

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of an appeal by Courtney Rossow of the Zoning Administrator's denial of a request to keep one large animal at 565 S. McKay Circle, located in the R-1-21 zoning district, due to the property's failure to meet the required open space requirement.	Approved
#2	Proposed Conditional Use Permit for a Micro-Entrepreneurship allowing Vickie Lake and Kathleen Hunt to own and operate a home-based business consisting of a farm stand and the sale of cottage food products and non-food craft goods at the property located at 10 W Clark Street in the RM-7 zone.	Approved
#4	Approval of minutes from the January 20, 2026, and the February 3, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meetings.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON FEBRUARY 17, 2026 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 Sarah Moore, Vice-Chair Jason Hill, Commissioner John Montgomery, Commissioner Gary Merrill

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent:

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Community Development Director Bill Cobabe, City Council Member Derek Dalton, City Recorder Alisha Fairborne, Sargent Sager, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman, City Planner/GIS Analysty Tae-Eun Ko, Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, City Attorney Tysen Barker

On Zoom:

Citizens and Guests Present: Jeremy Bendi Xer, Courtney Rossow, Ian Howard, Vickie Lake, Kathleen Hunt

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Unknowns

Commission 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 Tuesday, February 7, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Sarah Moore explained that the Planning Commission would implement a revised meeting format in which each agenda item would include a staff or applicant presentation, followed by public comment, and then Commission discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner Montgomery noted that he had seen a similar format used previously. Chair Sarah Moore responded that it had been beneficial in the past and expressed confidence it would improve meeting flow. She reminded attendees that public comment would be limited to three minutes per speaker, without back-and-forth dialogue, though Commissioners could ask clarifying questions during presentations. The meeting then proceeded to the first agenda item.

AGENDA

1. Presentation, Public Hearing, and Discussion and Consideration: Appeal by Courtney Rossow of the Zoning Administrator's denial of a request to keep one large animal at 565 S. McKay Circle, located in the R-1-21 zoning district, based on the property's failure to meet the required open space standard.

Presentation by Community Development Director Bill Cobabe

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that the request was being brought on behalf of property owners located on Makay Circle who wished to keep a horse on their property along with associated accessory structures.

Bill Cobabe stated that the request conflicted with the City's zoning ordinance in two primary ways. First, the property did not meet the minimum open space requirements necessary to house a large animal under the current code. Second, certain accessory structures had been placed within required setback areas for the zone. As a result, Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore had issued a letter of denial due to not meeting the setback and open space requirement for 1 horse. However, pursuant to City Code, that determination could be appealed to the Planning Commission for review and a final decision.

Bill Cobabe clarified that the request before the Commission was not a variance but rather involved consideration under the conditional use framework. He acknowledged that the City's code allows the Planning Commission, in certain instances, to apply conditions or consider deviations if impacts can be appropriately mitigated. He concluded by offering to answer any questions regarding the standards outlined in the staff report and stated that the matter was now before the Commission for consideration.

Chair Sarah Moore thanked him for the detailed staff report and indicated that the Commission had sufficient information.

Bill Cobabe noted that the applicants were present and available to answer questions. He advised that if Commissioners had specific questions for the applicants, it would be appropriate to ask those prior to opening the public hearing. He added that the Commission could also raise additional questions or concerns after receiving public comment, if necessary.

Public Hearing

Email Received 02/15/2026:

Hi, my name is Janet Gonzalez from 410 W Williams Lane Grantsville, Utah 84029. I have spoke to our neighbor about the smell. I told them it was way too strong because the horse urines next to our house. If they can move the horse where the yellow section of the picture you mail me it might help with the smell.

Email Received 02/15/2026:

This email is in response to a letter received in regards to Courtny Rossow's request for appeal of the Zoning Administrator's denial of a request to keep one large animal at 565 S. McKay Cir.

We are the Parks family and live across the street from 565 S. McKay Cir, at 436 W. Williams Ln. Our family has no issues with a large animal at this residence. They have been very meticulous at cleaning up the animal waste every week. There is plenty of space for the animal and they have ensured that the animal is well taken care of. The horse has a great temperament, is kind, and in all honesty is nice to have in what I would think would be a more "country" town.

