

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Recommendation of the proposed plat amendment for Cherry Wood Estates located in the R-1-21 zone.	Approved
#2	Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for West Haven PUD Subdivision.	Tabled
#3	Discussion of the proposed rezone, and General Plan Amendment for the 5 Center Minor Subdivision.	Discussed
#4	Consideration of the twin home dwelling layout located in the Falcon Landing Subdivision.	Approved
#5	Consideration of the preliminary plat for Falcon Landing located in the RM-7 and R-1-12 zoning	Approved
#6	Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, specifically Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.	Approved
#7	Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapter 20 Sign Regulations.	Tabled
#8	Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Planning Commission meeting schedule, changing the regular meetings from the 1st and 3rd Thursday of each month to the 1st and 3rd Tuesday for November and December 2025.	Approved
#9	Approval of minutes from the September 4, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON OCTOBER 2, 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 Sarah Moore, Debra Dwyer, Jason Hill, Chris Horrocks

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent: Chairman Derek Dalton

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Manager Michael Resare, Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe, GIS Analysis / City Planner Tae-Un Ko, City Council Member Rhett Butler, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman.

On Zoom: Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

Citizens and Guests Present: Kurt Brooks, Glen Phillips, Sheri Thompson, Hank Thompson, Gary Pinkham, Holly Jones, Kell Bker, Jeff Averett, Denise Averett, Terry Stapley, Kevin Jense, Ronald Butler, Eric Crithlow, Brittney Webb, Tom Webb, Barry Bunderson

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Unknowns

Commissioner Vice Chair Sarah Moore 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, October 2, 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 Preliminary Plat Application for West Haven PUD subdivision.**

Email Received 10/01/2025

Mandy Smith
Resident of Grantsville
10/1/2025

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed subdivision development of West Haven and Cherry Wood Estates phase 2. As a resident of this community, I am deeply concerned about the potential negative impacts this project may have on our neighborhood's character, environment, infrastructure, and overall quality of life.

While I understand the need for responsible growth and development, I believe this particular proposal raises several serious issues:

1. **Traffic and Safety Concerns:** The addition of new homes will significantly increase traffic, posing safety risks for pedestrians, and our children in the area.
2. **Environmental Impact:** The proposed site includes green space and wildlife habitat that would be disrupted or destroyed. This loss of natural areas is irreversible and detrimental to local biodiversity.
3. **Strain on Infrastructure:** Our existing infrastructure—including schools, water supply, and emergency services—is not equipped to handle the increased demand that this subdivision would bring.
4. **Community Character:** The scale and design of the proposed development do not align with the character and aesthetic of our neighborhood. This could diminish property values and alter the sense of community we currently enjoy.

I respectfully urge the planning commission and relevant authorities to reconsider or reject this proposal. I also request that a thorough environmental and traffic impact study be conducted and shared with the public before any decisions are made.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am hopeful that the voices of concerned residents will be heard and that thoughtful, community-centered planning will prevail.

Sincerely,
Mandy Smith

Kevin Jensen: Kevin Jensen was present to comment on this item. He stated that he lived at 633 West Cherry and was an adjacent landowner. He recalled that during a previous discussion, it was indicated that the developer would not be required to complete Cherry Street. He expressed concern with this, explaining that when he had attempted to develop his own property, he was required to complete Cherry Street, as were several others in the area. He asked whether the current proposal would still allow the developer to move forward without completing the road. Mr. Jensen also noted that he had read in the materials that the developer would need to acquire land from property owners along the street. He inquired how that process would work, as the information did not specify how much land would be taken or what the terms would be. He stated that he was uncomfortable proceeding without clarity on whether property owners might be subject to eminent domain if they chose not to sell, and whether Cherry Street would ultimately be completed. Kevin Jensen continued his comments, stating that his primary concern remained the issue with the completion of Cherry Street. He explained that the City had previously come close to facing a lawsuit over the matter because multiple property owners were told that the road had to be completed as part of their development requirements. He noted that when the current developer became involved, they were told the road did not need to be finished, which created an inconsistency and significant frustration among affected landowners. Mr. Jensen emphasized that if the same situation were to occur again, there was a strong likelihood that the same lawsuit could be brought forward. He concluded his remarks by thanking the Commission.

