

**Action Summary:**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
#1	Mountain Meadery Retails Goods Establishment- Consideration	Approved with conditions.
#2	Mountain Meadery Mini Warehouse- Consideration	Approved with conditions.
#3	Raven Management CUP (North Hale St. Rentals)- Consideration	Approved with conditions.
#4	The Place General Plan Amendment- Discussion	Discussed.
#5	The Place Rezone- Discussion	Discussed.
#6	Brentwood PUD- Discussion	Discussed.
#7, 9, 11, 17	Code Amendments for Chapters 1, 7, 11, and 21.6.13- Discussion	Voted to action item, recommended for approval.
#13	Code Amendments for Chapters 12	Recommended for approval with conditions on verbiage change.
#8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16	Code Amendments for Chapters 3, 8, 11.5, 15, 21, 21.2.10- Discussion	Discussed.
#18	Minutes 9/19/2024 Regular Meeting- Consideration	Approved.
#19	Minutes 9/25/2024 Special Meeting- Consideration	Approved.
#20	Minutes 10/3/2024 Regular Meeting- Consideration	Approved.

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON NOVEMBER 7, 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:** Vice-Chair Derek Dalton, Rob Jaterka, Trent Stirling

**On Zoom:** Chair Rick Barchers

**Commission Members Absent:** Jeff Downward

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:** Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, Deputy City Recorder Gina Roberts, City Engineer Robert Rousselle, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Rhett Butler, City Council Member Heidi Hammond, Smith Hartvigsen  
Contracted Attorney Jay Springer

**On Zoom:** Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Camille Childs, Josh Childs, Michelle Pitt, Barry Pitt, Gary Pinkham, Lana C., Clayton Sheffer, Shere North, Duke North, Kevin Hall, Debbie Hall, Mick Moore, Garrett Doerr, Mildred Russell, Penny Anderson, Richard Anderson, DeeAnn Allen, Chris & Mindy Willes, Star & Chris Erickson, Jeffrey & Kimberly Walker, Diane Allen, Kasey Brown, Anthony Brown, Scott Miller, Camille Miller, Misty Russell, Clifford Russell, Bill Gentry, Janette Toone, Katelyn Butler, Macie Chukwuba, Mike Worthington, Jamie Fitzgerald, Randy Fitzgerald, Mary Burgess, Steve Burgess, Micheal Vanwyck, Diane Crawford

**Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom:** Unknowns

**Commission Vice-Chairman Derek Dalton called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM.**

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 7, 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 Mountain Meadery to have a retail goods establishment for sales and tasting of alcohol products in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building.**

No comments.

- b) Proposed conditional use permit for Mountain Meadery to have a mini warehouse for the manufacturing, packaging, and bottling of wine/ mead in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building.**

**Deanne Allen:** Deanne Allen was present to speak on this item. She stated that she lives near this location and loves the community as it is. She begged for a reconsideration of this project because of the issues that come with businesses bringing liquor into the community. She referenced crime, rowdiness, and drunk drivers. She stated that she feels this is the wrong thing to bring into Grantsville.

- c) **Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City General Plan and Future Land Use Map for "The Place" to go from a Rural Residential 1 (RR-1) designation to a Mixed-Use Density (MU) designation, located at approximately 799 N. 600 W.**

**Email Received 11/4/2024:**

THERE IS NO INFORMATION IN THE PACKET FOR AGENDA ITEM NO 4.

Gary Pinkham

- d) **Proposed Rezone for "The Place" to go from zoning designation A-10 to MU, located at approximately 799 N. 600 W.**

**Email Received 11/4/2024:**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 5 THE MU ZONE WILL OPEN THE AREA UP TO MULTI-UNIT HOUSING. DOES THE CITY WANT HIGH DENSITY MULTI-UNIT HOUSING IN THIS AREA? ALL OF THE SUROUNDING PROPERTIES ARE EITHER RR-1 OF A-10.

IN THE PLANNING STAFF ANNALYSIS AND COMMENTS FOR AGENDA ITEM 5 THERE IS A NOTE THAT INCLUDES A STATEMENT THAT A PORTION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA IS ZONED PUD. NOTE THERRE IS NO PUD ZONE IN GRANTSVILLE CITY, SEE CHAPTER 13 OF THE CODE.

ANY PROPERTY IN THE CITY THAT IS SHOWN AS PUD ON THE FUTURE USE, ZONING, OR MASTER PLAN MAPS FOR THE CITY SHOULD BE RECLASSIFIED TO THE PROPER ZONE. IF A ZONE HAS NOT BEEN SET FOR THE PARCEL, A ZONE SHOULD BE CHOSEN AND ASSIGNED TO IT.

Gary Pinkham

**Email Received 11/5/2024: (This was also read aloud during the meeting)**

Grantsville City Planning Commission

November 5, 2024

RE: Zoning Request to MU

799 N. 600 W.

Grantsville, UT 84029

Planning Commission:

My name is Martin Anderson, representing myself and my wife Suzanne; we are immediately adjacent land owners and oppose the request for rezoning at the above address. Please read this letter at the November 7, 2024 planning meeting. Our reasons for opposition are cited below.

As mentioned, our farm is immediately adjacent to the subject property bordering it's east boundary. In fact, the subject property was once part of our family farm until a few years ago when my uncle sold and moved. Our ground is currently used for farming and grazing and has been so used for over 100 years. In addition to our property, let's explore ALL of the immediately adjacent property: The property to the north and east is currently used for grazing and farming coupled with one single family home, and has been so used for 100 years plus. Property (farm) to the south has been farmed for as long as I can remember (I am crowding 70). One step removed from the immediately adjacent property also consists of grazing and farm land. NONE of the property in the area is zoned MU. MU zoning is simply inconsistent with the character and land use of the entire area. Designating this property MU would represent a classic case of spot zoning.

In addition, there are insufficient public facilities to accommodate any major development. Finally, there is no solid plan provided by the requester to warrant the need or desire by Grantsville City to make a zoning change.

Please vote to deny this zoning change request. Thank you for considering these comments.

Yours Truly,

Martin Anderson

**Email Received 11/6/2024:**

I am emailing regarding the zone change request of Wilbert Moore- Parcel 01-620-0-0085. They request to change the land to MU zone should be denied by the Planning and Zoning Committee. That allows the potential to allow 10 residents per acre. If you take a look at the current residents and sizes of lots in and near the area, you will see that changing the zoning to put more than 2 residents per acre does not fit the type area we currently live in. Grantsville City is growing and change is inevitable, but it is your and our duty to make sure that new growth and development fits in specific areas. We want to keep Grantsville a nice place to live and we can do that without making it look like a cookie cutter town by piling houses in between other larger acre lots. The other residents in this area along with myself ask that you take the sizes of lots around and near this parcel of land and make the zoning for this fit what we currently have.

