

**MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL,  
HELD ON JANUARY 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, LOCATED AT  
429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA  
ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.**

**Mayor and Council Members Present:**

Mayor Heidi Hammond  
Councilmember Rhett Butler  
Councilmember Derek Dalton

Councilmember Jake Thomas  
Councilmember Jeff Williams

**Council Members Excused:** none.

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:**

Michael Resare, City Manager  
Alicia Fairbourne, City Recorder  
Tysen Barker, City Attorney  
Shelby Moore, Planning & Zoning Admin  
Robert Sager, Police Chief

Bill Cobabe, Comm. Development Director  
Heidi Jeffries, Treasurer (via Zoom)  
Detective Bobby Bassett  
Officer David Morris  
K9 Officer Zero

**Citizens and Guests Present or online via Zoom:** Geoff Dupaix, Travis Hair, Mary Bishop, Sheila Snow, Les Peterson, Kaycee Foster, Regan Richmond, Lynn Hollinger, Chad Hembree, Amanda Mair, Arlene Mair, Dee Mair, Andy Jensen, Andrew Kelsch, Gwyn Kelsch, Nicole Cloward, Daniel Meza, Barry Bunderson, Diana Bunderson, Gary Merrill, Robert Rousselle, and others who may not have signed in using their full name or only a phone number via Zoom, or handwriting was illegible.

Mayor Hammond called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked Jolene Jenkins to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA:**

**1. Public Comment**

Mayor Hammond opened the floor for public comment at 7:01 p.m. There were none. The floor was closed.

**2. Summary Action Items:**

**a. Approval of Minutes from the December 17, 2025 City Council Regular Meeting.**

There were no corrections or comments.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve the Meeting Minutes from the December 17, 2025 City Council Regular Meeting.

**Second:** Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**b. Approval of Bills**

Councilmember Dalton asked for clarification regarding a concept permit refund associated with a rezone application. Planning & Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that applicants seeking preliminary guidance are charged a concept fee instead of a rezone fee, and if the applicant later proceeds with the rezone, the concept fee is reimbursed and replaced with the rezone fee.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve the invoices.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**3. Presentation by the Grantsville City Police Department to Tooele Martial Arts Academy.**

Chief Sager presented a recognition on behalf of the Grantsville City Police Department to representatives of Tooele Martial Arts Academy, thanking Keith Azbury and Andrew Arellano for their longstanding support and training provided to Grantsville officers. He stated that the Academy had donated significant time and resources to help officers develop defensive tactics and self-defense skills that improved officer safety and community protection. Detective Bobby Bassett and Officer David Morris also addressed the Council, explaining that the training had elevated the department’s defensive tactics program, reduced use of force incidents, and increased officer confidence through safe and humane control techniques. Mayor Hammond thanked the representatives for their service and invited them to pause for a photograph before concluding the presentation.

Council Member Butler stated that, due to the presence of several members of the Veterans Memorial Park Committee in attendance, he proposed moving agenda item number nine forward to be considered next.

**Motion:** Council Member Butler moved to proceed to agenda item number nine.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**4. Consideration of Resolution 2026-01, a Resolution adopting the Utah Department of Transportation Corridor Agreements for State Route 138 and State Route 112 within Grantsville City Boundaries**

Mr. Resare stated that representatives from UDOT were present to address the item, and Ms. Moore provided an overview, explaining that the corridor agreements addressed existing and future access locations, signal spacing, future routes, and coordination with the City's master transportation plan.

Mr. Geoff Dupaix, representing UDOT, explained that the agreements were based on the Tooele Valley Area Study, which evaluated future traffic performance in light of projected growth throughout the valley. He stated that the purpose of the agreements was to identify planned signal locations and access spacing to better manage traffic flow and support coordinated land use and development. He noted that similar agreements were being presented to Tooele County, Tooele City, and Erda, as the corridors passed through multiple jurisdictions. He also explained that the agreements had been reviewed by City and state attorneys, with revisions made to address dispute resolution provisions.

At the request of the Mayor and Council, Mr. Dupaix briefly reviewed the proposed signal locations along State Route 112 and State Route 138, including future collector road connections and spacing objectives. Clarification was provided regarding Hale Street and other signal improvements, and Council Members asked questions regarding Sheep Lane, future construction timing, and right-of-way coordination. Mr. Dupaix stated that some signal improvements were anticipated later in the spring, subject to final approvals and right-of-way acquisition.

