

**Action Summary:**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
#2	Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Patsy Perry, to own and operate BnP Firearms and So Much More, LLC a home-based business involving firearm transfers and related services, located at 176 S Hale Street in the R-1-21 zone.	Approved
#3	Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Cody Johnson to establish Accessory Farm Employee Housing on the property located at 587 E Durfee Street, in the A-10 zone.	Approved
#4	Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of the proposed Master Development Agreement for Mack Canyon Subdivision located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.	Approved
#5	Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0-0014 to change the land use designation from MixedUse Density, High Single-Family Density Residential, and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.	Approved
#6	Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0014 to from R-1-21 to the R-1-12 for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.	Approved
#7	Approval of minutes from the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON APRIL 7, 2026, 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, Commissioner Cameron, Commissioner

**On Zoom:**

**Commission Members Absent:**

**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 Recorder Alicia Fairbourn, Mayor Heidi Hammond

**On Zoom:**

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Patsy Perry, Ben Perry, Bryan Sadler, Unknown Sadler, Joe Kempe, Angelyn Kempe, Julie Maekay, Greg Wodeley, Paul Linford, Cody Johnson, Tyler Johnson

**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, April 7, 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 and Discussion: Discussion of a proposed concept for Falcon's Landing Subdivision.**

### **Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the concept proposal for Falcon's Landing Subdivision, explaining that the development had been approved in late 2025. She stated that staff had since identified an opportunity to improve connectivity by extending Wild Rose through the subdivision, which could eventually connect to North Street and intersect with Race Street to help improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on surrounding roads.

Shelby reviewed the approved plat and displayed an overlay showing the proposed extension. She explained that extending Wild Rose would result in the loss of two lots, reducing the total number of units from 29 to 27. In exchange, the developer proposed transitioning from attached twin home units to detached single-family homes on the remaining lots. She clarified that this would apply to all lots previously designated as "A" and "B" units. Shelby noted that this concept was being brought forward for feedback only and that, if supported, it would return with a formal development agreement and updated layout.

Chair Sarah Moore asked to display the original approved layout for comparison and confirmed that the change would result in the loss of two lots. Commissioner Moulton asked why specific lots were being referenced, and Shelby clarified that the reference was only an example and that the change would apply to all similarly designated lots.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the developer was present, and Shelby confirmed that the developer was attending virtually. Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the developer had agreed to the proposal voluntarily, and Shelby confirmed that there had been no pressure and that the developer was supportive of bringing the concept forward.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about the project timeline. Shelby explained that the project was currently in final plan review, but staff had asked the developer to pause that process until direction was received from the Planning Commission. She noted that the project was close to final approval and that timing would depend on the Commission's feedback.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether there were any downsides to the proposal. Shelby stated that the primary change would be smaller lot single-family homes but noted that she did not see this as a negative, particularly since surrounding areas were not yet developed. Commissioner Montgomery asked about potential delays, and Shelby estimated that the changes could result in approximately a three-month delay, depending on how quickly revised plans could be completed. She confirmed that the developer was agreeable to that timeline.

Chair Sarah Moore expressed support for the proposal, stating that extending the road would improve traffic flow and reduce bottlenecks. She noted that the City currently has several U-shaped streets and that creating a through connection would be beneficial for long-term circulation. City Council Member Derek Dalton provided input and stated that he supported the proposal, noting that the extension would help distribute traffic and reduce pressure on nearby streets. He described the proposal as a good compromise.

The Commission expressed general support for the concept, indicating that the proposed change would improve connectivity and benefit the overall development.

No formal action was taken, as the item was presented for discussion only.

**2. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Patsy Perry, to own and operate BnP Firearms and So Much More, LLC a home-based business involving firearm transfers and related services, located at 176 S Hale Street in the R-1-21 zone.**

**Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented this item. She explained that the request was for a home occupation involving firearm transfers, background checks, limited gunsmithing, and occasional craft-related work, all to be conducted within the basement of the home.

Shelby stated that the business would be operated solely by the homeowners, with hours of operation proposed Monday through Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. She noted that firearms would be stored securely and that the site plan demonstrated adequate parking, including space within the garage and driveway for customers. She explained that the application was brought before the Planning Commission because customers would be visiting the home.

