

Action Summary:

| Agenda Item | Item Description | Action |
|--------------------|---|---------------|
| #1 | Consideration of a proposed rezone for 587 E Main Street, in the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation, to RM-15 (Multiple residential District) zoning designation. | Approved |
| #2 | Consideration of a proposed rezone for 15 N Center Street and 9 N Center Street, in the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation, to C-N (Neighborhood Commercial District) zoning designation. | Approved |
| #3 | Consideration of the proposed amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for Grantsville City. | Approved |
| #4 | Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting, and the December 2, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. | Approved |

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON DECEMBER 16, 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: Chair Derek Dalton, Vice-Chair Sarah Moore, Jason Hill, Debra Dwyer, Chris Horrocks

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent:

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe, City Planner/GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko, Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Jeff Williams, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman, Robert Rousselle consultant with Ensign Engineering, Mayor Neil Critchlow, Deputy Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow

On Zoom: City Council member Jake Thomas

Citizens and Guests Present: Sidney Rasher, Derrick Rasher, Robert Rousselle, Regan Richmond, Shane Conner, Michelle Conner, Diana Bunderson, Barry Bunderson, Robert Petersen, Annette Petersen, Linda Storrer, Kristi Lawrence, Alta Calcagno, Michael Whitworth, Maria Whitworth, Derek Church, Melanie Hill, Jeremy Hill

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Unknowns

Commission Chair 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 Tuesday, December 16, 2025 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

- a) Consideration of a proposed rezone for 587 E Main Street, in the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation, to RM-15 (Multiple residential District) zoning designation.**

No comments

- b) Consideration of a proposed rezone for 15 N Center Street and 9 N Center Street, in the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation, to C-N (Neighborhood Commercial District) zoning designation.**

Email Received 12/12/2025:

Hi, I am a resident of Grantsville and I also live on Center Street. I am against the potential commercial zoning of 15 N & 9 N Center Street. Please keep Center Street residential only!

Sent from my iPhone

Email Received 12/12/2025:

To Whom It May Concern: I'm reaching out about the consideration of zoning change for 15 N & 9 N Center Street. The Wrathall House, the historic pride of Grantsville, is located right there, and I fear changing the zoning to commercial will cheapen what is a

beautiful look at Grantsville's past and a safe neighborhood for families. Please do not change the zoning.

Sincerely,

Sam B.

Email Received 12/12/2025:

Dear members of the planning and zoning commission,

It would be a disaster to turn 15 N & 9 N Center Street into commercial zoning! The historic home south of these properties is a family home which would be negatively impacted by a zoning change. This street has always been zoned for family homes. Having commercial properties next door to where young children live and play would be dangerous! Thank you for your careful consideration of the above.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Tolman Coombs

Email Received 12/12/2025:

Dear Grantsville Zoning Commission,

It has been brought to my attention that the owner of the lots, 15 N Center Street and 9 N Center Street is trying to rezone these properties to a commercial area. This is very concerning to me as a resident of Grantsville City, as a parent and grandmother. Currently, this area is surrounded by residential homes and an elementary school. This area is does not need more traffic creating unsafe roads and areas for pedestrians.

I also think Grantsville needs to stick to building new businesses to the business areas and stop creating new random businesses in the middle of residential areas where people live and are trying to have peace and security in a neighborhood.

People move to Grantsville for community not for businesses.

Please consider keeping this property residential and keeping center street a place where home owners feel comfortable and secure.

Thank you,

Mrs. Tippetts.

Email Received 12/12/2025:

To whom it may concern,

I was recently told about the potential rezoning of the empty lots at 15 N Center St. and 9 N Center St. from residential to commercial. As a mother of a young child that attends Grantsville Elementary, I do not think that is a good space for a business. I find the potential for increased traffic to be a huge safety risk. That intersection is already busy often. More people coming and going pose a threat to not only the other vehicles on the road, but the children that walk to and from school. I believe that area of town should remain the friendly small town community neighborhood that it currently is. Please consider this opinion for not only the homeowners nearby that would be most directly affected, but also the parents and children that want to feel comfortable and continue loving where they live!

Thank you for your time,

Jacey Marley

Email Received 12/12/2025:

Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission -

My name is Sidney Rasher. Me and my family live in the historic Wrathall home at 5 N Center Street here in Grantsville. We have owned our home for close to 5 years and have spent over \$100,000 within that time to restore and preserve this important part of Grantsville history (with another \$75,000+ committed to spend just in brick work). We live in an amazing community, have wonderful neighbors and love where we live. Myself and my husband both have lived in Grantsville our entire lives. I was recently appointed to be on the Grantsville Historic Preservation Commission. We take great pride and love our town.

