

Tooele City Planning Commission
Business Meeting Minutes

Date: October 8, 2025

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Tooele City Hall, Council Chambers
90 North Main Street, Tooele, Utah

Planning Commissioners

Melanie Hammer
Jon Proctor
Jon Gossett
Chris Sloan
Tyson Hamilton
Weston Jensen
Kelley Anderson

Council Member Liaisons

Councilwoman Maresa Manzione
Councilman Ed Hansen

Staff Present

Andrew Aagard, Community Development Director
Matt Johnson, City Attorney
Paul Hansen, City Engineer

Minutes Prepared by Alicia Fairbourne

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman Sloan called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

Melanie Hammer, Present
Jon Proctor, Present
Jon Gossett, Present
Chris Sloan, Present
Tyson Hamilton, Present
Weston Jensen, Present
Kelley Anderson, Present

3. Public Hearing and Recommendation on a Land Use Map Amendment request by Tooele 90, LLC to reassign the Land Use Designation for approximately 10 acres located at approximately 900 South Main Street (south side of SR-36) from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential.

Mr. Aagard presented the item and explained that the applicant, Tooele 90 LLC, requested a land use map amendment for approximately 10 acres located on the south side of SR-36 at approximately 900 South. The proposed change would reassign the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to High Density Residential (HDR) in order to facilitate a future rezone to MR-8 for townhome development. He reviewed the property's history, noting it had previously been rezoned R1-7 and received preliminary subdivision approval for single-family detached homes. However, no further development had taken place aside from a submitted final plat for eight lots. He emphasized that the land use map amendment would apply only to the 10-acre portion in question and was a necessary step before any rezoning could occur. He also noted that several public comments had been received in opposition, citing traffic, infrastructure, and density concerns.

At the request of Commissioner Hamilton, the Planning Commission chose to hear the applicant's presentation prior to opening the public hearing, diverging from their typical order of proceedings. Vice Chair Sloan noted that doing so could help address some of the public's concerns before they were formally raised.

Jason Boal, the applicant's representative, described the proposed development concept, which included cottage homes and townhomes on a portion of the larger 178-acre site. He explained that the proposed density would be offset by open space and the possibility of a conservation easement along the hillside. Mr. Boal stated that the total project density would remain low at approximately 1.5 units per acre when averaged across the entire site. He presented a concept plan including trail networks, potential park amenities, and detailed architectural and layout examples for the proposed housing types. He noted that the townhomes would be platted for individual ownership and that the design included a mix of two- to four-bedroom floorplans. While it had not yet been determined if the project would be for sale or rental, it would offer ownership potential. Parking was planned to meet City requirements, with garages and driveways for each unit.

Mr. Boal also explained the rationale for PUD-related modifications being sought. These included reduced lot widths, adjusted setbacks, and increased lot coverage to accommodate the cottage home format. He stated that traffic and geotechnical studies had been updated to reflect the new layout and that utility easements were under review with Rocky Mountain Power. He emphasized that the product type responded to growing demand for smaller, more affordable single-family homes and that the development aimed to preserve open space and offer public benefits.

Commissioner Anderson inquired about home sizes. Mr. Boal responded that the homes would range from approximately 1,000 to 1,200 square feet. Vice Chair Sloan asked about the status of Rocky Mountain Power easements, whether the lines would be buried, and if parking would be increased. Mr. Boal responded that the previous plan did not involve burying lines and that the current concept included adequate on-site parking. Vice Chair Sloan also asked if the proposal aligned with the property's existing water rights. Mr. Aagard and Mr. Hansen confirmed that the site had approximately 200 acre-feet of water rights and that the increase in density was likely intended to fully utilize that allocation, though no final layout analysis had yet been performed.

At 7:29 p.m., Vice Chair Sloan opened the public hearing.

Wade Hintze expressed opposition to the proposed development, citing concern for wildlife that winters in the area, questioning how a conservation easement would address that issue. He also raised doubts about the city's water availability, noting conflicting messages regarding water shortages. Additionally, he challenged the accuracy of the traffic study, stating that Main Street already experiences significant congestion. He felt that adding more high-density housing in that location would worsen existing problems and was not in the city's best interest.

