

Action Items:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of a proposed Final Plat for the West Bench Subdivision, located at 169 North Taylor Road, in the R-1-21 Zone.	Approved
#2	Consideration of a request for a Plat Extension Approval for the Wells Crossing Phase 7 Subdivision.	Approved
#3	Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement for Falcons Landing Subdivision located approximately on Booth Street and Wild Rose Drive.	Approved
#4	Recommendation of a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Alington Subdivision on Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138.	Approved
#5	Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement for the Alington Subdivision on Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138.	Approved
#6	Approval of the minutes from the June 16, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON JULY 7, 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: Vice Chair Jason Hill, Commissioner Gary Merrill, Commissioner John Montgomery

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent: Chair Sarah Moore, Commissioner Cameron Moulton

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: City Council Member Derek Dalton, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman, City Planner/GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko, City Attorney Tysen Barker, Mayor Heidi Hammond, Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, City Recorder Alicia Fairbourne

On Zoom: Community Development Director Bill Cobabe

Citizens and Guests Present: Hank and Sheri Thompson, Kimerlee and Robert Smith, Geoff and Kristen Nestegard, Terry Allen, Kris Allen, Jeff Allen, Wayne Boyer, Ken Goodrich, Clay and Michelle Barney, Joe White, Jacob White, Kory Clark, Trevor Brimley, Judy Malmgren, Ira Malmgren, Trista Favor, Kayla Cameron, Teresa Jensen, Nadine and Max Hunt, Marty Grant, Jacob Landers, Dawn Pentico, Chad Wheat, Christopher Fields, Brittany Coggle, Trent and Kathy Baker, Mark Lawyer, Josh Cook

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Mark Cox, Jason Cook, Ethan Weaver, Chance Peterson, Karli Cook, Freedom Design, Josh Cook, Kaitlin Mcgee, Unknowns

Vice Chair Hill 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, July 7, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Hill explained the format of the meeting. He stated that staff would first present each item, followed by a public hearing and public comment period for items requiring public input. The Planning Commission would then proceed with discussion and consideration of the item.

Vice Chair Hill reminded members of the public that comments would be limited to three minutes per speaker. He asked anyone wishing to comment to state their name for the record before speaking. He also noted that the Planning Commission could not engage in direct dialogue during the public comment period; however, questions or concerns raised by the public could be addressed during the Commission's discussion and consideration of the item.

AGENDA

- 1. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a proposed Final Plat for the West Bench Subdivision, located at 169 North Taylor Road, in the R-1-21 Zone.**

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the proposed Final Plat for the West Bench Subdivision was located east of 169 North Taylor Road in the R-1-21 Zone. She stated that the proposal consisted of a three-lot minor subdivision served by an existing private lane. Shelby explained that although the City's current code limits private lanes to serving two dwelling units, this private lane had been established prior to the code amendment and already served three lots. She noted that the subdivision process

was intended to bring the existing configuration into compliance with current subdivision requirements.

Shelby reviewed the proposed lot layout, explaining that Lot 101 fronted Taylor Road, while Lots 102 and 103 would be served by the existing private lane extending from Mack Canyon Road. She also reviewed the proposed fire turnaround easement and hammerhead turnaround that would serve the subdivision.

Shelby explained that the Fire Department had reviewed the proposal because the property was located within a wildland fire area. She stated that the Fire Department required Lots 102 and 103 to install water storage tanks and residential fire sprinkler systems at the time of development until public water service and fire hydrants became available in the area. She noted that no other concerns had been identified during staff review.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the proposed lots would connect to public water and sewer services. Shelby explained that no public utilities currently existed in the area and that future connections would only occur if additional development extended utilities to the site. She stated that the proposed lots had been reviewed and approved by the Tooele County Health Department for individual wells and septic systems.

Commissioner Montgomery asked how far the nearest public utilities were located. Shelby explained that the closest utilities were located near SR-112, approximately one mile from the subdivision.

Public Hearing

No comments

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the Planning Commission's decision centered on the lack of available public utilities in the area and acknowledged that connecting to City water and sewer was not currently feasible. He stated that the proposal met the requirements outlined by staff.

John Montgomery made a motion to approve the consideration of a proposed Final Plat for the West Bench Subdivision, located at 169 North Taylor Road, in the R-1-21 Zone. With the following conditions: The Final Plat shall substantially conform to the plans submitted for review. All Development Review Committee requirements shall be completed prior to plat recording. The applicant shall obtain all required approvals and permits for private water and wastewater systems from the applicable regulatory agencies. The private road shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the

approved plans and all applicable City standards. All applicable fees shall be paid prior to recording the Final Plat. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason Hill “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

2. Presentation, Discussion, and Consideration: Consideration of a request for a Plat Extension Approval for the Wells Crossing Phase 7 Subdivision.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the applicant was requesting a six-month extension for the Wells Crossing Phase 7 Subdivision. She stated that the Land Use Ordinance requires subdivision infrastructure to be completed and the plat recorded within one year but allows the Planning Commission to grant a six-month extension.

