

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Safe Harbor CUP- Consideration	Tabled.
#2	Deseret Meadows Application Allowance- Consideration	Recommended for denial.
#3	Burmester ROW Rezone- Discussion	Recommended for approval.
#4	Townhomes at Presidents Park Final Plat- Discussion	Recommended for approval.
#5	Heritage Farms Ph. 1 Final Plat- Discussion	Recommended for approval.
#6	Cherry Wood Lot 109 Vacate & Amend- Consideration	Recommended for approval.
#7	Cherry Grove Plat Amendment (Lots 601, 602)- Consideration	Tabled.
#8	Cherry Grove Plat Amendment (Basin)- Consideration	Tabled.
#9	Code Amendment Ch. 13- Discussion	Recommended for approval.
#10	Code Amendment 21.2.11- Discussion	Recommended for approval.
#11	West Bank Master Plan- Consideration	Recommended for approval with modifications.

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON JULY 18, 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 Rick Barchers, Vice-Chair Derek Dalton, Jeff Downward

Commission Members Absent: Kevin Hall, Rob Jaterka

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth, Community & Economic Development Administrative Assistant Jaina Bassett, Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham, City Engineer Robert Rousselle, City Council Liaison Rhett Butler, City Council Member Heidi Hammond

On Zoom: Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

Citizens and Guests Present: Michael Vanwyck, Savannah Bushman, Michael Bushman, Mike DeCarlo, Jamie Tolman, Alex Faulk, Stacie Reidhead, Lynzie Harris, James Stipanovich, Dalton Stice, Sarah Chidester, Amanda Johnson, Rachel Johnson, Thane Smith, Wade Sandberg, Mike Colson, Barry Bunderson, Ron Ward, Connie Ward, Bradley Tolman, Sean Van Noy, Darrelyn Van Noy, Angie Stipanovich, Trevor Lujan, Heidi Hammond, Krisel Travis, Paul Johnson, Barb Yauney

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Jessica Hanson, Jessica Lilley, Rena Schultz, Shelby Densley, Mark Baker, Several Unknowns

Commission Chairman Rick Barchers called the meeting to order at 6:59 PM.

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 18, 2024 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

- a) Proposed conditional use permit for Savannah Bushman to own and operate Safe Harbor, a Sober Living Home/ Transitional Treatment Home, located at 119 N. Waterhole Way in the RM-7 zone**

Amanda Johnson: Amanda Johnson was present to speak on this item. She stated that she has concerns regarding this permit due to the large number of children in the neighborhood (about 69); the recidivism rate of individuals that have been in jail and been through a treatment program in a state to come to a home like this (about 3.3/7 people); the flow of the neighborhood as all residents would need to pass the entire neighborhood to get to this home; and the negative impact on home values and sellability rates (possibly a value drop of 8%). She stated that the viability of the home's residents to get back on their feet is very low in this area, and heavily car-dependent. She also mentioned that there is not enough room for each resident to have a parked car at the residence.

Paul Johnson: Paul Johnson was present to speak on this item. He stated that he has concerns about this permit, and that he has done lots of research on these types of homes. He stated that he has a friend that lives close to a home like this in Cache County, who is unable to let his daughter outside without his direct supervision, which is a concern for him as a parent. He also stated that he and his wife knocked on 70 doors in this neighborhood, and received concerns from 69 out of

70 of the homeowners. He stated that they moved to this neighborhood because it is a safe community for their family and children, unlike the large cities. He stated that it is not a matter of if, but when, something bad will happen, that children will be exposed to. He expressed concerns regarding the impacts of this home and its residents on the children and others in the community. He stated that he is very against this proposal.

Dalton Stice: Dalton Stice was present to speak on this item. He stated that his concern is that if this permit was approved in this meeting, he does not believe that the City has control or oversight of the individuals that are admitted into this home, or the criminal history that they have. He said that he feels this is an unfair position to put the Planning Commission in. He stated that there are several children in this neighborhood, with most of them on the same street that this home is. He expressed that he is uncomfortable with this proposal in this area, and that this is a poor area for the placement of a home like this.

Ron Ward: Ron Ward was present to speak on this item. He stated that he feels there are City zoning regulations for a reason, and to throw them out would defeat the purpose of Planning Commissions. He stated that he feels the residents of this home would need to walk some distance to reach transportation or food, and that it would be better suited for an industrial or business area, not a residential area.

Sarah Chidester: Sarah Chidester was present to speak on this item. She stated that she lives in this area and has children there. She stated that this area has a high concentration of children. She expressed concerns regarding the residents' potential access to transportation and medical clinics. She noted that there are not many jobs in Grantsville as it is, which would make it harder for the home's residents. She expressed concerns about inadequate parking space for residents' vehicles, and the potential for children to be exposed to drug paraphernalia. She stated that she feels the business plan has holes in it, and expressed concerns regarding the high potential for relapse. She stated that there is no reason for it to be located in a family-oriented neighborhood.

Mark Baker: Mark Baker was present to speak on this item. He stated that he lives in the neighborhood of this proposal. He stated that he has 5 years of experience in social work, specifically with children of parents in these types of programs. He stated that he believes in these programs and supports them 100%, but has concerns regarding this location for them in a residential area. He stated that about 4/10 individuals in these programs are successful, with many of them completing the program more than once, and with frequent relapses. He stated that this poses a threat to the small children in the neighborhood, and feels it is better suited for a commercial area away from residential homes. He stated that he hopes the applicant can find a better location for this proposal.

Jessica Lilley: Jessica Lilley was present to speak on this item. She stated that she is a friend of the applicant, Savannah. She stated that she is in support of this application, and that she disagrees with the statistics stated by the previous resident. She stated that she is a successful

individual of recovery and a program like this, and that these individuals are seeking a second chance that this home would provide for them. She stated that she hears the concerns about the effects on children, but does not feel that this home or its residents would pose a threat to the neighborhood's children. She stated that she would trust the potential residents with her own children's lives. She expressed that the residents in these homes deserve the same opportunities as everyone else. She stated that when there is proper structure in places like this, children can have their parents back and they can live a good life.

