

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of the proposed plat amendment for the Kenneth Fawson Subdivision.	Approved
#2	Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for Soelberg's Market, Located at East Durfee Street and Matthews Lane.	Approved
#3	Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for The Highlands Phase 7.	Approved
#4	Discussion of Chapter 2, definitions (104), Chapter 14.6 Codes and Symbols and Use Table 14.1, Chapter 15.1 Codes and Symbols and Use Table 15.7 (Family Food Production).	Discussed
#5	Discussion of front setbacks and side yard setbacks for chapters 14 and 15.	Discussed
#6	Discussion of Light Ordinance.	Discussed
#7	Approval of Planning Commission Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. May 6, 2025 Special Meetingb. May 22, 2025 Regular Meetingc. June 19, 2025 Regular Meeting	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON AUGUST 7, 2025 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, Trent Stirling, Sarah Moore, Debra Dwyer

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent:

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Rhett Butler, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman.

On Zoom: Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

Citizens and Guests Present: Gary Pinkham, Roger Hale, Jana Hale, Amy L Walker, Barry Bunderson, Evan Nelson

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Unknowns

Commission Vice-Chairman Derek Dalton 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, August 7, 2025 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

- a) **Consideration of the proposed plat amendment for the Kenneth Fawson Subdivision.**

Email received 8/4/2025

Ladies and Planning Commission,

This minor sub is most likely the first step in the planned development of the entire property into a full subdivision. This is a common tactic by developers to minimize their costs and to generate revenue for the major sub to follow.

There are a few things to consider that are related to the future development of the property.

1. The purpose of the short stub street into the property from the West was to provide for a street and utilities that would serve this future development and provide an outlet onto SR 112 to reduce the amount of traffic going out to Main Street. The proposed 60' wide section fronting onto SR 112 should be widened to 66' to meet the standard street section for a City street. There should be an extension of the sewer and water into the property from the West to provide services to the future development.
2. Some engineering thought should be given to the future management of storm water from the future development. Will a basin be required since the existing system to the West may be at capacity.
3. The street to SR 112 may need to be coordinated with the property owner to the North. This would provide access to the commercial property at the corner of Main and SR 112. Perhaps they each do a half-width dedication. -Gary Pinkham

Gary Pinkham: Gary Pinkham was present to comment on this item. He provided context regarding the subdivision to the west, noting that about 16 years ago, the City required a stub-out to the east (shown as South 130) to extend the road to 112 and provide additional access into the subdivision for traffic mitigation. He observed that the current layout still accommodates this connection, with a 60-foot-wide strip extending to Main Street, though the width may need to be updated to 66 feet or the code modified. He explained that small initial subdivisions are often developed in a simple, low-cost manner to fund future phases. He emphasized the importance of ensuring streets and utilities are stubbed off South 130 to prevent excess traffic on internal streets. Regarding the corner property where houses were recently demolished, he noted concerns about access points near the traffic signal. He recommended that developers and property owners coordinate to establish a single access point, avoiding a driveway immediately adjacent to the street, which could create future traffic hazards.

b) Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for Soelberg's Market, Located at East Durfee Street and Matthews Lane.

Email Received 08/04/2025

Ladies and Planning Commission,

The half-width dedication for the future City street, Lookout Ridge Drive, needs to be a minimum of 33' to meet City Code. If it is to be developed to provide access as is stated on the plans, it may need to be wider or get the adjoining property owner to do a dedication also in order to have enough width for the minimum half width construction per City Code. This minimum half-width is required to meet the fire code.

If this is not done, the City may be required to purchase additional property from the neighbor to the West for the street ROW. This may also create an encroachment that will harm the neighbor's property or violate setback and PUE code.

Gary Pinkham

Email Received 08/05/2025

Ladies and Planning Commission,

The half-width dedication for the proposed Lookout Ridge Drive must be at least 33' wide to meet the City's Code. If this is not done the City will be required to take additional land from the property owner to the West to get the require 66' ROW. This may create easement and setback problems for that owner and cost the City a good deal of money.

There also needs to be adequate width to construct the minimum half-width street to the City's standards and meet the fire code. The narrow width of the proposed dedication do not meet either legal requirement. The minimum for this needs to be 39.5' with the minimum fire code met.