I understand that there are "minimum open space" requirements, but if the neighbors do not have an issue with the location of the horse, then it shouldn't be an issue for you.

The owners at 565 S. McKay Cir, have already made improvements to the home and landscape that the previous owners failed to do. I expect that they'll be continuing to improve and beautify their home to contribute to a lacking neighborhood. It would be one thing if the owners allowed their home and space for their animal to become ugly, uncared for, and smelly, but that's not the case.

Please reconsider the appeal and allow them to keep their horse on their property.

Sincerely,

The Parks

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Montgomery began by asking whether the violation had been triggered by a neighbor complaint or by staff observation. Courtney Rossow responded that they had been told there was no complaint and that a City employee had observed the horse and structures while driving by. She explained that they were first-time homebuyers who had recently moved from Washington State and had relied on their realtor and the property listing, which identified the property as horse property. Ian Howard added that he had conducted what he believed to be thorough research online before constructing the shed and shelter and had not found clear information regarding the setback or easement restrictions.

Courtney Rossow stated that the shelter was placed on skids so it could be moved if required. She added that they had spoken with neighboring property owners before construction to ensure the structure would not obstruct views or create concerns. According to her, neighbors indicated they had no objections.

Commissioner Merrill asked which subdivision the property was located in. Ian Howard responded that it was Wells Crossing, the last road south off Mormon Trail.

Commissioner Merrill observed that the shed appeared movable and stated that relocating it could resolve the setback issue. He then focused on the lot size and open space requirement, explaining that the code required 10,000 square feet of qualifying open space located at least 100 feet from neighboring dwellings. Based on the staff report, he noted that only approximately 6,500 square feet of the property met both the size and separation requirements.

Ian Howard acknowledged that while the total pasture area is 10,000 square feet, only about 6,500 square feet complied with both standards. Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe clarified that the lot was approximately 0.6 acres and that the 100-foot setback requirement significantly reduced the amount of qualifying area.

Courtney Rossow stated that they cleaned the pasture weekly and had begun using odor-control pellets and powder after receiving a complaint about smell. Ian Howard added that neighborhood children frequently visited the fence to see the horse and that interactions with neighbors had generally been positive.

Commissioner Merrill stated that he struggled with the request. While he supported property rights, he expressed concern about setting a precedent. He explained that approving a request for a property that did not meet ordinance requirements would make it difficult to deny similar

requests in the future. He told the applicants that the property clearly did not meet the code standards, which made approval challenging.

Courtney Rossow responded that the conditional use permit process was intended to evaluate individual circumstances. She emphasized that they were requesting approval for only one horse, had followed the process, and had neighbor support.

Vice Chair Hill stated that he appreciated the applicants' cooperation and compliance with the appeal process. However, he said he could not support allowing the accessory structures to remain within required setbacks, noting the Commission had denied similar setback requests in the past and needed to remain consistent. He stated he was considering whether approval for one horse could be structured under existing nuisance standards in the code. He also observed that seasonal impacts, including flies and odor, could be significantly worse during summer months.

Chair Sarah Moore shared her experience living near horses and explained that flies and odor intensify during warmer weather. She stated that the 100-foot setback requirement existed to address public health and nuisance concerns. She also expressed concern that current neighbor support might not reflect long-term neighborhood conditions, as property ownership changes over time. She emphasized the Commission's responsibility to apply the ordinance consistently and consider long-term impacts.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that although the applicants should have confirmed compliance before purchasing the property, he did not believe the Commission should unnecessarily interfere if neighbors were not being harmed. He suggested that approval could be conditioned on compliance with nuisance standards, with the understanding that substantiated complaints could result in the permit being revisited.

City Attorney Tysen Barker clarified that any conditions must be grounded in standards contained in City code, such as odor, flies, or nuisance thresholds. He explained that revocation of a conditional use permit would require due process and an opportunity for the applicants to be heard.

Throughout the discussion, Courtney Rossow and Ian Howard reiterated their willingness to relocate the shed and shelter to comply with setback requirements. They also offered to install a privacy fence, increase cleaning frequency, and implement additional measures to mitigate odor and flies. They emphasized that they were seeking approval for one horse only and were attempting to be responsible and cooperative property owners.