Shelby reviewed the location of the subdivision, noting that it was located off Mormon Trail Road, with Scenic Slopes to the north and North Star Ranch to the west.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether this was the applicant's first extension request. Shelby confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Merrill asked why the applicant was requesting the extension. Shelby explained that the project had experienced delays due to floodplain issues that required additional review before moving forward.

Discussion and Consideration

Gary Merrill made a motion to approve the consideration of a request for a Plat Extension Approval for the Wells Crossing Phase 7 Subdivision. With the following conditions: All original conditions of approval shall remain in effect. The applicant shall complete all outstanding City, engineering, and agency requirements prior to recording the Final Plat. All applicable fees shall be paid prior to plat recording. The Final Plat shall be recorded on or before January 17, 2027, unless an additional extension is requested and approved in accordance with City Code. Prior to recording the Final Plat, the applicant shall satisfy all outstanding City requirements, including payment of approximately \$282,685.51 in outstanding fees and obligations owed to the City, completion of all engineering requirements, and receipt of all required agency approvals. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason Hill “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

3. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement for Falcons Landing Subdivision located approximately on Booth Street and Wild Rose Drive.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the proposed Master Development Agreement for the Falcon's Landing Subdivision resulted from previous direction provided by the Planning Commission to extend Wild Rose Drive through the subdivision rather than ending in a cul-de-sac. She reviewed the updated preliminary plat and explained that extending Wild Rose would provide a future connection to Race Street and potentially North Street as surrounding properties developed.

Shelby explained that to accommodate the roadway extension, the developer agreed to reduce the number of lots by one and requested approval to reduce the minimum lot sizes within the R-1-12 portion of the subdivision to approximately 6,750 square feet. She stated that the proposed lot layout would remain fixed under the Master Development Agreement and could not be modified without further approval. Shelby also explained that the agreement included a waiver of the fee in lieu of open space, noting that because the subdivision was less than 20 acres, the developer would otherwise be required to pay a fee in lieu rather than dedicate open space. She stated that the fee would likely be less than \$10,000 and explained that staff believed waiving the fee would provide a greater benefit to the City by allowing the roadway connection.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether there was anything unusual about the proposed Master Development Agreement. Shelby explained that it followed the City's standard template and primarily documented the extension of Wild Rose Drive, the approved lot layout, the reduced lot sizes, and the waiver of the fee in lieu of open space.

Commissioner Montgomery asked Shelby to explain how the fee in lieu of open space was calculated. Shelby reviewed the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance, explaining that developments under 20 acres could pay a fee in lieu based on ten percent of the undeveloped land value rather than dedicate open space. She noted that an appraisal had not yet been completed because it would not be required until the final plat was recorded.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether the Planning Commission would review the subdivision again after approving the Master Development Agreement. Shelby explained that the Commission would review the final plat but that the Master Development Agreement would establish the approved layout.

Commissioner Merrill questioned whether the reduced lot sizes complied with the R-1-12 zoning requirements. Shelby reviewed the zoning boundaries and explained that only the lots north of Lot 7 were located within the R-1-12 Zone, while the remaining lots were located within the RM-7 Zone. She reminded the Commission that it had previously expressed support for reducing the lot sizes in exchange for extending Wild Rose Drive.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the proposal differed from previous requests because the City would receive a public benefit through the roadway extension. Shelby agreed and displayed the Master Transportation Plan, explaining that extending Wild Rose would improve future traffic circulation by allowing the roadway to eventually connect to Race Street and potentially North Street as adjacent properties developed.

Commissioner Merrill expressed concern about maintaining consistency in Planning Commission decisions, noting that previous requests had been denied for not meeting minimum lot size requirements. He questioned whether approving reduced lot sizes in this instance could create inconsistency in future decisions.

Vice Chair Hill stated that the roadway extension represented a benefit to the City and viewed the proposal as a reasonable compromise that advanced the City's long-term transportation goals.

Public Hearing

Email Received 07/05/2026:

Re: Public Comment on Falcons Landing

We are writing as the owners and residents of the properties located at 589 E Clark St, 581 E Clark St, and 131 N Booth St, which are adjacent to the proposed Falcons Landing development. We are concerned about the lack of information on the development and how it will impact current property values and the privacy of adjacent properties. We ask the Commission to ensure all facets of the proposed development plan as currently presented address these concerns prior to the approval of any plan. This development will have an impact on surrounding properties that have been in place for many years. It has been understood that at some point, the property would be developed, but previous proposals were with lower density housing that would allow for shorter structures on larger lots that is consistent with the current area. These plans also included provisions for at least a privacy fence where the proposed development met currently developed property.