Sean Van Noy: Sean Van Noy was present to speak on this item. He stated that he heard the previous comments, but individuals often have the choice between incarceration and these treatment homes, and they often do not want to put in the work to recover and choose prison. He stated that he has young children nearby this property and has experience with loved ones struggling with addiction and recovery. He said that he heard these programs can require large amounts of money from the residents, which does not seem to help them. He feels this is not a good location for this type of home.

Jessica Hanson: Jessica Hanson was present to speak on this item. She stated that she just moved away from Grantsville, but previously lived near this property. She stated that she is in support of this permit. She stated that she believes this location was chosen because it is a great community, surrounded by churches, and has great support. She noted that she found a beta website for Safe Harbor which suggests great programs centered on family, women, and children. She said that she knows Savannah and knows she has amazing intentions. She stated that she does not believe children will be at risk like others seem to think, and that this is a great program for Grantsville.

Lynzie Harris: Lynzie Harris was present to speak on this item. She stated that she believes Savannah has a huge heart and will do wonderful things for people. She stated that she does believe in second chances, but as a mom she does not think this would be good for her children. She stated that this would change the environment of the neighborhood in a negative way. She stated that she has to be away for short amounts of time, and this would cause her increased anxiety with leaving her children. She stated that this is not the environment she wants.

Rachel Johnson: Rachel Johnson was present to speak on this item. She stated that she is not a parent, but is a recent graduate and has concerns. She stated that the jobs in Grantsville are very limited, and those already in Grantsville have a hard time finding jobs without commuting. She stated that she worries about the home's residents' abilities to find a job suitable for them. She stated that she is all for people getting better, but feels Tooele may be a better location for a home like this, as it has more businesses and jobs than Grantsville.

Stacie Reidhead: Stacie Reidhead was present to speak on this item. She stated that she lives directly across the street from this property and has young children. She stated that when she was young she lived next to a supervised women's house like this one, and it was a bad experience

for her. She stated that police presence was common, as well as fights, and other negative experiences. She stated that her family moved because of that home. She stated that her 13-year-old son currently goes all over the neighborhood on his bike, and she wants her younger children to have the same opportunity without worrying about what will be along their way. She stated that with a home like this there is no guarantee of the people that are admitted, or those they are associated with that may show up. She stated that these homes change the nature of the neighborhood they are in, and feels that this residential area is not an appropriate location for this home. She expressed that the neighborhood is family-oriented and she wants it to remain that way.

Jamie Tolman: Jamie Tolman was present to speak on this item. She stated that she lives in this neighborhood and has a young child that currently has freedom to play in the neighborhood. She stated that she has witnessed the struggles of addiction with her loved ones, and watched them relapse and have other issues. She stated that everything is great until something snaps, and she is afraid of that happening. She stated that she moved to Grantsville to get away from a situation like this, so her family can feel safe, and she does not want it around her child. She expressed concerns regarding the proximity to medical services, as the closest resources are in Tooele. She also mentioned the lack of proximity to community centers and other amenities that would be beneficial for residents of these homes.

#1 Email Received 7/2/2024 at 12:25pm

Hi, My name is Lynzie Harris. I am a neighbor and a friend of Savanna Bushman. I live at 122 sage hill circle just across from her. Our neighborhood is very kid friendly and family oriented. I would say we are very lucky to live here. Unfortunately, I don't feel like our neighborhood would benefit from this type of business. I know that as a mother of three kids, I am afraid of the change in dynamic that will occur or could occur with the different challenges that the individuals needing this help would be going through. I feel like it puts my family and most of all, my children at risk. I personally would not feel comfortable not knowing what could happen if an individual were to attract criminal activity to the area. Or relapse, what could happen? There is so much that crosses my mind of what "could" happen. And it has made me feel very anxious and uneasy. I want to mention that I have lived in Grantsville my whole life. I love it here and love our city. I just don't think this is the right place to provide this care. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Lynzie Valdez Harris.

#2 Email Received 7/9/2024 at 8:07pm

Hello Jaina,

I am a homeowner that lives at 61 Aspen way in Grantsville. It has been brought to my attention there are plans in the works to create a halfway home inside my neighborhood loop just down

the street of my home.

This is VERY concerning to me as I have 3 very young girls aging from 1-4 years in age.

While I do understand the importance of a halfway home, as I have family members who have personally used them on their path through recovery, inside this neighborhood full of young family's with lots of little kids constantly playing outside simply is not the place.

I am concerned about traffic too and from the home as this home is located towards the back corner of the neighborhood and it is required to drive through the neighborhood to get to it.

I am worried about the people associated with those would be staying in this home coming around our neighborhood and around our kids and family's.

This area also does not provide many options for employment for these individuals who would be staying here making it a poor location for this home.

I hope this email is taken into consideration and you would treat this situation the same as if this halfway house was being considered next door to your own home with your own family and children.

Thank you,
Allen Murphy

#3 Email Received 7/9/2024 at 8:12pm

Please do not put a halfway house or rehab center in the middle of our neighborhood! There are kids in nearly every home in our area. I teach an in home preschool and the children love our nature walks around the block. My Little girls are just getting to the point where they can ride their bikes up and down our quiet street and I'm afraid all this will be ruined if this is put here. I left the city to get away from this stuff. I'm here in grantsville to raise my family in a safe environment. Don't take that from my little darlings!

Rhondelle Murphy

#4 Email Received 7/10/2024 at 9:23am

I am writing in protest of a halfway house that is proposed to be on Aspen Way in Grantsville. I know a halfway house can be a good program to give support to drug addicts, or people coming from prison. Some actually want to change, but others don't and continue the unwanted behavior. I have grandchildren that are living on that street and there are a lot of other little children in that area making it a poor spot for one. It's just not worth the danger and risk it

would put the kids in. Please consider a different location that wouldn't provide as much risk to our children and community.

Sincerely,
Kellie Murphy

#5 Email Received 7/10/2024 at 10:20am

I am completely in agreement that half way homes are a great way to help people get back into a productive lifestyle. However, my concern is with the placement of the one you are currently planning on opening in Grantsville. A neighborhood that type of house is located in is extremely important. A neighborhood with a lot of young children would not be appropriate. Perhaps a more rural setting with the homes farther apart would work better. Please consider carefully the location. Thank you.

