

Action Summary:

#1 MTP amendment, proposed ATP and Main St. MP- Consideration	Recommended for approval.
#2 Land Use Code amendment Ch. 1.18- Discussion	Discussed, moved to action item, recommended for approval with stated changes.
#3 MDA for Twenty Wells PUD- Discussion	Discussed.
#4 Rezone of Durfee Landing- Discussion	Discussed.
#5 Highlands PUD- Discussion	Discussed.
#6 MDA for Highlands PUD- Discussion	Tabled.
#7 Minutes from 3/7/24 regular meeting.	Approved.

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON MARCH 21, 2024 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ON ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members Present: Chair: John Limburg, Vice-Chair: Rick Barchers, Kevin Hall, Derek Dalton.

Commission Members Not present: Rob Jaterka

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth, Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton, Community and Economic Development Administrative Assistant Jaina Bassett, Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham, Fire Chief Jason Smith, Police Chief Robert Sager, City Council Member Jeff Williams.

On Zoom: Aqua Consultant Shay Stark, City Engineer Robert Rousselle

Citizens and Guests Present: Jeff Downward, Laura Imlay, Lee Imlay, Jacob Clegg, Penny & John Anderson, Thane Smith, Katelyn Butler, Janette Toone, Paul Brierley, Andrea & Jim Smith, Amy Walker, Ed & Elaine Burrola, Pete S., Greg Copeland, Mike Nielson, Kelly Nielson, Shane Steere, Ben Hunt

On Zoom: Several unknowns.

Commission Chairman: John Limburg called meeting to order at 7:00 PM

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2024 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

a) PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GRANTSVILLE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (MTP), AND PROPOSED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (ATP) / MAIN STREET MASTER PLAN

No comments.

b) PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GRANTSVILLE LAND USE AND MANAGEMENT CODE - CHAPTER 1, SECTION 1.18 – NOTICE

Gary Pinkham- Gary Pinkham was present to speak on this item. He noted that he has some changes he would like to see. It was noted that those will be discussed during the Discussion item on the agenda.

c) PROPOSED MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE ESTATES AT TWENTY WELLS PUD

Ron Kunz- Ron Kunz was present on Zoom to speak on this item. He stated he lives on Gold Dust Rd. He stated this project will be near his home and expressed concerns regarding his own home's value due to the smaller sized lots in this proposal. He noted that he believes there are better locations in Grantsville for high density, and noted he would like to encourage the developer/ owner to provide half acre lots for this project.

Janette Toone- Janette Toone was present to speak on this item. She stated that she lives on Gold Dust Rd. with property towards Twenty Wells. She expressed concerns regarding the timeline, specifically for the improvements, especially the parks and the lack of open space. She noted that she has witnessed other parks being proposed that were never finished. She stated that she just wants to make sure the proposed park and amenities are completed for the residents to use, as promised.

d) PROPOSED REZONE OF DURFEE LANDING FROM ZONING DESIGNATION A-10 TO C-G, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1350 W. MAIN ST

Laura Imlay- Laura Imlay was present to speak on this item. She owns property at 906 Cherry St., directly adjacent to the land for the proposed rezone. She noted her appreciation for the time and dedication that went into the information collection for the

General Plan, and the opportunity for her to speak. She stated that they felt peace knowing that their home would remain in an area with similar and favorable uses to their own. She stated that she feels confident in the City's ability to maintain the character of the City and community. She noted that she understands how difficult it must be to sell land as agricultural, but feels that there must be a better solution to rezone this property, than to rezone it to commercial. She wants to keep her neighborhood residential, and expressed her strong opposition to this proposed rezone. She stated that she loves Grantsville and appreciates all that serve the City.

Shane Steere- Shane Steere was present to speak on this item. He stated that he submitted his concerns via email, and proceeded to read that email for the public comment portion:

Good afternoon members of the community economic development and planning commission,

I would like to offer my comments and concerns regarding the rezoning of the residential areas to a commercial zoning and future development of the Durfee Landing complex.

To give you a little background on myself, I am a Senior Superintendent for a commercial builder and have been in the residential and commercial construction industry for around 25 years. I have lived in communities that are similar in size to Grantsville (Johnstown, Colorado and Rigby, Idaho), a smaller community (Laketown, Utah) and much larger (Surprise, Arizona and Bountiful, Utah). Being in construction, my livelihood and lifestyle rely completely on development and new construction. I have also learned that my family and I choose where we live with the understanding that my jobsite is most likely not going to be in the same town, city, county and sometimes the same state. I am currently building my families primary residence on the west end of Cherry Street in Cherrywood Estates. My family and I have lived in Grantsville three times since 2014. Once in the South Willow Estates, once in Cherry Grove and now getting ready to move into Cherrywood Estates.

