

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of a proposed rezone of Parcel 01-066-0-0030 from A-10 (Agricultural) to the Shopping Commercial District (C-S), located at approximately 519 W Main Street.	Approved
#2	Consideration of proposed amendments to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapters 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, and 21.	Tabled
#3	Consideration of the proposed Grantsville City Annexation Policy Plan.	Approved
#4	Approval of minutes from the February 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meetings.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON MARCH 3, 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 Cameron , Commissioner Gary Merrill

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent: Commissioner John Montgomery

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, Community Development Director Bill Cobabe, City Council Member Derek Dalton, Sargent Sager, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman, City Planner/GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko, Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Manager Micahel Resare, City Recorder Alicia Fairbourn, Mayor Heidi Hammond

On Zoom:

Citizens and Guests Present: Shelton Ross, Unknown, Unknown

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, March 3, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA

Chair Sarah Moore explained that the meeting would follow a new format for public hearing items. She stated that staff would first present each item, followed by a public hearing and public comment period for items requiring public comment. The Planning Commission would then proceed with discussion and consideration.

Chair Sarah Moore reminded members of the public that comments would be limited to three minutes per speaker. She asked that individuals approaching the podium state their name for the record, and noted that the Commission could not engage in direct conversation during public comment, but questions raised may be addressed during the Commission's discussion of the item.

1. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed rezone of Parcel 01-066-0-0030 from A-10 (Agricultural) to the Shopping Commercial District (C-S), located at approximately 519 W Main Street.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the item and explained that the request was to rezone the rear portion of the property from A-10 to CS. She indicated that the adjacent parcel to the front is already zoned CS and showed the area on the map, noting that the proposed change would extend the CS zoning designation through the back portion of the property.

Shelby Moore reviewed the surrounding land uses, stating that residential development is located to the north, mixed residential and commercial uses are located to the south along Main Street, commercial properties are located to the east, and residential uses are located to the west.

She also explained that the property is designated in the General Plan and Future Land Use Map as mixed-use density in the northern portion of the property, supporting a combination of residential and commercial uses. She stated that the corridor along Main Street supports commercial and economic development.

Shelby Moore concluded that staff finds the proposed rezone to be consistent with the General Plan and Future Land Use Map. She explained that the rezone would promote orderly

commercial development along Main Street and, with proper site design and buffering, future development could remain compatible with adjacent properties.

Public Hearing

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore noted for the record that staff had not received any emails or phone calls regarding the proposed rezone.

Chair Sarah Moore confirmed that no comments had been received by email or phone and that no members of the public were present to comment during the meeting. Seeing no additional comments, she closed the public hearing and brought the item back to the Planning Commission for discussion and consideration.

Discussion and Consideration

Shelton Ross was present to answer questions. Chair Sarah Moore asked if the Commission had any questions for the applicant. Commissioner Moulton asked what the applicant planned to do with the property. Mr. Ross stated that the property would be used for RV storage and noted that he was currently in the process of applying for a conditional use permit for that use.

Commissioner Moulton asked if the storage would involve customers bringing their RVs to the site for storage. Mr. Ross confirmed that the property would be used for storing RVs.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore clarified that RV storage is listed as a conditional use within the zoning table. She explained that the staff report included the zoning table so the Commission could see what other uses would be permitted within the CS zoning district if the property were developed for another purpose in the future.

Chair Sarah Moore confirmed that the Commission was currently only addressing the zoning request and not the conditional use permit. She asked if there were any additional questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Hill asked whether the buffering requirements referenced in the staff report would need to be addressed as part of the rezone or during the conditional use permit review. Shelby Moore explained that buffering requirements would be addressed during the conditional use permit process or when the property is developed.

Commissioner Merrill stated that the request appeared straightforward and noted that the rezone would create continuity with the surrounding commercial zoning along the corridor. He commented that the change seemed appropriate and possibly overdue.

Chair Sarah Moore then asked the applicant whether the RV storage would include covered storage structures or if it would be open-air storage. Mr. Ross responded that the storage would be open-air and that no structures were planned for the site.