Gary Pinkham

Gary Pinkham: Gary Pinkham was present to comment on this item. He stated that along the west boundary line, the proposed dedication for a city street does not meet city code in terms of width. He explained that if this area is to be used as a point of access, it must be constructed to the half-width standard, including 26 feet of asphalt, which could extend onto the neighboring property. He highlighted that it is unclear if the developers have coordinated with the neighbor, and currently, the dedication is not legally compliant. He also mentioned a well in the corner, noting that the drawings do not reflect the well's protection zone. City Council Member Rhett Butler clarified that the well is outside the area shown on the plan, so it is not a concern. Gary emphasized that regardless, the street dedication must be widened to meet code and fire safety requirements to be considered legal.

c) Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for The Highlands Phase 7.

Email Received 08/04/2025

Ladies and Planning Commission,

When this plan was submitted to and reviewed by the DRC over a year ago, it was pointed out to the applicant and designer that the streets need to be designed to the minimum 66' ROW standard.

This phase and all phases to come are part of the major change and addition to the original development. They are subject to the Code in force at the time of the application for the revisions that brought this land into the development. This requires 66' ROW.

Gary Pinkham

Gary Pinkham: Gary Pinkham was present to comment on this item. He stated that the proposed plan was submitted to the City approximately a year and a half ago. During the Development Review Committee (DRC) review, it was identified that the city streets are currently planned as 60-foot rights-of-way, which do not comply with the code requiring 66-foot rights-of-way. This includes the stub-outs on the northwest corner of the developed area. He explained that wider transitions have already been implemented, but to meet code, the right-of-way must be increased to 66 feet. The 60-foot right-of-way was

removed several years ago because it was too narrow to maintain a 26-foot clear zone for fire trucks when parking was on both sides.

AGENDA

1. Consideration of the plat amendment for the Kenneth Fawson Minor Subdivision.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that Shay Stark, consultant with Aqua Engineering, was available online to discuss the application and the reasoning behind the proposed approach. Barry Bunderson and Evan Nelson were also present to answer questions regarding this item.

Evan Nelson stated that they were proposing to create a half-acre buildable lot from an existing field owned by his parents. He explained that their intent was to build a home and return to the property. He added that the layout was designed to accommodate potential future street development, although they currently planned only a single lot.

Shay Stark, consultant with Aqua Engineering, stated that the city had reviewed the proposal with consideration for potential future development. He explained that sewer and water lines were being stubbed across the full frontage. This would ensure that if a street were eventually extended to SR 112, the property and home would not be disrupted.

Vice Chair Dalton asked if the home was intended for personal use. Evan Nelson confirmed that it would be his residence.

Barry Bunderson clarified that the proposed lot, referred to as Lot 6B, would be created between the existing Lots 6A and 6C, which already extended to the west boundary. He explained that the new lot would follow the existing lot lines and that the other lots were already established.

Commissioner Stirling asked about utility access for the new lot. It was confirmed that utilities would be accessed from the existing road, consistent with Shay Stark's earlier explanation.

Commissioner Sarah Moore asked whether potential future commercial development on the remaining land had been considered. She also asked whether driveway access had been staggered to avoid conflict. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore clarified that no commercial development was planned on the subject parcels. She explained that nearby commercial parcels were part of a prior subdivision and had UDOT-approved access not controlled by the city. She added that even if a road were extended through the property, UDOT would coordinate access.

Evan Nelson stated that they planned to live in the home long-term. He noted that future commercial development along SR 112 was indicated in the general plan, but the current zoning allowed for half-acre residential lots. He explained that they structured the proposal to meet

current zoning requirements without seeking a zone change. Commissioner Sarah Moore confirmed she had no additional concerns.

Vice Chair Dalton asked about the width of the private lane. It was confirmed to be 26 feet. He reminded the applicants that when 130 South becomes a public street, they would be required to install curb and gutter. He noted prior issues where this requirement had not been completed in a timely manner.

Barry Bunderson added that UDOT typically manages future access spacing. If access spacing requirements cannot be met, UDOT may require easements to consolidate points of access for safety and long-term planning.