Shelby further explained that the business would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local firearm regulations. She noted that staff had contacted the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), who confirmed that firearm sales and transfers are allowed in a home-based setting. She reviewed the proposed conditions, including limitations on employees, requirements for secure firearm storage, and ensuring that the business does not generate excessive traffic.

**Public Comment**

**Email Received 03/30/2026:**

To whom it may concern:

With respect, there is no reasonable justification for approving this request. Opening up a 'firearm transfer and related services', or as so nebulously stated and So Much More as a home-based business in a residential setting is ludicrous. This is not something we want in our family centered community!

Consider the potential consequences, none of which are the least bit beneficial, and make your decision prudently. You cannot effectively manage safety and security in a fly by night home based operation. Such businesses should be housed in properly-resourced facilities, away from residential homes, away from the streets where our children live and play.

Do not give an ounce of consideration to opening a door for trouble by creating space for a catastrophe-in-the-making. Be wiser than the applicants of this request. No foolish decisions, please.

Regards,

Wayne & Iris Nixdorf

### **Discussion and Consideration**

Patsy Perry was present to answer questions regarding this item. Commissioner Montgomery asked whether ammunition would be sold. Patsy Perry stated that selling ammunition was not the initial intent but, if it were to occur, it would be on an order basis only, with no inventory stored on-site. She explained that any ordered items would be picked up upon delivery and that no stockpiling of ammunition or firearms was planned. She further clarified that most transactions would involve ordering firearms for customers, completing required paperwork, and transferring the items upon arrival, with minimal storage.

Commissioner Moulton suggested that a condition could be added to address ammunition storage. Patsy Perry confirmed that ammunition could be shipped directly to customers and reiterated that storage was not part of the business plan.

Commissioner Montgomery raised questions regarding frontage requirements and noted that the property would not meet current standards under recently updated home occupation regulations. Shelby explained that the application was submitted prior to the adoption of those amendments and therefore qualified under the previous standards. Commissioner Montgomery advised the applicant to remain mindful of parking and operational impacts given the limited frontage.

Commissioner Moulton asked how the applicant estimated customer volume. Patsy Perry explained that the business would operate by appointment only, relying on word-of-mouth rather than online marketing, and anticipated approximately one to two customers per month. She emphasized that customers would be required to schedule appointments and would not be allowed to arrive without notice.

Chair Sarah Moore asked how the business would be marketed. Patsy Perry confirmed it would primarily be through word of mouth. Shelby suggested that flyers at local businesses could be an option, and Chair Sarah Moore expressed support for avoiding excessive signage. Chair Sarah Moore stated she had no concerns with the proposal and expressed support for the applicant's entrepreneurial efforts.

**Cameon Moulton made a motion to recommend approval of the consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Patsy Perry, to own and operate BnP Firearms and So Much More, LLC a home-based business involving firearm transfers and related services, located at 176 S Hale Street in the R-1-21 zone, with the conditions outlined in the staff report and the additional condition that no ammunition inventory be stored on-site for retail sales. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," John Montgomery "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.**

### **3. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Cody Johnson to establish Accessory Farm Employee Housing on the property located at 587 E Durfee Street, in the A-10 zone.**

#### **Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented this item. She clarified that the address in the staff report had been listed incorrectly but confirmed that all supporting documents, including the radius report, reflected the correct location.

Shelby explained that accessory farm employee housing is a conditional use within agricultural zones, provided the property meets the requirement of at least 10 contiguous acres. She stated that while the primary parcel is approximately 3.5 acres, the applicant owns additional contiguous parcels totaling over 30 acres, thereby meeting the requirement.

She described the proposed structure as a conversion of an existing agricultural shop into a two-level accessory dwelling unit (ADU) intended for a farm employee. She noted that the site provides adequate parking, with approximately five parking stalls available. Shelby explained that one of the primary considerations was the required water dedication of 0.218 acre-feet, which is a standard requirement that staff cannot waive.