Vice Chair Hill stated that he would make a motion. He moved to approve the appeal of Courtney Rossow regarding the zoning administrator's denial for the request to keep one large animal at 565 South McKay Circle, located in the R-1-12 district. He stated that the approval

would be subject to conditions, including that the use not create a nuisance and that the applicants comply with City code.

As he continued, Vice Chair Hill stated that the applicants would be required to bring all structures into compliance with setback requirements, pay all applicable fees, comply with health and safety standards, limit the scope of use to one animal, and acknowledge that the permit would be subject to administrative review. He further stated that failure to comply with the conditions could result in revocation of the permit.

Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman asked for clarification regarding the condition referencing compliance with setbacks. She noted that the horse itself did not meet the setback requirement and asked whether the motion intended to require the horse to be kept in a specific area. Vice Chair Hill clarified that he was referring specifically to the structures meeting setback requirements, not relocating the horse to a different portion of the yard.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the location of the horse within the yard would be at the applicants' discretion, noting that one neighbor had suggested keeping the horse within the yellow area identified in the staff report, to help with the odor. Ian Howard responded that they believed they could work out the horse's location within the yard.

City Attorney Tysen Barker clarified that the conditional use designation required compliance with the code and that if the applicants complied with the prescribed standards, the conditional use could remain. He explained that the conditions needed to tie back to standards already in the code.

Commissioner Montgomery suggested that the structure could potentially be placed as close as possible to the compliant area to reduce impact. Courtney Rossow responded that they could move the structure but could not place it within the yellow area due to the setback and separation requirements. Commissioner Merrill clarified that the primary issue was not only the structure placement but also the required square footage and 100-foot separation for the animal itself.

Chair Sarah Moore clarified that the shed in the front yard violated the 30-foot setback from the road and would need to be relocated. She explained that the rear shelter would need to be moved slightly to comply with the setback requirement and suggested that relocating it toward the interior of the backyard could allow the horse access while bringing it into compliance.

Courtney Rossow asked whether a variance would be appropriate. Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe clarified that a variance was a specific legal action handled by the Board of Adjustment and that the applicants were not seeking a variance in this case. He stated that the Commission should avoid using the term to prevent confusion.

Bill Cobabe then asked that the motion be restated for clarity, noting that the discussion following the original motion had made it somewhat unclear for the record.

Commissioner Merrill stated that he wanted to be clear for the record that he believed the applicants were facing a very difficult situation. He said that even if the conditional use permit were granted, he believed it would be a significant uphill battle for them moving forward. He stated that, in his opinion, it was likely that a nuisance complaint would arise in the future, particularly during the summer months, and that such a complaint could be valid. He acknowledged that he could be wrong and said he hoped he was wrong for their sake, but reiterated that his gut feeling was that the situation would not last long-term without issue.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of an appeal by Courtney Rossow of the Zoning Administrator's denial of a request to keep one large animal at 565 S. McKay Circle, located in the R-1-21 zoning district, due to the property's failure to meet the required open space requirement. With the following conditions: Required to comply with City Code regarding the setback for structures. Payment of Fees: All fees associated with the permit and future permit must be paid. Health and Safety Standards: All industry standards regarding health, safety, and welfare regulations must be followed. Scope of Use: The use of the property must remain within the parameters approved in the application. Any expansion of use requires prior approval. Administrative Review: This permit may be periodically reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and/or reviewed if any complaints are received. Non-Compliance Consequences: Failure to comply with any of these requirements may result in revocation of the permit. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Nye," Jason Hill "Aye," "Gary Merrill "Aye" and John Montgomery "Aye." The motion was carried 3 to 1 the motion passed.

2. Presentation, Public Hearing, and Discussion and Consideration: Proposed Conditional Use Permit for a micro-entrepreneurship allowing Vickie Lake and Kathleen Hunt to operate a home-based business consisting of a farm stand and the sale of cottage food products and non-food craft goods at 10 W Clark Street, located in the RM-7 zoning district.

Presentation by Community Development Director Bill Cobabe

Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe stated that the Commission was already familiar with what was being proposed and the location of the project. He explained that the applicant was present and had been patient throughout the review process. He noted that the applicant had worked well with staff and had been cooperative as staff worked through outstanding issues to reach what he described as a good place in the review.