Here are my comments about Grantsville as a whole. The first time that we moved to Grantsville was when I was working for a residential builder in Stansbury Park. We looked at living in Tooele but decided Grantsville was a bit slower and more spread out and more relaxed than the areas of Tooele we looked at. That lifestyle is what has brought my family back two more times. We bought and built out here knowing that we would have to go outside of Grantsville for specific shopping, entertainment, dining options and work. I believe that most of the people that have moved to Grantsville have had the same understanding. I

know that it would be great to be able to capture more of the money that is spent outside the city and offer jobs that keep the residents of Grantsville working in our city. In my opinion Grantsville continues to grow because of the lifestyle that comes with the space and friendly attitude that radiates from here.

My concerns about the Durfee Landing rezoning are taken from the years I have spent in construction, my experience living in other communities and the desire that I have for my family. It seems like this commercial complex would be one of the largest, if not the largest, commercial developments in Grantsville.

1 - One thing that I am a little confused on from the packet is whether this is planned to be a Multi-Unit Residential Development as it states on Page 158 and 159 of the full packet or if it is planned to be a commercial development as it shows on Page 160? It seems like the C-G designation would be the development as shown on Page 160.

2 - As a business owner there are three key factors directly related to success. They are location, location, location. This location seems very odd to me due to the fact that it is not on any main arterial street segments in Grantsville. I read in the report that "development will eventually creep up the West Hillside". I agree that it will eventually head that way. What I am seeing is that the current developments are largely in the far west (Highlands) and east side (20 wells, Brentwood). I am sure that Northstar is continuing to expand to the south. I don't recall any planned growth to the west of the proposed Durfee Landing. This plot does not have the needed street traffic to survive.

3 - I have also seen several flex spaces completely empty only a couple of years after construction is complete. These have been because of location, lease costs, lack of traffic (foot and vehicle) so it is hard for me to be optimistic about so much strip mall type of construction.

4 - I also noticed that there is an outdoor and household storage lot noted. I called the managers of the already existing storage facilities in Grantsville to check on the availability of units. EACH of them expressed that they have units available. If we add another storage facility we are taking rents and livelihood away from current Grantsville businesses. I don't feel right about that.

5 - What businesses have expressed interest in setting up shop in Grantsville? This plan shows 6 retail/office buildings, 4 larger office/warehouse buildings and three strip mall buildings. That is a lot of space to fill for Grantsville.

6 - There are also two areas noted as "Park/Open Water Storage Area". Are these going to be turf or are they going to turn into weed fields like the majority of the retention basins around Grantsville?

7 - With this size of development, there are typically tax incentives that are used to draw businesses in. What, if any, incentives have been promised to the developer and or future businesses?

8 - Who is going to pay for the street extension and utility infrastructure at Main Street and Cherry Lane?

9 - Do we have enough water to sustain this complex?

10 - Is the intention of the developer to keep the buildings or sell them to private ownership groups? If they are planned to be sold, who will be responsible for the upkeep of the surrounding areas?

On the personal side of this discussion, my family and I chose to build our home on the lot that we did to get away from this type of development. On the future land use map adopted January 15, 2020 it shows the majority of commercial zoning is west of the Walmart Distribution Center, the length of Burmister, through the center of Grantsville along State Route 138 and east near State Route 112. I believe those are better locations with better traffic than the proposed location of Durfee Landing. I want Grantsville to continue to be a place that people feel comfortable. I feel like this type of development is not the right fit for Grantsville. I don't want Grantsville to look like some areas of Tooele, West Valley, Bountiful, Layton and most cities throughout the state that have empty shops and unkempt property.

Thank you for reading my comments and concerns. I would love to share these in person on Thursday night if there is time to do so.

He noted that he noticed after sending the email that there is some proposed development in the Sun Sage area.

He stated that he spoke with a friend that works for the City of Orem, who noted they have several flex spaces that remain vacant, a problem that Grantsville would have.