The proposed small lot s raise serious compatibility concerns. Smaller lots can reduce privacy for existing neighbors, place homes closer together, and change the character of an area th at has developed with different surrounding property patterns. This significantly impacts open space and views of the surrounding area. They may also encourage taller structures or building forms that overlook adjacent yards and homes. We are concerned that this would be inconsistent

with current nearby properties, and potentially harmful to the use, enjoyment, and value of existing homes. We are also concerned that the proposal does not appear to provide meaningful public space or neighborhood amenities consistent with GLUDMC 21.1.15(5). If smaller lots are being requested, there should be a clear explanation of how the development will offset the increased density with open space, landscaping, or other public benefits. Waving fees that would be used to offset these impacts is not in the best interest of the city or those impacted by this development.

Privacy, fencing, lighting impacts, and buffering should be clarified and understood for existing neighbors before approval. At this point, we do not have enough information about the proposed houses, including their size, height, orientation, or whether they would be single-story or multi-story. Those details matter because they determine whether existing neighbors will face direct overlooking, loss of privacy, lighting impacts, or an abrupt transition in scale.

Lot six in the plan appears to be a corner lot with an area of 9,000 square feet. GLUDMC 15.4 of the Land Use Ordinances states that corner lots have a minimum of 10,000 square feet.

The plan appears to show non-conforming setback distances for the side yard of lot 27. According to GLUDMC 15.4, side yard setback for these lots would be 7.5' on one side and 15' on the other side. The plan doesn't specify whether the side yard setbacks are the same for lots 1-5 and 23-26.

We respectfully request that any approval include specific conditions, including:

- Specific information about the proposed houses, including anticipated height, number of stories, building orientation, garage placement, window placement, and how privacy impacts to adjacent properties will be avoided.
- A stormwater and drainage plan demonstrating that runoff, grading, and utility work will not negatively affect existing neighboring properties.
- Meaningful buffering along shared property lines, including a required fence, and/or landscaping that protects existing residents.
- Lighting standards to prevent glare onto neighboring properties and to preserve residential privacy.
- An explanation of why the open space requirements and fees (GLUDMC 21.1.15) are being waived for this development and what alternatives were considered?

For these reasons, we request that the Commission deny the proposed Falcon Landing plan as currently presented. The above items need to be addressed to ensure that this development is consistent with existing development and will not negatively impact current owners.

As a general comment, the process for receiving public comments is unacceptable. The initial letter was dated June 19th, but the material was stated it would be available by July 3rd at 5:00 PM and then allows citizens two and a half days over a holiday weekend to provide a meaningful written response to the commission. This does not allow enough time for research and depth of understanding for a full response from those who would be permanently impacted.

Thank you for your time, and your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Jeff & Denise Averett
Eric & Celesta
Critchlow Hank & Sherri Thompson

Wayne Boyer: Wayne Boyer was present to comment on this item. He stated that he owned the property adjacent to the proposed development and expressed concern regarding the proposed stormwater retention area. He asked what the proposed 33-foot area represented, how it would affect the lots, and whether it involved changes to the zoning. He stated that, to his knowledge, the proposal had never previously been approved by Grantsville City and questioned why he had not been notified if it had been approved. He requested clarification regarding how stormwater would enter and exit the proposed retention area and confirmed that the area measured 33 feet. After Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore confirmed the width, he reiterated his concern about how the stormwater would affect his property and requested that those issues be addressed before any approvals were granted. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore advised that those questions could be discussed with staff at the Planning and Zoning office, as the Planning Commission could not answer all of those technical questions during the meeting.

Hank Thompson: Hank Thompson was present to comment on this item. He stated that he owned property near the proposed development and opposed reducing the lot sizes as proposed. He stated that he agreed with Commissioner Gary Merrill's comments and suggested that if additional right-of-way was needed for the road, the City should consider using eminent domain to acquire only the necessary roadway rather than allowing smaller lot sizes. He stated that reducing the number of lots while maintaining larger lot sizes would preserve the value of the development. He expressed the opinion

that smaller lots did not contribute the same value to either the surrounding neighborhood or the City.