Rebecca Smith, a nearby resident, expressed serious concerns about the project. She shared that due to drought and water restrictions, her household had removed their lawn, which had become overrun with morning glory and goat heads, and were struggling to maintain a garden. She acknowledged that water

rights might exist for the subject property but questioned the broader issue of overall water availability in the city, particularly given ongoing drought conditions.

Ms. Smith also voiced concerns about speed and safety along SR-36, stating that the speed limit transitions abruptly and remains too high in the area, with drivers often exceeding 50 mph. She referenced a fatal accident at a nearby corner and mentioned large rocks in her yard from previous incidents. She warned that with increased development, the risks of accidents would likely rise.

Additionally, she raised concerns about hillside stability and runoff, particularly in the event of an earthquake. While she acknowledged that a rockfall study had been done, she questioned its adequacy and remained worried about the potential for falling rocks and the impact on wildlife that regularly enters her yard. Ultimately, she opposed the project, stating there was not enough space in the area to support high-density development.

Jennifer Hinton, a long-time resident living near the proposed development, expressed strong opposition to the land use amendment. She noted her deep roots in the area, having lived within a quarter-mile of the property for most of her life. Ms. Hinton, who holds a degree in conservation biology and whose daughter is a mule deer biologist for the state, emphasized the ecological significance of the area, describing it as prime winter habitat for mule deer. She reported a drastic decline in the deer population since nearby development began and raised concerns about increased wildlife-vehicle collisions, which she has tracked over the years.

She criticized real estate developers for lacking long-term investment in the community and urged the Planning Commission to take their responsibility seriously. Ms. Hinton also raised concerns about noise and traffic along SR-36, stating that semi-truck traffic has made it impossible to converse in her own backyard despite the buffer of a cemetery. She invited staff to visit her property to experience the conditions firsthand.

She questioned the validity and scope of the traffic study, asked for clearer details on planned road access, and emphasized the need for a traffic signal at Settlement Canyon Road. Hinton acknowledged that growth is inevitable but stated that high-density development at this location was unwise, even with the proposed conservation easement. She urged the Commission to preserve the character and safety of the community.

Kory Sagendorf a resident who lived near Coleman Street for about ten years, expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed development on wildlife and public safety. He echoed earlier comments regarding the decline of the mule deer population, particularly in winter months, noting an increase in deer being struck by vehicles. He warned that as development replaces wildlife habitat, children living in the new homes could face similar dangers due to the proximity of the highway. Mr. Sagendorf urged the Planning Commission to consider the safety implications of placing homes so close to a high-speed roadway.

Larry Seals a longtime Tooele resident living near 480 South, voiced opposition to the proposed high-density zoning. He recommended postponing any additional high-density development until the Midvalley Highway is constructed, suggesting that its completion could provide valuable insight into future traffic patterns. He expressed concern that the added housing would worsen existing traffic congestion, particularly through downtown and along the southern corridor, likely necessitating a new traffic signal and contributing to further backups on Main Street. Seals stated that the current zoning is more appropriate and would allow for a more desirable neighborhood with quarter- or fifth-acre single-family lots. He also cited safety, noise, and the proximity of the site to an already busy two-lane highway as significant issues.

Ruth Brown, a five-year resident of Tooele who relocated from Hawaii, expressed her appreciation for the community but opposition to the proposed land use amendment. She compared Tooele's limited access routes to the one-road-in, one-road-out situation she experienced in Hawaii, noting it as a major

concern. Brown expressed skepticism toward the project's supporting studies, suggesting they were designed to present an overly optimistic view. She aligned herself with earlier speakers and cited concerns about water availability, traffic, safety, and environmental conservation as reasons for her opposition.

There being no further public comments, Vice Chair Sloan closed the floor at 7:42 p.m.

Following public comment, Mr. Boal returned to the podium and clarified that there would be three access points to the site. Two would be to SR-36 and one to Settlement Canyon Road. All of these access points had been previously approved by UDOT. He also indicated that a future connection to a parcel to the south was contemplated via an access easement to allow for long-term connectivity.

Vice Chair Sloan stated that although he had supported the earlier iteration of the project, he now had concerns about current traffic conditions and whether the proposed 20-foot setback from SR-36 provided sufficient buffer for safety and livability. He emphasized that his perspective had changed based on the realities on the ground, despite his general support for property rights. He acknowledged the credibility of the concerns raised by residents and expressed reservations about the appropriateness of the proposed HDR designation at this time.