Council Member Dalton identified an error in Section 1 of the draft resolution referencing a rezone that was unrelated to the corridor agreements. City Attorney Tysen Barker confirmed the language was incorrect and clarified that the resolution should state approval of the UDOT corridor agreements for State Route 112 and State Route 138 only. He further stated that he was comfortable with the agreement following revisions to the dispute resolution language. Ms. Moore and UDOT representatives explained that the updated agreements were driven by recent growth, completed studies, and the need to replace outdated corridor plans. Mayor Hammond asked if there were any additional questions or concerns before proceeding.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-01, a Resolution adopting the Utah Department of Transportation Corridor Agreements for State Route 138 and State Route 112 within Grantsville City Boundaries with the correction noted in Section 1.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**5. Public Hearing: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-01, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans,**

### **Impact Fee Facilities Plans, and Impact Fee Analysis for Grantsville City.**

Mayor Hammond explained that the item required a public hearing and that a presentation would be given prior to public comment. Mr. Robert Rousselle of Ensign Engineering presented the proposed amendments, stating that impact fee plans were updated periodically and that the most recent changes focused on parks and transportation. He explained that impact fees could only be charged to new development and were intended to fund growth related public facilities. He noted that the amendments resulted in a reduction of certain impact fees, including a decrease of approximately \$100 per dwelling unit, and explained that demographic assumptions remained based on a 5 percent growth rate consistent with prior studies.

Mr. Rousselle explained that park-related amendments included updating project names and costs, including renaming Eastmoor Park to Scott Bevan Park and revising the Scenic Slopes project phases and costs based on recent bids. For transportation, he stated that recent roadway projects had been incorporated and that Sheep Lane was removed as an impact fee eligible project because it was no longer planned as a new roadway expansion within the applicable timeframe. He further explained that non-residential transportation impact fees would shift from a square footage-based model to a project specific approach requiring trip generation or traffic impact studies, allowing fees to be assessed based on actual traffic impacts rather than building size alone.

At 7:41 p.m., Mayor Hammond opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The floor was closed.

During Council discussion, Mr. Resare explained that the amendments would reduce projected impact fee revenue but would improve fairness and scalability, particularly for large industrial and commercial developments. He stated that the changes would reduce staff time spent allocating square footage categories and would rely on developer-provisioned studies reviewed by City staff and engineers. Council Members asked questions regarding budget impacts, timing of fee changes, treatment of previously approved fees, costs of traffic studies, applicability to residential development, and the City's long-term responsibility for Sheep Lane. Staff clarified that the changes would not apply retroactively, that residential projects would not be required to complete traffic studies, and that impact fees could only be used for projects listed in the adopted plans.

Additional discussion addressed long term planning for major roadway costs, potential future transportation assessments, and coordination with regional growth and UDOT planning efforts. Council Members expressed appreciation for the updated approach, asked about unintended consequences, and discussed the importance of balancing development impacts with long term infrastructure funding.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve Ordinance 2026-01, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans, Impact Fee Facilities Plans, and Impact Fee Analysis for Grantsville City.

**Second:** Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**6. Consideration of Ordinance 2026-02, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a Master Development Agreement for the Cloward Court Minor Subdivision, including easement and access rights.**

Ms. Moore introduced the discussion and stated that the item had been approved unanimously by the Planning Commission the previous evening and noted that clerical errors related to zoning designations had been corrected and redistributed. She explained that the agreement addressed a private lane, utility access, and easements, including responsibility for maintenance of the private lane, water meters, fire hydrant, and sewer facilities, with maintenance obligations assigned to Ms. Cloward. Council Members confirmed the Planning Commission’s prior approval and asked clarifying questions regarding the hammerhead turnaround, roadway surface, and fire access. Ms. Moore explained that the turnaround had been approved with the recorded plat, that the drive would be a gravel private lane, and that fire staff had reviewed the construction plans to ensure all weather access standards were met. Councilmember Butler noted that the agreement generally followed the newly approved Master Development Agreement format, with non-applicable provisions removed.

**Motion:** Councilmember Dalton moved to approve Ordinance 2026-02, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a Master Development Agreement for the Cloward Court Minor Subdivision, including easement and access rights.

**Second:** Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**7. Consideration of Ordinance 2026-03, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a rezone for certain real property located at 15 North Center Street and 9 North Center Street from the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation to the C-N (Neighborhood Commercial District) zoning designation.**

Ms. Moore explained that the applicant had previously submitted a concept proposal to both the Planning Commission and City Council to receive feedback on whether the property should remain residential or be rezoned commercial in accordance with the General Plan. She stated that feedback from prior discussions indicated support for commercial zoning, noting that the property was located on Center Street adjacent to existing commercial uses and the fire station, and that the site had previously been zoned commercial before being rezoned to RM-15 following a subdivision. She explained that the C-N zoning was one of the City’s more restrictive commercial districts and allowed limited, small scale commercial uses, while RM-15 would permit higher density residential development. Ms. Moore stated that the Planning Commission vote had been split but resulted in a recommendation for approval.