Jeff Everett: Jeff Everett was present to comment on this item. He stated that he owned property adjacent to the proposed development and expressed concerns regarding inconsistencies between the proposed plan and the City's current land use regulations. He explained that he had submitted the letter outlining those concerns. He stated that the current ordinance required corner lots to contain a minimum of 10,000 square feet and believed one of the proposed corner lots measured only approximately 9,000 square feet. He also questioned the reduction in minimum lot size from 12,000 square feet to 6,750 square feet, stating that such a significant reduction to accommodate a roadway appeared excessive. He stated that the roadway would likely eliminate only one lot, yet the proposal increased the total number of lots from the previous plan to 28, which he believed was inconsistent with the justification being presented. He also stated that the zoning regulations required one side yard setback of 7.5 feet and the opposite side yard setback of 15 feet, but observed that the proposed lots appeared to provide only 7.5-foot setbacks on both sides, which he believed did not comply with the current regulations. He expressed concern about privacy for the existing homes along the south side of the development, explaining that he had lived there for more than 20 years and understood that development would eventually occur but believed the current proposal represented a substantial change to the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed lot configuration would likely result in taller homes with only 15 feet separating adjacent structures, creating what he described as a wall of homes with very little space between them. He also noted that the previous proposal had included a privacy fence, while the current proposal did not, and stated that such a feature should be considered. He further expressed concern that significant information remained unavailable, including the architectural design of the homes, water infrastructure plans, and other project details. He stated that while he understood the need for the proposed roadway, he believed additional right-of-way acquisition through eminent domain might still be necessary farther north to complete the connection. He concluded by requesting that the Planning Commission carefully review the concerns outlined in the letter submitted by the neighboring property owners before making a decision.

Mark Lawyer: Mark Lawyer was present to comment on this item. He stated that he agreed with the comments made by previous speakers, particularly those made by Jeff Everett, and noted that he had also submitted written comments to the Planning Commission. He stated that three of the proposed lots would directly border the rear of his property, which he believed would negatively affect his privacy and quality of life. He explained that his property currently had views of the Stansbury Island open space and expressed concern that the proposal did not appear to include any meaningful open space. He stated that he believed the City's planning efforts should preserve the quality of life

and rural character that had historically defined Grantsville and expressed concern that the community was beginning to resemble more densely developed areas along the Wasatch Front. He also expressed concern that the additional homes would increase traffic along Booth Street, making it even more difficult and less safe to access Main Street. He acknowledged that it appeared the Planning Commission had already made a recommendation but wanted to ensure his concerns were placed on the record. He stated that privacy was a primary concern and believed a substantial, well-constructed privacy fence should be required to protect existing homeowners. He also expressed concern that the smaller lot sizes could encourage taller homes, which would further impact existing views and the quality of life for neighboring residents. He concluded by thanking the Planning Commission for their time and stated that, given additional time, he likely would have submitted additional comments.

Discussion and Consideration

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore clarified that the previously approved preliminary plat included 29 attached twin-home units on approximately 6,750-square-foot lots. She explained that the revised proposal would reduce the development to 28 detached single-family lots while extending Wild Rose Drive through the subdivision, resulting in fewer units than previously approved while providing improved connectivity for the City.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that he appreciated the comments received from neighboring property owners but believed many of the concerns would exist regardless of whether the revised layout was approved because the subdivision had already received preliminary approval. He asked Shelby to further explain the tradeoff between the roadway extension and the revised lot layout.

Shelby reiterated that the revised proposal replaced the previously approved attached twin homes with detached single-family homes while reducing the overall number of units and extending Wild Rose Drive. She also explained the applicable building height, lot coverage, and setback requirements, noting that the setback language had since been clarified through amendments to the Land Use Ordinance. Shelby further explained that staff would be available to review the approved construction plans with neighboring property owners to answer questions regarding stormwater drainage.

Vice Chair Hill asked Shelby to address concerns regarding the public notification process. Shelby explained that notices were mailed to all property owners within 500 feet using a radius report provided by Tooele County, posted on the City's website and the State Public Notice Website, posted at City Hall, and placed on the subject property with a sign containing a QR code and copies of the public notice at least ten days before the hearing.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that he believed the City had fulfilled its public noticing requirements and reiterated that the roadway extension represented a unique public benefit that justified the recommendation. He also requested that a six-foot privacy fence be included as part of the recommendation in response to concerns raised during the public hearing.

Vice Chair Hill stated that the Planning Commission's responsibility was to evaluate the proposal based on the Land Use Ordinance and the City's long-term planning objectives. He acknowledged the concerns raised by neighboring property owners and encouraged them to continue participating in the process when the proposal was considered by the City Council.

Commissioner Merrill reiterated his concerns regarding consistency in applying the City's zoning standards but stated that he had no additional comments.

John Montgomery made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed Master Development Agreement for Falcons Landing Subdivision located approximately on Booth Street and Wild Rose Drive. With the following conditions: The Master Development Agreement shall substantially conform to the version presented to the Planning Commission. Any future subdivision plats shall comply with the approved Master Development Agreement and all applicable provisions of the Grantsville City Land Use Code. All required public improvements and infrastructure shall be designed and constructed in accordance with City standards. Any future amendments to the Master Development Agreement shall require review and approval in accordance with City Code. Installation of a six-foot privacy fence along the adjoining residential properties. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason Hill “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Nye.” The motion passed 2-1.