Shelby also addressed a note in the staff report regarding the distance from a fire hydrant, stating that although the report initially indicated noncompliance, further review with the Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, confirmed that the property does meet the required distance. She confirmed that the structure already exists and is currently under construction, and that the applicant initiated the review process by applying for a building permit.

Commissioner Montgomery asked about occupancy, and Shelby explained that the use is limited to a single-family arrangement with one livable bedroom, with any additional rooms required to remain storage. Commissioner Moulton asked about how the situation came to staff's attention, and Shelby clarified that the applicant voluntarily initiated the process through the building permit review and subsequent site visit.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about utilities and water service, and Shelby explained that the unit would be connected to the existing residence and would not have separate utilities. The applicant, Cody Johnson, was present to answer questions. He confirmed that the primary residence on the property is currently occupied by an elderly resident and that the proposed housing would be used for a ranch hand. He stated that the purpose of the unit is to allow farm employees to be on-site for agricultural operations and that future use of the existing home may also support ranch operations rather than rental purposes.

**Public Comment: No comments**

**Discussion and Consideration**

Commissioner Montgomery stated that he did not have any concerns, and Commissioner Moulton also indicated no concerns or additional questions.

Chair Sarah Moore asked if there were any proposed conditions for the Conditional Use Permit, and it was confirmed that no additional conditions were necessary beyond standard requirements.

**John Montgomery made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Cody Johnson to establish Accessory Farm Employee Housing on the property located at 587 E Durfee Street, in the A-10 zone. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," John Montgomery "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.**

**4. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of the proposed Master Development Agreement for Mack Canyon Subdivision located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.**

**Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Mack Canyon Subdivision. She explained that the item had previously been reviewed as a discussion item to gather feedback from the Planning Commission and was now being brought forward for formal consideration.

Shelby stated that the development consists of approximately 114 acres and includes up to 170 residential lots. She explained that the project was initially proposed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), but after review, staff determined that the proposal generally complies with the R-1-12 zoning district standards. As a result, staff and the developer agreed that a rezone to R-1-12 combined with a Master Development Agreement would be a more appropriate approach.

She clarified that through the MDA, the developer is committing to a specific site plan, including lot sizes, road cross sections, commercial components, and improved open space. Shelby emphasized that the developer would not be able to increase density or deviate from the approved plan, as they are bound to the agreement. She further explained that the development includes a mix of half-acre and quarter-acre lots, designated commercial acreage, and usable open space rather than undeveloped land.

Shelby noted that the MDA includes provisions stating that if the developer does not comply with the agreement, the zoning would automatically revert back to R-1-21. She also explained that the commercial portion would require a future rezone during Phase Two and that the agreement outlines requirements related to bonding, infrastructure, and timing of improvements.

Commissioner Montgomery confirmed that the Planning Commission would be making a recommendation on the entire master plan, and Shelby confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Moulton asked about maintenance of the open space and amenities, and Shelby explained that over ten acres would be dedicated to the City and maintained as a public park.

**Public Comment:**

**Brenda Peterson:** Brenda Peterson's statement was read into the record by Julie Mackley. Brenda Peterson stated that her property sits directly behind the open space area, which has been used in at least three other developments. She stated that the same section of land had been used for property in prior developments and is now being used again for this development. She stated that in 2020, there was a request to change the layout so that four houses would be located behind the property, but it is now designated as open space, which she stated is preferable to having four houses directly behind her home. Brenda Peterson further stated that she was unable to attend the meeting and requested that her opposition be entered into the record. She expressed concern that the area had previously been zoned for half-acre lots and that there have been ongoing efforts to change that zoning over time.

**Julie Mackley:** Julie Mackley was present to comment on this item. She stated that she had submitted a letter for Agenda Items Five and Six and expressed confusion as to why the Master Development Agreement was being discussed prior to the General Plan Amendment and rezone. She questioned whether approval of the master plan would result in approval of the subsequent items or if her concerns regarding Agenda Items Five and Six should be addressed at that time. Julie Mackley stated that her concern, in addition to her letter, is that if the development is approved, it will set a precedent for future developments to request smaller lot sizes. She stated that the developer may use the same reasoning that adjacent lots are smaller in order to justify additional density. She acknowledged that the proposal includes additional amenities but stated that the City already has similar developments and limited remaining areas with half-acre lots extending toward the mountains. She stated that she is concerned that continued changes will result in smaller and smaller lots, which is not consistent with the rural character that residents moved to the area for.