Jena Langford

#6 Email Received 7/11/2024 at 4:44pm

July 11, 2024

Dear Grantsville Planning & Zoning Commission,

We would like to express concerns with the zoning adjustment request (conditional use permit) for 119 Waterhole Way. Approving this permit for a Sober Living Home / Transitional Treatment Home will negatively impact our neighborhood. We have lived here for over a decade and put a lot of time, energy, and service into our great community. Our kids have enjoyed Farm Camp, participating in Little League sports, and extracurricular school activities. We support local businesses, volunteer with the schools and with other activities whenever possible. We want Grantsville to grow in positive ways! We know this would be a negative change.

Allowing the stated permitted use of this property would create a disjointed flow of this neighborhood. Over 70 single-family homes ... and on the same lot size, a 24-hour treatment facility business? No. This is not the place. There is not enough space here to adequately serve that business. It also seems the house itself would not allow enough room for common areas, such as a kitchen/cafeteria, visiting rooms, laundry, or other amenities needed for 7-12 individuals (more than just bedrooms). And where will the 24/7 staff be staying? Also this would increase traffic flow and disturb the peaceful neighborhood environment. Grantsville already has a transitional treatment facility on 159 W Vine St. It was approved in February of 2023. That isn't a lot of time to verify the effects it will have on the community before adding another. How is this facility benefiting Grantsville City? Will it still be beneficial in 5 years, 10 years? Do we (as city residents) really think another will be a good idea? How has it impacted that neighborhood? Do the residents living near that business feel it enriches their lives? We have spoken with people in Cache County, Utah who are also in a small community, with limited

public services such as transportation and job opportunities. They have a similar group home that has been there much longer. It is located in a larger structure, but still next door to family homes. Their report is that it is bad news! The residents of the transitional home don't seem to be making progress, people of questionable character are often sitting around outside. The families there can no longer have their children play outside safely. They've also seen the facility switch between housing different groups and ages, and it's all the same for the neighbors: trouble. If this Grantsville location is approved, the homeowners would have no say in what's happening in their neighborhood. The group home occupants could be changed by the business's discretion. How is the business funded? Is the state paying for it? Does Grantsville City get extra financial kickback by having this facility within its boundaries? How does it help Grantsville at all? And if so, is that worth the trade-off of potentially damaging the future of this neighborhood?

Please see attached news articles regarding group homes and residential treatment centers

From the NBC article "Residential Treatment Centers put profits ahead of children's safety" (www.nbcnews.com): "Residential Facilities... in a system that optimizes profit over the well-being and safety of children... often pack the facilities to capacity and fail to hire adequate qualified staff... Flaws that are endemic to the operating model of the companies, which treat children as payouts" (NBC News, June 12, 2024) "American tax dollars are funding these facilities...some of which receive over \$1,200 per day, per child from the Medicaid program. The experiences and trauma these kids are left with reads like something from a horror novel." (NBC News, June 12, 2024)

Are the owners of the proposed sober living home qualified to meet the demands of such a facility? Do they have the licensure, education, and training to deal with the variety of problems and challenges that residents of the group home will have? Will there be enough qualified staff there? How is this guaranteed to continue throughout the existence of the business? We have checked Utah's Division of Professional Licensing (<https://dopl.utah.gov>) and Utah's Division of Corporations and Commercial Code (Utah.gov) and have found no licensing for the potential owners of the group home (Savannah Bushman, Michael Bushman, and Safe Harbor). If a facility like this is not run well, it will be a disaster for both the group home participants and the community. Currently in our neighborhood there are more than 60 children living within close walking distance of the proposed Group Home. Many kids are often playing right outside this property, in a quiet circle of the neighborhood. If the group home houses children, they will influence our community too. There will be a revolving door of occupants with various traumatic life experiences interacting with our neighborhood's impressionable kids. Stable environments allow healthy growth. We need to protect our community's most precious asset: the children, because they are the future. Placing a group home in the middle of a stable neighborhood creates constant change, chaos, and other challenges. This is not good for our children or for our future. The facility would be "open for business" 24/7. This is not conducive to a family schedule. The business would be required to have constant camera surveillance, why? Probably because things

have historically “gone wrong” at some point with this type of group home. It seems that the real question is not “if” something goes wrong, but “when” and “how often.” Individuals who have been in prison for drug charges and successfully completed a rehabilitation program would be permitted to live in a facility like this. Statistics show that these people still have a 48% relapse and rearrest rate (over 8yrs). And of those rearrests, 30% are drug related, and about 20% violent. (see the chart on pg. 23: Recidivism and Federal Bureau of Prisons Programs: Drug Program Participants Released in 2010 (ussc.gov)) These numbers are too high to feel safe for our family and neighbors!

*** Please see attached news articles regarding group homes and residential treatment centers

From the Deseret News article “Victim loved helping troubled teens” (www.deseret.com):
Regarding the murder of a group home worker (Raechale Elton), Johnson, a Weber State criminal justice instructor of the victim, said “There are dangers in working in group homes for troubled teens. In criminal justice we have these unexpected dangers that lurk, and that’s what happened with her” (Deseret News, Feb 18, 2006)

We don’t want to invite something into our neighborhood that has a high potential to cause personal damage/loss to our family or neighbors. This neighborhood is a great place for families and kids, not for a group home facility. Due to the layout of the neighborhood, accessing the property requires going past nearly every other house in the neighborhood. It would impact the WHOLE neighborhood. The owner of the facility has no guarantee for the safety, comfort, or general welfare of those within the vicinity of the group home. Are they installing surveillance cameras and security gates for OUR properties...? Is that really a family-oriented lifestyle? Also, if approved, the owners would no longer be living in the neighborhood with their family. Probably because they don’t want their own children subject to that environment. The business description states they will not accept individuals with violent or sex offense histories. What’s considered a non-violent crime? Among the top of the list are theft and drugs. Not things we want around our neighborhood. Also, just because it doesn’t show up on someone’s criminal history doesn’t mean it couldn’t happen in the future. There are “unexpected dangers that lurk” as the Weber State criminal justice professor stated about the murder case.