I write to you today to express my strong opposition on the rezoning of lots 9 N & 15 N Center Street. Though we have businesses nearby - the salon, daycare & sweethearts are all on Main Street. Center Street is a residential area with families that would be negatively affected by commercial properties being added here. With the elementary school on the other side of Main Street and no traffic lights on this side of town, most of the day it is very difficult to even turn off of Center Street onto Main. Adding commercial properties to our street would only create more congestion and dangerous traffic.

We try to be understanding and considerate neighbors. We know when the fire station has events or the salon next door gets busy, that people will likely use our personal parking. We have never discouraged this, however it does show that there is a lack of parking and space for the current traffic this street receives. Adding more businesses will create much larger parking issues.

We love our town, we know that growth is inevitable. However we just ask that we can leave the zoning on Center Street how it is. The current zoning allows for multi residential homes. We welcome neighbors and families! Keep our neighborhood a family friendly area.

Our home, The Wrathall House, is on the National Register of Historic Places. The Grantsville Preservation Commission has started talks of creating a Historic District encompassing Center and Clark Street. If the zoning were to change on the 2 lots near our home, it could affect that overall plan and the historic integrity of the surrounding neighborhood.

I appreciate your time and hope that the concerns I bring up can be of value to your decision making process.

- Sidney Rasher

Email Received 12/12/2025:

To whom it may concern,

It has come to my attention that the two lots, 15 N & 9 N Center Street, are in discussion to turn the lots from residential zoning to commercial zoning.

I am against turning the lots to commercial zoning. This is a residential area where there are young children present. Keeping it residential will allow more houses and children. Whereas turning it into commercial property will be an increased risk for our children's safety.

There are already concerns about traffic and adding two businesses on center street will add to the congestion. As a neighbor, I would want that property to stay as a residential zone. It needs to be a neighborhood not a business.

Thank you for your time,

Kayla Cameron

Email Received 12/16/2025:

To whom it may concern:

Please keep this as residential property to maintain a neighborhood. There is always a lot of congestion as it is on this street when the fire dept has events. Let's not add to that and keep businesses on Main St. where they belong. Trying to keep Grantsville a quaint little town is part of its charm that we should keep that way. This property is too small to have

as commercial property. There's not much room there to do anything with. Thanks for your consideration in this matter.

Tischa

Email Received 12/16/2025:

Please keep Center Residential and don't bring office buildings next to one of the most historic and beautiful homes in Grantsville. Grantsville needs to say no to changing the property from Residential to Commercial.

Thanks

Linda Batterman

Email Received 12/15/2025:

I am very concerned about businesses being put up by my house on center st. About 6 or 7 businesses west of the carwash on the Northside of Main are closed. Is that's what is going to happen on center. Businesses brought in disrupt our neighborhood only to fail and become vacant abandoned eyesores?

Michelle

Email Received 12/15/2025:

Hello,

My name is Derrick Rasher. My family and I bought our home at 5 N Center Street a little over 4 years ago. When we bought this home, we bought it with the intent of restoring it to its former beauty. We bought it with the understanding that this piece of Grantsville's history was worth saving to stand as landmark of what Grantsville used to be. In recent years, Grantsville has headed into a direction that detracts from this. The rezoning of 9 and 15 Center street will continue this negative trend that the City has been on. To rezoning these lots to any commercial zoning will distract from the historic significance of our home and the work that we have put into it. In the last 4 years my family and I have spent countless hours and countless dollars to ensure the preservation of history. In the last 4 years we already witnessed the original barn of the Wrathall family torn down without any attempt to salvage or preserve. This has also happened with the small cabin that was where Arby's now stands.

Other points of concern that I have is the fact that small businesses in Grantsville are already struggling while being in much higher traffic areas. In the strip mall across from Maverick there have been store fronts that have changed hands or remained empty for years. In years past the small restaurant that gas since burned down next to the fire station

changed hands frequently. Are the businesses that would be built on Center Street to face the same future? Why not focus on ensuring the current success of businesses instead of building for more uncertainty?