Greg Copeland- Greg Copeland was present to speak on this item. He noted that he recently purchased a lot in Sun Sage. He noted that he understands that the item is for discussion of the rezone request, but that the concept plan is concerning to him. He stated that as a commercial development, there are certain things that must be taken into consideration. He expressed concerns about this area being an island for commercial development if approved, as well as concerns about traffic and access. He noted that a

large amount of parking stalls are proposed in the concept plan, which suggests high levels of traffic. He stated that the accesses would be through predominantly residential areas, which is concerning for residents. He suggested that changing the land use plan is not in the best interest of the residents, and that more time is needed for the public to adequately provide input on this proposal.

e) PROPOSED PUD FOR THE HIGHLANDS SUBDIVISION, LOCATED ON SR138

Kelly Nielsen- Kelly Nielsen was present to speak on this item. She stated that she is a resident of the currently built-out area of the Highlands development, where she has lived for about 2 years. She stated that they moved to Grantsville to get away from the crime they were around in the Salt Lake City area, and to live in a smaller community that would be better for their family. She stated that they have loved it here, but that there have been issues with the residents and builders in their area. She stated that after looking at the proposed plan, it looks like a lot is planned for that area. She expressed concerns about traffic, parking, and flooding. She stated that she does not think growth is a problem because it is going to come, but is concerned about how quickly it will come. She stated that the high density is concerning, and suggested removing some units to help mitigate the potential issues with traffic and parking. She noted that the idea of having a park closer to her home would be beneficial for her and her family.

Mike Nielsen- Mike Nielsen was present to speak on this item. He stated that in the five currently developed areas of their development, there are open spaces that are unkempt. He noted that they are concerned about the proposed open space areas remaining unkempt and inaccessible for the public. He would like to see less housing in this plan, and more park space. He noted that most of the parks proposed are in the multi-residential areas and none in the single-family residential areas.

AGENDA

John Limburg made a motion to move agenda items one and two to the end of the meeting, so they can be addressed after item number six. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

1. Consideration to recommend approval of the amendment to the Grantsville Transportation Master Plan (MTP), and to recommend approval of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) / Main Street Master Plan.

Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton was present to answer questions on this item. He noted that this was part of a study that involved some staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council members. He noted that the ATP is a plan for movement around Grantsville City without automobiles. He stated that this is a guide for what Grantsville could be.

Chairman Limburg noted that Midvalley Highway was not considered in the MTP. Aqua Consultant Shay Stark was present and stated that there were not any actual numbers to use for Midvalley Highway when this study was done, as it was under construction. He noted that this will be amended to account for Midvalley Highway in the future.

Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham was present. He noted that the areas to the West of the foothills seem to be excluded from this plan. He also noted that to the South and East, there is nothing in the future plan to move people towards town.

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend approval of the amendment to the Grantsville Transportation Master Plan (MTP), and to recommend approval of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) / Main Street Master Plan. John Limburg seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Nay,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye.” The motion carried.

2. Discussion regarding the proposed amendment to the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code - Chapter 1, Section 1.18 – Notice.

It was noted that the purpose of the proposed sign requirement is to be more transparent and to help the public be more aware of the applications that have been accepted by the City.

Vice-Chairman Barchers indicated that he would like the required signs to be larger, if the development is larger. He suggested that the signs be posted every 100 yards on the frontage of the property, and on any intersection included in the property. He also suggested that the signs be the color yellow to be more noticeable.

Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham stated that there is a clerical error in (2)(b)(C). He stated that the word “subdivision” needs to be changed to “zoning change”.

John Limburg made a motion to make agenda item number two an action item. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Rick Barchers made a motion to approve the proposed amendment to the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code - Chapter 1, Section 1.18 - Notice, with the stated clerical change, that the signs be posted every 100 yards and at any intersection on the property, that the applicants be charged for recovery of the cost and staff time related to the signs, and that the signs be the color yellow. John

Limburg seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

3. Discussion regarding the proposed Master Development Agreement for The Estates at Twenty Wells PUD.

Scott Yermish was present to answer questions, representing the property owners. Jacob Clegg was also present to answer questions, as the project’s engineer. Mr. Yermish noted that the PUD was approved by City Council last night, March 20th. He stated that they have been working with James Waltz on the Master Development Agreement, and that they have agreed to do everything previously requested, specifically the large park and upsized water and sewer lines. He noted that those items are addressed in the Master Development Agreement. Mr. Yermish stated that this is the first draft of the Master Development Agreement, and suggested it would be best to have a Work Session with the Planning Commission and City Council, so they can work together on the details.

Commissioner Kevin Hall asked the applicants to address the concerns expressed in the public hearing portion of this meeting, specifically regarding parks and the small lots that are up against Anderson Ranch lots. Mr. Clegg stated that any lots that are up against Anderson Ranch will be half acre lots or will have a large buffer. He stated that a fence will act as a buffer in some areas.

Mr. Yermish stated that they looked at the phasing and noted they have different ideas for the park. He noted that they will sit down with Public Works and determine the specifics of the park. He stated that the Master Development Agreement is legally binding and assured the room that the park will happen and will be required of them in this agreement. He noted that park improvements will come with each phase, as requested by the City.

