

APPROVED

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	JC Marble LLC/ Giron CUP- Consideration	Approved with conditions.
#2	Staker Parson CUP Amendment- Consideration	Approved with conditions.
#3	Matthews Landing MDA- Discussion	Voted to action item at applicant's request, recommended for denial.
#5	Minutes 8/1/2024- Consideration	Approved.
#6	Minutes 8/15/2024- Consideration	Approved.

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 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, Rob Jaterka, Jeff Downward, Trent Stirling

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Public Works Director Christy Montierth, Community & Economic Development Administrative Assistant Jaina Bassett, Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Attorney Tysen Barker, Planning Advisor Gary Pinkham, City Council Member Jeff Williams, Mayor Neil Critchlow, Sergeant Skinner

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

Citizens and Guests Present: Camille Giron, Gabriel Gavidia, Ron Kunz, Micheal Vanwyck, Jeanell Mouritsen, Steve Jackson, Marlo Meno, Mary Chappell, BJ Ryan, Jeff Johnson, Jared Mitchell, Carol Jefferies, Matt Christensen, Thane Smith, Josh Romney, Anthon Stauffer, Wade Budge, Rich Mouritsen, Coby Yates, Steve Waldrip, Jordan Colohan

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Several Unknowns

Commission Chairman Rick Barchers called the 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, September 5, 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 JC Marble LLC/ Julio Giron to manufacture and store countertops, on 0.53 acre at 648 E. Cedar Ct. in the R-1-21 zone.

No comments.

b) Proposed amendment to the conditional use permit for Staker Parson Materials & Construction currently allowing a sand and gravel excavation business, to expand the area of disturbance from 50 acres to the highest allowable acreage at one time, within the parcel boundary which is approximately 560 acres.

No comments.

c) Proposed PUD for the Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons) subdivision, located at approximately 1079 W. Hwy 112, including the consideration of the concept plan and variance table.

Email Received 9/2/2024

Dear Mayor Critchlow and City Council Members,

My name is Kayla Cameron. I have lived in Grantsville for over twenty years. I saw that there is a chance to give public notice for the Deseret Medows Subdivision located off SR-112.

First of all, I am not sure what has been planned for that area but I would like to see it developed with 1/2 acres or acre lots to fit in with the rest of the land and houses nearby. We as Grantsville residents are very proud of our country-like community and I would love to see more space available for horses or hobby farms.

With that being said, I am also very aware of how fast our community has been changing and that it is getting more and more difficult to keep that small town. My biggest concern with this subdivision is that our roads are already often congested. My parents live near this proposed subdivision on Sun Valley Dr. There have been several times that it's impossible to drive toward the middle of Grantsville or Tooele, especially during high commute times (work, school, etc.). I have joked with other residents that you must turn right to go left anywhere in town.

I believe strongly that before this subdivision and others go in, City Council needs to focus on our infrastructure. We are now at a time where we need to start looking at adding more traffic lights to the intersections on Main St and SR-112 to break up the flow of traffic. Ideally, I would like to see a light at SR-112 and Sheep Lane as well as Main Street and Hale St intersections.

I do hope that you consider looking at adding traffic lights before the subdivision is developed. Thank you for your time and for everything that you have all done for Grantsville.
Sincerely,
Kayla Cameron

Email Received 9/4/2024

Janette Toone
4th September 2024

Grantsville City Planning Commission

Grantsville City Council

September 5, 2024 - Public Hearing Proposed PUD for the Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons) subdivision, located at approximately 1079 W. Hwy 112, including the consideration of the concept plan and variance table.

Dear city planning officials,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed high-density Planned Unit Development (PUD) Deseret Meadows located at 1079 W. Hwy 112 . While I understand the need for increased housing density to accommodate growing populations and urban expansion, I am deeply concerned about the lack of essential community facilities included in this development, specifically schools and churches. I hate to bore you with complaints; but in this letter I will restate many of the same concerns that I already voiced in opposition of the Twenty Wells PUD located just across the highway from this development.

The absence of educational facilities, such as schools, in the proposed PUD is a significant issue. High-density residential areas, by their nature, are likely to attract families with children. Without adequate educational infrastructure, families will face undue hardships, including longer commute times for children, overcrowded existing schools, and potential delays in educational services. This will adversely affect the quality of education and create unnecessary strain on the Tooele County School District. Mayor Critchlow has stated that “schools aren’t his problem”, but it is very difficult for our school district to build new schools on non-existent properties. Why do we continue to consider approving PUD conceptual plans that do not leave ample space or better yet donate land for future schools?