Trent Stirling made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed plat amendment for the Kenneth Fawson Minor Subdivision. With the following conditions: The private lane shall meet all design and access standards of the City and any required fire department regulations, all utility easements and access easements shall be recorded on the final plat, any outstanding engineering or staff review comments shall be addressed prior to recordation, and the applicant shall submit a mylar of the amended plat for City signatures and recording. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

2. Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for Soelberg’s Market, Located at East Durfee Street and Matthews Lane.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented this item. She explained the portion of the property under review and highlighted that the well and surrounding areas were shown on the GIS map. She noted that the Lookout Ridge road would be extended and that an easement had been obtained from the property owner. Shelby clarified that Solbergs had dedicated their half of the right-of-way, and the city was constructing the road to full width to meet fire code and provide access. The road would extend north in the future, and on the west side, no sidewalks or park strips would be installed, leaving a full 38-foot asphalt width.

Commissioner Dwyer confirmed that the park strip and sidewalk would remain on the other side, and Vice Chair Dalton clarified that the extension of Lookout Ridge would align directly with the existing road across the street. City Council Member Rhett Butler stated that it was lined up as much as possible and added that any future southward extension would incorporate part of the existing private lane and continue toward Nygreen Street, ensuring as much alignment as possible. Commissioner Trent Stirling asked how the road would connect further, and it was confirmed it would align with Main Street.

Commissioner Sarah Moore and Commissioner Dwyer confirmed they had no questions at that time. Vice Chair Dalton raised questions about parking calculations. Shelby explained that parking plans were still under review but must comply with the development agreement timeline, ensuring stalls could not be reduced after approval. Vice Chair Dalton reviewed the gross floor square footage for retail and food pads and noted a potential shortfall in parking. Shelby explained that assumptions about restaurant seating could affect calculations, and final parking requirements would be addressed during full plan review. Jared Mitchell confirmed that grocery and hardware store parking calculations were in line with city standards, and Shay Stark noted that the grocery portion would require approximately 160 parking stalls, confirming that overall, they were adequately provided. In regard to the pads, it was discussed that parking would be addressed once they were occupied, considering the specific occupants of each space.

Vice Chair Dalton asked about stormwater management, and Shelby described an underground storm basin that would capture and control water on site. He also asked about delivery and loading plans. Jared Mitchell explained that trucks would enter from Matthews Lane, circulate around the north side and back of the store, and exit through the new Lookout Ridge connection to minimize conflicts with customer parking.

When asked about lighting and signage, Jared stated that all lighting would comply with city ordinance, with internally illuminated signs preferred where possible. He noted plans for monument signs on Matthews Lane and at the corner of Matthews and Durfee to serve the overall development, including pad sites, grocery, and hardware.

Sarah Moore made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Preliminary Plat Application for Soelberg’s Market, Located at East Durfee Street and Matthews Lane. With the following conditions: The final plat and construction plans shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to recordation and building permit issuance, and any outstanding staff or engineering comments shall be addressed prior to approval of final construction drawings. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

3. Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for The Highlands Phase 7.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided background, noting that the PUD application had originally been submitted in 2022. At that time, the RM-7 zoning allowed seven dwelling units per acre. The PUD application had been approved in 2024 without any deviations from the code. She explained that under the previous Utah State Code, residential local streets were required to have a minimum paved width of 32 feet. Because neither staff nor the Planning

Commission and City Council raised questions about road widths at that time, the design was not specifically discussed.

Shelby continued that the Master Development Agreement (MDA) for Highlands Phase 7 had just been approved by City Council the night before. The proposed cross-section for Phase 7 matched the design used in previous phases, with 32 feet of pavement, which met both state standards and traffic study recommendations, as the development was expected to generate fewer than 1,000 trips. She highlighted that the Phase 7 plans met all RM-7 zoning requirements except for the 60-foot right-of-way width and the planting of shade trees along public streets. Shelby clarified that the shade trees had not yet been shown on the plans, and noted that it was up to the Planning Commission to decide whether to make that a condition of approval. She also presented the overall conceptual PUD layout for reference.

Vice Chair Dalton confirmed that the area under discussion was near Lot 13, with the area above that already under construction. Shelby clarified that the lighter yellow portions on the map represented areas previously approved.

Commissioner Stirling raised a previous concern noted by Mr. Pinkham regarding road widths. Shelby explained that the MDA addressed this issue. While the master transportation plan called for a 32-foot paved width for residential streets, there was also a 38-foot pavement width with a 66-foot right-of-way for certain streets. She confirmed that the concern regarding the right-of-way had been resolved in the MDA.