Derrick Rasher

Mayor Neil Critchlow: Mayor Neil Critchlow was present to comment on this item and asked whether anyone in the public wished to speak on behalf of the item. He then stated that he would speak on the item himself. He explained that he wanted to provide a history of the property and the request. He stated that years ago the zoning had been changed from commercial to RM-15 to allow multiple apartment units on the property. He explained that the applicant was now requesting to change the zoning back to commercial, which was the zoning originally planned for the site. He stated that he thought the Commission would find that history helpful. He added that the zoning change had occurred approximately ten years earlier and that the change had been made for the applicant at that time.

Maria: Maria Whitworth was present to comment on this item and identified herself as a resident of Center Street. She described how her family had made a very intentional decision to build on Center Street after looking at many locations throughout Grantsville while several subdivisions were being developed. She explained that they wanted to live in the center of the community and be in a place where they could contribute, which led them to build on the corner of Center and Clark near the elementary school. She noted that children walked by their home every day and that children often stopped by for snacks or to play basketball. She expressed concern that there was already significant traffic in the area and that it was difficult to access Main Street, and she stated that maintaining neighborhood safety for children walking along Center Street was important to her family. She described the neighborhood as one where residents had intentionally chosen to build or move there, explaining that neighbors cared for one another, held a block party, and were mindful about maintaining their lots, properties, and families. She shared that when they chose to build in the neighborhood, she kept a poem in her home titled The House by the Side of the Road and read a portion of it to illustrate the values that guided their decision, including being part of the community and being a friend to others. She concluded by asking that Center Street remain a place for homes rather than businesses, so families like hers could preserve what they had intentionally built in the neighborhood, and she thanked the Commission for their time.

Shane Conner Shane Connor was present to comment on this item. He explained that he often interacted with neighbors while in their yards or helping with snowplowing. He stated that although speaking publicly was hard and somewhat traumatic, the matter was important to him. He noted that he was a direct descendant of Lucas Johnson, who settled Clover Springs in Rush Valley, and that he had lived in Tooele County for the past 25

years of his 53-year life. He shared that he had lived in many neighborhoods due to his father's military service and his own, among other circumstances. He expressed that this neighborhood was by far his favorite, stating that he could rely on his neighbors. He described observing neighbors like the Lawrences and Whitworths volunteering at the fire department, weeding flower beds, and picking up garbage, and the Hills caring for other people's properties. He explained that these families acted as parenting neighbors at large, ensuring the youth in the neighborhood had a safe place. He shared examples of neighborly support, including the Crawfords making repairs on his roof at no charge while raising a young family, and Kadeen transforming her property from a rundown rental into a beautiful home, personally cleaning the runoff ditch and removing junk. He noted that they had watched the Rashers restore a historic house while raising a young family. He described community traditions, including yearly Center Street neighborhood parties themed on Old Lincoln Highway, which they planned to hold twice a year. He stated that the neighborhood was close-knit, actively supporting the Fire Department and Veterans Park, and maintaining the gravel road for community parking. He acknowledged that the street was already busy due to the school and Fire Department but emphasized that while they enjoyed these community elements, there could be such a thing as too much. He stated that the proposed rezoning would isolate a family from their community, calling it a situation that should never have been brought to the meeting. He emphasized that Grantsville did not need the proposed business location and that the neighborhood did not need it, adding that only one person in town supported it for self-gain rather than community benefit. He affirmed his support for small businesses but opposed small business displacing tax-paying citizens from their neighborhood. He emphasized that the house was a family home from the 1890s, not a business, and asked the Commission to respect it. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Michelle Connor: Michelle Connor was present to comment on this item. She explained that her family had moved into the greenhouse on North Center seven years ago and that what drew them to the home was the charming neighborhood and the small-town feel. She shared that she understood and loved small-town life, having grown up in Lehi, Utah, and recalled experiencing the town's first fast-food restaurant and first traffic light, noting how her hometown had grown into a much larger city with many traffic lights, restaurants, and businesses. She explained that she appreciated how growth in Lehi preserved Main Street, Center Street, and State Street, maintaining the small-town character she had grown up with. She stated that neighbors in Grantsville took pride in their community, noting that her husband raked the gravel for all the neighbors and that they held neighborhood parties. She added that they enjoyed when the town came to their neighborhood for events such as the 4th of July or homecoming parades, while also valuing the quiet of their area most of the time. She expressed concern about the proposed commercial property coming into their neighborhood. She explained that driving west down Main Street in Grantsville past the car wash revealed six or seven

failed businesses with empty buildings or lots that could have been used for other businesses. She questioned whether the same pattern would happen in their neighborhood, turning it into abandoned eyesores. She stated that she loved the small businesses on Main Street and felt that the city should focus on restoring businesses there rather than introducing commercial development into residential neighborhoods.