Feel free to reach out to me directly.

Thank you,

Hailey Richeson

**Email Received 11/7/2024:**

I am a resident of Grantsville and I am opposed to The Place rezoning @ 799 N 600 W. That area of town needs to stay rural. There is no infrastructure in that area for that at all. I live in that area and I do not want more development. I live here for the open spaces. Please be against this rezoning and development.

**Kevin Hall:** Kevin Hall was present to speak on this item and noted that he lives directly adjacent to this proposal. He stated that he has a gate opening that is historic and referred to as The Other Place. He stated it has real meaning to him and his family, and was shocked that the applicant chose to name it similarly. He stated that himself and several of his neighbors are in opposition of this proposal. He mentioned the current agricultural uses of the property and surrounding areas. He said there is nothing nearby that is zoned MU or that has MU uses. He stated that he recognizes growth is here and will come, but that we should be real careful in changing things too quickly. He stated that this proposal would be the poster child for spot zoning, and that he sees no merits of it.

Mr. Hall also discussed the MU zone. He said that in his opinion, the MU zone is going to be the demise of Grantsville. He stated that the MU zone consists of tiny lots, apartments, townhouses, and those kinds of things. He noted the need for affordable housing, but said this zone will create nothing but those housing types in the community. He stated that the City needs to take a serious look at the code for the MU zone, as nothing good seems to come of it. He said that the reality of it is that if it is not managed, those housing types are all that will be seen in the City.

**Penny Anderson:** Penny Anderson was present to speak on this item and noted that she has several letters from residents regarding this proposal. The first was from Ed Barrus which stated, "I am definitely against an MU zone in the Picadilly Ln. area. Traditional farming and small lot property owners typically do not make good neighbors. Sincerely, Ed Barrus." The second was from Joyce Summers which Ms. Anderson read as the following, "She has lived at her property for 23 years, and they were attracted there because it was an agricultural location. Her husband and her moved into this property so they could have horses and farm the ground. They spent countless hours irrigating and raising hay. We have also enjoyed being able to raise a garden and enjoy the land and outdoors. Our neighborhood is filled with farmers and ranchers that share our love of the rural lifestyle. I received notification that they're wanting to have the zoning changed to an MU zone. Doing this would be considered spot zoning and does not conform to the City's master plan. To put this type of zoning in the middle of an agricultural type of area would devalue the property and rural lifestyle. Please do not approve this zone change. Once you get this done, there is no going back." The third was from Ms. Anderson and her husband Richard which stated, "My name is Penny Anderson and my husband Richard and I are both lifelong residents of Grantsville. My husband has been a rancher and farmer his whole life. Over 30 years ago we purchased a farm on the West end of Grantsville and we have farmed that property ever since. Our property is surrounded by other farmers and ranchers and the zoning is A-10. We purchased in this area because of the agricultural zoning. There has been a request to change the zoning in the middle of this area to go from an A-10 to an MU.

This would potentially allow the owners of that property to put 250 residences on that 25 acre piece. Think about that- 250 on 25 acres. I have several concerns about this zone change request. First, this is not at all conducive with Grantsville City's master plan. Second, to change the zoning in the middle of an A-10 zone to an MU zone would be considered spot zoning. Third, there's not any kind of infrastructure to support this kind of zone in this area. I don't know what the reason is for this zone request, but I do know that if this zone change is allowed, the property owner can change their minds about what they want to do and as long as they meet all the requirements of the MU zoning, the City cannot legally refuse the request. This is one of the last agricultural areas left in Grantsville that still exists. Please let us keep it that way. I drove up the road the other day and looked down, and all you could see were nice fields, people growing hay. You know, we have lots and lots of populated areas so let's keep some of these rural areas rural. There are plenty of other areas in the City that have already been stripped of their agricultural roots. Please don't let this area be added to that list. Thank you."

**Janette Toone:** Janette Toone was present to speak on this item. She said that over the past year she has observed the Commissioners making some difficult land use decisions. She said that every time she writes an opposing letter or comes before the Planning Commission or City Council, she is told that if the property in question hadn't already been zoned MU by a previous board, the discussion would not even be on the table. She said that she recognizes that the MU zone has a place to integrate residential, commercial, and industrial, but that it offers more benefits to developers than the residents. She noted she feels that it seems harder to enforce zoning codes in the MU zone. She noted that there are plenty of high-density areas going in, and referenced strain on public places like schools and medical care. She said that she enjoys the peace and quiet, and development takes that away. She said with more people around, there is more crime and issues. She urged the Commission not to approve any further MU properties. She said it is a conflict of interest for the Zoning Administrator to try to rezone her property to MU, when she has been there the last year and seen the challenges that the zone has brought the City.

**Mike Worthington:** Mike Worthington was present to speak on this item. He stated that he is good friends with Nick and Shelby, but disagrees with this zoning proposal. He said his family owns the property directly to the South of this property, and they do not want to see the infrastructure in the road that would be required to support the potential development here. He stated that this proposal does not fit with the surrounding uses.

**Clifford Russell:** Clifford Russell was present to speak on this item. He stated that he lives up the road from this property. He mentioned concerns about this proposal not matching the area and the infrastructure. He said that the road there is hardly wide enough for two vehicles to pass each other, let alone any equipment that could be there. He expressed that he hopes the Commissioners hear the public comments and decide accordingly.

**Chris Willes:** Chris Willes was present to speak on this item. He stated that he lives in the area of this project, and would not have known about this proposal if it wasn't for his neighbors. He mentioned that he saw the public notice sign, but that the QR code took him to a website that did not mention this application. He said it is frustrating that the QR code takes you to a website

where this application is not mentioned. He reiterated that this is not a good area for Mixed Use development. He said if he wanted to live in Daybreak, he would go live in Daybreak.

**Duke North:** Duke North was present to speak on this item. He stated that he owns property adjacent to this one, and he is friends with Nick and Shelby. He feels that Mixed Use is not anything he wants in Grantsville at all, and especially not in this area. He said that Mixed Use is horrible. He said that the zoning and lot sizes have been dropped continuously. He said that back in the day there were 3 police officers, and asked how many there are currently. It was noted that there are 19 officers at this time. He asked if the Commissioners received the public comment from his brother, Martin Anderson, and requested that it be read aloud at that time. The letter, previously listed, was read aloud.