This business is aiming to reintegrate individuals into society and maintain jobs with sobriety. Can Grantsville adequately support that? The resources needed to support that idea are not readily available nearby. Recent high school graduates with no criminal background are finding it challenging to get employment here. Transportation would also be a problem. If these group home residents aren’t working, what will they be doing? If this change was approved, it would negatively impact the salability of homes in the neighborhood. Because, honestly, who wants to live and raise a family next to a hazard? No one. Are the time and presence we have contributed to our community in helping build it to become a safe environment being completely

disregarded? It feels as if our goodness and kindness is being exploited, while the potential business owner walks away with a monthly profit. Many of our neighbors agree that this would be a terrible and inadequate placement for a sober living home/ transitional treatment home. (See attached petition with 77 signatures of neighbors most closely affected) Please listen to the voice of the people in denying this permit use in our neighborhood!

Concerned citizens,

Paul Johnson

Amanda Johnson

(see also petition received)

#7 Email Received 7/12/2024 at 12:22pm

Dear Grantsville City

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal for establishing a safe house in our residential neighborhood. While I understand the necessity of providing support for individuals transitioning out of the criminal justice system, placing such a facility within a residential area raises significant concerns that cannot be overlooked.

1. Public Safety Concerns

Our neighborhood is home to many families with young children who play and walk to school daily. Studies have shown that recidivism rates among individuals released from correctional facilities remain a pressing concern. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, nearly 68% of released prisoners were re-arrested within three years, and 77% were re-arrested within five years of release. The presence of individuals with a high likelihood of re-offending in a neighborhood filled with children poses an undeniable risk. The safety of our children must be our top priority, and introducing this element into our community threatens that safety.

2. Lack of Accessible Amenities and Employment Opportunities

Our neighborhood lacks essential amenities and employment opportunities within walking distance, making it unsuitable for a safe house. The residents here rely on personal vehicles for most errands and activities, as there are no nearby stores, public transportation options, or support services. There are also no local businesses or industries where residents of the safe house could easily find employment. This isolation would not only inconvenience the safe house residents but also potentially increase loitering and trespassing as they seek access to necessary services and jobs.

3. Impact on Property Values

The introduction of a safe house can have a detrimental effect on local property values. Research indicates that the presence of correctional facilities or halfway houses in residential areas can lead to a decrease in property values. A study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia found that homes within a half-mile of a halfway house experienced a reduction in property values by up to 8.2%. This decline in property value affects the financial well-being of all homeowners in the vicinity.

4. Community Resources and Stability

Residential neighborhoods are typically designed to provide a stable and secure environment for families. The integration of a safe house could strain local resources, including law enforcement, healthcare services, and community support networks. Additionally, the presence of such a facility may cause anxiety and fear among residents, especially parents of young children, disrupting the social fabric and overall sense of community.

5. Zoning and Land Use Regulations

Most residential neighborhoods are governed by strict zoning laws that dictate the appropriate use of land to maintain the character and integrity of the area. The introduction of a safe house is likely to contravene these regulations, setting a precedent for future deviations that could further alter the neighborhood's landscape. It is crucial to adhere to zoning regulations to preserve the intended residential nature of our community.

6. Alternative Solutions

While it is essential to support individuals in their reintegration into society, alternative solutions must be considered. Safe houses should be located in areas that are better equipped to handle the unique challenges they present, such as commercial zones or areas with more robust support infrastructure. This approach ensures that the needs of these individuals are met without compromising the safety and stability of residential neighborhoods.

In conclusion, while the goal of providing support for individuals transitioning from the criminal justice system is commendable, placing a safe house in a residential neighborhood filled with children, lacking accessible amenities and employment opportunities, poses significant risks to public safety, property values, community stability, and zoning integrity. I urge you to reconsider this proposal and seek alternative locations that better align with the needs of both the residents and the individuals requiring support.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Brian Peterson

[150 Aspen Way](#)

#8 Email Received 7/17/2024 at 3:28pm

Dear Ms. Bassett,

We are writing in reference to the public hearing on the Sober Living Home on Waterhole Way. We are not able to attend the public hearing, but we would like to make it known that we are concerned about the possible location of this Home. We live close by (Dry Creek Circle) and have two small children. We're also aware of many other children within our small neighborhood. Our concern is for the safety of these children. This type of Home may bring situations to the area that could put the children in the neighborhood in unsafe situations. We ask that you take this concern into consideration as you make a decision.

Thank you,

Camille & Nickolas Coons

#9 Email Received 7/17/2024 at 3:50pm

Grantsville City Planning and Commission,

This email is regarding the rezoning of 119 Waterhole Way, for a sober living home. I am strongly opposed to allowing Savannah Bushman to own and operate Safe Harbor Sober Living. My decision is nothing against Savannah, and her family, but instead based on my personal experience with close family and friends with a drug addiction.

I have lost both friends, and family, to drug addiction and have watched my sister battle addiction for 20+ years. I know the effects it has on a family, as my mom raised my nieces and nephew as their legal guardian from the ages of newborn, 3, and 5 because of my sister's battle with drug addiction. I have seen all the struggles that come with addiction. I fully understand the need for sober living and other resources to help addicts become clean and sober, but because of what I know and have experienced with sober living houses, I do not want one in my neighborhood for the reasons of increased crimes, reduced safety, and reduced home values.

I understand that sober living houses are a privilege only available to non-violent criminals, and require a completion of a drug course to be accepted, but it is also inevitable there will be relapses and altercations that cannot always be controlled. When these events happen, people tend to act in very dangerous and harmful ways towards themselves and/or others by either committing violence, vandalizing, and/or theft. I have personally seen family members harm and steal from the people that love them most. Not because they are a bad person but because they lose control while under the influence of drugs, or withdrawing and needing their fix. If an addict is willing to commit these acts towards family, they would have no problem doing it to the residents of our community. The residents should not have to experience or witness these events, especially with the impact they can have on children. This is concerning and not fair to the residents to have to deal with this, at no fault of their own.