- 4. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Alington Subdivision on Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138.**

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the proposed Arlington Subdivision Planned Unit Development (PUD) was located on approximately 33.67 acres in the Mixed Use Zone at approximately 948 East SR-138. She reviewed the history of the project, explaining that the Planning Commission first reviewed a preliminary subdivision layout in October 2022, followed by City Council approval of the

preliminary plat in December 2022. She stated that the Planning Commission later reviewed the required PUD in September 2023 and that the applicant had since redesigned the project and returned with an updated proposal.

Shelby explained that the proposed PUD included 256 detached single-family residential units, commercial development fronting SR-138, public streets, private alleys, sidewalks, HOA-maintained open space and stormwater facilities, RV and contractor parking, and future phased development. She also reviewed the Flex Ready Home concept, explaining that the homes were designed with foundations and infrastructure that would allow homeowners to expand the homes over time while providing an attainable entry-level housing option. She noted that the proposed homes were expected to begin at approximately \$350,000.

Vice Chair Hill asked Shelby to review the requested deviations from the City's current development standards. Shelby explained that the applicant was requesting reduced lot sizes, reduced setbacks, increased lot coverage, a reduction in the required perimeter landscape buffer, and modifications to the open space requirements while meeting the remaining PUD standards. She also explained that the applicant proposed 1,138 parking stalls, including garage parking, driveway parking, visitor parking, and dedicated RV parking.

Commissioner Montgomery asked how the City determined moderate-income housing eligibility. Shelby explained that the City followed Tooele County Housing Authority guidelines and would require deed restrictions on 50 homes to ensure they remained within the moderate-income housing program.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the proposed price point generally aligned with moderate-income housing and expressed support for providing attainable homeownership opportunities within Grantsville. He commented that while the ability to expand the homes in the future was a benefit, he believed the greatest value was providing an affordable detached single-family home at the initial purchase price.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether the amount of open space had changed from the concept previously presented to the Planning Commission. Shelby explained that the layout had been modified to accommodate additional units and roadway improvements, resulting in changes to portions of the open space.

Commissioner Montgomery asked which roads would be public and which would remain private. Shelby explained that the primary east-west roadway and the connection to SR-138 would be public streets, while the western internal roads and alleyways would remain private and maintained by the homeowners association.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the proposed parking count included the future commercial development. Shelby explained that the 1,138 parking spaces were dedicated solely to the residential portion of the project.

Commissioner Merrill also expressed concern regarding the proposed seven-foot perimeter landscape buffer adjacent to existing residential properties, noting that it represented a significant reduction from the thirty-foot buffer required by the Land Use Ordinance. He stated that the overall concept appeared innovative and supported the goal of providing attainable housing but believed several requested deviations should be addressed before the proposal moved forward.

Commissioner Montgomery reiterated his support for the housing concept, stating that communities serious about providing attainable housing opportunities would likely need to consider projects similar to this proposal.

Joe White, was present to answer questions regarding this item. Joe clarified that the development continued to provide approximately 22 percent open space, consistent with the previous concept plan. He explained that while land and development costs in Grantsville would result in slightly higher home prices than similar projects in Ephraim, the homes were still expected to begin between approximately \$320,000 and \$340,000.

Joe also addressed concerns regarding the reduced landscape buffer, explaining that while the setback from the property line to the trail measured approximately seven feet, there would be additional separation between the trail and the homes, resulting in more than thirty feet between existing neighboring properties and the proposed structures. Commissioner Merrill requested that the plans clearly illustrate that separation in future submittals.

Commissioner Montgomery asked how homeowners would finance future home expansions. Joe explained that many homeowners could refinance as equity increased, although he acknowledged that not every home would ultimately be expanded. He added that the Flex Ready concept also provided flexibility through future accessory dwelling units and multigenerational living arrangements rather than relying solely on physical home additions.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether a future traffic signal was anticipated at Alington Way and SR-138. Shelby explained that UDOT would determine whether a signal was warranted through the required traffic study. Joe added that the project's traffic study had already been completed and that while a traffic signal was not currently warranted, UDOT had required deceleration lanes and other roadway improvements as part of the project.

Commissioner Merrill stated that his primary concern regarding the proposal had been addressed after clarification that the seven-foot measurement applied to the trail setback rather than the distance between the proposed homes and the adjoining residential properties.

Public Hearing

Email Received 07/05/2026:

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and City Council,

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the Alington Subdivision PUD (Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039). While the applicant, Ironwood Real Estate, LLC, proposes a mix of commercial and residential uses, the density of 5.9 units per acre – totaling 700 units – is an unsustainable burden on our existing community.