Council Members discussed the surrounding zoning, traffic considerations, and compatibility with nearby properties, noting that much of the adjacent land was already zoned commercial. Council Members also discussed the historical home located nearby and confirmed that its zoning was not being changed by the proposed action. Councilmember Dalton asked questions regarding potential conflicts of interest under Utah ethics laws due to the property owner's current employment with the City. Ms. Moore and Mr. Resare stated that the ownership had been disclosed and that the property owner was not employed by the City at the time of the initial concept application. Mr. Barker stated that disclosure requirements had been satisfied and that City employment did not require relinquishment of private property rights, and that the application did not create an appearance of impropriety or legal risk.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve Ordinance 2026-03, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a rezone for certain real property located at 15 North Center Street and 9 North Center Street from the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation to the C-N (Neighborhood Commercial district) zoning designation.

**Second:** Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Nay"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". The motion carried 3-1.

**8. Consideration of Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a rezone of real property located at 587 East Main Street from the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation.**

Ms. Moore presented the item and explained that the subject property was currently zoned commercial and located within an area planned as a future commercial corridor. She stated that staff had concerns with removing commercial zoning in that area but noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval and that no public comments had been received during its review.

Council Members discussed the location of the property, surrounding zoning, and the City's long-term goal of maintaining commercial corridors. Ms. Moore confirmed that a single-family dwelling was permitted within the current commercial zoning and noted that the existing home on the property had been substantially improved by the owner. The property owner addressed the Council and explained that the lot was not large enough to reasonably support a commercial use without acquiring adjacent properties, and that the intent of the rezone was to allow for an additional residential dwelling rather than commercial redevelopment. He stated that significant investment had already been made in the existing home and that there was no intention to remove it.

Council Members asked questions regarding subdivision options, lot size limitations, and whether alternative zoning approaches could allow residential use while retaining commercial zoning. Ms. Moore explained that the property was a legal nonconforming lot created by metes and bounds and that additional structures were not permitted without rezoning or subdivision that met current standards. Council Members acknowledged the

applicant's efforts to improve the property and discussed the balance between commercial planning goals and practical development constraints.

**Motion:** Councilmember Williams moved to approve Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance of Grantsville City approving a rezone of real property located at 587 East Main Street from the C-D (Commercial Development District) zoning designation to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) zoning designation.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Nay"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Nay"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". With the vote tied, Mayor Hammond voted "Nay." The motion failed.

**9. Discussion and possible approval of the amended design of the Veterans Memorial Park with a reduced scope of work, and consideration of Adopting Resolution 2026-03 approving the redesign.**

City Manager Michael Resare explained that bids for the original Veterans Memorial Park design had exceeded the available budget, requiring a redesign with a reduced scope of work. He stated that the revised design reduced concrete elements, slightly reduced and re-centered the heart feature, adjusted electrical components, and removed the pavilion, while maintaining the overall intent of the project. He requested Council approval of the amended design so the project could be rebid using the revised plans.

Ms. Casey Foster and **Mr. Dean**, representing the Veterans Memorial Park Committee, addressed the Council and stated that although the original bids were disappointing, they believed the revised scope would allow the project to proceed within budget while preserving the approved design concept. They explained that the changes improved accessibility, provided additional landscaping space, did not alter the statue, and maintained plans for a living memorial wall recognizing veterans, with the ability for future expansion. Council Members expressed support for the revised design, noted the benefits of the adjusted layout, and thanked the committee for its continued efforts. Mayor Hammond confirmed that the item was eligible for Council action.

**Motion:** Councilmember Thomas moved to approve Resolution 2026-03, a Resolution approving the amended design of the Veterans Memorial Park with a reduced scope of work.

**Second:** Butler seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**10. Discussion and possible action on rescheduling the Regular Meeting from January 21<sup>st</sup> to January 22<sup>nd</sup>.**

The Council discussed rescheduling the January 21 regular meeting due to its conflict with Elected Officials Day at the Capitol. Mayor Hammond explained that the event involved

an early start and a full day of meetings and that the January 21 meeting was also scheduled to include interviews and selection of a new council member to fill the vacancy, which could require additional time. She proposed moving the meeting to January 22 and changing the start time to 6:00 p.m. to allow sufficient time to address all agenda items.

Council Member Butler asked about statutory timelines for filling a council vacancy. City Recorder Alicia Fairbourne explained that notice of the meeting to fill the vacancy was required at least 14 days in advance and that the meeting could be renoticed without changing the application deadline. Staff further explained that the Council had 30 days to fill the vacancy, with additional statutory procedures applying if the vacancy was not filled within that period. Mayor Hammond noted that applications were due January 16 and that City Hall would be closed that afternoon for maintenance, with applicants directed to submit materials at the Justice Court building. Council Members discussed the potential length of the interview process and agreed to revisit scheduling needs closer to the deadline. Mayor Hammond asked if there were any objections to the proposed date and time change, and no objections were raised.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve rescheduling the Regular Meeting from January 21<sup>st</sup> to January 22<sup>nd</sup> and to start at 6:00 p.m.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

## 11. Adjourn

There being no further business, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to adjourn.

**Motion:** Councilmember Williams moved to adjourn.

**Second:** Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.