Additionally, the exclusion of community and spiritual spaces, such as churches, in the development plan undermines the social cohesion and cultural fabric of the area. Churches and similar community facilities often play a vital role in providing social support, community activities, and a sense of belonging. Their absence in a high-density area may result in a diminished quality of life for residents and a lack of essential social services.

Lastly, both of these planned communities, Twenty Wells PUD and Deseret Meadows PUD, will place an increased burden on existing infrastructure, including roads, utilities, and emergency services. Highway 112 is already bursting at the seams. The lack of a comprehensive plan that includes community facilities exacerbates this issue, as the infrastructure necessary to support these facilities is also missing. This can only lead to congestion and diminished service quality. The prospective parks that these developers are using to entice you to approve these plans will barely accommodate the proposed new influx of residents. These new parks are not going to solve our city's current need for green spaces, playgrounds, and recreation fields.

A development that does not address educational and community needs may create a living environment that lacks essential services and infrastructure, potentially leading to higher costs for the city and residents in the future. In light of these concerns, I urge you to reconsider the approval of this high-density PUD in its current form. I recommend that the development plan be revised to include necessary educational and community facilities, ensuring that it meets the holistic needs of its future residents and contributes positively to the surrounding area.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I hope my concerns will be taken into account in the decision-making process. I am available for further discussion and would appreciate any updates on the status of this proposal.

Sincerely,
Janette Toone

Email Received 9/5/2024

City Council/Planning Committee Members:

We have serious concerns related to the proposed PUD called Deseret Meadows on Highway 112. We disapprove of the high-density development for the following reasons:

Transportation - Grantsville City and Tooele county at large do not have the infrastructure in place (or planned) for massive increases in population. Our roads and traffic cannot handle the possible 1,600+ vehicles that would come from this development alone. Were Midvalley Highway two lanes each direction (as it should have been initially) and I-80 three lanes each direction around the point of the mountain, this might alleviate some of the current problems.

Water - there are always water shortage concerns for Grantsville. The plans show major needed improvements for millions of dollars. What are the plans to pay for these improvements?

Property Taxes - With all the needs the city currently has, we are opposed to any use of tax dollars/increases that don't directly benefit current residents of Grantsville.

Density - There are already multiple current developments in Grantsville where houses are being built without buyers. Lot sizes continue to decrease with each new development, which is ruining the small-town, open space feeling we enjoy and moved here to find.

We are not opposed to growth in general, we know it is inevitable, but feel it could be done in a more gradual, and fitting way instead of Daybreak-esque communities. Tooele, Stansbury, and Salt Lake have enough high-density living areas that Grantsville can keep its quaintness and uniqueness.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

Jewkes Family

Micheal Vanwyck: Michael Vanwyck, a resident, was present to speak on this item. He referenced the City policies and procedures, including promoting the . He stated that there have been over 1,000 rooftops since January, a large number of them being townhomes. He asked why the developers are asking for all of the variances, if they can achieve a high density without them. He stated that he does not understand how the 15 units per acre is being achieved in the proposal. He noted some discrepancies including different numbers of unit counts throughout the project. He stated that he recognizes the need for affordable housing, but noted that the profit nationwide on townhomes is 25% for developers. He stated that the City should ask the developers instead to decrease that profit margin to 10-15%, rather than the developers asking for all of the variances. He referred to the Lakeview Business Park, and asked where the residents' opportunities for employment are, that were promised by the developers. He stated that the sewer system is outdated and should be mechanical. He stated that he would like to see where the power they are claiming to be available is. He asked the Commissioners to keep in mind that the 15 units per acre density is not attainable in that space.

Ron Kunz: Ron Coombs was present to speak on this item. He asked that the Commissioners balance the density and other items when considering this project. He asked for consideration of schools and other needed items for a development of this size.

Gary Pinkham: Gary Pinkham was present to speak on this item. He referenced the zoning districts this project includes, and how items in this proposal are not allowed in those zones. He stated that the proposal shows multi-unit housing in both zones that do not allow it. He noted that the developer states that they are asking for a decreased amount of units, but are actually asking for an increased unit count. He stated that the proposal includes more units in areas than the zoning allows for. Mr. Pinkham referenced other developments moving through the approval process in the City, and stated that this proposal's density is almost triple what the other developments are asking for. He stated that a PUD does not create a new zoning code, but only allows developers to ask for specific variances to specific codes. He stated that the pre-existing codes remain in place, with the few exceptions that are explicitly approved.