Mark Nielsen: Mark Nielsen was present to comment on this item. He stated that the proposed development would be located near his property boundaries. He expressed agreement with the concerns raised by Kevin Jensen, noting that requirements and expectations related to the project seemed to be changing frequently. Mr. Nielsen concluded his remarks by thanking the Commission.

b) Consideration of the preliminary plat for Falcon Landing located in the RM-7 and R-1-12 zoning.

Email Received 10/01/2025

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of the Wildrose-Booth area. I moved to Grantsville a little over a year ago. One of the main reasons I wanted to move to Grantsville was that it still felt like a small hometown that I was from. My husband and I love how quiet and peaceful this neighborhood is. This is our home. Grantsville is a breath of fresh air. The people in Grantsville are polite and courteous. My husband and I both understand that growth and development is a necessity for any town and city. We understand that communities grow. We understand that with growth, homes need to be built. I believe that anyone who wants the small town feel and a great sense of community, would and should choose Grantsville over any other place to live. My request is not that we stop growth within our city and in our community but that we be mindful of how the growth affects the roads, parking, traffic, and the communities we live in. I request that the city looks into other single family homes placed on large lots, then that of the proposed twin homes. My hope is that the city would consider housing which would facilitate families to be spaced out and therefore less crowded. If you look at the surrounding neighborhoods and lot sizes, you will see the area has large lots and happy families. We chose this community for those reasons. Please don't overcrowd our community and neighborhoods.

Thank you

Jenn Lutz

c) Consideration of the twin home dwelling layout located in Falcon Landing Subdivision.

Email Received 10/01/2025

LADIES AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS,

THE DEFINITION FOR TWIN HOMES THAT IS INCLUDED IN THE STAFF REPORT FOR THESE TWO ITEMS VERY CLEARLY STATES THAT THE TWIN HOME WILL BE LOCATED UPON TWO LEGAL LOTS, ONE UNIT ON EACH LOT WITH A COMMON WALL ALONG THE LOT LINE SEPERATING THE TWO

LIVING UNITS. LOT 9 IS A SINGLE LOT AND CANNOT LEGALLY HAVE A TWIN HOME LOCATED ON IT. LOTS 11 THROUGH 16 COULD HAVE TWIN HOMES LOCATED ON ONLY TWO LOTS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE STREET. THE LOTS MUST BY CODE BE ADJOINING LOTS. THE APPLICAT SHOULD CHOOSE WHICH LOTS WILL BE USED FOR THE TWIN HOMES AND CLEARLY SHOW THAT ON THE PLANS. THE APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED IS EITHER INCOMPLETE AND/OR NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE CITY'S CODE.

GARY PINKHAM

Gary Pinkham: Gary Pinkham was present to comment on this item. He referred to the section of the application materials and the cover sheet prepared by the administrator, which described a twin home as a housing type built across a property line, with one living unit located on one legal lot and the second living unit on an adjoining lot. He stated that, by law, a twin home must occupy two separate lots in order to be legal. Mr. Pinkham explained that the applicant was requesting approval for twin homes on seven lots, noting that one of those lots was a single lot and therefore could not legally accommodate a twin home. He further stated that the remaining six lots were divided into two groups of three, located on opposite sides of the street. To comply with code requirements, a twin home would need to occupy two of those lots, leaving one lot on each side remaining as a single lot, which could not legally contain a twin home. He noted that the submitted plans did not specify the locations of the proposed twin homes and that the wording of the request implied twin homes would be placed on each of the seven lots, including the single lot, which would not comply with city code. Mr. Pinkham concluded that the application should be revised to clearly identify which four lots would be used for twin homes and which would remain standard lots, emphasizing that as currently written, the proposal did not meet code requirements and would be illegal to approve.

d) Recommendation of the proposed plat amendment for Cherry Wood Estates.