Bill Cobabe stated that staff felt comfortable with the proposal at its current stage. He directed the Commission's attention to the conditions outlined in the staff report, explaining that those conditions were intended to address potential concerns associated with the property. He encouraged the Commissioners to review those conditions carefully and invited questions or concerns from the Commission.

Public Hearing

Email Received 2/10/2026:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am Carol Hawker Malone, Trustee of the trust that owns the property located at 52 East North Street, Grantsville, Utah.

This is in response to a notification I received by mail on Monday, February 9, 2026, regarding the public hearing to be held on February 17, 2026, at 7 p.m. at Grantsville City Hall to discuss the Conditional Use Permit written about in the subject line of this email.

I have no comments about this Conditional Use Permit other than to say that I have no concerns regarding it and see no problem with allowing it to be granted.

Sincerely yours,

Carol Hawker Malone

Discussion and Consideration

Vice Chair Hill began the discussion by thanking the applicants for their patience as the Commission worked through the new micro-entrepreneurship ordinance. He expressed support for the concept but stated that his primary concern remained the placement of detached accessory structures in the front yard.

Vickie Lake responded that the buildings could be relocated if necessary, although she preferred to keep them near the front of the property. She explained that the lot was a corner parcel and that moving the structures to the rear would direct customers into her backyard, which she wanted to avoid. She preferred the activity to remain visible from the street.

Chair Sarah Moore acknowledged the importance of visibility but explained that the issue was not the business concept itself. Rather, the zoning code prohibits detached accessory buildings in required front yards. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe clarified that while the micro-entrepreneurship ordinance permits certain activities, it does not override the base zoning restrictions on front-yard structures.

Vickie Lake acknowledged the front-yard limitations, particularly on a corner lot where both street frontages may be considered front yards, but emphasized that the structures were set back and not creating hazards. She described the operation as a small cooperative-style farm stand featuring flowers, produce, cottage foods, quilts, and crafts from local contributors, not a commercial storefront.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether one structure could be used strictly for storage rather than customer access. Vickie Lake explained that the additional sheds were intended for enclosed display space, as the original farm stand was small and open.

The Commission discussed possible alternatives, including attaching a structure to the home or using movable buildings. Chair Sarah Moore reiterated that the concern centered on detached buildings in the front yard. Vice Chair Hill emphasized the need for consistency and precedent, noting that approving detached front-yard structures could create challenges for future applications.

Discussion turned to the dual street frontage. Vice Chair Hill indicated he viewed the Hale Street frontage differently from Clark Street, since the home's primary façade faced Clark. Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman provided frontage measurements of approximately 140 feet along Clark Street and 197 feet along Hale Street. The Commission also discussed parking capacity and lot width.

Vickie Lake confirmed that two of the sheds exceeded 10 by 10 feet, with one approaching 200 square feet, while the farm stand itself was smaller. Commissioner Montgomery suggested limiting the operation to two structures within the 10 by 10 size allowance to reduce intensity concerns identified in the staff report. Chair Sarah Moore referenced the staff report, explaining that multiple retail-style structures and visible display areas risked shifting the operation from a low-impact micro-business to a small retail establishment. The goal, she stated, was to maintain residential compatibility.

Chair Sarah Moore reviewed the proposed conditions, including limits on hours of operation, traffic consistent with a home occupation, compliance with setbacks, prohibition of unscreened outdoor storage, maintenance of required licenses, and revocation for noncompliance. Business activity was expected to occur primarily within one enclosed structure, with limited accessory display.

Commissioner Montgomery suggested a configuration allowing one 10 by 10 structure near the existing farm stand location and another similar structure along the Hale frontage, provided it was not directly in front of the home's front exterior. Any additional structure used strictly for storage would be relocated to the rear yard.

Vickie Lake agreed she could operate with two customer-facing structures and relocate one building to the backyard for storage only.

Chair Sarah Moore summarized that the Commission appeared comfortable limiting the site to two customer-facing structures with defined size limits, with all other storage complying with setback and screening requirements. The applicants confirmed their agreement.