Jordan Colohan: Jordan Coolhan was present to speak on this item. He stated that his backyard borders this proposal. He stated that the sewer line runs through his backyard, and is extremely concerned about that with the number of new residents that will come with the new developments. He stated that a two-lane highway would make residents' commutes difficult. He

stated that he feels the approval of new developments is the City biting off more than it can chew. He noted that he moved his family to Grantsville because of the small-town feel, and he sees that changing with the new developments like this one.

AGENDA

1. Consideration of the proposed conditional use permit for JC Marble LLC/ Julio Giron to manufacture and store countertops, on 0.53 acre at 648 E. Cedar Ct. in the R-1-21 zone.

Camille Giron was present to represent this item. She stated that they are asking for a conditional use permit to manufacture and store countertops. She noted that the shop will be insulated, sound-proof, and on 6 inches of concrete. She explained that they have a showroom in Tooele where customers can look at the products, so no customers would be coming to the property.

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore stated that she reviewed the CC&Rs for the HOA in this neighborhood, and they do not need to receive permission from their HOA for this use.

Chairman Rick Barchers asked how waste will be disposed of. Mrs. Giron stated that the water is recycled, and any remaining waste is taken to the dump.

Mrs. Giron is unsure if there will be a sewer connection to the shop, but that she intends to have water and power connections. Mrs. Moore stated that these items will be reviewed with the building permit.

Commissioner Trent Stirling asked how much traffic is expected with this proposal. Mrs. Giron clarified that standard traffic can be expected, as her husband transports the products.

Commissioner Rob Jaterka stated that he would like to see the shop be aesthetically pleasing for the neighborhood.

Rick Barchers made a motion to approve the proposed conditional use permit for JC Marble LLC/ Julio Giron to manufacture and store countertops, on 0.53 acre at 648 E. Cedar Ct. in the R-1-21 zone, with the following conditions: all business equipment must be stored inside of the shop; proper disposal methods are maintained; no customers will come to the home; and if there are complaints determined to be valid by any state, county, or local officials, this permit must be reviewed by the Planning Commission within 30 days and may result in revocation if determined to be out of compliance. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

2. Consideration of the proposed amendment to the conditional use permit for Staker Parson Materials and Construction currently allowing a sand and gravel excavation business, to expand the area of disturbance from 50 acres to the highest allowable acreage at one time, within the parcel boundary which is approximately 560 acres.

Gabriel Gavidia was present to represent this agenda item. He referenced the reclamation plan, and noted that this is the footprint of the quarry that they expect in the next 20-30 years. He noted that they are hoping to have a ready-mix plant and asphalt plant, along with an area to sell the products. He stated that the purpose of this request is to expand the use already approved by their existing conditional use permit. It was noted that the new Hall road will be the main access point for this use. Mr. Gavidia stated that in the future they do anticipate around the clock work, with blasting only during the daytime hours. He stated that their work is monitored and will be regulated by the BLM, and that they do not anticipate anything getting out of the mine.

Chairman Barchers asked if they would be doing any hard blasting, and Mr. Gavidia confirmed this. Chairman Barcher asked what the point of sale would be, and Mr. Gavidia confirmed it would be in this area, likely providing the City with tax benefits.

Mrs. Moore noted that the verbiage listed in the “Conditions & Conclusions” section of the staff report is from the current permit, and that the Commissioners have the discretion to change those numbers at this time. She also noted that the City staff will require them to provide proof of their applications with the State.

Chairman Barchers stated that the conditions on the existing permit will remain in place, other than the requested amendment to the area of disturbance allowed. Mayor Neil Critchlow suggested that they notify the residents prior to blasting. Chairman Barchers echoed this request, suggesting perhaps a specific day or time for the residents to be aware of.

Commissioner Jaterka expressed concerns regarding the double shifts mentioned and the dust, affecting the residents living nearby. He suggested 100 acres to be allowed at one time before reclamation is required. Mr. Gavidia noted that 100 acres may be limiting, and asked for 200 acres instead. Commissioner Jaterka stated that he is comfortable with 200 acres.

Rick Barchers made a motion to approve the proposed amendment to the conditional use permit for Staker Parson Materials and Construction currently allowing a sand and gravel excavation business, with the following conditions: all conditions listed on the existing permit except the area of disturbance allowed; applicant must provide the Zoning Department with a copy of the SWPPP and Dust Mitigation plans, and the Reclamation Bond, all filed with the State of Utah; the owner must maintain an all-weather, dustless road with all-year access off of SR138; any equipment must utilize the I-80 and SR138 north route to access the project; applicant must notify the City if continued access of more than 24 hours is needed to travel through Grantsville City Main St.; applicant must provide evidence to the Community Development Department of the necessary water rights, and must maintain adequate water onsite; the area of disturbance be increased to 200 acres at a time within the parcel boundary; applicant must work with City staff to agree on hours of operation and blasting notifications; and if the applicant is found to be in

violation of any terms of this agreement or past, current, or future laws, the permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission within 30 days, and may result in revocation. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

3. Discussion of the proposed Master Development Agreement for the Matthews Landing subdivision, located West of Matthews Lane.