Email Received 10/01/2025

Hello,

This is regards to the proposed plat amendment for Cherry Wood Estates Phase 2 to realign Cherry Street and also the West Haven PUD.

Who is the builder for the West Haven PUD? Are they going to be high-end high-density housing to match the quality of homes already existing? I'm concerned about crime and drugs coming in with high-density housing. Aren't you? I'm surprised high-density housing is coming to this neighborhood. I'm aware of other high-density housing plans that are

coming to Grantsville, but I was shocked to learn 46 homes are coming just around the corner from my new home, which I was so careful in choosing. Even after doing extensive due diligence before pulling the trigger to move here, I didn't know about these plans until today when I opened the mail. It was quite shocking. Also, I'm very concerned of the quality of building in what looks like a pit or valley and how rain run off and mud slides are going to be mitigated. It doesn't look like a stable place to build!

I'm not opposed to growth, but not at the expense of quality of building and safety of existing residents. Would you please direct me to Grantsville's master plan for growth along with the road and infrastructure plans? I'd like to compare what you send me to what I viewed when I was doing my due diligence.

Thank you!
Stephanie Bird

Email Received 10/01/2025

Mandy Smith
Resident of Grantsville
10/1/2025

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed subdivision development of West Haven and Cherry Wood Estates phase 2. As a resident of this community, I am deeply concerned about the potential negative impacts this project may have on our neighborhood's character, environment, infrastructure, and overall quality of life.

While I understand the need for responsible growth and development, I believe this particular proposal raises several serious issues:

5. Traffic and Safety Concerns: The addition of new homes will significantly increase traffic, posing safety risks for pedestrians, and our children in the area.
6. Environmental Impact: The proposed site includes green space and wildlife habitat that would be disrupted or destroyed. This loss of natural areas is irreversible and detrimental to local biodiversity.
7. Strain on Infrastructure: Our existing infrastructure—including schools, water supply, and emergency services—is not equipped to handle the increased demand that this subdivision would bring.
8. Community Character: The scale and design of the proposed development do not align with the character and aesthetic of our neighborhood. This could diminish property values and alter the sense of community we currently enjoy.

I respectfully urge the planning commission and relevant authorities to reconsider or reject this proposal. I also request that a thorough environmental and traffic impact study be conducted and shared with the public before any decisions are made.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am hopeful that the voices of concerned residents will be heard and that thoughtful, community-centered planning will prevail.

Sincerely,
Mandy Smith

Mark Nielsen: Mark Nielsen was present to comment on this item. He stated that a house had been constructed in a location where it was not originally intended, explaining that the prior owner of the property had purchased it with the understanding that no house would be built there. He said the City later permitted construction, which had led to flooding problems for nearby residents during heavy rainfall. Mr. Nielsen expressed frustration, stating that these drainage issues were creating significant hardship for property owners rather than helping them. He emphasized that the area floods severely during major storms and that water runoff from two houses located uphill flows directly onto his property. He stated that there were no barriers or drainage systems in place to manage the water, which often continued onto a neighboring property and nearly damaged their fence. He reiterated that the house should never have been built at that location and expressed disappointment that the issue had been allowed to occur. Mr. Nielsen stated that until existing flooding problems were addressed, he would be opposed to any new development in the area.

e) Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, specifically Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

Mark Nielsen: Mark Nielsen was present to comment on this item. He stated that he remained opposed to any new development at this time, reiterating that existing issues in the area had not yet been resolved. He explained that there had been past problems with inspections, noting that his own house had been inspected by someone online from New York City, according to what he had been told. He expressed concern that there were several practices and approvals within the process that did not seem appropriate or legitimate. Mr. Nielsen emphasized that the City should ensure these matters were properly addressed before moving forward with additional projects.

f) Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapter 20 Sign Regulations.

Email Received 10/2/2025

Dear Chairman Dalton and the Grantsville Planning Commission:

Re: Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapter 20 Sign Regulations, Agenda item f. on the October 2, 2025 Planning Commission agenda.