Commissioner Merrill explained that while he appreciated the collaborative effort taking place, he felt the Commission was piecing the layout together during the meeting rather than reviewing a finalized plan from the applicants. He stated that he preferred the applicants return with a revised site plan that clearly showed exact building dimensions and precise placement so that the Commission was not finalizing those details mid-discussion.

Commissioner Merrill then moved to deny the application without prejudice. He clarified that he was not attempting to stop the project, but rather to allow the applicants to return quickly with a refined and clearly documented plan that aligned with the Commission's direction.

Chair Sarah Moore sought clarification. She repeated that he was making a motion to deny and asked whether that was his intent.

Commissioner Merrill confirmed that he was moving to deny without prejudice.

Chair Sarah Moore then turned to City Attorney Tysen Barker and asked whether the item could instead be approved that evening if the Commission clearly articulated the desired configuration and conditions in the motion.

City Attorney Tysen Barker responded that approval could proceed if the motion was sufficiently specific. He explained that as long as the Commission clearly described the structure sizes, placement expectations, and code-based conditions, staff would be able to administer the permit. He stated that the key was ensuring the conditions were clearly tied to standards already contained in the ordinance.

Commissioner Montgomery commented that "without prejudice" simply meant the denial would not be final, but he questioned whether denial was necessary if the Commission already understood the configuration it wanted.

Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe then addressed the Commission. He explained that a formal denial even without prejudice would require the applicants to restart the application process and repay associated fees. He stated that if the Commission's goal was to allow revisions without financial penalty, tabling the item would preserve the existing application. He further advised that if the Commission chose to table, it should provide specific direction so the applicants understood exactly what changes were expected.

Upon hearing that denial would require the applicants to reapply and repay fees, Commissioner Merrill clarified that this was not his intention. He stated that he had believed “deny without prejudice” would allow them to return without restarting the process. He then withdrew his motion and reiterated that his only concern was having a clear and precise plan reflected in the record.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Conditional Use Permit for a micro-entrepreneurship allowing Vickie Lake and Kathleen Hunt to operate a home-based business consisting of a farm stand and the sale of cottage food products and non-food craft goods at 10 W Clark Street, located in the RM-7 zoning district.. With the following conditions: All business activity shall be primarily conducted within one enclosed structure. Accessory sheds shall not be used for customer access or retail display. Accessory structures shall comply with all setback requirements of the RM-7 zoning district. One 10-foot by 10-foot accessory structure may be located in the front yard facing Clark Street, and one 10-foot by 12-foot accessory structure may be located near the home facing Hale Street. Hours of operation shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., consistent with ordinance standards. Traffic shall not exceed levels typical of a home occupation. Any outdoor storage must be screened and approved. Any expansion of structures or increase in intensity of use shall require additional Planning Commission review. Failure to comply with these conditions may result in revocation of the Conditional Use Permit. The Conditional Use Permit shall run with the land unless revoked due to noncompliance. All requirements of the Grantsville City Code must be met unless otherwise approved and modified by the Planning Commission. All fees associated with the permit and any future permits must be paid. All applicable health, safety, and welfare standards must be followed. The permit holder must maintain current state licensing at all times. The permit holder must maintain a current business license at all times. The use of the property must remain within the parameters approved in the application, and any expansion of the use requires prior approval. This permit may be periodically reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and may also be reviewed upon receipt of complaints. Failure to comply with any of these requirements may result in revocation of the permit. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” “Gary Merrill “Aye” and John Montgomery “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Geographic Information System (GIS) Presentation by the Grantsville City GIS Analyst/City Planner Tae-Eun Ko.

GIS Analyst and City Planner Tae-Eun introduced the new Grantsville City GIS interactive map and explained that the goal of the project was to improve public access to property and infrastructure information.

She stated that the Community Development Department had previously relied on the Tooele County GIS system, which provided parcel data but did not include Grantsville-specific zoning information. Zoning had only been available as a separate PDF document, requiring staff to switch between sources when reviewing properties. She explained that this process increased review time and created the potential for error.

To address these issues, the City developed an interactive GIS map accessible on both desktop and mobile devices. Tae-Eun explained that the map contains 56 layers organized into six main sections. Utility layers include storm drain, irrigation, sewer, and water infrastructure. Transportation layers include roads, ADA infrastructure, bike lanes, street lighting, traffic signals, and signs. Community Development layers include parcels, zoning, and city boundaries. Additional layers include parks, garbage pickup areas, and reference features such as streams.