Alex Grorshownie: Alex Grorshownie was present to comment on this item. He explained that he was speaking on behalf of his neighbor, Katie, and that he lived at 54 North Center Street. He expressed that he loved his neighborhood and that caring for one another and knowing neighbors were there for him was very important. He stated that he was a retired school bus driver and had chosen to spend his remaining years living in Grantsville. He emphasized that people were the lifeblood of a city and that connection and community were important. He expressed concern that if 9 and 15 North Center Street were rezoned to CN, the neighborhood would suffer. He stated that rezoning would isolate the neighbors at 5 North Center Street, which he described as a historic home occupied by a family. He explained that the family deserved peace and security to raise their children in a neighborhood not surrounded by businesses. He stated that the location was not suitable for commercial use and that it would bring more traffic and potential parking issues, which were already problematic. He suggested that there were other locations better suited for businesses if the city desired. He acknowledged that it might not be possible to please everyone but expressed hope that 9 and 15 North Center Street would remain as they currently were. He noted that while business could create more revenue for the city and provide profit for the landowner, sometimes the well-being of families and neighbors was more important than money.

Kristi Lawrence: Kristi Lawrence was present to comment on this item. She explained that her parents were born in Grantsville, she was raised there, and her children were also raised there. She noted that she had lived in the city her whole life and was a business owner in Tooele County, giving her perspective on both what made Grantsville great and the need for growth and development. She expressed that she believed it would be a mistake to zone the lot in question commercial. She explained that the area was the heart of Grantsville and that she had chosen to live there for that reason. She contrasted the charm of historic areas like Center Street with the newer subdivisions of cookie-cutter houses, emphasizing that the true charm of Grantsville lay in its historic homes, such as the house on the corner, which was on the National Registry for Historic Homes and well-known in the community. She stated that preserving the historic home was important to the community and to the family that lived there. She expressed concern that placing multiple businesses next to the historic home would diminish its value and that the home was not suitable for commercial use, such as an Airbnb, because it was structurally a residential home. She emphasized that the family was restoring the home and maintaining it in a way that exemplified the type of neighbor the community wanted. She stated that

while growth and development had a place in Grantsville, there were areas where the value of historic homes should be prioritized over commercial development. She expressed concern about optics, noting that a city employee seeking commercial zoning for their own property could appear self-serving, even if proper procedures were followed. She stressed that the neighborhood was residential and valued as such. She acknowledged that living near Main Street and the fire station was acceptable but noted that there were few lots three or four properties on Main Street in residential areas, and there was no need to convert them to commercial. She concluded by urging the Commission to maintain residential zoning, even for multi-home residential use, and expressed that they wanted families on the street rather than businesses that would not add to the charm or value of the neighborhood.

Sydney Rasher: Sydney Rasher was present to comment on this item and began by expressing emotion, noting that hearing her neighbors speak about their love and care for one another was moving for her. She stated that she was raised in Grantsville and that she, her husband, and their three young children lived in the historic home at 5 North Center Street, next door to the two lots in question. She explained that their home was built in 1898 and was on the National Register of Historic Places. She shared that they had invested over \$100,000 in restoring their home and planned to spend more, emphasizing that their investment was motivated by their love for Grantsville, its history, and their community, rather than financial return. She expressed concern that if the two lots were rezoned to commercial, the decision would prioritize potential profit and personal gain for the property owner while negatively affecting all property owners on the street and surrounding area. She addressed rumors suggesting their house might someday be commercialized, such as being an Airbnb or venue, and clarified that they had no plans to pursue that and that the home's floor plan and other factors made such use impractical. She stated that commercial zoning for the neighboring lots would isolate their home from the rest of the neighborhood. She noted that the street was near existing commercial properties on Main Street, some of which were vacant, struggling to maintain tenants, and lacking in customers, parking, and foot traffic. She emphasized that they had always been understanding and considerate neighbors, allowing people to use their personal parking for fire station events or the nearby salon, but pointed out that adding commercial buildings would reduce available parking. She explained that there were currently no sidewalks on the street, and that if a sidewalk were added alongside commercial buildings, the gravel parking strip nearest to their house, where they currently allowed parking would be eliminated, creating larger issues for the neighborhood. She concluded by stating that they loved their town and understood that growth was inevitable, but she asked that the current zoning remain, which allows for multi-residential homes. She welcomed neighbors and families and requested that the neighborhood remain family-friendly and historically respectful. She thanked the Commission for their time.