I am contacting you on behalf of the Utah Sign Association ([USA](#)) and the International Sign Association ([ISA](#)). Both associations represent the on-premises sign industry and assist jurisdictions throughout Utah and beyond in the creation of beneficial and enforceable sign regulations. We very recently became aware of the proposed sign code update. Below is a summary of the attached comments and recommendations along with some reference documents (below) that have been cited.

Firstly, we have noted that portions of the existing code include content regulation, which may conflict with the 2015 Supreme Court decision in *Reed vs. Town of Gilbert*. This decision has significant implications for sign regulations, and we believe it is crucial to align the code with this precedent to avoid potential legal challenges.

The proposed standards for ground signs along SR-138 and SR-112 will render most existing signs non-conforming. This could place an undue economic burden on businesses that rely on these signs for visibility and communication with their customers. We recommend revisiting these standards to find a more balanced approach that supports both the city's goals and the needs of local businesses. The proposed illumination standards lack specificity, which may lead to undue discretion in their administration and enforcement. We suggest adding more detailed illumination standards to ensure the regulations are clear, enforceable, and aligned with the city's intentions.

Some of the language in the code is ambiguous or unclear and could also result in undue discretion. Clarifying this language will help create a more transparent and fairer regulatory environment.

In light of these concerns, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission refer the proposed sign regulations draft back to the Planning & Zoning department. This will allow for stakeholder engagement and collaboration to address these issues comprehensively.

[Content Neutral Sign Codes report FINAL R.pdf](#)

[EMC Resource - Recommended Night -Time Brightness Levels Revised 8-16 R.pdf](#)

Best regards,

James Carpentier, AICP

AGENDA

1. Recommendation of the proposed plat amendment for Cherry Wood Estates located in the R-1-21 zone.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided background information, noting that the applicant was requesting approval of a plat amendment associated with a previously

approved PUD application. The amendment proposes maintaining a 66-foot right-of-way consistent with city standards and realigning a road that had originally encroached approximately five feet onto an adjacent property. The realignment now runs along the property line, addressing prior concerns.

Commissioner Hill expressed support for the realignment, noting that it appropriately stays within the property boundaries. Commissioner Horrocks confirmed that the proposal made sense based on the maps and staff analysis. Commissioner Dwyer also indicated no objections and expressed satisfaction that the amendment addressed prior issues. Vice Chair Sarah Moore stated that she had no concerns with the proposed change.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed plat amendment for Cherry Wood Estates located in the R-1-21 zone. With the following conditions: The final plat shall reflect the corrected ROW alignment as presented, all conditions of the West Haven Townhomes PUD approval, including the requirement for ROW alignment, remain in full effect, any retaining wall impacts shall be consistent with the details provided on the approved preliminary plat and shall not adversely impact adjacent property owners. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

2. Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for West Haven PUD Subdivision.

Heidi Jones, representing the Butler family, was present to answer questions on this item. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided background information, she explained that the PUD application had been submitted with a public hearing on March 7, 2024, and council approval on March 20, 2024. Negotiations on the Master Development Agreement (MDA) followed to implement deviations and conditions required by council and the Planning Commission. Preliminary plat review began January 23, 2025, after the application was received on January 10, and concluded September 9. During the review, staff confirmed the alignment of Cherry Street and noted that adjustments would impact adjacent properties to maintain a 60-foot right-of-way. Shelby emphasized that the property remains partially within a flood zone, requiring elevation adjustments before constructing basements. Staff also highlighted Chapter 21 requirements for paved frontage improvements on existing streets not built to current city standards, which would apply even if the applicant had sufficient alternative access to the development.

Holly Jones explained that the PUD allowed the developers to correct the alignment of Cherry Street, which otherwise would have remained undeveloped. The Butlers intended to gift the land for Cherry Street to the city, ensuring the road could be properly aligned without any city expenditure. Holly provided details to the background information, she stated five years prior,

the Butlers had attempted to build four homes, but the city had denied the plan despite multiple egress points. They then engaged legal counsel and verified the future land use designation allowed high-density development with only two access roads, eliminating the requirement to fully develop Cherry Street at that time.