Vice-Chairman Rick Barchers noted that the Planning Commission is in favor of a Work Session for this agenda item. He also noted that the schedule for the park is not very clear. Mr. Yermish clarified that anything stated per phase must be done at the beginning of the phases. City Council Liaison Rhett Butler clarified that the “phases” listed refer to the phases of improvements, not the phases of the development. Chairman John Limburg acknowledged that the resident’s concern about the open spaces not being finished, is a valid concern. The Commissioners stated that the improvement phases need to be linked directly to the development phases.

Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham was present to speak on this agenda item. He noted that the Master Development Agreement was dated, and should not be until it has received official approval. Mr. Pinkham stated that discussions should not include any promise of units per acre or build-out, but that the City code should determine the build-out and units per acre allowed. He noted that in section 6.6 on page 11, there is a period at the end. He stated this sentence should continue, the period should be removed, or the sentence should be rewritten.

Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton noted that this is a very rough draft which the City Attorney has not reviewed yet. Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth stated that this draft will be reviewed and discussed further, before and during the work session.

Vice-Chairman Barchers noted for the public's benefit, that half of this area is already zoned MU (Mixed-Use), specifically everything above area three. Therefore, the Commission is already bound by those requirements and allowances for that area.

Chairman Limburg spoke to the benefits of the proposed large park in this area, as Grantsville City is park-deficit.

4. Discussion regarding the proposed Rezone of Durfee Landing from zoning designation A-10 to C-G, located at approximately 1350 W. Main St.

Lance Ford was present to speak on this agenda item. He noted this is their third time coming before the Planning Commission, and that they have looked at several different proposals for this project. He noted that the feedback received at the prior Planning Commission meeting led them to look at the other developments that are coming in. He stated that he appreciates the thoughts and feelings expressed by the residents during the public hearing portion of this meeting. He expressed the desire to eliminate negative feelings and to have a proposal that is favorable for all.

He stated that they were asked to speak to some of the residents of Grantsville, and noted that they did so. He stated that one resident, Andrew Nelson, expressed interest in restaurants like Chick-fil-a, a Walgreens or CVS, and the idea of a microflex warehouse. Another resident, Isaac Peterson, expressed interest in a specialized hardware store, an IFA or tractor store, a steakhouse, and the idea of a microflex warehouse. Residents Cody and Brayden Dunn expressed interest in a steakhouse, a normal fast-food concept, an Italian restaurant, a coffee shop, and the ideas of green space there. Residents Chris and Sherice mentioned that they do not want to see fast food or a small strip mall, or anything that would bring in traffic. Resident James Muir expressed interest in an IFA, karate/dance/jiu jitsu location in the micro flex warehouses, to avoid traveling to Tooele for those amenities. Mr. Ford stated that after receiving this feedback, they feel confident in the ability to create a commercial development that would be beneficial for residents of Grantsville.

Mr. Ford acknowledged the concern about maintenance of green spaces, and stated that they would be maintaining all of the green space and park space, even if no tenants are there. He spoke to the potential traffic that this proposal may bring, and noted that this has been done in other places like Pleasant Grove. He noted that there are methods that can be used to deter traffic, such as speed bumps. He stated that he would like to eliminate the retail office turnout onto Cherry Street, so people would not be turning directly onto that road, helping to preserve the quiet area. Mr. Ford noted that their intention is not to take business away from local businesses, but to support the growth and provide revenue to the City.

Commissioner Derek Dalton stated that he would rather see something with houses in the back with commercial development up front, so it would blend in better with the surrounding uses. He stated that they do not need to be the exact same lot sizes as the surrounding lots. Mr. Ford received this suggestion favorably, and noted that he could accept this.

Commissioner Hall acknowledged the public comment that referred to this development as an island for commercial development. He noted that he feels the C-G zoning in this area would be an island. He noted that he agrees with Commissioner Dalton's suggestion of putting housing in the back that would blend in with the surrounding lots better.

Chairman Limburg acknowledged the public comment which mentioned open space versus green space. He noted that the Commissioners are moving away from the interest in open space because they recognize the issues that may come with that. He noted that in response to a concern mentioned previously, it is not the Commission's role to discuss the competition for businesses that this would bring in. He also noted that this zoning designation in this area is not something he would vote to approve. Chairman Limburg stated he would like to see commercial development in the areas designated for it, on the future land use map.