Chair Sarah Moore asked how many RVs the applicant expected to store. Mr. Ross stated that he anticipated approximately 75 units year-round and clarified that the site would be used only for storage and not for RV occupancy.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about potential increases in traffic. Shelby Moore explained that those operational details, including site layout, parking dimensions, circulation, and the number of units that could be accommodated on the property, would be evaluated during the conditional use permit review when a detailed site plan is submitted.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of consideration of a proposed rezone of Parcel 01-066-0-0030 from A-10 (Agricultural) to the Shopping Commercial District (C-S), located at approximately 519 W Main Street. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye” and Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

2. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of proposed amendments to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapters 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, and 21.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that she had emailed the Commission earlier that morning noting that when the Word document was converted to PDF, the redlined changes were not included in the meeting packet. Because the redlines were important for both the Commission and the public to review, she recommended that the item remain a discussion item and be tabled without a motion so a corrected version could be provided at a future meeting.

Shelby Moore explained that the amendments originated from a review of several chapters of the Land Use Code, including Chapters 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. During the review, staff determined that changes in one section affected other chapters, which resulted in a broader set of amendments across multiple sections of the code.

She began by reviewing the proposed changes to Chapter 2 (Definitions). Shelby Moore explained that staff clarified and added new land use terms, removed outdated or redundant definitions, aligned terminology throughout the code, and improved cross references. She also noted that many sign related definitions were removed from Chapter 2 and consolidated into Chapter 20, which governs sign regulations.

Shelby Moore explained that road related definitions were reorganized into a dedicated subsection for streets and roads. She also described updates to the clear view site triangle definition, which was revised to reflect the City's 30 foot measurement from the back of the sidewalk rather than the previous 40 foot standard.

Additional definitions were added or expanded for terms such as community gardens, conditional uses, detrimental impacts, and mitigation conditions to better align with Utah State Code. She noted that the conditional use permit definitions were expanded to provide clearer guidance consistent with state law.

Shelby Moore also explained that driveway standards were aligned with Chapter 6, including establishing a minimum width of 24 feet for shared driveways. Definitions for housing types were expanded, including fourplex dwellings, and employee related definitions were clarified for use in conditional use permit standards.

She further described updates to the home occupation definition, which was expanded to include clearer standards related to permitting intent, frontage and access requirements, client traffic, employee limits, and signage restrictions.

Shelby Moore also reviewed updates and additions to definitions including household pets, Class A kennel permits, master development agreements, pioneering agreements, overlay districts, and parcels of land, along with updates referencing current Utah State Code sections.

She explained that definitions related to streets and road systems, including alley, arterial road, local street, private lane, and private street, were reorganized and clarified. The private street definition was also updated to reflect state code limitations that allow cities to require no more than 32 feet of asphalt width.

Shelby Moore noted that updated cross section diagrams for public and private residential streets were added to the code to provide clearer reference for sidewalk widths, park strips, and pavement dimensions.

Finally, Shelby Moore explained that definitions related to stormwater facilities were added to clarify that stormwater infrastructure cannot be counted as open space within subdivision developments, addressing previous ambiguity within Chapter 21.

Public Hearing

The item was being treated as a discussion item and would be tabled to a future meeting, the Commission did not open the public hearing and no public comments were taken.

Discussion

The Planning Commission discussed several definitions within Chapter 2, including Definitions 19, 53, 54, 80, 92, 97, 114, 119, 128, 178, 272, 279, and 288.

Commissioner Hill asked for clarification on Definition 53 related to conditional uses, specifically how “detrimental impacts” are evaluated when considering a conditional use permit. Attorney Barker explained that under Utah State Law, conditional uses must be approved unless the identified detrimental impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated. He noted that if an applicant proposes mitigation measures that substantially address the impacts, the permit must generally be approved. However, if the impacts cannot be meaningfully mitigated, the City may deny the request. Attorney Barker also suggested that related terms such as detrimental impacts and mitigation conditions could potentially be organized as subsections under the conditional use definition, although staff noted those terms may apply to other sections of the code as well.

The Commission also discussed Definition 80 related to dwelling units and how the definition may apply to situations such as basement apartments or fourplex units. Definitions related to Family Food Production (Definition 97) were reviewed, including questions regarding references to horses and other large animals. Definitions addressing Front Yards and Corner Lots (Definition 114) were also discussed due to potential inconsistencies between the diagram included in the packet and existing code language stating that corner lots contain two front yards.

Additional discussion occurred regarding Definition 178 related to master plans, with a suggestion that the definition reference the City’s General Plan. The Commission also reviewed Definition 272 addressing street classifications and traffic thresholds, including questions regarding the origin of the daily trip numbers and how alley access and private streets may apply to certain housing types.