Commissioner Stirling also asked about trail locations. Shelby pointed out on the map that a trail would run along Mack Canyon, which now had a 108-foot right-of-way to accommodate a 10-foot trail. She noted that this alignment would connect with UDOT's planned trail along SR-138. Commissioner Stirling expressed his approval of the trail and noted that the 108-foot right-of-way was necessary.

Commissioner Dwyer asked about the shade trees, and Shelby confirmed that this issue had been addressed in the plans. Commissioner Sarah Moore indicated that she had no additional concerns.

Vice Chair Dalton asked why the MDA had been approved before the preliminary plat. Shelby explained that the MDA needed to be finalized first due to the complexity of the Highlands development, allowing the plat to be reviewed promptly, without delaying the agenda.

Vice Chair Dalton inquired about fire flow in the area. Shelby stated that the SR-138 water line had been connected and the system was awaiting final PRV installation before fire flow testing could occur. She noted that building permits could not be issued without fire sprinklers, with the exception of properties like North Star Ranch that had already met requirements.

Vice Chair Dalton also asked about the number of building permits issued to date. Shelby estimated approximately 120 permits, far short of the 632-total allowed in the overall development.

Vice Chair Dalton acknowledged a personal concern with road widths but noted that the MDA was already approved, leaving no options for modification at this stage.

Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Preliminary Plat Application for The Highlands Phase 7. With the following conditions: The Master Development Agreement (MDA) must be approved by the City Council, final construction drawings and engineering plans must be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to final plat recording, all infrastructure improvements shall be constructed in accordance with City standards, and shade trees shall be planted along all public streets in compliance with RM-7 zoning requirements, and shown on the final landscape and/or improvement plans. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

4. Discussion of Chapter 2, definitions (104), Chapter 14.6 Codes and Symbols and Use Table 14.1, Chapter 15.1 Codes and Symbols and Use Table 15.7 (Family Food Production).

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the issue of roosters needed to be revisited because a prior motion had not been properly noticed. She clarified that the intent of the current proposal was to prohibit roosters, noting that the Police Department had expressed concerns regarding noise and complaints from residents. Shelby acknowledged Commissioner Dwyer’s previous suggestion to allow at least one rooster, but emphasized that enforcement and neighborhood impacts were significant factors.

Vice Chair Dalton asked about the frequency of complaints related to roosters. Shelby indicated that the city typically received between 25 and 30 calls per week, particularly concentrated in areas like Williams Lane and Wells Crossing. She confirmed that existing roosters could be grandfathered in if they met the code at the time, but new roosters were not currently allowed under existing regulations.

Commissioner Sarah Moore noted that nuisance roosters should be addressed through enforceable regulations and highlighted the importance of containment and animal pens. Vice Chair Dalton asked whether the Utah Right to Farm Act would apply; Attorney Barker clarified that, while the Act protects agricultural activities, local zoning laws prevail, meaning the city’s restrictions on roosters would take precedence.

Discussion then turned to potential thresholds for allowing roosters, with Shelby and commissioners reviewing acreage requirements and animal units. Commissioners considered options such as a one-acre minimum for roosters, unit-based animal calculations, and the number of chickens per acre. Shelby noted that the discussion could also include revisiting limits for other types of farm animals, but the immediate focus was on roosters.

Commissioner Dwyer proposed restricting roosters to larger lots (one acre or more), particularly outside dense subdivisions. Vice Chair Dalton emphasized that the main concern was reducing nuisance complaints and the associated demands on city and public safety resources. Commissioners Sarah Moore and Commissioner Stirling highlighted the importance of considering enforcement, site visits, and follow-up calls in determining appropriate limits.

Shelby agreed to compile data on the time spent by city staff responding to complaints, including site visits, follow-ups, and letters issued. Commissioners agreed that this information would help inform future decisions.

Attorney Barker provided an update on the Right to Farm Act, confirming that while it exists, local zoning laws take precedence over any perceived protections for roosters.

Discussion closed.

5. Discussion of front setbacks and side yard setbacks for chapters 14 and 15.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that staff proposed a uniform 25-foot front yard setback to align with typical driveway lengths, simplify plan reviews, and provide clarity. She noted that rear yard setbacks would remain unchanged, allowing homeowners flexibility to position their homes further back. Shelby also proposed clearer side yard setbacks of 7.5 feet on one side and 15 feet on the other to ensure consistency across the relevant zoning districts (R121, R112, RM7, RM15).