**Joseph Kempie:** Joseph Kempe was present to comment on this item. He stated that he owns property within the development area and expressed that the proposal is significantly different from what had been discussed approximately a year prior. He stated that the changes are difficult to process in a short amount of time and expressed frustration with what he described as ongoing changes. He stated that he is concerned about the maintenance of amenities such as soccer fields and questioned the overall direction of planning in the area. He stated that he feels there are concessions being made to developers while impacts are being felt by surrounding residents. He referenced other developments and expressed concern about increased traffic and density, stating that he does not want the area to become congested similar to larger developments such as Daybreak. He stated that he remains uncertain about the proposal and its impacts.

**Angelyn Kempe:** Angelyn Kempe was present to comment on this item. She stated that she resides within the development area and expressed concern regarding the proximity of new homes to existing horse property. She stated that while half-acre lots have been proposed, fences are located directly adjacent to horse areas, which may lead to complaints related to animals. She stated that she is concerned about potential conflicts between residents and agricultural uses. She also expressed concern regarding increased traffic, stating that children regularly play and ride in the area and that additional development would result in a significant increase in vehicles. She stated that potential commercial uses, such as a gas station, would further increase traffic. She acknowledged that the developer has worked with residents but stated that she remains concerned about how the development will progress. She further stated that future development north of Mack Canyon is expected to include additional housing, which contributes to her concern regarding continued growth and density in the area.

**Brian Sadler:** Brian Sadler was present to comment on this item. He stated that he is not an immediate neighbor but moved to Grantsville for the half-acre lot character and expressed appreciation for that development pattern. He acknowledged that the number of units would

remain the same but expressed concern regarding the commercial component of the project, specifically the inclusion of a gas station. He stated that he would support removing the commercial portion to maintain the character of the neighborhood. He also raised concern regarding the long-term maintenance costs associated with City-owned property and questioned whether those costs would result in a net benefit when compared to tax revenue generated by the development. He stated that he is not opposed to development but would prefer to see the continuation of half-acre lots.

### **Discussion and Consideration**

Paul Linford was present to answer questions on this item. Commissioner Montgomery acknowledged the concerns raised by the public but stated that the overall number of residential units, and therefore traffic, would remain consistent whether the lots were half-acre or quarter-acre. He noted that many existing half-acre lots are not fully utilized due to lack of irrigation and often remain undeveloped or unused. He expressed support for the proposal, noting that the developer is providing amenities, including parks and open space, at their own expense.

Commissioner Moulton asked what would occur if the gas station or commercial use was not developed. Paul Lindford explained that alternative uses such as storage or other commercial businesses could be considered, but the commercial component was included at the City's request.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe provided additional context, explaining that commercial uses along SR-138 represent the highest and best use of the land due to increasing traffic volumes. He stated that commercial development helps buffer residential areas from major roadways and contributes to the City's financial sustainability. He also noted that the City currently lacks sufficient park space based on standard planning ratios and that the proposed development helps address that need by providing a mix of active and passive open space.

The Commission discussed traffic impacts, with both staff and the applicant indicating that there is no significant difference in traffic generation between half-acre and quarter-acre lots with the same number of units. It was also noted that higher density developments can, in some cases, result in slightly fewer vehicle trips per unit.

Chair Sarah Moore discussed the long-term vision of the City, stating that the General Plan anticipates a mix of housing types, open space, and commercial uses. She emphasized the importance of providing affordable housing opportunities for younger families while maintaining community amenities. She also addressed concerns related to proximity to livestock, noting that existing regulations help mitigate conflicts.

City Council Member Derek Dalton expressed concern regarding the provision in the MDA that allows the zoning to revert back to R-1-21 if the developer does not complete the project as proposed. He stated that this could create inconsistencies and confusion if portions of the development are completed under different zoning standards. He indicated a preference for the PUD process, which would avoid reverting zoning.