The Commission briefly discussed Definition 119 related to geologic hazards and whether radon should be included, Definition 92 related to environmental impact assessments, Definition 279 related to swimming pools and whether the definition should distinguish between private residential and public pools, and Definition 288 related to the structure of the “use” definition and whether related terms such as accessory use and temporary use should be grouped together.

The Commission also noted minor drafting and numbering issues within the document that staff will review prior to bringing the item back for further consideration.

Cameron Moulton made a motion to table the consideration of proposed amendments to the Grantsville City Land Use and Management Code, Chapters 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, and 21. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye” and Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of the proposed Grantsville City Annexation Policy Plan.

Presentation by Community Development Director Bill Cobabe

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that the item had been discussed briefly at a previous meeting. He stated that he wanted to review it again for the benefit of those who were not present during that earlier discussion.

Mr. Cobabe explained that an annexation policy plan is required by state code if a city wishes to guide and manage future annexations. He clarified that the plan does not mean the City is declaring ownership over any property or requiring annexation. Instead, it serves as a statement that if property owners in those areas choose to petition for annexation into Grantsville, the City would be willing to consider it.

Mr. Cobabe reviewed the map and explained that it identifies three primary areas, labeled A, B, and C. He noted that each area is described in more detail within the text of the policy plan, including where each area is located and what the City anticipates for future planning purposes.

He also addressed a question raised at an earlier meeting regarding the limits of Area B. Mr. Cobabe explained that the annexation consideration area would stop at Mid Valley Highway, and that only property west of that road would be considered within that area. He clarified that the property previously questioned by the Commission lies east of that road and therefore is not included in the annexation area being considered.

City Council Member Rhett Butler noted that the City has already been involved in annexation efforts east of that road, referring to property farther south near the lake that had previously been owned by Kennecott. Mr. Cobabe confirmed that property is separate from the area shown on the current annexation policy plan and is not part of the proposed annexation area under discussion.

Mr. Cobabe stated that there is no imminent annexation proposed for Areas A or C. He explained, however, that Area B includes a substantial amount of land currently in dispute, and staff wanted to ensure the City's annexation policy plan reflects the possibility of that area eventually being annexed into the City limits.

Public Hearing

No Comments:

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Moulton asked whether another municipality could include the same property within its own annexation policy plan. Mr. Cobabe explained that cities typically coordinate with

neighboring municipalities to avoid overlapping expansion areas. To staff's knowledge, there is no overlap within the proposed plan except for the area associated with the ERT related dispute that remains unresolved.

Commissioner Moulton then questioned what would prevent a city from placing very large areas within an annexation policy plan as a placeholder. Mr. Cobabe responded that although there is no strict legal limitation, practical considerations limit such actions. Cities are required to provide municipal services such as water, sewer, fire protection, and police protection to annexed areas, which generally restricts how far a city can reasonably expand. He acknowledged that annexation policy plans can function somewhat like a "wish list" of areas a city may consider annexing in the future if property owners pursue annexation.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the City would ever compete with Tooele County regarding annexation areas. Mr. Cobabe explained that the County typically does not oppose annexations because responsibility for services such as law enforcement and fire protection shifts from the County to the City when annexation occurs.

Commissioner Moulton commented that the process sometimes feels like a strategic exercise between municipalities. Commissioner Merrill added that if cities are planning 25 years ahead through annexation policy plans, it raises the question of whether communities should also consider planning further into the future. Mr. Cobabe responded that longer-term growth considerations are addressed in the City's General Plan, which will likely be reviewed and updated in the future if the City receives grant funding. He clarified that the annexation policy plan simply identifies areas the City would consider if property owners request annexation.

Commissioner Hill asked whether property owners outside the mapped annexation areas could still petition for annexation into Grantsville. Mr. Cobabe confirmed that they could, although it would be unusual and would depend on whether the City could reasonably provide services to the property.

Attorney Tysen Barker added that once an area is included within a city's annexation policy plan, another municipality would generally need that city's permission before annexing land within the designated expansion area. Commissioner Merrill commented that the process can sometimes resemble a strategic effort by cities to secure logical areas for future growth. Attorney Barker agreed that the purpose of the policy plan is to allow cities to protect areas that make sense for potential expansion.