This neighborhood has many children that still enjoy playing outside. Parents have never had to worry about their child's safety, and children have always felt safe playing in the neighborhood. I believe this sober living house would change all of that. Sober living homes tend to bring more traffic to the area from many people coming and going. These homes house multiple people at one time, and usually for short periods of times, meaning that there will always be a revolving door of people inside and outside of the home. This can put residents on edge and uncomfortable in their own home and neighborhood due to the increase in traffic of unknown people, with unknown backgrounds. This will end that feeling of a quiet small-town neighborhood that we all love and enjoy.

It does not take very much research to find that sober living homes will reduce surrounding home values. A study out of Philadelphia by the Federal Reserve Bank estimates any home within a half-mile of a sober living house can see a reduction in home values by 8.2%. With today's housing market, many of us do not have the means to move away if the sober living home was to be approved. So, instead, the residents of this neighborhood would be left to deal with the effects the home would bring. The introduction of a sober living home would negatively impact the equity of everyone's home in the neighborhood, which in today's economy, is not something many families can afford.

I do understand that sober living homes can be beneficial and a positive thing for recovering addicts. However, I do believe there are better locations that will not wreak havoc on a small-town community due to increased crime, reduced safety, and diminishing home values. I would hope that the members of Grantsville City Planning and Commission would consider these concerns and make the best decision for our community to keep our city safe and desirable for years to come.

Best,

Trevor Lujan

#10 Email Received 7/17/2024 at 9:39pm

We would like this to be considered for the meeting.

After careful thought and consideration, I do not think it is in the best interest of our neighborhood or community to put a transitional home on our street. I have grown up very close to situations with recovering addicts and they do get better (sometimes), but it is oftentimes a long a grueling path for them to get better. Within the first year out of treatment alone 80% will relapse. I've watched my sister-in-law relapse time and time again with alcohol and recently over the last 2 years I have watched my brother try to get clean off heroin. Things go great while they are clean, but one slip and it can turn bad quickly. When things get bad there can be public altercations, screaming and yelling, all the way to potential full-on fights, possibly finding drugs or paraphernalia around. As well as creating a potential higher need for police involvement. I

have worked hard and tried to choose very carefully where to raise my family and keep my child out of these environments. My brother I mentioned before, lives in the city where there are tons of resources (i.e. day programs, public transportation, hospitals, ERs and activities to stay busy) and he still has had a hard time. I do not believe Grantsville has the resources a recovering addict needs readily available. Most resources are in Tooele or out towards SLC. 25 minutes is a long time when someone potentially needs help. Especially when relying on public transportation. I also think by opening this Transitional house it will take away from the resources we are already short-handed on.

With the unknowns and how fast situations can change in this house/environment; I also worry about the kids in our neighborhood. This house is placed right in the middle of the street where there are lots of little kids constantly out playing and running around. It has been stated this will be for non-violent offenders and for females. How long will that stay the case though. Will there be a new meeting if these things change? My sad truth is Drug and Alcohol addiction, and recovery, can quickly turn violent from the things I have already experienced firsthand. Relapse can also bring more issues that can bleed into the neighborhood.

This will also more than likely hit the whole neighborhood financially as well. This will drop our property values that we have all worked so hard for. I feel like if Grantsville allows this house to move to a Sober living/Transitional home, it will come to negatively affect the neighborhood and community I have come to love in the last 4 years.

Thanks,

Bradley and Jamie Tolman

#11 Email Received 7/17/2024 at 11:31pm

To whom it may concern:

We live on Wilrose Dr. around the corner from the proposed sober living/Transitional home.

There are way too many kids in the neighborhood to have ex cons trying to get back on their feet.

Also there are not that many places for employment in Grantsville as is. It is all around the wrong location for such a house. The idea is great, the location is horrible too many kids in the neighborhood, not really any jobs in town, it's a great way to drop the property values of all the homes in the neighborhood too.

No one is going to want to move into an neighborhood that has a transitional home in it, especially if they have kids.

Would you want a transitional home/sober living in your neighborhood or next door to your family and kids??

There is no way to regulate who gets housing there or what their record/background is.

Do you want drugs and alcohol in a family neighborhood? I get it is a sober living, BUT people only change IF they want to.

Who is helping them rehab their lives? Are they trained, licensed professionals?? Or just someone trying to be helpful who doesn't have the proper training and skill set to actually help these individuals straighten their lives out?

Once their old friends find out where they are, then you have more ex cons in the neighborhood possibly trying to push drugs, alcohol or maybe even try to kidnap children in the area and traffic or abuse them physically or sexually or worse murder.

Please, my wife and I urge you NOT to approve the conditional permit for the the safe harbor/sober living/ transitional treatment home.

Who is going to be offering the said treatment? Are they certified, licensed professionals??

Or is it just someone who thinks they can help people get on their feet and TRY to straighten their lives out?

These people need a better location for them to get on their feet and TRY to straighten out their lives, not in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time,

Mike & Erica Sticht

#12 Email Received 7/18/2024 at 9:24am

Jaina,

My name is Mark Baker and I live at 46 Barbed Wire Circle in Grantsville. I wanted to send you an email to express my concerns with the plan to convert one of my neighbors homes into a Transitional Treatment Home.

Let me start by sharing with you that I spent 5 years working at the highest residential treatment level for at risk youth and foster youth. I was a "live-in" behavioral specialist that oversaw the care and treatment for up to 10-11 teenage girls at a time and also a consultant to 20+ treatment foster parents. I was responsible in working with these at risk youth in helping them overcome behavioral issues with included, Self-Harm, Suicidal Ideation, Trauma from Sexual Abuse, Trauma from Physical Abuse, Drug Use, Alcohol Use, and more. I lived in a home with these

youth 24/7, along with my wife, and supervised 3 other Associate Staff Members who worked in the home during the day. I worked directly with these youth myself and also supervised and trained my treatment level foster parents how to work with these at risk youth and their behaviors. I've helped them achieve nationally recognized certifications in the behavioral teaching model adopted by the non profit organization and in short - I have experience with a "live-in" treatment program.