Commissioner Stirling noted that current front yard setbacks on smaller lots limit usable backyard space, particularly for keeping animals, and supported the clarified side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Sarah Moore emphasized that smaller front setbacks allow for larger backyards, enhancing resident enjoyment while maintaining neighborhood aesthetics. She also noted potential cost savings on landscaping and utility connections.

Vice Chair Dalton expressed concern that applying a uniform 25-foot setback across all zones could make neighborhoods appear too uniform and suggested maintaining larger setbacks for bigger lots while applying reduced setbacks only on smaller lots.

Shelby Moore clarified that the discussion and proposed adjustments applied only to single-family lots of half an acre or larger and did not affect townhomes or multifamily developments.

After discussion, Vice Chair Dalton recommended amending Chapter 15 to implement the proposed front and side yard setbacks while leaving Chapter 14 unchanged, noting that the City Council would have final approval. Commissioners Stirling and Commissioner Sarah Moore expressed support for the compromise, agreeing it balanced clarity, flexibility, and usability for homeowners.

Discussion closed.

6. Discussion of Light Ordinance.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the draft ordinance had been revised to include zoning designations and definitions as previously requested by the Commission, and sought direction on whether the Commission wanted to pursue a dark sky ordinance.

Vice Chair Dalton expressed concerns regarding enforcement, noting uncertainties about measuring lumens, defining acceptable lighting, issuing citations, and the additional after-hours workload it could impose on staff. He emphasized the difficulty of enforcement in residential areas, suggesting that residential regulation could be overly intrusive into personal property.

Commissioner Sarah Moore referenced potential state-level support and certification through Housing and Community Development or DWS, but Vice Chair Dalton clarified that the proposed local ordinance would not involve formal certification, only compliance with local limits. Discussion included whether existing residential lighting should be grandfathered, with general agreement that older installations could be exempt.

Commissioner Dwyer questioned the volume of current complaints and suggested addressing issues on a case-by-case basis, noting that complaints are infrequent. Shelby Moore confirmed complaints are occasional and likely higher during holidays.

Vice Chair Dalton and other Commissioners generally favored focusing any ordinance on commercial properties, citing the need to control lighting impacts from larger developments such as big-box stores. Residential regulations were suggested to be limited, possibly including a simple curfew for trim lights, but without extensive enforcement.

Commissioner Sarah Moore proposed a possible citywide restriction for residential trim lights to be turned off by 11:00 PM, but it was acknowledged this would likely be enforced only in response to complaints, similar to nuisance issues. Commissioner Stirling noted that the dark sky concept was appealing but not critical, particularly for residential areas, and agreed there was no need for formal code enforcement.

Discussion closed.

7. Approval of minutes from the May 6, 2025 Special Meeting, and the May 22, 2025 and June 19, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meetings

Debra Dwyer made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes from May 6, 2025. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from May 22, 2025. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from June 19, 2025. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

8. Report from Zoning Administrator.

Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore announced that Jason Hill had been appointed as the new planning commissioner and would join once his training was complete. She noted that the Commission also needed to elect a new chair and vice chair, asking whether that required being listed on the agenda. Attorney Barker advised that placing the item on the agenda was the safer option. Vice Chair Dalton recommended waiting until Commissioner Hill could participate, and the group agreed to address the elections at a future meeting.

10. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Sarah Moore inquired about the status of hiring a new Community Development Director. City Manager Michael Resare stated that a new Community Development Director has been hired, and will begin on the 26th.

11. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler provided an update from the previous night’s City Council meeting. He explained that the Council approved an amendment to the zoning fee schedule. He stated that this item had been on the agenda several times and had been discussed extensively, including during a recent work meeting where it was reviewed more thoroughly. He noted that the change was presented by Shelby Moore and that the Council ultimately decided to move forward with approval. He added that he felt the amendment was an important step in the right

direction, particularly in helping the Planning and Zoning Department balance its budget and work toward a net zero outcome.

12. Adjourn.

Sarah Moore made a motion to adjourn. Trent Stirling seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Trent Stirling “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Debra Dwyer “Aye,” Derek Dalton “Aye.” The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.