Motion: Commissioner Proctor moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the One O'Clock Subdivision Land Use Map Amendment request by Jason Boal, representing Tooele 90, LLC, to reassign the land use designation for approximately 10 acres from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential, application number 2025084. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, "Nay"; Commissioner Proctor, "Aye"; Commissioner Gossett, "Nay"; Commissioner Hamilton, "Nay"; Commissioner Jensen, "Aye"; Commissioner Anderson, "Nay"; Vice Chair Sloan, "Nay". The motion failed 5-2.

Motion: Vice Chair Sloan moved to forward a negative recommendation to City Council for the One O'Clock Subdivision Land Use Map Amendment request by Jason Boal, representing Tooele 90, LLC, to reassign the land use designation for approximately 10 acres from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential, application number 2025084. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, "Aye"; Commissioner Proctor, "Aye"; Commissioner Gossett, "Aye"; Commissioner Hamilton, "Aye"; Commissioner Jensen, "Nay"; Commissioner Anderson, "Aye"; Vice Chair Sloan, "Aye". The motion carried 6-1.

Mr. Aagard informed the public that the land use map amendment would likely be considered by the City Council at their November 5 meeting and advised residents to monitor upcoming agendas, noting that separate notice would not be issued for the Council public hearing.

4. Public Hearing and Recommendation on a Zoning Map amendment Request by Tooele 90, LLC to reassign the zoning for approximately 38 acres located at approximately 900 South Main Street (south side of SR36) from R1-7 Residential to MR-8 PUD Multi-family Residential and R1-7 PUD Residential zoning districts and to establish the conditions of the One O'Clock Hill PUD.

Mr. Aagard briefly introduced the zoning map amendment request, noting it followed the prior land use item, which had received a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission. He explained that the request involved reassigning zoning on approximately 38 acres to a combination of R1-7 PUD and MR-8 PUD, with conditions established through a planned unit development overlay. He emphasized that the PUD does not alter permitted uses or densities but allows for flexibility in design standards in exchange for a public benefit. In this case, the applicant proposed a conservation easement over the remainder of the 178-acre property and a public trail along the south. He clarified that this proposal would result in approximately 60 additional units beyond what would be allowed under standard R1-7 zoning. Mr. Aagard explained that it was up to the Planning Commission and City Council to determine whether the proposed conservation easement and trail constituted sufficient public benefit to justify the PUD designation.

In response to Commissioner questions, Mr. Aagard explained that a conservation easement would prohibit future development on the designated area, though it was unclear whether public access would be granted since the land would remain privately owned. He noted that past concepts for the site had included commercial development on top of One O’Clock Hill, and a conservation easement would preclude that type of proposal in the future.

There being no further questions from the Commission, Vice Chair Sloan opened the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Kalani Mascherino, a resident of Two O’Clock Drive, raised concerns about traffic, parking, and access to the proposed public trail. She questioned where trail users would park and expressed concern that the development's limited on-site parking could not accommodate additional traffic. She referenced existing congestion at nearby intersections and the cumulative impact of recently approved developments, including a Holiday Oil gas station and additional apartments, which she believed would worsen traffic and safety issues along SR-36. She also referenced a personal vehicle accident and expressed skepticism that the current traffic infrastructure could safely support additional density in the area.

Kortnee Smith, a Tooele-based realtor, opposed the rezone, expressing concern about its long-term effects on infrastructure, safety, the environment, and community character. She stated that Tooele’s infrastructure was already strained and that high-density housing would add pressure to schools, emergency services, and utilities. She also raised concerns about erosion and runoff at the base of the hillside, loss of community identity, and the visual and environmental impacts of building near One O’Clock Hill. She urged the Commission to prioritize infrastructure investment and preservation of the city's landmarks over short-term development gains.

There being no further comments, Vice Chair Sloan closed the floor at 8:02 p.m.

Following the public hearing, Mr. Boal addressed the concerns raised. He reiterated that the proposed conservation easement was intended to preserve One O’Clock Hill and could be tailored to include the most heavily used wildlife areas. He emphasized that the overall project density was approximately 1.5 units per acre, which was significantly lower than typical high-density standards. He asserted that the PUD offered a tangible public benefit by preserving open space and offering community amenities such as trails, park space, and playgrounds. Mr. Boal stated that the applicant was open to considering noise mitigation, xeriscaping, and fencing along SR-36 if those elements would improve the project. He clarified that although the land use designation would allow for higher density, the proposal maintained a balanced layout and offered ownership opportunities for young families. He also clarified that the trail system would be accessible by sidewalk connections, not dedicated trailhead parking, and pointed out several areas within the project that were designated for parks and playgrounds.