While I worked directly with these youth, I was required to also work with their parents who often times were completing some sort of recovery program that would be similar to the proposed program being reviewed for approval at this time. I have learned first hand the difficulties the parents have had with drug and alcohol recovery and I've seen many of these parents work very hard to complete their program so they could be reunited with their children in my care. I have great compassion for these parents who are in these programs and am a strong supporter of the programs available to help them with recovery so they may one day be reunited with their children.

My concerns with this transitional treatment home is not that I don't believe in the program, but rather that having a "live-in" program in a small neighborhood full of children could be detrimental to the life of a child or many children. Every youth placed in my care or in the care of my treatment foster parents had a very similar story - Parents were on drugs, did drugs in front of their children, neglected the children, abused the children, children developed PTSD/Trauma related behaviors and were placed in home after home, program after program, therapist after therapist, medication after medication. It was and is heartbreaking to me to think of the damage and hurt that these parents have caused to their own children that even with the perfect therapist, medications, etc... their life will never be the same.

In the 5 years I worked in my career in Social Work, I never saw a program that allowed recovering addicts to live in a home that was in a neighborhood with small children. These programs for the parents I worked with were in commercial areas or in larger cities that have large buildings near businesses that have apartment style living accommodations. There was plenty of resources nearby to support the program such as, hospitals, doctors, therapists, law enforcement, closer to majority of employees as support staff lived near by, etc... I am highly concerned that placing them in a house in a neighborhood will expose the many young children to potential risks, such as drugs, alcohol from relapses. The majority of the children I worked with were Sexually abused by their parents or another family member. I would worry that the children living in the neighborhood could be exposed to these risks when a program participant has a moment of relapse.

In the experience I have had, only about 4 out of 10 program participants in treatment home programs for addicts are ever able to fully become sober. And out of these 4 program participants

100% of them have had to complete their program multiple times before they are successful with Sobriety.

In short, I would humbly and emphatically ask that you not allow the transitional treatment home to be approved. For the safety of the children and not in opposition of programs like this, but rather the location of this program. The risks are just too great to take. I wish you and everyone involved in this decision process had the first hand experiences I have had... Standing on a roof top in the middle of the night stopping a youth from jumping off, working with police because a youth picked up an axe and chased the other youth in the home with it, night after night of calling police to find a youth before they hurt themselves, picking up youth who were found doing drugs and skipping school, and story and story like these over a 5 year period.

I am very compassionate and love the youth and parents I worked with, but I want to make sure they get the help they need without causing hurt to another innocent youth nearby in the neighborhood. I have 3 children of my own who play outside with other friends in the neighborhood. I want them to be free to be a kid and not worry about being exposed to the world of those recovering from the choices they have made. I want Grantsville to remain a rich family friendly environment that continues to foster the "keep your doors unlocked" feel to its community members. I feel that putting a program like this in the wrong location is really going to change Grantsville and the small neighborhood I live in. And I really plead with you to vote "NO" to approving my neighbor's request to turn their small neighborhood home into a large treatment home. (By the way, the treatment home I lived in was on large acreage away from small neighborhood full of children).

Please, Please do not approve this transitional treatment home. There are better options for these programs in better locations that can still support the people who need these programs.

Thank you for your time and consideration to please not pass this transitional treatment home request.

Mark Baker

#13 Email Received 7/18/2024 at 9:43am

Good Morning,

I would like to express my strong objection for the proposed conditional use permit for Savannah Bushman to own and operate a sober living Home/Transitional Treatment home at 119 N Waterhole Way.

My understanding is that the Bushmans do not have a license to run a sober living facility. I also understand that it is a requirement in the state of Utah to be licensed and undergo background checks for this type of venture. I have had the opportunity to look over the Ms. Bushman's

proposal information and I personally feel that granting a permit to her based on the information that she has given would be unwise. The information they have submitted is very vague and gives no specific details about how they plan to accomplish the things that they state they will do. This type of business would require a great deal of planning, preparation, and capital. They have given no information that would indicate that they are capable of providing the services described. Also, they have given no information about their financial situation and their ability to pay staff or other professionals that they mention in the description. The average salary for a sober living home manager, in the state of Utah, is \$20 per hour. If they plan to staff the home 24 hours a day, they will need to be prepared to pay said manager(s) nearly 15,000 in the first month. This is only one cost to be considered when running this home. Are they prepared to pay this amount right out of the gate? They also mention offering counseling sessions and educational workshops which would incur more cost.

The information provided about the residence is also inaccurate. They describe the home as a 2,900 square foot home. This is grossly inaccurate. The home is only 2,350 square feet. They also state that there isare up to 5 parking spaces, where there are 4 maximum. Also, given the amount of residents and staff to be living in this home, I feel that the size of the home is inadequate.

I object to bringing recovering addicts into our neighborhood. I have read up on sober living facilities and the information I have come across indicates that there is a fairly high occurrence of relapse. This would potentially bring drugs and dealers into our little neighborhood. I do not want my kids or any of our neighbors' kids being exposed to drug use, paraphernalia, or being introduced to drugs.

Lastly, I think that the location is a poor choice. There are inadequate jobs, emergent medical care, or mental health providers in close proximity, especially for people who may not have access to transportation.

I feel it would be in poor judgment to grant this conditional use permit to Ms. Bushman based on the lack of preparation, licensing, poor location, and safety issues when it comes to other residents in the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Chris Chidester

62 Dry Creek Circle

**b) Proposed rezone of parcel 01-043-0-0017 from zoning designation A-10 to MD,
located at approximately 791 N. Burmester Rd.**

No comments.

- c) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 13 (Zoning District Establishment) to include the Mixed Use District, as outlined in Chapter 19a.**

No comments.

- d) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Section 21.2.11 (Subdivision Regulations – Determination of Appropriate Process) to reference the correct Utah State Code.**

No comments.

AGENDA

1. Consideration of the proposed conditional use permit for Savannah Bushman to own and operate Safe Harbor, a Sober Living Home/ Transitional Treatment Home, located at 119 N. Waterhole Way in the RM-7 zone.