The applicant responded that the proposal reflects what the City has requested, including amenities, trails, and open space, and stated that pursuing a PUD would significantly extend the timeline. He indicated that if the proposal were denied, the development could proceed with standard half-acre lots without the additional amenities.

**John Montgomery made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of the proposed Master Development Agreement for Mack Canyon Subdivision located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138. With the following condition: Any failure to comply with the agreement would trigger reconsideration of the unapproved portion of the development for rezoning as determined feasible by the City. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.**

**5. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0-0014 to change the land use designation from MixedUse Density, High Single-Family Density Residential, and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.**

**Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed General Plan Amendment for the Mack Canyon Subdivision. She explained that the amendment would change the land use designation for the project area from mixed-use, high single-family residential, and low-density residential to medium-density residential. She clarified that this item is part of the process required prior to the rezone and that both items would ultimately be recommendations to the City Council.

Chair Sarah Moore noted that the item had already been discussed in prior agenda items and suggested moving directly into the public hearing.

**Public Hearing**

**Email Received 04/07/2026 in Regards to Item 5 &6:**

To the Grantsville City Planning & Zoning Commission

In September of 2020, Mr. Linford asked for a zoning change from R-1-21 to R-1-12 on 140 acres. I have been writing letters, for those same 6 years, asking the P&Z Commission and the City Council to deny this Zone change.

The agenda packet states that this zone change is to create cohesiveness and one type of zoning across this development, instead of the three that are designated on the Future Land Use Map. The packet fails to show the current zoning map, and the current developments that are already in place.

When comparing the two maps side by side, it makes more sense to keep the current zoning of ½ acre lots in place. The areas that are designated in the Future Land Use Map as mixed use, are right on Highway 138, with the higher residential density area being a small swath directly behind the mixed use. The bulk of this development sits in an area already designated on the Future Land Use Map as Low Density. Mixed Use, according to the city map, is a designation that states it needs to be compatible with surrounding uses. The entire area of this development is currently zoned as ½ acre lots and is surrounded on three sides by ½ acre lots and 5 acre lots.

From a neighbor perspective, the amendment would significantly alter the rural feel of this area, which is currently ½ acre lots next to Highway 138, increasing to 5 acres on Taylor road, and then increasing to 40 acre parcels. Mack Canyon road is a great divider from larger lots on the south side into the smaller lots on the north side. There is no need to continue to add more areas of smaller lots on the south side of Mack Canyon Road, making a patchwork of large lots, to tiny lots, and then back to even larger parcels.

The number of homes being built is not the issue for the neighbors of these parcels. I bought my home in an established area with larger lots, animal rights, and agriculture. I have attended city meetings where people have complained about animal noises and smells. People that want smaller homes and no land, do not want to live in the middle of those of us that want to be surrounded by animals and all that entails.

Grantsville is growing, our utilities need to be upgraded and current residents are facing the financial pain of that increase. We don't need to add to the problem by changing the zoning to higher density in areas that were designed to be more rural. If anything, we need to create more areas with larger parcels.

Thank you for your time,

Julie Mackley

**Joseph Kempe:** Joseph Kempe was present to comment on this item, he stated that he did not understand the item and expressed confusion about the multiple layers of changes being discussed. He stated that it felt like there were “layers upon layers of confusion” and asked if

someone could explain what was happening in simple terms. He questioned whether it was appropriate to ask those types of questions during the public hearing. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe clarified that the Commission was currently taking public comment and that questions could be addressed after the public hearing was closed. Commissioner Moulton acknowledged this and indicated that the comments would be addressed following the public hearing.