Mr. Cobabe then directed the Commission to the maps included in the packet, noting that two versions were provided. One map includes the water areas of the Great Salt Lake, while the other displays land areas only. He explained that the land beneath the lake is owned by the State, and that the land only map may be clearer from a planning perspective.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about a small section of land located between Areas A and B that was not included within the annexation boundary. Mr. Cobabe explained that the area primarily consists of State-owned land or property owned by the Morton Salt Company, which is why it was excluded.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether staff was recommending one map over the other. Mr. Cobabe responded that either version could be approved but indicated that the land only map would likely be the most practical for planning purposes.

Gary Merrill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of the proposed Grantsville City Annexation Policy Plan using map 2. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” “Gary Merrill “Aye” and Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

4. Approval of minutes from the February 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meetings.

Commissioner Merrill noted one correction. He explained that in the section regarding the conditional use permit, the minutes indicated that the motion passed four to one, when in fact only four commissioners were present and the vote should have been recorded as three to one. He pointed out that the minutes correctly listed the individual votes but the summary vote count was incorrect.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes from the February 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. With the following condition: Correction to the conditional use permit vote, changing the vote from four to one to three to one. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” “Gary Merrill “Aye” and Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.

5. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore thanked the Planning Commission for their time and participation and reminded them that staff is available to assist with questions as needed.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe asked commissioners about their availability to attend the upcoming planning conference scheduled for April 8 through April 10 in Bryce Canyon, noting the City would like to register attendees soon. Commissioner Moulton stated he may be able to attend but needed to confirm.

Mr. Cobabe also reminded the Commission of the training and workshop meeting scheduled for March 24 from approximately 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at City Hall, noting that food would be provided.

Shelby Moore informed the Commission about a proposed joint work meeting with the City Council regarding the Master Transportation Plan, tentatively scheduled for April 15. She explained that consultants would already be presenting the plan to the City Council that evening and staff would like the Planning Commission to participate. The Commission briefly discussed possible timing options, and Shelby Moore asked for a decision by the end of the week so staff could properly notice the meeting if needed.

Shelby Moore also noted that consultants plan to hold a public open house on April 30 to gather feedback on the Master Transportation Plan. She stated that Planning Commission attendance is optional.

Lastly, Shelby Moore informed the Commission that staff has received requests from developers for work meetings to review conceptual plans prior to formal applications. After discussion, the Commission indicated they were open to holding these discussions during regular meeting times, provided a reasonable time limit, such as one hour, is established for each presentation.

6. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Hill suggested that the Commission receive additional training on conflicts of interest, including when disclosures should be made and how they should be handled during meetings. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe agreed and stated that the topic could be included in the upcoming workshop session scheduled in a couple of weeks.

Commissioner Merrill then shared feedback from a discussion he had with a Planning and Zoning Commissioner from West Valley City. He explained that their commission uses the first meeting of the month as a work session to review projects in depth, while the second meeting is reserved for formal decisions. Commissioner Merrill said he liked that structure because it allows more time for discussion between commissioners and developers and may also provide additional time for the City Council to review Planning Commission recommendations before taking action.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the City had previously attempted a similar format, with the first meeting intended for discussion and the second for decisions. However, items often continued across multiple meetings without reaching a resolution, which ultimately led staff to discontinue that structure. She noted that work meetings with developers were later introduced to address those needs.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe added that many developers appreciate the City's two-week meeting cycle because it allows them to receive feedback or decisions more quickly rather than waiting a full month between opportunities.

City Council Member Rhett Butler commented that the time between Planning Commission recommendations and City Council consideration often depends on the complexity of the item. Some items may move forward quickly, while others require additional time for Council review. Commissioner Merrill responded that allowing at least two weeks between Planning Commission recommendations and City Council consideration could be beneficial for more complex items. Council Member Butler agreed that additional time between those steps can sometimes be helpful.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the Planning Commission's role in the decision-making process. Mr. Cobabe explained that under state law, the Planning Commission must provide a recommendation before the City Council can act on legislative land use matters. If the Planning Commission fails to reach a decision, the lack of recommendation is treated as a negative recommendation. Shelby Moore added that the City's code reflects this requirement and specifies that if an item is not resolved after four meetings, it is treated as a recommendation to deny.

7. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler stated that he did not have any specific items from the City Council to report but expressed appreciation for the work the Commission had been doing.

8. Adjourn.

Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," Gary Merrill "Aye" and Cameron Moulton "Aye." The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.