Alta Calcagno: Alta Calcagno was present to comment on this item and stated that she had been a resident of Grantsville for 15 years and loved the town. She explained that one of the aspects that attracted her to Grantsville was the small-community feel, which she had been grateful to see maintained over time. She acknowledged that development and growth were part of any town in Utah. She added that she was the chair of the Historic Preservation Commission and had been involved since its establishment over eight years ago. She expressed a passion for historic homes and the history of Grantsville. She explained that rezoning a residential area to commercial use could introduce secondary impacts, including increased traffic, noise, nighttime lighting, and public safety concerns, potentially attracting crime. She stated that these changes could alter the established neighborhood character, exacerbate congestion, and reduce walkability. She noted that nearby residential properties could experience diminished quality of life and potential declines in property values due to spillover effects. While acknowledging that commercial uses could provide additional services and economic activity, she explained that such transitions often place a strain on existing infrastructure, including the lack of sidewalks and parking, and could affect the surrounding community and schools. She emphasized that Main Street contained multiple vacant lots and underutilized buildings, representing a more appropriate and strategic location for commercial growth. She explained that directing new businesses to Main Street would support infill development, leverage existing infrastructure, and minimize adverse impacts on established residential neighborhoods. She stated that concentrating commercial activity along Main Street could help establish a downtown and, if planned intentionally, could support the long-term goal of creating and revitalizing a central core that the city had lost. As chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, she stated that they were very mindful of historic homes and wanted to preserve them and the surrounding areas. She expressed hope that in the future, a historic district could be created to protect additional properties.

Jeremy Hill: Jeremy Hill was present to comment on this item and stated that he lived at 90 North Center Street. He expressed that he was against the rezoning. He added that the Commission should also consider the traffic and activities at the fire station, which already contributed to congestion. He noted that adding a strip mall across the street would create even more traffic and problems. He concluded by observing that everyone on North Center Street who was present was against the rezoning, which he said spoke volumes.

Linda Storrer: Linda Storrer was present to comment on this item and stated that she was not a resident of Center Street, having grown up on Apple Street and lived on the east side of town her entire life. She expressed strong opposition to turning the property into commercial use. She noted that many points she wanted to make had already been addressed and highlighted Jeremy Hill's comments regarding the fire station, Veterans Park, and the elementary school, explaining that those locations already changed the

atmosphere of the area and that adding commercial property would further increase traffic and alter the neighborhood. She emphasized pride in the historic home, noting that it was well-loved and cared for, and stated that isolating the home would make that part of town an eyesore. She shared that she had been inside the home as a child and described it as beautiful and structurally unsuitable for use as a B&B or any other business. She expressed gratitude that the family chose to live in and maintain the home. She added that the optics of rezoning 9 and 15 North Center Street to commercial were concerning, noting negative social media attention and public perception. She stated that approving the rezoning would worsen the community's view of city leadership. She concluded by expressing her desire for better outcomes for all of the community and thanked the Commission.

c) Consideration of the proposed amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for Grantsville City.

No comment

AGENDA

1. Consideration of a proposed rezone for 587 E Main Street, in the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation, to RM-15 (Multiple residential District) zoning designation.

Regan Richmond was present to answer questions related to the item. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that while researching the lot at 587 East Main Street, she discovered an error in the zoning designation. The lot was currently shown as CD on the zoning map but was actually zoned CN. She noted that this discrepancy did not affect potential residential uses but did limit commercial options. She highlighted that the property was part of the city's commercial corridor, surrounded by duplexes and with mixed-use high-density and commercial designation on the future land use map. She also displayed images of the lot and the existing house.

Regan Richmond clarified that the house currently occupied only one half of the double lot and that they were interested in the option to build another residential property rather than pursuing commercial use, which would not fit the surrounding neighborhood. Chairman Dalton acknowledged the item had appeared on previous agendas as a concept proposal, and Richmond confirmed there were no concrete plans.

Vice-Chair Sarah Moore asked if there were any specific plans for the lot, and Regan explained that they hoped to create an affordable home for a local family rather than a rental property or high-end home. Commissioner Dwyer expressed support for residential development in this location, noting that while Main Street could support commercial uses, this particular lot was

more suitable for a small home. Commissioner Hill agreed, seeing no reason to oppose the residential use given the context.