**Micheal Vanwyck:** Micheal Vanwyck was present to speak on this item. He noted that on December 21st of last year, there were this many people in the room. He stated that he lives on the very East side of town. He stated that he has attended almost every meeting since December 21st of the previous year, and encouraged the public to get involved. He said that the more eyes that are involved, the better it is going to be.

He said that at the meeting the previous night, he heard a developer say the words, “detrimental impact.” He said that the engineer’s analysis of the project said that the current wastewater system is not sufficient for the proposed project of 954 units, and asked that no more growth or rezones be allowed until the system is adequate to service them. He said that in terms of detrimental impact, the City is five officers short. He said that the more growth allowed, the more the current residents are affected. He said that Grantsville is the last area around Salt Lake that has not been taken over, and asked again that new growth and rezones not be allowed.

**Diane Crawford:** Diane Crawford was present to speak on this item, and noted that she is a newer resident in The Highlands subdivision. She stated that she moved here from Salt Lake because her son-in-law hauls concrete to the Salt Lake area, but could not sleep during the day when needed. This led them to Grantsville where it is less noisy and populated, and they have valued that choice. She stated that she saw on Facebook before moving in, that residents were concerned about having enough water for new development. She said if there was not enough water before, where is it coming from now? She said that a lot more infrastructure and resources are needed before a development comes to the City. She expressed that the quality of her new home was not what they expected, and were sorely disappointed. She stated that after speaking with other residents in new homes, 75% of them were disappointed with the quality of them. She noted that Grantsville may come to be known for houses that lack.

**Shere North:** Shere North was present to speak on this item, and noted that she is a 63-year-old resident of Grantsville. She expressed that she does not have anything against the applicant, but is against this rezone proposal. She noted that she purchased her home in the agricultural area 28 years ago and has loved it for the views and quiet. She said she does not want high-density housing that will block the beautiful land that they love to look at on a daily basis. She expressed that she does not want the traffic that will come with the development. She also noted that there is no City water or sewer in the area. She stated that she would hate

to see that many homes coming in, that could contribute to her losing her well. She stated that farmers use their wells for their livelihood. She stated that the growth was to be on the South side of town, not the North side. She noted that Picadilly Road is not sufficient for high volumes of traffic.

**Any further public comments made during the meeting are not listed, as the handheld recording device stopped working at this point of the meeting. There were technical issues with the Zoom recording, so that recording is not available. We apologize for the inconvenience.**

- e) Proposed PUD for the Brentwood subdivision, located at approximately 47 S. Main St., including consideration of the concept plan and variance table.**

**Email Received 11/4/2024:**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE ADDRESS FOR THE PROPERTY IS INCORECT. SEE MY ATTACHED NOTES FROM A PREVIOUS REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION. THE ONLY CHANGE I SEE THEY MADE IS TO THE STREET TO THE EAST OF MAVERICK OFF SR138, IT IS NOW A 66' ROW. NOTE THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TABLE DOES NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF GLUDMC 12.4.2.C.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE CODE WOULD PERMIT ROUGHLY 45 SINGLE FAMILY LOTS ON THE PROPERTY. THEY ARE ASKING FOR 146 UNITS WITH THIS PUD CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION. THIS IS AN INCREASE FOR 100 UNITS THAT WILL REQUIRE 50% DESCRIBED AS MODERATE INCOME HOUSING.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6, WILL UDOT PERMIT THE ACCESS POINT OFF SR138 FOR THE EASTERLY STREET? MOST OF THE SPACING DISTANCES LISTED IN THE UDOT ACCESS CHART EXCEED THE DISTANCE SHOWN ON THE DRAWING.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE WORD "POSSIBLE" FOR AMENITIES MEANS NO AMMENITIES.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE STREETS ARE TOO NARROW TO PERMIT STREET SIDE PARKING. DRIVEWAY SET BACKS LESS THAN 25' WILL NOT ACCOMMODATE A FULLSIZED PICKUP OR A SERVICE/DELIVERY VAN.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THERE ARE NO SERVICES SHOWN ON THE FRONT OR SIDES OF THE BUILDINGS IN THE VARIOUS RENDERINGS. THIS WILL REQUIRE ALL SEERVICES TO COME INTO THE BUILDING FROM THE NON-STREET END OF THE UNIT. THERE MUST BE AN ALLEY WAY THAT WILL PROVID ALL WEATHER ACCESS TO THESE SERVICES FOR THE CITY AND THE FRANCHISE UTILITIES.



FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE PROPOSED MAVERICK LAND AND ROAD ALIGNMENT DOESN'T LOOK LIKE IT LINES UP VERY WELL.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 THE SECOND ACCESS ROAD EASEMENT SHOULD BE A DEDICATED CITY STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY NOT AN EASEMENT.

FOR AGENDA ITEM 6 BOTH OF THE EAST/WEST STREETS SHOULD BE 66' CITY STREET RIGHT-OF-WAYS TO PROVIDE PROPER ACCESS TO THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTIES TO THE EAST OF THIS PARCEL.

Gary Pinkham

**Email Received 11/5/2024:**

Hello,

I'm told this is the best address to reach out with concerns regarding the 146 town home development in Grantsville. High density townhomes do not feel appropriate or fit in well with the general feel, culture and tradition of the city of Grantsville.

Grantsville is far enough away from the greater Wasatch front that is not a convenient place to build townhomes - which usually coincide in proximity to more commercial development, public transportation and other business centers. Therefore, a large number of town homes just creates a lot of commuter traffic and congestion. By contrast, Grantsville is a small town that most people love for it's comparatively rural setting. High density development will only bring resentment from the people of the city and broader valley. Surely, a more appropriate and lower density zoning can be achieved as a win-win with the community.

As a resident of the Tooele valley, I plead with you to resist and reject this type of development in Grantsville and to relay this concern to other city planning and diving committee members.

Thank you, David Iverson

**Email Received 11/7/2024:**

Hello,

My name is Megan Flanagan, I am a proud citizen of Tooele County. I became aware that there is a meeting to discuss some zoning issues that the people of Tooele County absolutely do not want... more townhomes.

Townhomes are not for rural or even suburban life, they are for urban areas. Townhomes are not more efficient, affordable or desirable. Townhomes do not have backyards, nothing I've seen being newly built in Tooele County has a backyard. Tooele County is not a commuter

town, we don't need that kind of housing here, especially in Grantsville! NIMBY is not affordable! Section 8 is segregation!

Please do not allow the developers to build 13 acres of townhomes in Grantsville. We don't have the infrastructure in Tooele County to handle the traffic, the volume of people or the resources! Please do the right thing and vote AGAINST URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN A NON-URBAN environment!!