Holly emphasized that the Butlers had already invested in engineering costs to realign the street and that the city had not yet taken ownership of the land. She expressed frustration that the requirement to obtain additional land from adjoining property owners to meet a 60-foot right-of-way had arisen late in the process. She argued that this was not part of the original agreement and described it as a stall in the process, noting that the Butlers had adequate alternative access for their development. Holly stressed that the Butlers' actions represented a gift to the city, and the new requirement seemed to contradict that intent.

Shelby Moore clarified that the MDA explicitly required the 60-foot right-of-way for Cherry Street prior to preliminary plat approval, which had not been secured. Holly reiterated that acquiring additional land was not the developer's responsibility and described the situation as potentially punitive, given the Butlers' voluntary contributions to the city. City Manager Michael Resare suggested tabling the item to allow staff to research the issue further and coordinate with the city attorney.

Commissioners Hill and Dwyer agreed that more background was necessary before making a decision, acknowledging the applicant's efforts and expressing understanding of their frustration. Commissioner Hill emphasized that their role was to ensure compliance with city codes and make informed decisions rather than rush judgment under uncertainty. Commissioner Horrocks agreed, noting that additional information was necessary to fully understand prior discussions and agreements. Vice Chair Sarah Moore confirmed that tabling the item would allow staff to clarify right-of-way requirements and review prior agreements.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to table the Consideration of the Proposed Preliminary Plat Application for West Haven PUD Subdivision. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Chris Horrocks "Aye", Deborah Dwyer "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye." The motion was carried unanimously.

3. Discussion of the proposed rezone, and General Plan Amendment for the 5 Center Minor Subdivision.

Barry Bunderson was present to answer questions regarding this item. He noted that the discussion pertained specifically to Lots 1 and 2 of a minor subdivision originally completed in 2020. Barry provided context regarding the history of the property, explaining that it was previously zoned CS but did not meet area requirements. At the time, the previous owner, Doug Higley, rezoned the parcels to RM-15, although some RM-15 regulations have since changed. He emphasized that the lots remain vacant and that he was exploring the potential for a

commercial zoning designation, specifically CN or CG, to support tax base growth and community development.

Vice Chair Sarah Moore and Commissioner Dwyer clarified that Barry Bunderson owns only these two lots and confirmed that he did not have immediate development plans, but was seeking input on appropriate zoning for the area. Barry explained that while he could leave the zoning as RM-15, he wished to understand whether a CN or CG designation would better serve the community and avoid duplicative applications. He noted that a CG zone would allow broader commercial use, while CN is more limited, and that both lots are slightly larger than the minimum size required for CG zoning.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, provided context from the city's perspective, showing that the surrounding area includes existing commercial zones, mixed-use parcels, and RM-7 residential zoning. Shelby noted that commercial zoning would be consistent with surrounding parcels and explained the differences between CN and CG zoning, including allowable uses and scale of development. City Council Member Rhett Butler referenced the packet map showing the surrounding parcels, confirming commercial use in the immediate vicinity and clarifying that a nearby historic home, owned by the Rashers, could potentially be converted to civic or commercial use in the future.

Commissioner Hill suggested that CG zoning would be preferable due to its compatibility with residential neighbors, particularly in limiting heavy machinery that might be more appropriate under CN zoning. Commissioner Dwyer expressed general support for commercial development while noting she was not fully familiar with the distinctions between commercial zones. Commissioner Horrocks agreed that commercial zoning aligns with the surrounding neighborhood context, particularly considering the daycare located directly behind the lots.

Barry then asked about the possibility of vacating the existing 132-foot-wide road to create more usable space, noting that portions of the road currently extend onto private yards. He indicated that this was not a priority but sought input for potential future planning. Vice Chair Sarah Moore encouraged Barry to consider economic development opportunities and community benefit when proposing zoning changes, suggesting that CG zoning might support a wider range of family- or community-oriented commercial uses, whereas CN would accommodate heavier equipment or industrial-type uses.