Savannah Bushman was present to speak on this agenda item. She stated that she read through the concerns that were expressed, and she hears them. She stated that it is not a halfway home or treatment facility, but would provide a safe place for women that want to reconnect with their children. She noted that there are four registered sex offenders in their neighborhood, but does not see residents complaining about them. She stated that her own son plays with several of the residents' children, and understands the concerns for children. She stated that the women seeking the support this home would provide, are women in the neighborhood churches and other areas they interact with. She stated that these women often feel alone and judged, but they deserve the same quality of life as everyone else. She stated that she is a recovered addict herself, and was given the opportunity of a second chance like this home, which gave her the life she has. She stated that she proposed this home because she does love the community and the people in it. She stated that this home would be an opportunity for those already in the community that need a little extra help. She stated that there is on-demand UTA and carpools available for transportation. She stated that those admitted to this home would not have any violent charges like murder or sex offenses, and would have already successfully completed a treatment program. She stated that she has requests from three women in the community, if this permit was to be approved.

Vice-Chair Derek Dalton asked how long most residents would live in the home, and Ms. Bushman clarified that 6 months is a typical length of a stay, until residents can get on their feet. Vice-Chair Dalton noted that he had concerns about parking, and Ms. Bushman stated that most residents would not have vehicles of their own to park on site.

Vice-Chair Dalton noted that there is an existing facility like this one in Grantsville for men, and that it is not at full capacity. He expressed his appreciation for Ms. Bushman's passion, as well as the community's concerns. Commissioner Jeff Downward stated that he has loved ones that were

not given the opportunity this home would offer, but also has concerns about parking. Chair Rick Barchers echoed concerns about parking. Chair Barchers noted that a conditional use permit may not be required for a home like this with five residents or less. Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore stated that it would still be a conditional use. It was noted that this would need further research.

Chair Barchers stated that when the Planning Commission reviewed a previous permit like this one, the applicant stated that it was common practice to have two individuals per room, and asked if that was the case in Ms. Bushman's experience. Ms. Bushman stated that this is not common practice, and there are issues in some facilities where residents are being overcrowded.

Chair Barchers stated that if this permit were to be approved, he would like to add the condition that any change to what was included in the application, including ownership, must come before the Planning Commission for approval. He noted that this would be in addition to the conditions listed in the staff report. Ms. Bushman stated that she was aware of the staff's conditions and is prepared to meet those and this additional condition.

Commissioners stated that their main concern is parking, and that they will need to research further, and consult experts on the matter. They noted that businesses are held to a different standard than residential homes. It was noted that this proposal will be revisited at the next Planning Commission meeting on August 1st.

Jeff Downward made a motion to table the proposed conditional use permit for Savannah Bushman to own and operate Safe Harbor, a Sober Living Home/ Transitional Treatment Home, located at 119 N. Waterhole Way in the RM-7 zone. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton "Nay," Jeff Downward "Aye," Rick Barchers "Aye." The motion carried and the item was tabled.

2. Consideration of the allowance for Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons), to allow them to continue with the application submitted in 2022 and the City Codes in place at that time.

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to speak on this item, as well as Thane Smith with The Romney Group. Ms. Moore stated that this application was previously submitted and withdrawn by Jeff Allen, and now The Romney Group would like to proceed with it. She stated that the land use code specifies a time limit of one year, which has been exceeded, and that it is the responsibility of an applicant to complete due diligence and identify the time period in which an application is no longer active.

Mr. Smith stated that there have been several state and City code changes since this application was submitted. He noted that while the City code changes are minor, there are large changes in State code including the requirement for engineering on preliminary plats. He also stated that

applications lie with the property owner, not the applicant, and the property owner did not know that this application was pulled. He stated that the original idea in August 2022 was to create a PUD to reduce overall density in the area, and to create a more affordable community.

Chair Barchers read section 21.2.1 regarding diligence as listed in the staff report, and asked Mr. Smith if he felt they met this requirement. Mr. Smith stated that they were making ample progress at the time the application was pulled in April 2023. Chair Barchers stated that he understands the code regarding diligence to mean that they would be unable to grant an extension on this application. Commissioners Downward and Dalton stated their agreement, and expressed concerns in applying code that is not current to new applications.

Rick Barchers made a motion to table the allowance for Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons), to allow them to continue with the application submitted in 2022 and the City Codes in place at that time, until the end of the meeting when a legal opinion can be obtained from the City Attorney. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Moore read a text message from City Attorney Dallin Littlefield which said, “I agree with you about Deseret Commons. If they submitted an application in 2022 and “they [have] not completed a stage or [they’ve failed] to make a progress report to the planning commission” within 365 days, then they need to restart and resubmit their application (which would then apply current 2024 ordinances when they resubmit their application).”

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend denial of the allowance for Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons), to allow them to continue with the application submitted in 2022 and the City Codes in place at that time, until the end of the meeting when a legal opinion can be obtained from the City Attorney. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously and the proposal was denied.

3. Discussion of proposed rezone of parcel 24-018-0-00R from zoning designation A-10 to MD, located at approximately 791 N. Burmester Rd.

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to speak on this item. She noted that this item was requested by the City, as the road originally was going to have two hard 90 degree angle turns. It was noted that the purpose of this was to reconfigure it to meet required standards, and to be in the right-of-way.

Aqua Consultant Shay Stark was present on Zoom and noted that if the road needed to be widened, a portion of the Lawrence Brothers property would need to be purchased to accommodate that.

It was noted that the parcel number on the public notice is different from the parcel number on the staff report, and the City attorney would need to determine if public noticing would need to be redone or not.

Rick Barchers made a motion to table the proposed rezone of parcel 24-018-0-00R from zoning designation A-10 to MD, located at approximately 791 N. Burmester Rd., until the end of the meeting when a legal opinion can be obtained from the City Attorney. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Moore read a text message from City Attorney Dallin Littlefield which said, “No, the incorrect parcel number on the Burmester noticing won’t be an issue. In fact, the incorrect parcel number is the parcel number that still shows on the County Parcel Viewer. I noticed they’ve also said “791 N Burmester Road,” and that’s sufficient notice between those two items. I don’t think anyone would reasonably mistake which property is being up for rezoning consideration.” Ms. Moore replied with a text message which said, “The parcel on the noticing was 24-018-0-00R but the staff report shows 01-043-0-0017.” City Attorney Littlefield replied with a text message which said, “Oh okay. I still believe it’s not an issue, even then too.”