Respectfully,

Megan Flanagan

**Email Received 11/7/2024:**

I am writing regarding my concern over a proposed development (Brentwood Subdivision) behind Maverick.

I would oppose more development in Grantsville.

I oppose developing farm land.

I oppose high density housing.

Many people like this town small and believe we do not have the infrastructure to support continued development.

Kathleen C

Grantsville Resident

**Email Received 11/7/2024:**

**Public Comment:** Planning and Zoning Commission -Meeting November 7, 2024 – 7pm – Agenda item #6 – Brentwood Subdivision

Hello,

My name is Terry Larsen, and I am a concerned resident of Grantsville. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed new development (Brentwood subdivision) just off Hwy 112 behind the Maverick Gas Station.

While I understand the need for affordable housing in our city, I believe that this project would have a detrimental impact on our community. First and foremost, the proposed development is simply too large for the area. The increase in population density would put a strain on infrastructure, leading to increased traffic congestion. This type of housing being proposed is simply not in keeping with the character of our neighborhood and town. This development would bring in a large number of residents, which could lead to increased crime rates and other negative

social effects. It would also drastically alter the aesthetic of our area, replacing the existing open spaces with a monolithic, high-density housing complex.

I've lived in Grantsville for more than 25 years, and as time passes, developments are encroaching on the open space property. I have nothing against raising more tax revenue for the city or constructing affordable homes. The construction of these densely populated townhomes is what I oppose. Given Grantsville's reputation for wide space, people typically choose to go west because they want larger lots and acres where they can raise farm animals at a lower cost. Rapid expansion, particularly in the form of high-density housing, has been shown to have numerous detrimental effects, including overcrowded schools, traffic-strained infrastructure, and rationed natural resources such as water, loss of farm and open space, increased pollution, packed recreation sites, and increased concerns of safety and crime.

The developer clearly states that only 28 out of the 146 units will be considered "affordable housing." Local property taxes and school taxes are not paid by people. The per-k of property worth determines how much they pay. A high-density housing project into a low-density neighborhood is, in my perspective, essentially stealing the tax base that already exists. The truth is that developers frequently understand how to circumvent local tax regulations in order to further lower their own tax obligations and shift the burden to others.

In conclusion, I strongly urge you to give this proposed housing development another look and to take my concerns into account. While I recognize the need for affordable housing, I believe that this project is simply not the right fit for this area. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Concern 1: **Revising city code changes:** updating city code modifications; to allow for the construction of more townhomes, the developer is requesting that the planning and zoning commission update the setback regulations. In my opinion, the developer should not be allowed to alter the setback requirements in order to profit from the addition of additional townhomes in a smaller space. In my view, the city created these setbacks and other laws for a purpose; thus, unless there is a good cause, the city shouldn't change their codes.

Concern 2: **Safety:** Will the developer be required to have bigger street sizes than proposed to accommodate emergency vehicles? People are known to park on the street in these townhome developments. How will an emergency vehicle be able to pass and reach the scene if there are multiple cars parked on the street?

Concern 3: **Traffic Congestion.** With 146 townhomes in that small area, two to three people living in each townhome on average, and two cars per household on average, that means 292 more cars are leaving the development and turning onto a very small stretch of road to turn at Grantsville's only stop light. Main Street is very crowded during morning and evening commutes, so even if the developers add another access point leaving the area, more cars will have to cross it without any lights. I don't see how this won't be a nightmare for traffic and a safety concern for everyone. Does the city have any plans to help alleviate this situation?

Concern 4: **Water:** Can the city supply the water required for Grantsville's increased population given its rapid growth? I'm concerned about the source of water for all these newly approved developments, which also increases everyone's taxes if new or upgraded infrastructure is required.

Also, an 8” water line was required when we built in that area; the city will require a 12” water line for that development. What impact will that have on my power and water while they're building there?

Concern 5: **Livestock:** Will the developer have to put up a privacy fence around the property? The area is home to numerous livestock-owning residences and pastures. If people own dogs, would their livestock—such as cows, horses, goats, and chickens—be in danger if they are not required to put up a fence?

**f) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code  
Chapter 1 (Introductory Provisions).**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 7;

THE SENTENCE IN 1.12(1) NEEDS TO BE REWRITTEN IN ITS ENTIRETY. IT CURRENTLY AND IN THE REVISED FORM MAKES NO SENSE.

SUGGESTION – “GRANTSVILLE CITY OR ANY OWNER OF REAL ESTATE WITHIN GRANTSVILLE CITY ADVERSLY AFFECTED BY THIS CHAPTER OR ORDINANCES ENACTED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THIS CHAPTER MAY, IN ADDITION TO OTHER REMEDIES PROVIDED BY LAW, INSTITUTE:”

IN 1.19(7)(b), WHY CAN'T A CHARTER SCHOOL HAVE MORE PARKING IF THEY HAVE THE SPACE AND WANT IT? THEY DEFINITELY SHOULD NOT HAVE LESS.

Gary Pinkham

**g) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code  
Chapter 3 (Decision Making Bodies, And Officials), to implement modifications  
from SB174/ HB0476.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 8;

IN 3.1(2), THIS DOES NOT READ CLEARLY.

SUGGESTION – FAILURE TO MAKE A RECOMENDATION, WHENEVER SUCH RECOMMENDATION **IS** REQUIRED BY UTAH CODE OR THIS ORDINANCE,

IN 3.19.3 AND 3.19.4 THESE TWO STATED PROVISIONS DO NOT WORK TOGETHER. IN THE FIRST ONE THE CITY COUNCIL IS TO APOINT A PERSON TO BE THE HEARING OFFICER. IN THE SECOND THE CODE DEFINES IT TO BE THE PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR.

IN 3.20, CORRECT NUMBERING AND LETTERING OF THE SUB ITEMS.

IN 3.20(9), IF THE HEARING OFFICER IS TO BE THE PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTER, IS PER DIEM NECESSARY WHEN THIS IS PART OF THEIR WORK DESCRIPTION?

IN 3.21, THE HEARING OFFICER IS NOT PERMITTED TO GRANT DECISIONS THAT ARE NOT IN STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODE. NO CHANGE, ALTERATION, MODIFICATION, OR WAIVER TO THE CODE MAY BE MADE WITHOUT PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL.

IN 3.23(1), HOW WILL THE HEARING OFFICER DECIDE ISSUES IN FRONT OF THE HEARING OFFICER?

IN 3.25, NO CHANGE, ALTERATION, MODIFICATION, OR WAIVER (VARIANCE) TO THE CODE MAY BE MADE WITHOUT A RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND APPROVAL BY THE CITY COUNCIL. A VARIANCE IS A CHANGE TO THE CODE AND THIS REQUIRES THE LEGISLATIVE BODY'S, CITY COUNCIL'S, APPROVAL.