The Commission emphasized that this discussion was intended as preliminary guidance, and no formal decision was made. Barry noted his openness to civic or commercial uses that would benefit the community, including potential for mixed-use development consistent with city planning goals. Commissioner Hill highlighted that the Commission would not dictate the specific use but could provide feedback on zoning alignment with broader city planning objectives. City Council Member Butler reiterated the presence of nearby historic and residential structures, emphasizing consideration for community context.

Item Discussed

4. Consideration of the twin home dwelling layout located in the Falcon Landing Subdivision.

Glen Phillips was present to answer questions on this item. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore introduced the agenda item, explaining that she would turn the floor over to Shay Stark, consultant with Aqua Engineering, to provide further clarification on the city's definition of twin homes. She noted that staff had held multiple discussions to ensure a clear understanding of the code language.

Shay Stark outlined the definition of a twin home from Chapter 2 of the city code, describing it as a two-family dwelling divided into attached single-family dwellings on separate lots, sharing a common wall. He highlighted the portion of the code stating that adjoining lots occupied by a twin home must meet the minimum lot size of the zoning district, plus additional square footage required for the second dwelling. For the Falcon Landing project, the base lot size in the R-1-12 zone is 12,000 square feet, with an additional 1,500 square feet added for the second unit.

Shay explained that at the preliminary stage, the lots are considered together to ensure the combined size meets code requirements, with individual lot splits occurring at the final plat stage. He also noted that the project requested minor adjustments to front and rear setbacks, which would be addressed separately during the preliminary plat review. Shelby clarified that the conditional use permit under discussion only addressed the layout of the twin homes, with any setback deviations handled during the next item.

Commissioner Hill referenced Gary Pinkham's earlier public comments expressing concerns about irregular or awkward lot configurations. Commissioner Dwyer asked for clarification on prior discussions, and Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the preliminary layout currently combines parcels to meet conditional use requirements, with individual lot divisions to occur during the final plat process.

Glen Phillips confirmed that the twin homes would share a common wall but emphasized that each unit would occupy its own lot once the final plat is recorded. He illustrated the proposed layout, showing separate driveways, garages, and entrances, and referenced existing twin homes on Booth Street as a comparable example. Shay Stark added that the combined lot sizes are consistent with surrounding R1-7 and R1-12 properties, ensuring compatibility with the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Sarah Moore inquired about the square footage. Shelby Moore clarified that the R1-12 zone requires a minimum of 12,000 square feet, and with the additional 1,500 square feet for the second unit, each twin home lot would meet zoning requirements once divided. Shay Stark further explained that the property spans both the RM-7 and R1-12 zones, and once

subdivided, each twin home lot would measure approximately 6,752 square feet, comparable to adjacent parcels. Shelby provided a visual reference to show how the layout integrates with the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Hill clarified that the conditional use approval under consideration pertains only to the layout, not to setbacks. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that standard lot coverage limits would still apply, allowing for a maximum home width of approximately 20 to 25 feet within the required setbacks. She further noted that city code does not require a fence along the shared property line, though homeowners may install a privacy fence around the perimeter at their discretion.

Vice Chair Sarah Moore asked about unit sizes. Glen Phillips stated that each unit would have a main-level footprint of approximately 1,300 square feet, with a finished multi-story size of roughly 2,600 square feet, within the 1,500-square-foot allowance for the additional unit. He noted the project would contribute to the city's affordable housing goals.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of the twin home dwelling layout located in the Falcon Landing Subdivision. With the conditions: The setbacks shall remain as proposed, the developer shall place a 6-foot privacy around the north, west, and south of the subdivision, the developer shall meet all the requirements outlined in GLUMDC with the exception of the setbacks as proposed. Debra Dwyer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Chris Horrocks "Aye", Deborah Dwyer "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye." The motion was carried unanimously.