I urge you to deny this proposal for the following reasons:

- **Water Emergency Mandate:**

Governor Coxj's May 21, 2026, Executive Order declared a state of emergency due to historic drought. Grantsville is currently rationing water. Adding 700 new units will deplete reservoirs that are already at critical levels, directly threatening the water security of existing residents and their livestock.

- **Encroachment of Agricultural Rights:** The Alington site is adjacent established Rural Residential areas. Introducing high-density flex housing will lead to "nuisance" complaints against neighboring farm animals and violates the 100-foot setback requirements intended to protect agricultural uses.

- **Safety & Fire Access:** The Alington PUD features private streets. We require confirmation that these roads meet the 20-width and 55-foot outside turning radius required for aerial fire trucks. Failure to ensure this access puts current and future residents at risk.

- **Density & Lot Size:** The developer has required significantly reduced lot sizes (some as small as 1,000 sq. ft. for townhomes). This extreme density is fundamentally incompatible with the surrounding large-lot character of East Grantsville.

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the recommendation for both the Alington PUD and the Master Development Agreement.

Sincerely,

Clayton Barney

Email Received 07/03/2026:

Hello,

The Stahl family who has lived in Grantsville since 2018 and has loved this city despite the growth in the past 8 years would like to say that the plans for the Alington Subdivision do not at all match the lifestyle of Grantsville and it further poses issues of traffic and water. We understand that not every home will be built on half an acre or more

(although we wish they were and 100% percent support the decisions to keep the outlying areas zoned this way), we believe most of the citizens in Grantsville live here because they wanted the spread out, smaller town feeling. We do not want you to turn our city into a Salt Lake County type of place!

Sincerely,

Cole and Lindsay Stahl

Email Received 07/05/2026:

Dear:

Honorable Council Members and Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to formally log my protest against the proposed High-Density Planned Unit Development (PUD) located directly adjacent to my property at 3698 Sun Valley Drive and approximately 16 neighboring small agricultural tracts. While I understand the pressures of growth, inserting high-density residential zoning directly into an established, active agricultural corridor creates an immediate, irreconcilable conflict of land use.

When I purchased my property, I invested specifically in the rural zoning designation. This zoning explicitly permits and encourages small-scale farming, allowing my family to raise horses, pigs, goats, chickens, and cows, alongside a sustainable homestead garden. My neighbors and I actively utilize our lands for these exact agricultural purposes. Approving high-density housing directly bordering these 16 operational farms will inevitably result in severe nuisance complaints regarding livestock noise, dust, and standard agricultural odors. Furthermore, this development sits adjacent to Tooele Valley Meats, a vital local commercial agricultural operation. Introducing a dense population of residential tenants next to an active meat processing facility guarantees an influx of complaints that will unfairly jeopardize established local businesses and agricultural livelihoods. Beyond odor and noise conflicts, the sudden influx of high-density traffic adjacent to Sun Valley Drive poses a significant safety and infrastructure concern for a roadway designed for rural use. To mitigate these impacts and protect both existing property rights and future residents, the City must require a substantial zoning transition, which was approved in 2022 for single-family homes with 1/4 acre lots and half-acre lots that are better suited for the Rural residential lots next to Sun Valley and the Durfee street houses that are alongside this proposed development. I urge the Commission to mandate a low-density residential buffer zone immediately along Sun Valley Drive. A tiered buffer of larger, single-family lots graduating toward the interior of the development will naturally alleviate traffic congestion, provide a physical barrier for agricultural odors, and dramatically reduce future residential complaints.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and dedication to preserving the balanced rural heritage of Grantsville. I request that this letter be entered into the official public record for this application.

Sincerely,

Kevin Saunders and Christy Saunders, Owners

Clayton Barney: Clayton Barney was present to comment on this item. He stated that he was formally opposed to the proposed Master Development Agreement. He acknowledged that growth was inevitable but stated that it should not come at the expense of the established property rights and rural lifestyle of longstanding residents. He explained that he had lived next to the property for 29 years. He stated that his primary concern was the density of the proposed 243 Flex Ready Home units and their encroachment on the City's agricultural heritage. He referenced Grantsville Ordinance 2022-14, stating that animal use is prohibited within 100 feet of a residential dwelling. He stated for the record that his property contained an established pre-existing animal use and that, because his use predated the proposed development, it was legally grandfathered. He expressed concern that allowing high-density residential dwellings directly adjacent to his property would create an immediate and permanent conflict by placing new residents in a position to file nuisance complaints or pursue legal action against a pre-existing use. He requested that, before recommending approval of the Master Development Agreement, the Planning Commission require a 100-foot non-buildable buffer on the developer's side of the property line wherever the development bordered an existing large-animal property. He stated that this was the only way to honor the intent of the City's 100-foot separation requirement. He also requested that the proposed density be reduced, stating that 243 units on the property was inconsistent with the rural residential character described in the Grantsville City General Plan. He asked the Planning Commission to consider the interests of longstanding residents over those of a developer who did not reside in the area and urged the Commission to either deny the Master Development Agreement or require a significant perimeter buffer.