Gary Pinkham

**h) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 7 (Conditional Uses).**

No comments.

**i) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 8 (Regulation Of General Applicability).**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 10;

IN 8.4(2) AND 8.4(3), VERIFY THAT THE ZONES LISTED AS PERMITTING GROUP HOMES BY CONDITIONAL USE MATCH WHAT IS STATED IN TABLES 14.1 AND 15.1. IF THE TABLES NEED TO BE REVISED, MAKE EVERYTHING A CONDITIONAL USE TO MATCH THESE SECTIONS SO THE CITY CAN HAVE A SAY IN WHAT AND HOW THEY MAY BE RUN.

DITTO FOR 8.5(1) AND 8.5(3).

IN 8.8, ADD A SECTION THAT REQUIRES THAT ANY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT THAT IS GOING TO HAVE A CHANGE, ALTERATION, MODIFICATION, OR WAIVER TO THE CODE, A VARIANCE, BE REVIEWED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

Gary Pinkham

**j) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 11 (Site Plan Review).**

No comments.

**k) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 11 (Site Plan Review) to modify the Lighting Ordinance in section 11.5.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 12;

IN THE SECTION FOR THE AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 11, SECTION 11.5, I SEE NO HIGHLIGHTED AREAS OR SECTIONS THAT INDICATE WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED AS A CHANGE TO THE CODE. IS THIS CREATING TOTALLY NEW CODE? IF IT IS NEW CODE THE PUBLIC NOTICE SHOULD STATE THIS.

Gary Pinkham

**l) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 12 (Planned Unit Developments), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 13;

FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO CHAPTER 12, THE STATEMENT AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 2 IN THE NARATIVE FOLLOWING THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE TITLED "PLANNING COMMISSION TASK" SHOULD REQUIRE THAT IF THE PLANNER OR THE ATTORNEY MAKE CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO THE PROPOSED VARIANCES, THEY MUST BE RESUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THEIR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION. THIS STEP IS REQUIRED BY THE SECOND SENTENCE IN THE PREVIOUS SECTION AND SECTION 3.18(2) OF THE GLDUMC.

THE OPENING SENTENCE IN CHAPTER 12 SPECIFICALLY DEFINES THE PUD AS A DISTINCT CATEGORY OF CONDITIONAL USE. IN CHAPTER 12 THE PUD APPLICATION IS TO COMPLY WITH SECTIONS IN CHAPTER 7, CONDITIONAL USES. ANY APPLICATION FOR A PUD CONDITIONAL USE SHOULD BE SUBMITTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CHAPTER 7 WITH THE ADDED REQUIREMENTS OF CHAPTER 12.

ANOTHER IDEA IS TO COMBINE THE TWO CHAPTERS AND CREATE AN APPLICATION FOR A SIMPLE CONDITIONAL USE AND A MORE COMPREHENSIVE APPLICATION FOR THE PUD CONDITIONAL USE. THIS WOULD PUT ALL OF THE REQUIRED INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS IN ONE PLACE IN THE CODE.

IN 12.1(b) THE REVISION SHOULD BE REVISED TO READ “A LEVEL 4 OR LEVEL 5”.

IN 12.4.1, THE NUMBER 1 IS BEING STRUCK. SHOULD THIS REMAIN NUMBER 1?

IN 12.4 2 THE NUMBERING AND ALPHABETICAL DESIGNATIONS FOR THE SUB-SECTIONS NEED TO BE CORRECTED.

IN 12.4.2.4 (AS IT IS NOW WRITTEN) THE STATEMENT REGARDING LIGHTING IN THE 50’ BUFFER NEEDS TO STATE “NO LIGHTS OR LIGHT POLES MAY”

IN THE SECOND 12.4.2.3 (AS IT IS NOW WRITTEN) THE LAST FOUR WORDS IN THAT SECTION MAY BE BETTER STATED “DEVIATIONS **FROM** THE ORDINACE”.

Gary Pinkham

**m) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 15 (Residential And Multiple Residential Districts), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 14;

IN 15.4(1), THE WORDING IN THE SENTENCE REGARDING ATTACHED DWELLINGS OR MULTI-UNIT HOUSING IS COMPLETELY NEW.

DITTO FOR 15.5(1).

THE CHANGES IN 15.4(1) AND 15.4(2) MUST BE HIGHLIGHTED AND REVIEWED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL.

THE HOUSING TYPES REFERED TO IN 15.4(1) AND 15.4(2) DO NOT APPEAR IN TABLE 15.1. THE TWO SECTIONS AND THE TABLE NEED TO HAVE MATCHING USE TYPES TO AVOID CONFUSION/LITIGATION.

IN TABLE 15.1 THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME MINIMUM STANDARDS SET FOR THE KENNEL/YARD FOR THE CLASS “A” KENNEL PERMIT.

Gary Pinkham

**n) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21 (Subdivision Regulations), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 15;

FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO CHAPTER 21, THE STATEMENT AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 2 IN THE NARATIVE FOLLOWING THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE TITLED "PLANNING COMMISSION TASK" SHOULD REQUIRE THAT IF THE PLANNER OR THE ATTORNEY MAKE CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO THE PROPOSED VARIANCES, THEY MUST BE RESUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THEIR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION. THIS STEP IS REQUIRED BY THE SECOND SENTENCE IN THE PREVIOUS SECTION AND SECTION 3.18(2) OF THE GLDUMC.

IN 21.2.11 THE NUMBERING SYSTEM FOR THE SUB-SECTIONS NEEDS TO BE REVISED. THERE ARE DUPLICATIONS OF NUMBERS.

IN 21.3 CLEANUP THE NUMBERING FOR THE SECTION.

IN 21.4.2(b) CLEANUP THE WORD SALAD.

IN 21.4.2 THERE IS NO APPROVAL PROCESS SPECIFIED FOR LEVELS 1 OR 2.

IN 21.5.1 THE PUD IS A CONDITIONAL USE AND MUST MEET THE STANDARDS OF CHAPTER 7 AS WELL AS CHAPTER 12. AS I STATED EARLIER, THE CITY MAY WANT TO LOOK AT COMBINING THE REQUIREMENTS OF CHAPTERS 7 AND 12 TO CREATE ONE CHAPTER ADDRESSING THE APPLICATIONS FOR CONDITIONAL USES INCLUDING THE PUD CONDITIONAL USE.