5. Consideration of the preliminary plat for Falcon Landing located in the RM-7 and R-1-12 zoning.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided an overview of the plat and setback requests. She explained that the interior R1-12 twin home lots have a front yard setback of 30 feet, which complies with the code in effect at the time of the application, though the current code now requires 25 feet. The applicants are requesting a rear yard setback of 25 feet, instead of the standard 40 feet. Side yards for the twin homes are 7.5 feet on one side and 15 feet on the other, which complies with current standards. For corner lots, the front yard remains 30 feet, with the rear yard also requesting 40 feet. In the RM-7 portion of the subdivision, all lots comply with lot size and setback requirements. Shelby also provided measurements for specific lots (15, 14, 21, and 22), indicating that homes could be approximately 38 feet wide and 90 feet in length while still adhering to lot coverage limits.

Commissioner Hill confirmed that the requested deviation applied only to the R1-12 rear yards, which Shelby verified. Shay Stark, consultant with Aqua Engineering clarified that the front yards remain compliant at 30 feet, with only the rear yard requesting a reduction to 25 feet.

Commissioner Dwyer expressed support for the rear yard variance, noting that the additional space would be beneficial.

Shelby explained that the lot coverage limitations would prevent homes from exceeding the allowable size, ensuring that even with the reduced rear setback, the maximum home footprint would not surpass 2,700 square feet. Commissioners discussed the configuration and dimensions, confirming that the setbacks applied specifically to the twin homes, while single-family lots met standard requirements. Vice Chair Sarah Moore referenced similar twin homes on Booth Street, noting that rear yards there are also smaller than 40 feet, providing context for neighborhood compatibility.

The discussion then turned to fencing. Shelby explained that code does not require a fence along individual twin home lot lines, but a perimeter fence around the development is recommended. Commissioners agreed that a six-foot vinyl fence around the development would be most appropriate, consistent with neighborhood standards. Vice Chair Sarah Moore confirmed the development would not have an HOA, supporting affordability goals.

Shelby Moore also addressed the fee in lieu of open space requirement. She noted that under Chapter 21 of the city code, developments under 20 acres may pay a fee rather than provide open space. Falcon Landing, at approximately 7.5 acres, qualifies for this option. Commissioners acknowledged that the fee in lieu of open space is standard for a development of this size and had no objections.

Following discussion, Vice Chair Sarah Moore asked for a motion. Commissioner Dwyer moved to approve the preliminary plat for Falcon Landing in the RM-7 and R1-12 zoning districts, with all proposed conditions. Vice Chair Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, and Vice Chair Sarah Moore closed the item.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of the preliminary plat for Falcon Landing located in the RM-7 and R-1-12 zoning. With the conditions: The setbacks shall remain as proposed, the developer will be required to meet all of the GLUMDC codes and ordinances with the exception of the setbacks, the developer is required to place a 6-foot-tall privacy fence to the north, west, and south. and south of the subdivision, the developer shall meet all the requirements outlined in GLUMDC with the exception of the setbacks as proposed, fee in lieu of open space will be required to be paid prior to final platting, all conditions placed on the application will be required to be placed into a development agreement. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

6. Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, specifically Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

Community and Development Director Bill Cobe, presented this item, he explained that there were 53 references to the Zoning Administrator throughout the code, which is why nearly all chapters are impacted. The proposed amendment adds the Community Development Director as an additional authority alongside the Zoning Administrator and includes an “or designee” clause. He emphasized that the amendment does not change existing authority but allows flexibility when the Zoning Administrator is unavailable or a decision needs to be made.

Vice Chair Sarah Moore and Commissioner Hill expressed support, noting the efficiency of the change. Bill also highlighted updates to Chapter 9, which clarify definitions and responsibilities for park strips, including maintenance obligations extending to the edge of the asphalt where sidewalks or curbs are absent. Commissioner Horrocks confirmed that these updates are strictly clarifications, and Commissioner Dwyer asked about enforcement. Bill explained that clarification in the code empowers the city’s code enforcement officer to ensure compliance, and noted that some modifications, such as water-wise landscaping or gravel in place of sod, are consistent with previous practices.

Vice Chair Sarah Moore confirmed that no new requirements are being imposed and Bill reiterated that the amendments simply clarify and strengthen existing language, incorporating input from legal counsel. Commissioner Horrocks asked for additional clarification on the changes across all chapters, and Bill explained that every reference to “Zoning Administrator” now includes “Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or designee,” effectively establishing mutual backup authority between the two positions.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, specifically Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

7. Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapter 20 Sign Regulations.

Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that the Commission had received an extensive review with comments and recommendations and requested that the item be tabled to allow further review with the City Attorney. Bill noted that while most recommendations were valuable, some raised questions about the extent to which the city could regulate content on signs versus physical characteristics such as size, lighting, and materials. He emphasized that free

speech considerations prevent the city from restricting sign content unless it is offensive to community morals.

Jason Hill made a motion to table the proposed amendment to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapter 20 Sign Regulations. Debra Dwyer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

8. Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Planning Commission meeting schedule, changing the regular meetings from the 1st and 3rd Thursday of each month to the 1st and 3rd Tuesday for November and December 2025.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was present to answer questions on this item. Commissioner Dwyer expressed no preference between Tuesday or Thursday, noting that only other weekdays might pose a conflict.

City Council Member Rhett Butler asked for clarification on the reason for the proposed change. Shelby explained that the adjustment had been initially discussed internally to provide staff additional time for noticing and preparing packets for City Council. Additionally, Chairman Derek Dalton had requested the change due to scheduling conflicts, and recognized that moving meetings to Tuesday evenings could reduce conflicts for other community members interested in serving on the Commission.

Chairman Derek Dalton, participating remotely, stated that Tuesdays could encourage broader participation in Planning Commission vacancies, reduce scheduling conflicts with other community activities, and potentially improve quorum attendance. Commissioner Hill supported the approach as a temporary “test run” for November and December, allowing staff and Commissioners to evaluate the change before establishing a permanent schedule.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to recommend the approval of the amendment to the Planning Commission meeting schedule, changing the regular meetings from the 1st and 3rd Thursday of each month to the 1st and 3rd Tuesday for November and December 2025. Derek Dalton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye”, Derek Dalton “Ay.” The motion was carried unanimously.

9. Approval of minutes from the September 4, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman requested that approval of the September 4, 2025 meeting minutes be tabled to verify that the Chairman and Vice Chair were identified correctly.

Debra Dwyer made a motion to table the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from September 4, 2025. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously. The motion was carried unanimously.

10. Report from Zoning Administrator

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reminded Commissioners who signed up about the upcoming APA conference scheduled for next Thursday and Friday. She suggested coordinating travel and carpooling to address parking needs. Vice Chair Sarah Moore inquired if Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe or any other staff had additional announcements. No further items were raised.

11. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore opened the discussion by asking if any Commissioners were able to join the City Council’s recent online work meeting with UDOT regarding the corridor and potential signal placements. She noted that the recording and presentation would be shared with the Commission once available.

12. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler provided a report on recent City Council actions and discussions. He noted that the Council had approved amending the General Plan to include the Water Element. He then highlighted the Tooele Valley Connectivity Study presented by UDOT during a prior work meeting, emphasizing its relevance to future road planning and signal placement in Grantsville.

Rhett explained that the study projects growth through 2060, showing the Comprehensive Future Network, including State roads in red and City roads in other designations. The study forecasts significant traffic and employment growth, particularly related to industrial and commercial developments, including the Romney Group industrial park and Lakeview Business Park.

Commissioners discussed the implications of proposed signal locations, daily traffic projections (up to 72,000 trips per day on certain state roads), and UDOT’s standards for signal spacing. Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe emphasized the importance of integrating these planned corridors into the City’s Transportation Master Plan to ensure that future development preserves right-of-way and proper road widths.

Rhett also addressed ongoing discussions regarding the future development of Cherry Street on the West End. He clarified that the property owner is providing the land to the City but is not required to construct the road at this time. Commissioners discussed concerns about right-of-way width, prescriptive access rights, and future connectivity. Bill Cobabe confirmed that the PUD and development agreement had previously included these provisions, and that improvements would not be required at this stage. Shelby Moore indicated the item would be placed on the next agenda for further discussion after additional clarification with the property owner.

13. Adjourn.

Deborah Dwyer made a motion to adjourn. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously. The motion was carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.