**Julie Mackley:** Julie Mackley was present to comment on this item. She stated that the areas shown in purple on the map are currently developed as half-acre lots. She stated that the existing zoning in that area is half-acre lots extending to Highway 138, and that the purple and orange areas shown represent future land use designations rather than existing zoning. She stated that there are already half-acre lots developed up to Sunflower Way, along with five-acre and ten-acre lots in the surrounding area. Julie Mackley further stated that changing the designation to medium density would allow up to four dwelling units per acre instead of two. She referenced a prior development along SR-138 near Clark Street where zoning was changed, stating that promises were made at that time but that the developer ultimately built to the new zoning standards. She stated that once zoning is changed, the City loses the ability to restrict development to previous density levels. She stated that this would allow more homes than originally intended and concluded her comments.

### **Discussion and Consideration**

Commissioner Moulton requested clarification from staff regarding the procedural steps and how this item relates to prior approvals. Commissioner Montgomery added that the previously approved master plan establishes the layout and that this amendment aligns with that plan rather than introducing new changes.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe provided a detailed explanation of the planning process. He explained that the General Plan is an aspirational document that outlines long-term vision and does not create legal entitlements. He clarified that zoning is the governing document that determines what is permitted on a property and that the Master Development Agreement establishes the specific layout, number of units, and development requirements. He emphasized that the MDA provides the developer with vested rights and ensures the City receives agreed-upon amenities and infrastructure.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the proposed amendment would allow the developer to increase density beyond what was established in the Master Development Agreement. Bill explained that the sequence of approvals ensures that the MDA controls the number of units and layout, and that the General Plan amendment and zoning changes are consistent with that agreement.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the amendment is aspirational and not controversial, noting that it aligns with the previously discussed development plan.

**John Montgomery made a motion to recommend approval of the consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0-0014 to change the land use designation from MixedUse Density, High Single-Family Density Residential, and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.**

**6. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0014 to from R-1-21 to the R-1-12 for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.**

#### **Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed rezone of parcels outlined in Agenda Item Six from R-1-21 to R-1-12 for the Mack Canyon Subdivision. She explained that the surrounding zoning includes a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the RM-7 zone to the north, R-1-21 to the west, and mixed-use zoning with a PUD further beyond. To the south, she noted the presence of half-acre and one-acre lots, as well as R-1-8 zoning with 8,000 square foot lots, and an additional PUD in the RM-15 zone surrounded by half-acre zoning.

Shelby stated that the proposed rezone is intended to align with and formalize what had been recommended through the Master Development Agreement and General Plan Amendment.

#### **Public Hearing**

**Angelyn Kempe:** Angelyn Kempe was present to comment on this item. She stated that her only comment was to ensure that if the development does not come to pass, appropriate safeguards are in place so that higher-density uses, such as townhomes, are not developed around them. She stated that this is her greatest concern and emphasized the importance of having those protections clearly established and set in place to prevent future issues.

#### **Discussion and Consideration**

The Commission indicated no additional discussion following the public hearing.

**Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-065-0-0074, and 01-065-0014 to from R-1-21 to the**

**R-1-12 for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.**

**7. Approval of minutes from the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.**

**Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes from the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion was passed unanimously.**

**9. Report from City Staff.**

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe reminded the Commission members of the upcoming conference taking place on April 8–10.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reminded the Commission that a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and City Council is scheduled for April 14, 2026. She also stated that an open house for the Master Transportation Plan will be held on April 30, 2026.

Shelby further advised the Planning Commission that Grantsville Rodeo 2026 will take place on May 23 and May 24.

**10. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.**

Commissioner Moulton asked what would happen if there were not three Commission members present for a meeting. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe advised that the meeting would be canceled due to lack of a quorum and stated that a minimum of three Commission members must be present.

**11. Report from City Council.**

City Council Member Derek Dalton provided an update to the Commission, stating that the sewer contract has been issued and the sewer rates have been approved. Commissioner Moulton asked when the project was expected to be completed, and Derek Dalton stated that completion is anticipated by 2028.

Derek Dalton also stated that he, the Mayor, and Councilman Thomas attended a site announcement for the nuclear campus and advised the Commission to watch for future updates on that project.

He further stated that the City Council approved a contract for Veterans Park and approved funding for the installation of timing equipment at Scenic Slopes Park, which will allow users to track times and compete with others through an application.

**12. Adjourn.**

**John Montgomery made a motion to adjourn. Sarah Moore seconded the motion.  
The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.**