IN 21.6.3(17) THE TIME PERIOD FOR THE GUARANTEE SHOULD START WITH THE DATE OF ACCEPTEANCE BY THE CITY, NOT THE DATE OF INSTALLATION.

IN 21.6.3(19)(a) THE WORDING NEEDS TO BE CLEANED UP. THE MINIMUM IS TO BE HALF OF THE STANDARD RIGHT-OF-WAY OR SUFFUCIENT WIDTH TO PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF 26 OF ASPHALT SURFACE WHICH EVER IS GREATER.

IN 21.6.3(19)(c ) INCLUDE THE REQUIREMENT TO BRING THE ROADWAY SECTION UP TO CITY STANDARDS.

IN 21.6.6 THE BLOCK LENGTH MAY NOT EXCEED THAT PERMITTED BY THE FIRE CODE.

Gary Pinkham

- o) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21.2.10 (Development Review Committee) to remove the Planning Commission Consultant from the Development Review Committee.**

FOR AGENDA ITEM 16;



THE PROPOSED AMMENDMENT TO 21.2.10, THE PUBLIC ANOUNCEMENT STATES THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONSULTANT IS BEING REMOVED FROM THE CODE. IN THE STAFF REPORT IT STATES THAT BOTH THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONSULTANT AND THE CITY ATTORNEY ARE BEING REMOVED. IN THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE ONLY THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONSULTANT IS BEING REMOVED. IN THE ATTACHED STAFF REPORT AND THE PROPOSED CHANGES SHOWN BACK IN 21.2.10 OF THE PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEM BOTH THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONSULTANT AND THE CITY ATTORNEY HAVE BEEN REMOVED. THIS AGENDA ITEM NEEDS TO BE CORRECTED AND RESUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

Gary Pinkham

**p) Proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21.6.13 (Storm Drainage And Flood Plains).**

No comments.

**AGENDA**

**1. Consideration of the proposed conditional use permit for Mountain Meadery to have a retail goods establishment for sales and tasting of alcohol products in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building.**

Jeff Walker was present to represent this item. He noted that the intent of this business is not for customers to congregate and consume on-site, but to purchase or taste the products and consume at home.

Commissioner Trent Stirling asked if this permit could be revoked once approved, if DUIs skyrocket. Attorney Tysen Barker clarified that the permit could only be revoked if the applicant was not in compliance with the conditions listed on the permit.

Vice-Chairman Derek Dalton read through the seven conditions listed on the staff report, and Mr. Walker agreed to them all. Attorney Barker clarified that typically a warrant is required for a police officer to search premises, and this condition would be the applicant waiving the need for a warrant to search the property. Mr. Walker agreed to this.

**Rob Jaterka made a motion to approve the proposed conditional use permit for Mountain Meadery to have a retail goods establishment for sales and tasting of alcohol products in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building, with the following conditions:**

- 1. Building permit must be obtained for any changes made to the tenant space.**
- 2. Business license must be obtained, through approval by the City Council.**

3. The business license will not be issued until the bond required by Section 32B-6-705 of the Utah Code is in effect.
4. The premise shall be subject to inspection by any police officer.
5. All employees handling and selling alcohol must be at least twenty-one (21) years of age.
6. An air gap is required for any connection to a water source, to ensure the water remains uncontaminated.
7. Must be compliant with all state and federal regulations.

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

**2. Consideration of the proposed conditional use permit for Mountain Meadery to have a mini warehouse for the manufacturing, packaging, and bottling of wine/ mead in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building.**

Jeff Walker was present to represent this item. In response to Commissioner Stirling’s concern about DUIs, Mr. Walker stated that he will likely stop offering tastings without a designated driver if he experiences several instances where he tells customers to call someone for a ride.

**Rob Jaterka made a motion to approve the proposed conditional use permit for Mountain Meadery to have a mini warehouse for the manufacturing, packaging, and bottling of wine/ mead in the C-D zone, located at 822 E. Main St., in the South building, with the following conditions:**

1. Building permit must be obtained for any changes made to the tenant space.
2. Business license must be obtained, through approval by the City Council.
3. The business license will not be issued until the bond required by Section 32B-6-705 of the Utah Code is in effect.
4. The premise shall be subject to inspection by any police officer.
5. All employees handling and selling alcohol must be at least twenty-one (21) years of age.
6. An air gap is required for any connection to a water source, to ensure the water remains uncontaminated.
7. Must be compliant with all state and federal regulations.

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

**3. Consideration of the proposed conditional use permit for Raven Management LLC to allow Multi-Family Housing in the form of two (2) fourplexes, located at 268 N. Hale St., in the RM-7 zone.**

Holly Jones was present to represent this item. Vice-Chair Dalton asked if anything had changed since this item was previously discussed. Ms. Jones stated that utility modeling, a traffic study, and a landscape design were completed and submitted, as requested. She noted that no variances were being requested, just a conditional use.

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore clarified that the private easement is 30 feet wide. Ms. Jones noted that the frontage off Hale Street is wider.

Vice-Chair Dalton asked what concerns staff has, and Ms. Moore noted the conditions listed on the staff report including upsizing the water line and installing a fire hydrant.

Commissioner Jaterka asked if the entire development would be fenced. Ms. Jones stated that a 6-foot fence of some kind is planned, hopefully not vinyl as it is blown away by Grantsville wind. City Attorney Tysen Barker stated that his analysis of the fencing placement is that the private lane Chiekezie would then not serve the residents of this development, and would then not need to be wider. Aqua Consultant Shay Stark clarified that the only code section that mentions the need for a wider road or buffering is in the PUD code, which does not apply to this application.

Ms. Jones noted that these will be single-level units, owned by one company, and designed for a 55+ community. She also noted that two of the units are already spoken for by family members.

Commissioners expressed concerns about parking on Chiekezie Ln. and Ms. Jones stated that all they can do is post signs for no parking.

Vice-Chair Dalton expressed that he does not like this application. He also expressed a concern about the impact to home values of surrounding property owners, and that he wishes there was more the City could do.

**Trent Stirling made a motion to approve the proposed conditional use permit for Raven Management LLC to allow Multi-Family Housing in the form of two (2) fourplexes, located at 268 N. Hale St., in the RM-7 zone, with the following conditions:**

- 1. The existing water line will need to be up-sized from a 4-inch water line to an 8-inch water line in order to meet a minimum fire flow of 1,000 GPM with 20 psi residual from North Street to the development.**
- 2. The water line will need to be replaced from the intersection of North St. and Hale St. to the North end of the development's property line.**

- 3. Furnish and install one (1) fire hydrant adjacent to the development. Placement of the hydrant is to be approved by the Fire Chief and City Engineer.**

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

**4. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City General Plan and Future Land Use Map for "The Place" to go from a Rural Residential 1 (RR-1) designation to a Mixed-Use Density (MU) designation, located at approximately 799 N. 600 W.**

Items number four and five were discussed together. Chairman Rick Barchers noted that the applicant is a staff member, and asked Attorney Tysen Barker if she needs to step out of the room for the discussion. Attorney Barker stated that if that is the practice for Commissioners with an active application, that would be a good practice. Vice-Chair Dalton noted that he would like to ask the applicant some questions first.

