

Richard Hill is an attorney with the law firm of Durham, Jones & Pinegar and represents
Wasatch Valley Pizza, the Utah franchisee for Pizza Hut. He believes UDOT will approve the
conceptual site plan. He said the drive-thru portico will be substantially upgraded and there will
be only one ingress/egress on Main Street and the other access off of Main Street will be closed
to meet UDOT requirements. He said they will be happy to upgrade landscaping and clarified
their plan to leave the existing six-foot white vinyl fence to the west.

At 8:46 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

Commissioner Johnson asked Director Snyder for options in the event the Commission
disagreed with the opinion of the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Snyder said yes. The Commission
could request another interpretation and then submit an appeal of that interpretation to the Board
of Adjustment within 14 days. Mr. Snyder again stated he would provide a copy of the
interpretive administrative opinion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Helgesen made a motion for the Planning Commission to approve the
Conceptual Site Plan for Pizza Hut Centerville, located at 25 W Parrish Lane, with the
Conditions as amended (1-7) and Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Hirst seconded
the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

CONDITIONS:
1. A Final Site plan application must be submitted in accordance with CZC 12.21.110(e)(2).
2. A Conditional Use Permit application must be submitted in accordance with CZC
   12.21.100.
3. Consider how to further utilize the landscaping and screening expectations under CZC
   12.51 (Landscaping), with consideration of recommendations from staff.
4. The applicant must provide written permission from UDOT that their change in access
   from Parrish and Main is adequate.
5. A development schedule must be submitted with the Final Site Plan.
6. All proposed drainage and utilities should be reviewed and deemed by a City Engineer
   for the Final Site Plan.
7. A new traffic study must be provided by the applicant updating and re-evaluating the new
   access points instead of the old ones.

SUGGESTED REASONS FOR THE ACTION:
  a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be
developed [CZC 12.21.110(d)(2)].
  b) The development appears to satisfy, or be able to satisfy, the goals and objectives found
     within the Centerville City General Plan [Section 12-430-2]
  c) The proposed site has a nonconforming status, due to the change of tenant but not
     occupancy status, as established in [CZC 12.22.080(b)]
PUBLIC HEARING - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, LEGISLATIVE DECISION,  
Consider a proposed amendment to the General Plan, Chapter 12-480-2 Neighborhood 1,  
Southwest Centerville, Section 2, to allow residential uses in the Pages Lane Commercial  
District. Vinegar Brothers and Brighton Homes, LLC, Applicant

Director Snyder presented the staff report on the petitioner’s request to amend the  
General Plan text of the Pages Lane Commercial Area of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan. The  
petitioner wants to obtain Residential-Medium (R-M) zoning and develop up to eight (8)  
dwelling units per acre. Mr. Snyder said, unfortunately, this is not a good time to entertain this  
petition due to planning initiatives already underway. Since late 2016, the City has been  
reevaluating the specific plan for this neighborhood. He said the Planning Commission will need  
to decide whether to consider this petition in advance of the City’s current reevaluation. Staff  
recommends this petition be denied.

Vice Chair Hayman invited the petitioner to speak.

Taylor Spendlove of Brighton Homes said their objective is to obtain all the property east  
of Deseret Industries and request a zoning change to Residential-Medium (R-M). He said they  
already have three parcels under contract and are close to getting the fourth. He said it has taken  
over two years to get these parcels under contract and a delay in a decision from the Planning  
Commission will negatively impact this potential project. He asked the Planning Commission to  
table their decision to give Brighton Homes time to return with a more complete visual concept  
of their proposal.

At 8:58 p.m. the public hearing was opened and closed with no public comment.

Vice Chair Hayman invited discussion, saying she does not think commercial works in  
the area, but she is interested in the developer’s proposal.

Commissioner Daly said he wants fuller discussion about whether this area is right for  
residential or commercial uses and whether the area should be divided for development as east  
and west parcels. He said another reason to wait is because there are actually five parcels, and so  
while the Petitioner has tied up three of the parcels, approval now may result in piecemeal  
development.

Commissioner Helgesen expressed a desire not to rush but to wait for the City Council’s  
direction and consensus.

Commissioner Hirst said this is an opportunity to take a large parcel of land and plan a  
great development, and also that the public should be invited into the process. Commissioner  
Hirst said, based on the discussion at the work session with the City Council on March 21, the  
decision should not be rushed by market conditions and encouraged public participation before a  
decision is made. She recalled the planning process for development of the west side and  
suggested a community survey.

Director Snyder said one option is to hold a charrette or visioning process to discuss  
design standards and whether the site is best for residential, commercial, or something else  
entirely. He says the City has talked about this for three or four years and recommends staying  
true to the larger picture process.
Commissioner Johnson expressed his opinion that he sees land use planning creeping towards property owners being able to do less and have less discretion over their property. He said it is incredible that the developer has these parcels under contract and this opportunity may not come again.

Several Commissioners noted that it may be best to wait until more input could be gathered from the public and a consensus developed between the City Council and the Planning Commission.

Seeing a man who wanted to make a public comment, Vice Chair Hayman asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing at 9:18 p.m. Commissioner Daly made the motion and Commissioner Johnson seconded it.

The man introduced himself as Scott from Colonial Ace Hardware located in the Pages Lane Commercial Area. He said he wanted to challenge the notion that the location was not good for commercial use. He said Ace Hardware has a 25 year lease and it is a good retail area. He said he has doubled the profits in the last three years. He speculated that Deseret Industries may not stay at the current location. He agreed with the Commission's plan to get public input and referred to recent public pushback over homeless shelters in Salt Lake City.

Vice Chair Hayman closed the public hearing at 9:21 p.m. She said while she is sensitive to Commissioner Johnson's comments, she is inclined to deny the petition until such time as public comment is sought.

Commissioner Daly made a motion for the Planning Commission to recommend that the General Plan Amendments to the Pages Lane Commercial Area, as proposed by the Petitioner, be denied based on the Reasons for the Action (a-c). Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).

REASONS FOR THE ACTION:

a. The Planning Commission finds that a decision to amend the General Plan is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council as described in CZC 12.21.060(a).

b. The Planning Commission finds that the City is currently underway in a larger effort to reconsider the future land use planning for the Southeast Neighborhood Plan that already includes reevaluating the Pages Lane Commercial Area.

c. The Planning Commission finds that further evaluation efforts are needed to determine if it's appropriate to allow for a broad neighborhood plan language change, as proposed by the petitioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Upcoming for the April 12th:
- Arcoiris Reception Center CUP
- Ronin Motors CUP
- Chitsoe Johnson Preliminary Subdivision

CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS REPORT
- Accessory Building Setbacks
- SE Neighborhood Residential Plan
Vice Chair Hayman made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0). The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Vice Chair Cheylynn Hayman

Luanne Hudson, Recording Secretary

4-12-2017
Date Approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ADDRESS**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Raege</td>
<td>Ask ur Centerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Selene Breck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Goodfellow/Mary Tillius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve &amp; Kathryn Penrose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim &amp; Chris Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck &amp; Conni Madsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erine &amp; Peggy Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Spendlove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt &amp; Holly Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharron Smith</td>
<td>Centerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Bothell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Your address will be used only in the event the City staff needs to contact you pertaining to an issue discussed in the Planning Commission meeting.