Mary Chappell and Marlo Meno were present to represent this item. Chairman Barchers noted that the application seems incomplete. Mrs. Moore stated that this is accurate. She explained that if they would like to move forward with only the commercial development, they would need to rezone that section to a commercial zoning, as it is currently MU, which requires both commercial and residential development; then the subdivision process. She also explained that if they would like to continue with the proposal of both commercial and residential development, they would need to apply for a PUD, as required in the MU zoning district.

Chairman Barchers noted that the MU district requires 25% open space with amenities. City Attorney Tysen Barker clarified that these items would need to be addressed by the developers that come forward for the lots in the future.

Mrs. Moore suggested that if they would like to move forward more quickly than the subdivision process, they could do a lot line adjustment, followed by the future lot purchaser rezoning the property to commercial, then moving forward with their business on that lot. Attorney Barker noted that this suggestion would work fine, but that the reference to the maximum density for the current code is not in the City's best interest.

Chairman Barchers referenced the section requiring the City to improve Matthews Lane, and expressed concerns about this. He stated that the Planning Commission cannot give out the City's money, and that must be determined by the City Council. Mayor Critchlow stated that they are discussing this, and working towards a grant for it.

Vice-Chair Derek Dalton expressed concerns about the City paying for the improvements in this project, as that is something required of developers and has not been done before. He stated that this would set a precedent for the City, that is not sustainable. He also stated that he believes the proposed commercial does not meet the percentage requirements for MU. He stated that he would like to see the large lot on Main Street be all commercial, then the remaining lots to be residential development.

Ms. Chappell expressed that they do not know if the PUD process would be feasible for them, as they are not sure of what the future development may look like.

Chairman Barchers advised that the applicants work with the Zoning Administrator, Mayor, and Attorney to define a path and smooth over some of the items discussed.

Ms. Chappell asked if they can choose to take this before the City Council, and Attorney Barker confirmed that they can do so with or without a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Ms. Chappell requested a vote tonight, and to move before the City Council for a vote, regardless of the requested changes.

Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number three an action item.

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

Rick Barchers made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed Master Development Agreement for the Matthews Landing subdivision, located West of Matthews Lane. Derek Dalton seconded the motion.

Rick Barchers withdrew his motion.

Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed Master Development Agreement for the Matthews Landing subdivision, located West of Matthews Lane. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

Trent Stirling made a motion to take a five minute break. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously. The meeting resumed after five minutes.

4. Discussion of the proposed PUD for the Deseret Meadows (formerly Deseret Commons) subdivision, located at approximately 1079 W. Hwy 112, including the consideration of the concept plan and variance table.

Mrs. Moore was present to speak on this item. She stated that City staff has had many conversations with the developer and their attorney. She noted that the developer is hoping to move forward with the 2022 codes and densities, but staff believes it needs to be the 2024 codes and densities.

Thane Smith and Matt Christensen were present to represent this item. Mr. Christensen stated that they have met with City staff multiple times and have implemented their suggestions in the plan. He noted the 10 acre park they are proposing, as well as buffers.

Mr. Smith requested a powerpoint presentation to be shown, which was not previously included in the packet. Chairman Barchers accepted and the presentation was shown.

Mr. Christensen explained that they have 6 acres of proposed commercial, with retail included. It was noted that the proposed layout shown in the presentation is not the same version that staff has been reviewing. Mr. Christensen noted that the buffer along the north side of the project was a staff suggestion, which was implemented. He noted that the purpose of this project is to provide a variety of housing styles, specifically including affordable housing. He mentioned walking trails that will be throughout the project, and lead to the large park.

Mr. Smith noted the connectivity shown to the Lakeview Business Park. He noted the access points on SR112 and Sheep's Lane. He explained that they are requesting to use the 2022 code because of the density allowed at that time. He stated that the overall density would be lower than allowed, with the density being calculated overall rather than in the individual zones. He noted that they are asking for deviations from the City code, shown on the deviations table in the presentation. Mr. Christensen noted that all townhomes have 22-foot driveways, including the alley-loaded townhomes.