Shelby Moore was present as the applicant for this item. She expressed her apologies to resident Kevin Hall for the name, and noted that she will change it. Vice-Chair Dalton asked Ms. Moore what her intentions are with this proposal. Ms. Moore noted that if this property were zoned to R-1-21, open space would not be required in a development. However, open space would be required in the MU zone and park amenities would be approved by the City Council.

Attorney Barker noted that this item is only for discussion, and it would be beneficial to Ms. Moore as a landowner to hear the discussion and feedback. He noted that she should leave the room when the vote is made.

Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he despises the MU zone, and until the City cleans up the code for that zone, he is against it. He noted that several developments in the MU zone have promised things that were never followed through on, and commercial development has often been cut short.

Ms. Moore noted that she intends to complete a Development Agreement for this property once rezoned, to protect what can be done with the future development there. Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he would like to see the Development Agreement before making a vote.

Vice-Chair Dalton asked if Ms. Moore would be open to a name change, and Ms. Moore confirmed that she is absolutely open to a name change for this project. Vice-Chair Dalton noted that he is concerned about spot zoning if this were rezoned as proposed. He stated that even if a development agreement was completed a developer could come back and amend it in the future, and do the things it was meant to protect against.

Vice-Chair Dalton said there must be a better way to achieve the goal, but the City has not found it yet and needs to dig deeper to do so. Ms. Moore stated that she is open to feedback.

Commissioner Trent Stirling asked if she could just dedicate a portion of the property as a park now, without the need for a rezone. Ms. Moore stated that would not allow the City Council to determine the amenities at the park, or any at all. Chairman Rick Barchers noted that the definition of “open space” in the code needs to be modified, to require amenities automatically. He stated that would solve this issue in the first place.

Chairman Barchers stated that he has a hard time abandoning the general plan and the planned zoning and uses. Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he would like to see a zone that better matches the area. Commissioner Rob Jaterka stated that he lives in the area of this property and it is home to him. He stated that he would like it to continue feeling that way, and feels the MU zoning designation does not fit in there.

#### **5. Discussion of the proposed Rezone for "The Place" to go from zoning designation A-10 to MU, located at approximately 799 N. 600 W.**

Items number four and five were discussed together. See the notes from the discussion, listed under item number four.

#### **6. Discussion of the proposed PUD for the Brentwood subdivision, located at approximately 47 S. Main St., including consideration of the concept plan and variance table.**

It was clarified that the approximate address for this proposal is 808 E. Main St., not 47 S. Main St. as listed on the agenda.

Jake Clegg was present as the engineer for this project. He requested that a new variance table be shown in the meeting, and Vice-Chair Dalton granted this request. An unknown representative of the project was also present to answer questions for this item.

Vice-Chair Dalton asked if rights have been established for the road to the East, shown as a second access. The unknown representative stated that Josh Cummings is the current owner of that land, and that he is willing to grant them an access easement to the private road as shown on the concept plan. Mr. Clegg noted that they have discussed the gated access with UDOT and that they are still waiting for their approval. Ms. Moore noted that the City would rather have the access be public. The unknown representative stated that they are willing to discuss this with Josh Cummings. Ms. Moore noted that a corridor agreement is in progress with UDOT, which would include this as an intersection.

Mr. Stark noted that City code requires any development or phase over 30 feet, to have two accesses. He noted previous subdivisions that were required to provide temporary or emergency accesses in some phases, to make sure those units have a second access. He noted that this is the past precedent.

Commissioner Trent Stirling noted that the most northern private road does not seem to be large enough for potential future development. He asked if the applicant has considered widening the road to prepare for this. Mr. Clegg stated that they had not considered this point. The unknown representative stated that they would need to discuss this with their neighbor. Commissioner Stirling also asked about the right-of-way on the bottom curve. The representative stated that it has been a while since they discussed this with their neighbor, but they were previously amicable to the proposal. They also noted that utilities would need to be relocated there, which they would be willing to take on. They noted that the neighbor is amicable to this, as long as their access remains unimpaired. The representative asked if frontage improvements are required when the development comes in. Ms. Moore responded that they are required at that time, and the land owner would need to dedicate accordingly.

Commissioner Stirling asked if site triangles will be met. Ms. Moore mentioned the note on the variance table that they will be required to meet the site triangle requirements in the code, as designed on the preliminary plan.

Commissioner Jaterka stated that he believes another subdivision was required to put a buffer between the development and the neighboring land. Ms. Moore clarified that the buffering requirement for a PUD is 50 feet. Commissioner Jaterka stated that he would like to see a fence or something that will break up the density in this project, from the surrounding properties. The representative noted that they are asking for a 20-foot buffer variance, and asked if a masonry wall would be sufficient. Commissioner Jaterka stated that he would like to see a larger buffer.

Chair Rick Barchers stated that based on his interpretation of the code, they should meet the requirements of a standard residential street rather than using a private lane. He stated that a private street is to service one or two dwelling units, and this proposal has them servicing more than that. Mr. Stark confirmed that the code does only allow up to two units to be serviced by a private street. Chair Barchers stated that this variance is a hard no for him.

Chair Barchers also noted his concern about the front yard not meeting the setbacks or frontage as described in the code. Mr. Clegg stated it was their understanding that it is better to have smaller units and more open space, but can have eightplexes instead if that is more desired. The representative asked if it would be better for them to do apartments in the RM-15 zone.

Chair Barchers stated that they quoted the affordable housing clause, and asked what they are willing to commit to in writing, for affordable housing. The representative stated that they hope to meet the qualifications for USDA loans in the rural area, which would be affordable housing. They noted that they will do their best to meet the median house price of \$450,000 and are open to discussions as to what they can do.

Chair Barchers asked if the applicant has completed a study that shows the half-width road is sufficient. Mr. Clegg stated that he would have to revisit the traffic study to confirm.

Commissioner Stirling expressed a concern about parking on the road going north to south. The representative stated that the homes will have two-car garages and driveways for parking, as well as the additional parking provided. They also noted that there is an HOA that will enforce these things. Mr. Clegg noted that they are asking to define the front yard as whichever side the driveway is on, for the townhomes, both front-loaded and rear-loaded. He noted that the driveways will be 25 feet deep to allow for sufficient parking.