Jeff Downard made a motion to make agenda item number three an action item. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed rezone of parcel 24-018-0-00R from zoning designation A-10 to MD, located at approximately 791 N. Burmester Rd. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

4. Discussion of the proposed Final plat for the Townhomes at Presidents Park, located at approximately 815 S. Washington Ave.

Mike Colson and Barry Bunderson were present to speak on this agenda item. It was noted that the streets are private roads, and basins will be maintained by the HOA. It was also noted that driveways do meet the City’s requirements and are 25 feet deep.

Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number four an action item. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Final plat for the Townhomes at Presidents Park, located at approximately 815 S. Washington

Ave. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Rick Barchers made a motion to revisit agenda item number two, after receiving the opinion of legal counsel. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussion of the proposed Final plat for the Heritage Farms subdivision Phase 1, located on Mormon Trail.

Mathew Christensen was present to speak on this agenda item. He noted that all lots are ½ acre or larger. Vice-Chair Dalton asked if he was aware that a fee-in-lieu for open space would be required as no open space is provided, and Mr. Christensen confirmed that they are aware of this. Mr. Christensen clarified that while the preliminary plat is shown, phase 1 is for only 30 lots.

Chair Barchers asked if there are retention areas on private lots, and Mr. Christensen stated that there are retention ponds in the areas colored purple. Chair Barchers requested that it be noted for these areas to not be filled in by property owners.

Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number five an action item. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Final plat for the Heritage Farms subdivision Phase 1, located on Mormon Trail, with the condition that a fee-in-lieu for open space be paid in the amount of 10% of the undeveloped land value. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

6. Consideration of the proposed plat amendment to vacate and amend lot 109 in Phase 1 of the Cherry Wood Estates subdivision.

Mike DeCarlo and Krisel Travis were present to speak on this agenda item. It was noted that they requested to make a presentation to provide further details on the proposal. Chair Barchers approved this request.

Ms. Travis noted that there was a Zoom meeting between DR Horton and City Staff, where the City Attorney stated it would be best for the City to own this basin. Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore stated that this was accurate.

Commissioner Downward requested that DR Horton put gravel down on the outside of the fence surrounding the basin, and in the park strip. Ms. Travis stated that they agree to this condition.

Ms. Travis requested that condition number three in the staff report be removed, as this basin was previously inspected and accepted by the previous developer, and it is now out of warranty.

Jeff Downward made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed plat amendment to vacate and amend lot 109 in Phase 1 of the Cherry Wood Estates subdivision, with conditions one and two listed in the staff report, as well as the condition that DR Horton landscape the outside of the fence and park strip with gravel. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Nay,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried.

7. Consideration of the proposed plat amendment to lots 601 and 602 in the Cherry Grove subdivision, making them into two buildable lots.

The applicant was not in attendance, but Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to answer questions. Chair Barchers asked who built Apple St. through the parcel, and Ms. Moore stated that the developer did. The Commission expressed their desire to wait until the applicant is present to make a decision on this.

Rick Barchers made a motion to table the proposed plat amendment to lots 601 and 602 in the Cherry Grove subdivision, making them into two buildable lots. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

8. Consideration of the proposed plat amendment to parcel A in the Cherry Grove subdivision.

Rick Barchers made a motion to table the proposed plat amendment to parcel A in the Cherry Grove subdivision. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

9. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 13 (Zoning District Establishment) to include the Mixed Use District, as outlined in Chapter 19a.

Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number nine an action item. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 13 (Zoning

District Establishment) to include the Mixed Use District, as outlined in Chapter 19a. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

10. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Section 21.2.11 (Subdivision Regulations – Determination of Appropriate Process) to reference the correct Utah State Code.

Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number ten an action item. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Jeff Downward made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 13 (Zoning District Establishment) to include the Mixed Use District, as outlined in Chapter 19a. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

11. Consideration of the proposed adoption of the West Bank and Northwest Area Master Development Plan and Capital Facilities Plan.

Aqua Consultant Shay Stark was present on Zoom to speak on this agenda item. He described some modifications that were made, based on the requests received previously. He noted that the purpose of page 23 was to look at the highest possible density in the area, while page 24 shows the properties currently vested with specific development rights.

Chair Barchers noted that in looking at page 25, labeled the Update Future Land Use Map, he understands that to mean that the City would be adopting the map. Mr. Stark stated that a General Plan Amendment must be requested and approved to do so, and that is not being requested with this project. Mr. Stark suggested adding verbiage that labeled the map as a potential Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Stark also suggested changing number two on page 28, to include verbiage stating that the Planning Commission has no intention of amending the general plan to fit the maps in this proposal. Vice-Chair Dalton requested that the numbering be corrected on page 28, as there are currently two number 3's.

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed adoption of the West Bank and Northwest Area Master Development Plan and Capital Facilities Plan with the following conditions:

- 1. That the following be added onto number 2 on page 28 of the proposal: The Planning Commission voted that this adoption does not indicate that they are**

in favor of any amendment to the general plan, but that this document is for guidance of the capital facilities plan only; and

- 2. That the name of the map on page 25 of the proposal be changed to “Potential Updated Future Land Use Map”; and**
- 3. That the numbering be corrected on page 28 of the proposal.**

Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

12. Report from City Council Liaison.

City Council Liaison Rhett Butler was present and noted that a new City Attorney will be employed by the second Planning Commission meeting in August.

He also noted that at the prior City Council meeting, Anderson Ranch 4E was discussed, and they determined that an open space fee-in-lieu will be required of them, as recommended by the Planning Commission.

He reminded the Commission of the upcoming joint meeting on July 31st, noting that the meeting will begin at 7:00pm and is anticipated to be about 1 ½ hours long.

13. Adjourn.

Derek Dalton made a motion to adjourn. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously. The meeting ended at 9:41 PM.