Commissioner Horrocks inquired whether the small home would occupy a separate lot. Shelby confirmed the property was currently a single lot, and Regan explained that the dimensions and location did not accommodate meaningful commercial development. Shelby noted that while the lot was technically commercial, it was being used residentially, and rezoning to RM-15 would allow higher-density residential options.

Chairman Dalton stated that he preferred residential development over commercial on this lot and expressed support for rezoning to RM-15.

Derek Dalton made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed rezone for 587 E Main Street, in the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation, to RM-15 (Multiple residential District) zoning designation. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill“Aye”, Jason Hill “Aye”, Chris Horrocks “Aye.”. The motion was carried unanimously.

2. Consideration of a proposed rezone for 15 N Center Street and 9 N Center Street, in the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation, to C-N (Neighborhood Commercial District) zoning designation.

Barry Bunderson, owner of the two lots at 9 and 15 North Center Street, provided background on the property and the proposed rezone. He explained that he had previously sought feedback from the Planning Commission and City Council regarding potential uses for the lots. He provided a brief history of zoning in the area, noting that state-mandated zoning began in 1996 and that historical maps from 2003, 2008, and 2015 showed the area as CS (Commercial Service). Barry also noted his prior involvement as a private engineer on a project for Doug Higley, the historic home owner, during which Higley rezoned part of the property to RM-15 to create three lots consistent with the general plan.

Barry explained that he acquired the lots during delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and had since considered the best use of the property. While acknowledging the residential character of the neighborhood and expressing empathy for the concerns of local residents, he emphasized that the lots have direct access to Main Street and are of interest to commercial businesses. He stated that his intent was to consider what would best serve the overall community rather than pursuing personal profit. Barry noted that he could quickly sell the property for residential development, such as townhomes, but his focus was on community benefit. He also offered to discuss further topics, such as transportation impact fees and the benefits of business-generated tax revenue, if the commission wished.

Commissioner Dwyer addressed Barry and the audience, prefacing her comments by noting she would focus on the specific question at hand regarding potential commercial zoning. She asked Barry if he had any ideas for what type of commercial development he envisioned for the property.

Barry replied that he had no specific plans or buyers in mind. He clarified that he had no contracts, negotiations, or commitments with anyone and that the property was available for purchase at fair market value if someone wished to pursue commercial use.

Commissioner Dwyer then addressed broader concerns raised by residents about the perception of the process, including references to potential backroom deals. She emphasized that, based on her experience, Barry had approached the process transparently and with the intent to benefit the community rather than for personal profit. She praised him for seeking input from the Planning Commission and for considering what would be best for the town.

Commissioner Dwyer shared her background and long-standing ties to Grantsville, explaining that she joined the Planning and Zoning Commission to advocate for residents and support responsible growth. She expressed concern about the town's rapid population increase and reliance on nearby cities, noting that her perspective on the Center Street lots is shaped by her experience and local knowledge. She stated she favored small, locally-owned businesses over higher-density residential development, viewing them as beneficial to the town's economic and social vitality.

Commissioner Hill acknowledged his uncertainty on the issue. He emphasized the importance of considering Grantsville's overall master plan and long-term growth rather than focusing solely on immediate concerns. He noted that the placement of commercial corridors is a key element in the city's long-term planning, which aligned with some points previously raised by Barry.

Commissioner Hill expressed mild concern regarding Barry's acquisition of the property, noting he was aware of its status at the time of purchase. He recognized that he was attempting to revisit or change that designation and appreciated that he had sought input from the Commission. Commissioner Hill explained that he was still weighing the perspectives of community members who had voiced concerns, acknowledging that the property had been rezoned previously and that any change now represented another adjustment.

Barry elaborated on his interest in the property's history, sharing research about the historic home and its original owner, James L. Rathall. Bunderson highlighted Rathall's accomplishments as a successful farmer, business investor, city council member, and school board participant. He read excerpts describing Rathall as a person who "figures more conspicuously and honorably in connection with the business development of Grantsville and Tooele County" and noted his leadership in enterprises that contributed significantly to the community's development.

Barry suggested the Commission might consider Rathall's legacy when making decisions about the property, framing the discussion in terms of what would benefit the broader community rather than individual interests or immediate personal gain. Commissioner Horrocks responded that Barry's historical context addressed his questions and helped clarify the background and significance of the property.

Vice-Chair Sarah Moore noted that while staff had more direct interaction with Barry than the Commission, she aligned with Commissioner Hill's sentiments. She expressed a wish that the Commission could have provided more detailed guidance or options earlier when Barry had presented the concept of a rezone at a previous meet, but recognized that it was not the Commission's role to define development strategies for him.