Nadine Hunt: Nadine Hunt was present to comment on this item. She stated that she was formally opposed to the proposed Alington Subdivision Planned Unit Development and Master Development Agreement. She explained that she had been unable to hear the previous speaker and apologized if any of her comments repeated information that had already been presented. She stated that while the applicant, Ironwood Real Estate LLC, proposed a mix of commercial and residential uses, the density of approximately 243 units, or possibly more, would create an unsustainable burden on the existing community. She urged the Planning Commission to deny the proposal. She referenced Governor Spencer Cox's May 21, 2026, Executive Order declaring a state of emergency due to historic drought conditions and stated that Grantsville City was currently rationing irrigation water. She expressed concern that adding 243 new units would further deplete

reservoirs that were already at critical levels, directly threatening the water security of existing residents and their livestock. She also expressed concerns regarding public safety and emergency access, stating that the Alington PUD included private streets or alleys and that confirmation was needed that they met the required 20-foot width and 55-foot outside turning radius for aerial trucks, fire trucks, ambulances, and other emergency vehicles. She stated that failure to provide adequate emergency access could place current and future residents at risk and could expose Grantsville City to potential liability for failing to meet applicable codes. She further expressed concern regarding the proposed density and reduced lot sizes, stating that some townhome lots were as small as 20 by 30 feet and that the proposed density was incompatible with the surrounding large-lot character of east Grantsville. She questioned whether Flex Ready Homes were required to pay property taxes and asked whether the revenue generated by the homes would cover the City's long-term costs to provide services. She asked who would be responsible for the funding gap if the revenue was insufficient. She respectfully requested that the Planning Commission deny both the proposed Planned Unit Development and the Master Development Agreement. She concluded by asking whether anyone present, including members of the Planning Commission or others in attendance, would be interested in purchasing one of the proposed homes.

Kayla Cameron: Kayla Cameron was present to comment on this item. She stated that she was representing her family and urged the Planning Commission to oppose approval of the proposed Alington subdivision development. She stated that traffic congestion had been a significant issue within the city with minimal improvements in recent years. She believed that addressing transportation concerns should be the City's top priority before approving large-scale commercial and residential development. She stated that, according to the City's General Plan, the transportation infrastructure had not been updated since 2005, despite including statistics from 2013 through 2015. She stated that whether it had been over 20 years or 10 years since the last update, the City's streets and traffic management systems required urgent attention. She referenced an October 2025 UDOT report stating that the major highways were deteriorating and would continue to worsen. She stated that UDOT had identified the need for improved local road networks and had based its assessments on the assumption that both SR-112 and SR-138 would be widened. She stated that even with those assumptions, projections indicated traffic volumes would more than double within six years. She noted that UDOT had recommended additional connector roads and the installation of traffic signals along the major routes and stated that residents should not have to wait another 20 years for traffic signals or infrastructure improvements. She stated that introducing a large mixed-use development would only worsen existing traffic issues. While she understood that the primary roads were managed by UDOT and that modifications required UDOT approval, she stated that it was ultimately the City's responsibility to ensure future development aligned with the General Plan. She respectfully requested that the City complete a comprehensive traffic impact

study for the project that considered full build-out scenarios, future expansion, school drop-off and pick-up traffic, deliveries, construction activity, and emergency response needs. She stated that she did not support approval of the Alington development until a traffic impact study had been publicly posted, reviewed by the City, and enforceable off-site improvements had been agreed upon and implemented prior to occupancy.

Marty Grant: Marty Grant was present to comment on this item. He stated that he was speaking specifically about Flex Ready Homes and what he considered to be an unproven concept in Utah. He stated that, according to Flex Ready Homes, their business model required regulatory flexibility and changes to local regulations in order to function. He referenced testimony by Kurt Mabry of Flex Ready Homes before the Utah State Legislature in support of House Bill 184 and stated that Kate Bradshaw and Cameron Diehl had expressed concerns and opposition to the bill. He stated that Mayor Bradshaw had said the bill fundamentally interfered with the authority of city councils, negatively impacted longstanding land use policy, and created a flawed process. He stated that House Bill 184 ultimately did not move forward, which he believed demonstrated that Utah had rejected the concept and that Grantsville should not become the local test case. He stated that Flex Ready Homes had given presentations to Eagle Mountain, Ephraim, Nephi, Helper, Heber City, Santaquin, Tooele, and Grantsville. Based on public records, he stated that Ephraim was the only city that had approved the concept and that the project consisted of only 34 Flex Ready Homes. He stated that the business model had not been proven but that Grantsville was being asked to become the "guinea pig" and the company's flagship project to market the concept to other cities. He stated that six of the seven cities had pushed back against the proposal. He referenced comments from council members in Heber City who questioned the affordability claims and requested proof that the concept was successful, stating that no proof of concept had been provided. He also referenced discussions in Helper City, stating that concerns had been raised regarding the City's ability to provide services and that the City Council had voted 4-1 to deny a development annexation associated with Flex Ready Homes. He further referenced comments from an Eagle Mountain Planning Commissioner expressing concern that the initial investment did not translate into direct value for the buyer. He stated that city after city had rejected the Flex Ready Homes concept and that only one development consisting of 34 homes had been approved in Ephraim, which had not yet been completed. He concluded by stating that Flex Ready Homes remained an experimental concept that had been promoted for several years without widespread acceptance and expressed concern that Grantsville would become an unsuccessful example if it approved the project. He requested that the Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposal.