Following Mr. Boal’s comments, the Commission discussed the implications of forwarding a recommendation on the PUD despite the previous negative recommendation on the land use map amendment. Mr. Aagard explained that a recommendation could still be made on both the MR-8 and R1-7 PUD portions of the request, as the City Council would make the final decision.

Commissioner Jensen inquired if the water rights were transferrable. Mr. Hansen clarified the history of the water rights agreement, noting that water credits had been purchased by the prior property owner and that if the full allocation was not used on site, the city had agreed to repurchase the unused credits.

Motion: Commissioner Anderson moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the One O’Clock Hill zoning map amendment request by Jason Boal, representing 1290 LLC to reassign the zoning of the subject property to R1-7 PUD Residential and to adopt the One O’Clock Hill PUD standards proposed in the report, application number 2025085.

Commissioner Hammer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Gossett, “Aye”; Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”;

Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; Vice Chair Sloan, “Aye”. The motion carried 7-0.

5. **Public Hearing and Decision on a Conditional Use Permit request by Guaranteed Auto and Sales, LLC, to authorize the use of “Automobile Sales and Rental” to occur on .16 acres located at approximately 375 North Main Street in the GC General Commercial Zoning district.**

Mr. Aagard presented the conditional use permit request and explained that the applicant proposed to use the site for auto sales, with access only from Garden Street and no access from Main Street. The property has double frontage and is adjacent to both commercial and residential uses. The applicant anticipated 15 – 20 cars on site, with only two employees – one being the applicant and the other a family member – and proposed installing a steel building for storage.

Staff recommended approval of the permit with standard conditions and additional stipulations to address site-specific concerns. These included requiring a site plan review to assess paving, stormwater management, utility connections, and restroom facilities. Staff also recommended that any future Main Street access be subject to UDOT approval. Conditions were included to ensure lighting would minimize impact on adjacent residential uses and that the eastern portion of the lot be improved to support customer and emergency vehicle access.

Commissioners asked about the visibility and potential confusion caused by the lack of Main Street access, the building plans, and how parking requirements would be calculated. Mr. Aagard explained that a monument sign could be placed along Main Street to direct customers to Garden Street. He confirmed that the Community Development Director determines parking requirements when uses are not explicitly listed in the ordinance and that a site plan would be required to ensure adequate parking and access for emergency services.

Vice Chair Sloan then opened the public hearing at 8:23 p.m.

Bob Johnson, a nearby resident, expressed two primary concerns. First, he noted increasing traffic on Garden Street and suggested the possibility of restricting parking to one side to maintain traffic flow. He referenced another nearby business that experiences tight conditions due to large truck deliveries and limited parking. Second, he raised a fire safety concern, asking whether emergency vehicles – particularly in the case of an electric vehicle fire – could adequately access the property from both Garden Street and Main Street. Mr. Aagard responded that on-street parking would not be permitted and all required parking must be accommodated on-site. He also explained that emergency access and pavement standards would be addressed during the required site plan review and confirmed that the Fire Marshal would ensure compliance with safety regulations. Mr. Johnson concluded by thanking staff for addressing many of his concerns.

There being no further public comments, Vice Chair Sloan closed the floor at 8:27 p.m.

Applicant Karen Martinez, speaking on behalf of her father, clarified that the intent was to operate an auto sales lot – not a body shop – with 15 - 20 vehicles and limited staffing. She confirmed that they did not plan to access Main Street, would place a sign to direct customers, and planned to improve the property and add utilities. Vice Chair Sloan sought clarification on the use, and Ms. Martinez confirmed it would be strictly auto sales.

Motion: Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit request by Guaranteed Auto and Sales, LLC, to authorize the use of “Automobile Sales and Rental” to occur at the subject property, application number 2025081, based on the findings and subject to conditions 1 through 4 listed in the Staff Report dated October 1, 2025. Commissioner Hammer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Gossett, “Aye”; Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; Vice Chair Sloan, “Aye”. The motion carried 7-0.