Vice-Chair Sarah Moore stated that based on her experience with Bunderson, she did not expect extreme development and believed he would pursue a project compatible with the neighborhood. She emphasized that the Commission's role is to serve the community's long-term interests and expressed support for the zoning change. Barry noted that he had consulted neighboring property owners and community members about potential uses, stressing that these discussions were transparent and that he had kept the Mayor informed. Vice-Chair Sarah Moore concluded by addressing common concerns such as traffic or crime, noting these fears had not materialized in past developments, and highlighted the potential benefits of small businesses for the community.

Chairman Dalton acknowledged that property owners generally have the right to use their property as they see fit, but emphasized that rezoning is different. According to the law, the Commission must give careful consideration when a rezone is requested, particularly from residential to commercial.

He expressed concern that the subject property represented a spot zone, surrounded primarily by residential areas. He argued that small commercial uses, such as a print shop or smoke shop, would not meaningfully contribute to the city's long-term commercial development goals, noting that other large commercial areas, including the Twenty Wells property, the Romney Group holdings, and the Shawn Johnson property, already provide significant commercial capacity. He emphasized that this small parcel would not transform Grantsville from a bedroom community into a self-sustaining commercial hub.

Barry clarified the surrounding property uses, noting that commercial buildings adjoined the subject property to the north, west, and east, including a salon and other businesses along Main Street. Chairman Dalton acknowledged these points but maintained his position favoring residential zoning for consistency with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Dwyer asked for clarification regarding the practical implications of rezoning to commercial, specifically whether it would require businesses to occupy the site. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that allowed uses depend on the use table and the

future land use plan. Currently, the property could accommodate commercial development with a conditional use permit, or high-density residential up to 10 dwelling units per acre. She noted that a developer could potentially build more than six units per lot under the RM-15 designation, and that conditional use provisions limit the Commission's ability to restrict development unless a negative impact is demonstrated.

Commissioner Dwyer expressed concern that keeping the property residential could still allow high-density development that might not align with community expectations. She acknowledged the potential for small commercial businesses to benefit the area but highlighted the uncertainty and lack of specific plans for commercial development. Chairman Dalton reiterated that approving a commercial rezone would be premature, as it would allow any type of commercial development without a defined plan, contrasting this with a situation in which a specific commercial proposal was presented.

Shelby further clarified that the RM-15 zoning allows 10–15 dwelling units per acre according to the future land use plan. She emphasized that the proposed commercial zoning (CN) is one of the city's most restrictive commercial zones and reviewed the use table showing conditional and permitted uses, noting that not all commercial activities would be allowed.

Mayor Neil Critchlow addressed the Commission, noting that Barry had recused himself from reviewing any plans related to his own property when he was hired as the city's engineer to avoid conflicts of interest.

Barry asked the Commission to consider the broader 15-year vision for Main Street, referencing the city's general plan and future land use maps. Chairman Dalton responded that while commercial uses are generally intended for Main Street, the subject property on Center Street is primarily residential, and practical constraints make it unsuitable for significant commercial development. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore highlighted Goal Three of the General Plan, emphasizing a choice between high-density residential development or preserving the potential for low-impact neighborhood commercial use.

Vice-Chair Sarah Moore noted that state law protects property owners from restrictions unless there is clear evidence of egregious impact, emphasizing the importance of balancing landowner rights with community considerations. City Attorney Tysen Barker explained that rezoning is a legislative act requiring legitimate land use purposes and written findings of fact, with public input considered but not determinative.

Sarah Moore made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed rezone for 15 N Center Street and 9 N Center Street, in the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation, to C-N (Neighborhood Commercial District) zoning designation. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote

was as follows: Derek Dalton “Nay”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Jason Hill“Aye”, Chris Horrocks “Nay.”. The motion was carried 3 to 2

3. Consideration of the proposed amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for Grantsville City.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore introduced the discussion regarding proposed amendments to Grantsville City’s park and transportation Capital Facilities Plans and associated impact fee analyses. Robert Rosselle, consultant with Ensign Engineering, explained that the 2025 Second Amendment included minor adjustments to parks, such as renaming Eastmore Park to Scott Bevan Memorial Park with ADA improvements, and reclassifying phased projects at Scenic Slopes for funding flexibility. Transportation updates reflected recent project completions and reclassified Sheep Lane from a planned widening to a rehabilitation project, reducing associated costs by approximately \$2,700, since UDOT is not currently widening SR 112 and 138 and industrial growth in the area remains limited.