Mr. Ford stated that in his previous discussions with the City and Planning Commission, the residential portions being requested today, were discouraged. He noted that commercial development was encouraged, so that is what he is attempting to move forward with. He noted that the purpose of this rezone is to look towards what could be there in the future. Mr. Ford asked what type of development Chairman Limburg would like to see if this were a blank slate. Chairman Limburg stated that he would like to see the zoning match the future land use map, which shows RR-1 in this area. Vice-Chairman Barchers noted that the road in this area is only gravel at this time, which would be a concern for any type of development.

Mr. Ford asked the Commissioners what they would like to see in this development. Chairman Limburg and Commissioner Hall stated they would like to see half acre or one acre lots. Vice-Chairman Barchers and Commissioner Dalton stated they would like to see half acre lots. Commissioners stated that they are not against commercial development, but that commercial development does not fit in this area of Grantsville. Commissioner Hall stated that the one thing Grantsville needs is business, regardless of where that may be. He noted that businesses are needed more than residential homes at this time. City Council Liaison Rhett Butler noted that 15-20 years in future, it will make sense to have pockets of commercial development.

Bob Durfee, the property owner, was present to speak on this item. He spoke of water availability, and what would be required of them to provide that water for residential lots here. He noted that it would be hard for them to attain the required water. Commission members noted that consideration of water rights and availability is not a part of their roles or responsibilities.

5. Discussion regarding the proposed PUD for The Highlands subdivision, located on SR138.

Stephen McCutchans, Diane Rowberry, and Amy Walker were present at the meeting, along with Guy Haskell via Zoom. Mr. McCutchans noted that this property has been zoned RM-7 for over 20 years. He stated that this site is in a strategic location in the City, and the proposal includes a variety of housing styles to accommodate different family needs. He noted that a 10 acre park is included in this proposal, as well as other open spaces.

Chairman Limburg asked Mr. McCutchans if the City park, labeled number six, was planned to be a retention basin. Mr. McCutchans confirmed that part of that park is proposed to be a retention basin. He noted that specifics will be addressed in the Master Development Agreement, and that an HOA will maintain the parks. Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth noted that the City does not want to maintain the parks. Mr. McCutchans noted that they are hoping the trail system will be maintained by Grantsville City.

Mr. Haskell stated that his goal with this project is to make things as affordable as possible. He noted that the smaller green spaces will be maintained by the HOA. He noted that he does not want the HOA to include the 7000 sq ft homes, to keep the cost down. He noted that the overall goal is to reach a variety of people and their different needs, while maintaining affordability.

Vice-Chairman Barchers noted that the yards for some of the proposed units do not meet the code's requirements. Mr. McCutchans stated that this is one of the variations they are requesting in the PUD. Vice-Chairman Barchers stated that exceptions to yard sizes, setbacks, and parking requirements will not be granted. Commissioner Hall stated that he will also vote against approving exceptions to setbacks. Commissioner Dalton echoed these sentiments, stating that the code needs to be followed and that he would like to see a minimal amount of exceptions be requested. Chairman Limburg agreed, stating that codes related to safety will not be waived.

Mr. McCutchans noted that the exceptions requested could provide the affordable housing that is needed. Mr. Haskell stated that he is willing to look at the setbacks and yard size requirements, and attempt to implement them. He noted that they desire the variation to setbacks mostly where the homes are against the proposed trail. The Commission received this favorably, if parking requirements are met. Mr. McCutchans noted that one exception they are asking for is to allow the street parking to be counted as guest parking. He noted that he recognizes the alley-loaded homes to be a concern of the Commissioners. He stated that they will look at the possibility of changing them to not be alley-loaded.

It was noted that the developers would pave half of Mack Canyon, and the adjoining development would pave the other half of it.

Chairman Limburg stated that he would like to see the green spaces fully landscaped. Commissioner Dalton and Aqua Consultant Shay Stark noted that the PUD code requires them to be landscaped. Mr. Stark also noted that in the multi-residential areas, they are also required to be amenity-rich.

6. Discussion regarding the proposed Master Development Agreement for The Highlands subdivision, located on SR138.

John Limburg made a motion to table the discussion regarding the proposed Master Development Agreement for The Highlands subdivision, located on SR138. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

7. Approval of minutes from the March 7, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Rick Barchers made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 7, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Report from City Council liaison Rhett Butler.

City Council Liaison Rhett Butler was present for this agenda item. He expressed his appreciation for John Limburg and his service to the City, on the behalf of the City Council.

9. Adjourn.

Kevin Hall made a motion to adjourn. John Limburg seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Kevin Hall “Aye,” John Limburg “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” Motion carried unanimously. The meeting ended at 10:06PM.