Vice-Chair Dalton noted that he feels the City should focus on Chapter 12.1 of the City code when considering this application, regarding the PUD in creating a more desirable area than current code provides for.

The allowed and proposed uses for open space were discussed. The definition of front yards and side yards, along with the reason for the driveway and sidewalk placement were also discussed.

The Commissioners asked if it would be possible to have a bigger park area, and Mr. Clegg stated that it may be possible if some hurdles could be satisfied. Vice-Chair Dalton noted that because this area would be in an HOA, the park would not be for the public as a whole, but just for the residents there.

Commissioner Stirling reiterated that he wants to see a larger buffer than 20 feet. The representative stated that if a private road with an easement was allowed they could potentially provide a larger buffer, but if a public road is required they may not be able to do so. They also mentioned that they are proposing two-story units because they fit better in Grantsville, but that they could propose skinny three-story townhomes for rent instead.

Ms. Moore noted that the agenda for this meeting is large, and recommended scheduling a work meeting to further discuss the variances and concerns for this item.

## **7. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 1 (Introductory Provisions).**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item. She noted that the purpose of this amendment is to clean up the code.

## **8. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 3 (Decision Making Bodies, And Officials), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item. She noted that the changes discussed during the work meeting will be made to this amendment.

Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he would feel more comfortable with appeals going through the Board of Adjustment or another public board, where the public can be a part of those meetings rather than a Hearing Officer. Smith Hartvigsen Attorney Jay Springer was present to answer

questions on this item. He noted that they can make it a requirement to have the Hearing Officer consider appeals in public meetings. Vice-Chair Dalton stated that if the Hearing Officer is a staff member, he would like items to be considered in public meetings. Chair Rick Barchers stated that he likes the verbiage that allows City Council to decide which items would go to the Hearing Officer or not. The Commissioners agreed that more transparency is always better.

#### **9. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 7 (Conditional Uses).**

Commissioner Jaterka stated that he likes that the geotech report and utility modeling was added.

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

**Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 7 (Conditional Uses). Rob Jaterka seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **10. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 8 (Regulation Of General Applicability).**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item. She noted that this chapter is also affected by the appeals Hearing Officer, as well as some uses in zoning districts such as transitional treatment homes and group homes.

Vice-Chair Dalton asked if there is State code that requires transitional treatment homes or group homes to be allowed in certain zones. Ms. Moore stated that she is unsure of this. Attorney Barker stated that he will research this and get back to them. Chair Barchers stated that he would like to see specific conditions as a standard for these uses. Ms. Moore stated that it makes more sense to list these conditions on the permits and not in the code, as that would complicate the code more.

#### **11. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 11 (Site Plan Review).**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item, and noted some of the changes suggested.



**12. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 11 (Site Plan Review) to modify the Lighting Ordinance in section 11.5.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item, and noted some of the changes suggested. Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he would like some more clarification on how to determine which area you are in, to identify what is allowed. Chair Barchers stated that he would like verbiage added that defines holiday lighting, and how a situation with complaints can be remedied. Chair Barchers noted that permanent lighting is common, and may need to be addressed as well.

**13. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 12 (Planned Unit Developments), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item, and noted that many of the changes are cleaning up the code. Commissioner Stirling asked if 12.4.1 will not be crossed out as previously discussed, and Ms. Moore confirmed that this will be corrected.

Chair Barchers asked if the terms variations and deviations are technical legal terms, and Mr. Springer stated it is for consistency.

Ms. Moore clarified that the code will be renumbered as needed.

**Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number thirteen an action item. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 12 (Planned Unit Developments), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476, with the following condition: that the modification in 12.4 that is crossed out in red, still apply to that section. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**14. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 15 (Residential And Multiple Residential Districts), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item, and noted that many of the changes are cleaning up the code. She stated that the biggest change includes allowing up to 3 animals before a special permit is required. She also noted that this item could not be voted on

until it is determined if the group home and transitional treatment homes will be allowed in the different zones.

**15. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21 (Subdivision Regulations), to implement modifications from SB174/ HB0476.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore and Smith Hartvigsen Attorney Jay Springer were present to represent this item.

Vice-Chair Dalton expressed that he would like a third party involved in the DRC. Mr. Springer explained that a member of the Planning Commission cannot be involved in the DRC, according to State code. Vice-Chair Dalton stated that he would like to see a third party involved, so the Commission is not just getting all of their information from the City staff alone.

Mr. Springer clarified that SB174 and HB0476 are only required to apply to subdivisions for single-family, two-family, and townhomes. He noted that most cities do not want different approval processes, but that there can be different processes if desired.

**16. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21.2.10 (Development Review Committee) to remove the Planning Commission Consultant from the Development Review Committee.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item. No further discussion took place.

**17. Discussion of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21.6.13 (Storm Drainage And Flood Plains).**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to represent this item, and noted that this code outlines how drainage should occur. She explained some of the changes that are suggested. City Engineer Robert Rousselle was also present to answer questions on this item.

**Derek Dalton made a motion to make agenda item number seventeen an action item. Rob Jaterka seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code Chapter 21.6.13 (Storm Drainage And Flood Plains). Rob Jaterka seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**18. Approval of minutes from the September 19, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.**

Chairman Rick Barchers abstained from this vote, as he was not present at the meeting in question.

**Derek Dalton made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 19, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**19. Approval of minutes from the September 25, 2024 Planning Commission Special Meeting.**

Chairman Rick Barchers abstained from this vote, as he was not present at the meeting in question.

**Derek Dalton made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 25, 2024 Planning Commission Special Meeting. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**20. Approval of minutes from the October 3, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.**

Chairman Rick Barchers abstained from this vote, as he was not present at the meeting in question.

**Derek Dalton made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 3, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Robert Jaterka seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.**

**21. Report from Zoning Administrator.**

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present for this item. She did not have any items to report.

**22. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.**

Commissioner Stirling asked if they could get new ipads, and Ms. Moore stated that she can make the request.

**23. Report from City Council.**

City Council Liaison Rhett Butler was present for this item. He stated that he heard the concerns about the public notice signs not working, and requested that the link be fixed. Ms. Moore stated that she will modify the link once the new page is created to show the current meeting items.

**24. Adjourn.**

**Trent Stirling made a motion to adjourn. Jeff Downward seconded the motion. The vote is as follows: Rob Jaterka “Aye,” Trent Stirling “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye,” Rick Barchers “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously. The meeting ended at 10:34 P.M.**