Megan Spencer-Webb was present on Zoom, as part of this project. She noted that the 20-foot rear yard main building begins after the sidewalk. She noted that the proposed park will include trails moving through the property, connecting every home to the park. She also noted playgrounds, pavilions, open fields, basketball and pickleball courts, and picnic areas that will be in the park.

Mr. Smith noted that various types of fencing are proposed, to provide an integrated look in the community. He noted that the proposed private alleys would be behind the townhomes, and both those and the private lanes would be taken care of by the HOA. He noted that Lamb's Lane will act as a buffer between this project and the Lakeview Business Park.

Mr. Smith stated that they purchased this property primarily to provide affordable housing options for Lakeview Business Park employees, and the surrounding community. He noted that they built an upsized water tank for this project and the Lakeview Business Park, as well as an upsized trunk line and 16-inch transmission line. He noted that the upsizing was completed with the Lakeview Business Park, to accommodate for this project. He also mentioned that they are providing more open space than the 10% that is required, and less overall density than the underlying density allows. He also noted that the application states an incorrect unit count, and that they will update it to reflect the 925 units they are proposing.

Steve Jackson with Lennar Homes was present, as the buyer of this project. He mentioned the price points for their homes, fitting into the mid-tier income range. He noted that the homes would not meet the 80% AMI for affordable housing, but most would meet the state requirements for affordable housing.

Wade Budge was present, as the attorney for this project. He explained that this application is meant to be a continuation of the application submitted in 2022. He stated that the application was never closed, as they are the property owners and not Meritage Homes. He stated that the upsized infrastructure they put in, was with the understanding that it would provide for this project. He stated that their investment plays a part in it, and that they have continually worked on this project in recent months.

City Attorney Barker stated that based on the case law in situations like this, the applicant would likely prevail in court due to their investment and the assumption that their improvements were allowed to accommodate this project. He noted that it would be beneficial for the City to identify what is important about the 2022 codes, and to reach an agreement. He also noted that there is not clear direction on this, and he cannot say for sure which way the court would vote. He stated that his recommendation is to find a way to meet the needs of the requested 2022 standards.

Chairman Barchers stated that based on the deviations in the code, he is not sure if they could achieve the deviation and maintain sight triangles. Mr. Smith stated that sight triangles will be met, as that is a safety issue. Chairman Barchers stated that the City code does not allow single-family lots smaller than 4,000 feet or the lot frontage as small as they are asking for in the table. Mr. Smith stated that this is the purpose of the deviations table.

Chairman Barchers asked what the benefit of this project to Grantsville City is. Mr. Smith stated that their proposal depicts a more integrated housing type and a big park in the middle of the project, compared to the zoning they currently have which would allow more density and no park. He stated that their project would provide affordable housing. The Commissioners stated that there are several projects with affordable housing that have already been approved in the City, so that would not be a necessary thing for the City at this time. Mr. Budge stated that their proposal would mitigate issues that could arise from the density already allowed, which would be a benefit to the City. Mr. Christensen stated that another benefit of the proposal compared to what they are allowed, is the buffer they are provided. Chairman Barchers stated that the purpose of the MU district is to provide for the tax base of the City, and he anticipates the commercial development shrinking in order to implement buffers, which he does not want to see. He stated that he would like to see more commercial development in this proposal.

Mrs. Moore asked the applicant to provide a memo stating how they plan to address the Moderate Income Housing requirements, and asked if they have worked with UDOT on their 2030 master plan which turns SR112 from a 2-lane highway to a 5-lane highway. Mr. Budge stated that they will work to address these items with staff.

5. Approval of minutes from the August 1, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Trent Stirling recused himself from this vote, as he was not a Planning Commissioner member at the meeting in question.

Rick Barchers made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 1, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

6. Approval of minutes from the August 15, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Trent Stirling recused himself from this vote, as he was not a Planning Commissioner member at the meeting in question.

Rob Jaterka made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 15, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

7. Report from Zoning Administrator.

Mrs. Moore was present and asked the Commissioners’ thoughts on the training that took place during the work session. The Commissioners stated that they liked it, and would like to have further training with more time to discuss the topics.

She also reminded the Commissioners of the online training that needs to be completed, and asked them to update her on their status.

She asked them to review the proposed by-laws for meetings, and to provide feedback.

8. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

The Commissioners discussed the Deseret Meadows proposal, and noted that they need further discussion with the City Attorney to fully understand the correct avenues for reviewing the project.

9. Report from City Council.

No report was made.

11. Adjourn.

Jeff Downward made a motion to adjourn. Rob Jaterka seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye,” Jeff Downward “Aye,” Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously. The meeting ended at 10:05 PM.