6. **Decision on a Preliminary Subdivision Plan request by Entellus, Inc. for the Sage Flats Subdivision consisting of two lots proposed to be located at approximately 3100 North 250 East in the GC General Commercial and MR-20 Multi-Family Residential zoning district on 37.3 acres.**

Mr. Aagard presented the request by Entellus Inc. for preliminary subdivision plan approval for the Sage Flat Subdivision. The property consisted of 37.3 acres and was split between the GC General Commercial and MR-20 Multi-Family Residential zoning districts. The subdivision would create two lots – Lot 1 totaling approximately 19.7 acres in the general commercial zone, and Lot 2 totaling approximately 16.7 acres in the MR-20 zone, which had recently received site plan approval for a residential apartment complex.

The subdivision included the dedication of 250 East, a new north-south street through the center of the property. Both lots far exceeded the minimum lot size requirements for their respective zoning districts. Mr. Aagard confirmed that staff recommended approval, subject to the standard conditions outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Anderson inquired about the amount of acreage designated as general commercial, and Mr. Aagard confirmed it was approximately 19.7 acres.

Motion: Commissioner Proctor moved to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plan Request by Colby Cain, representing Entellus, Inc. for the Sage Flats Subdivision, application number 2025041, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated October 1, 2025. Commissioner Hamilton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Gossett, “Aye”; Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; Vice Chair Sloan, “Aye”. The motion carried 7-0.

7. **Decision on a request for a six-month site plan approval extension request by Sandrock Development for the 50th Place development proposed to be located at 350 North 50 West in the MR-8 Multi-Family Residential zoning district.**

Mr. Aagard explained that the applicant, Sandrock Development, had requested a six-month extension of a previously approved site plan for the 50th Place development, which was a four-unit townhouse project located at 350 North 50 West in the MR-8 Multi-Family Residential zoning district. The site plan had been originally approved nearly a year ago, and by ordinance, site plan approvals expire after one year if no action is taken. However, the ordinance allows the Planning Commission to grant an extension upon request.

Mr. Aagard noted that the applicant had stayed in contact with staff and still intended to construct the project but was working through some water-related issues. While the ordinance does not specify the length of an allowable extension, Mr. Aagard recommended six months, though the Commission could adjust that period at its discretion. The applicant’s intent was simply to retain their current site plan approval.

Motion: Commissioner Hamilton moved to extend the Site Plan Design Review approval for the 50th Place Multi-Family Residential development for six months from the date of this meeting, October 8, 2025, application number 2024-041. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Gossett, “Aye”; Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; Vice Chair Sloan, “Aye”. The motion carried 7-0.

8. **City Council Reports**

Councilwoman Manzione reported on the Utah League of Cities and Towns conference, noting that topics like infrastructure, transportation, and housing were recurring themes. She highlighted a session on community gathering centers and discussed whether Tooele has sufficient public spaces for such

use. She also mentioned the concept of “citizen academies” to help residents learn more about city operations.

Commissioner Hammer asked whether planning commissioners should attend similar trainings. Councilwoman Manzione shared that some planning commissioners from other cities had attended. Vice Chair Sloan confirmed that training funds were available and encouraged commissioners to participate in upcoming opportunities, such as the Land Use Institute.

9. Business Item – Election of a new Planning Commission chair for the remainder of 2025.

Vice Chair Sloan noted that Chairman Robinson had stepped down, and Mr. Aagard clarified that Commissioner Hamilton was ineligible to serve as Chair due to having served in that role within the past year, though he could be nominated for Vice Chair.

Commissioner Hamilton nominated Chris Sloan to serve as Chair. Commissioner Hammer seconded. There were no objections. Therefore, by acclamation, Commissioner Sloan was elected to serve as Chair.

Commissioner Proctor volunteered to serve as Vice Chair. Commissioner Gossett seconded. There were no objections. Therefore, by acclamation, Commissioner Proctor was elected to serve as Vice Chair.

10. Review and Decision – Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held September 24, 2025.

There were no corrections to the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Hammer moved to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held September 24, 2025. Commissioner Hamilton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Gossett, “Aye”; Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; Vice Chair Sloan, “Aye”. The motion carried 7-0.

11. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chairman Sloan adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

***Note:** The content of the minutes is not intended, nor submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.*

Approved this 12th day of November, 2025



Chris Sloan, Tooele City Planning Commission Chair