She emphasized that parcels and zoning can now be viewed together in a single interactive display, allowing users to quickly identify zoning classifications without switching platforms. Users can search by address, click on parcels for property details, and view infrastructure such as water lines and fire hydrants within city boundaries.

Tae-Eun also explained that the transportation and ADA layers support safety and connectivity planning. Although the map had not yet been officially published, she noted that it would be available soon. She thanked City Manager Michael, the Community Development Department, and Public Works for their support.

Commissioners responded positively. Commissioner Montgomery suggested adding trailhead locations and parking overlays to better visualize existing and planned trail systems. Chair Sarah Moore asked whether right-of-way and roadway width information could be displayed and expressed appreciation for the tool. Vice Chair Hill supported integrating County trail planning layers to better coordinate with the Tooele County General Plan. Commissioner Merrill commented that the interactive format improved clarity and reduced guesswork. Chair Sarah Moore thanked Tae-Eun and closed the item.

4. Approval of minutes from the January 20, 2026, and the February 3, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meetings.

Chair Sarah Moore moved to the next agenda item, approval of the January 20 Planning Commission minutes. She noted two discrepancies near the end of the document. First, she referenced a timestamp error that needed to be corrected for accuracy. Second, she explained that at one location she was identified as “Chair,” while on the following page she was identified as “Vice Chair,” and she requested that the title designation be made consistent throughout.

Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman asked for clarification regarding the location of the issues. After Chair Sarah Moore directed her to the relevant timestamped

section, Nicole Ackman confirmed both the time discrepancy and the inconsistent title designation. She stated she would correct the timestamp and revise the title to ensure consistency throughout the document.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes from the January 20, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. With the following condition the grammatical errors are corrected. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” “Gary Merrill “Aye” and John Montgomery “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes from the February 3, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” “Gary Merrill “Aye” and John Montgomery “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

5. Report from City Staff.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe informed the Commission that Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore was absent because she was attending a conference event where the Utah Asphalt Association was presenting the City with an award for the Matthew Street project. He explained that Shelby Moore had submitted the project, prepared a video as part of the application, and was attending with the Mayor and staff to receive the award.

Bill then moved to scheduling an off-week training meeting previously discussed by the Commission. He clarified that it would be a properly noticed public meeting but structured as a work session with no formal action items. He proposed March 10 or March 24, noting March 24 was short notice. After discussion, the Commission agreed to March 24 at 6:30 p.m., anticipating a meeting length of up to two hours.

He then asked which Commissioners planned to attend the Planning Conference scheduled for April 8 through April 10 in Bryce Canyon. He referenced a planning book authored by Craig Call, the State Property Rights Ombudsman, describing it as an accessible resource on planning principles.

6. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Merrill thanked Community Director Bill Cobabe for his report and stated that he did not want to create unnecessary work for staff through additional revisions. He expressed appreciation for serving on the Planning Commission and for the opportunity to contribute to the City.

Chair Sarah Moore responded that she looked forward to future meetings and acknowledged that although the current meeting had been lengthy, she anticipated continued productive discussions. She then asked Vice Chair Hill if he had anything further to add.

Vice Chair Hill stated that the discussion had been longer than expected but productive and worthwhile.

7. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Derek Dalton welcomed the newest Commissioner and praised the Commission's thoughtful discussion. He reported that the City recently held a well-attended groundbreaking for the Scenic Slopes project, noting construction has begun and that the West Street portion will be completed in a future phase. Director Bill Cobabe added that it was a strong community event.

Council Member Dalton then addressed the upcoming City Council meeting, highlighting the wastewater treatment facility project. He explained that the City is moving forward with bonding and will hold a public hearing, though no final decision will be made yet. Due to inflation, cost estimates increased from approximately \$30–\$32 million to a \$50 million bond structure to ensure coverage. Rate projections based on that figure include a potential 55 percent increase in the first year, followed by additional increases in the 20–30 percent range.

He encouraged Commissioners to review the presentation and asked if there were any comments to relay to the Council. Chair Sarah Moore thanked him for the update.

8. Adjourn.

Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.