Robert described the methodology for calculating impact fees, including maintaining a 5% growth rate, evaluating non-capital project costs, and excluding water and sewer adjustments pending the upcoming wastewater treatment plan. He noted the city had shifted from six-year to annual amendments to ensure fees remain current and recoverable for new development projects. Impact fees were based on level-of-service standards, with parks at four acres per 1,000 population, and non-residential fees tied to peak-hour trips and developer-submitted traffic studies. Trailer fees were removed due to updated code prohibitions.

Chairman Dalton and Vice-Chair Sarah Moore asked questions regarding the rehabilitation designation for Sheep Lane. Robert and Shelby explained that only additional capacity improvements are impact-fee eligible, standard maintenance or patching is funded separately.

Commissioner Hill raised concerns about the sufficiency of impact fees for road construction quality and the city’s inspection oversight. Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe clarified that impact fees fund new or expanded infrastructure, not remedial repairs, and that developer compliance with specifications affects long-term road performance. Commissioner Hill also emphasized the need to ensure new parks and infrastructure funded by impact fees would not leave the city underfunded.

Vice-Chair Sarah Moore questioned the relevance of comparing Grantsville’s fees to much larger cities. Bill and Robert explained that comparisons are illustrative and no true “apples-to-apples” exists due to variations in city size, development type, and infrastructure needs. Commissioner Hill suggested limiting comparisons to similarly sized cities with comparable demographics, which was supported by other commissioners. The group discussed adjustments to water and

transportation fees, including the Soelbergs Development saving approximately \$200,000 due to negotiated fee adjustments approved by the City Council.

Attorney Tysen Barker clarified the legal framework regarding impact fee adjustments and City Council decisions. He confirmed that the City Council's decision to waive or modify impact fees for the Soelbergs Development was fully within its legislative authority and legally defensible. He emphasized that while such adjustments may appear unconventional, such as occurring late in the process, they remain legitimate under state law.

The Commission discussed the ongoing need to update the plans regularly to ensure impact fees remain equitable, reflect actual project costs, and support city growth without creating undue burden on the general fund.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of the proposed amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for Grantsville City. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Derek Dalton “Nay”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Jason Hill“Aye.” The motion was carried 4 to 1.

4. Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting, and the December 2, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Derek Dalton made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from November 18, 2025. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: The vote was as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Jason Hill“Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

Derek Dalton made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from December 2, 2025. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Jason Hill“Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously.

5. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reminded the Commissioners that they are required to complete four hours of training before the January 6th meeting

Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe shared insights from his recent attendance at the APA conference, offering observations that could inform the Commission's work. He also reminded the Commissioners that the upcoming meeting would include discussion and potential nominations for chair and vice-chair positions, encouraging members to consider their interest in

serving in those leadership roles. He expressed appreciation for Chairman Dalton's contributions, thanking him for his service and dedication to the Planning Commission.

6. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Dalton reflected on his three years on the Planning Commission, describing it as a valuable and enjoyable experience. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity to work with a diverse group of knowledgeable individuals, noting that while disagreements occurred, the exchange of ideas had been enriching. He expressed hope that his contributions had been positive and conveyed confidence in the Commission's continued effectiveness. Chairman Dalton briefly mentioned the newly appointed alternate member, noting that a full-time position would eventually be filled, with the new commissioner expected to attend the next meeting.

Chairman Dalton encouraged Commissioners to stay engaged, ask questions, ensure proper procedures are followed, and speak up when concerns arise. He also highlighted the upcoming agenda item on the next City Council meeting regarding the resignation policy, explaining that Commissioners running for City Council must resign, a process that has historically supported successful transitions.

7. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Jake Thomas expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission and to Commissioner Derek Hill for their service. He emphasized the value of public comment, noting that focusing on the issues rather than personal attacks can provide important insights. He encouraged Commissioners to ask questions, engage fully with the issues, and educate themselves before making decisions. He acknowledged that public service is challenging and highly visible but encouraged Commissioners to remain positive, stay engaged, and focus on their work, noting that this approach also helps inform the public.

8. Adjourn. Derek Jason

Derek Dalton made a motion to adjourn. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Derek Dalton “Aye”, Sarah Moore “Aye,” Deborah Dwyer “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”, Jason Hill “Aye.” The motion was carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.