Jeff Nestegard: Jeff Nestegard was present to comment on this item. He stated that he bordered the property to the south and wanted to begin by discussing what he believed

were the facts. He stated that he understood the proposed Flex Ready Homes would be priced slightly higher than those in Ephraim due to increased land and development costs. He stated that a Flex Ready Home in Ephraim was currently listed for \$369,000 on UtahRealEstate.com and that homes proposed in Heber City were expected to start at approximately \$450,000. He stated that he believed the proposed homes in Grantsville would realistically be priced around \$400,000. He also stated that there were already 2,339 approved higher-density housing units within Planned Unit Developments in Grantsville and questioned whether the traffic study for the project included those previously approved developments or only existing traffic conditions. He expressed concern that future traffic from those developments would travel along Main Street and should be considered. He stated that the property was effectively landlocked between two highways and that while the development was designed as a walkable neighborhood similar to Daybreak, residents would not be able to safely walk to the rest of the community because access required traveling along a major highway that currently lacked curb, gutter, and sidewalks. He also questioned the commercial setback along Main Street, stating that the City's Master Transportation Plan anticipated future roadway expansion. He expressed concern that when Main Street was eventually widened, eminent domain could affect existing Grantsville residents on the opposite side of the roadway due to the proximity of the proposed commercial area. He stated that his final concern was privacy. He explained that parking areas serving the development would back directly onto the existing one-acre lots along Sun Valley Drive, resulting in approximately 24 to 48 vehicles parking immediately adjacent to neighboring properties. He stated that vehicle headlights would shine directly into his bedroom window as vehicles entered and exited the parking stalls throughout the day and night. He also expressed concern that the seven-foot walking lane would attract a significant number of pedestrians, stating that as many as 1,100 people could use the neighborhood because of its design, but that he believed the proposed location was not appropriate for that type of development.

Ken Goodrich: Ken Goodrich was present to comment on this item. He stated that he was the first resident to move onto Sun Valley Drive and explained that the area had historically been agricultural with livestock uses. He recalled that several years earlier, when the property was still located in Tooele County, discussions had taken place with the developer, Tooele County, Grantsville City, and neighboring property owners regarding the future development of the property. He stated that all parties had agreed the lots directly behind Sun Valley Drive would consist of one-half-acre lots and believed those records should still exist. He stated that the current proposal was not what had originally been agreed upon. He stated that Planned Unit Developments did not work and expressed concern that the proposed high-density development would reduce surrounding property values. He stated that neighboring homes were valued between approximately \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 and believed the proposed development would negatively

impact those values. He also questioned the proposed stormwater retention design, stating that several smaller retention ponds appeared to be scattered throughout the project rather than one larger basin, and asked where the stormwater would ultimately drain. He expressed concern that the development would bring many additional neighbors directly behind existing homes, resulting in increased noise. He stated that he disagreed with the financing model associated with the Flex Ready Homes, referencing concerns that homeowners could eventually lose their homes when larger payments became due. He agreed with previous comments that although homes might initially sell for approximately \$350,000, they would not necessarily retain that resale value. He urged the Planning Commission to deny the proposal and stated that changes to lot sizes should be approached carefully, recalling a previous development dispute in Draper Heights where a developer attempted to reduce minimum lot sizes from 12,000 square feet to 7,000 square feet and ultimately lost a lawsuit. He concluded by asking the Planning Commission to consider not only the residents of Sun Valley Drive but the interests of the entire Grantsville community.

Robert Smith: Robert Smith was present to comment on this item. He stated that he had moved to Sun Valley Drive two years earlier to leave the city because he believed Grantsville would continue to develop in a manner similar to the nearby ranchette-style neighborhoods. He stated that he supported the original concept that had been presented but did not support the current proposal. He expressed concern that the proposed development would result in vehicle lights shining toward neighboring homes and driveways, increased activity behind existing properties, and residents looking over backyard fences. He stated that, as a retired contractor, he had seen similar developments before and believed the same issues would occur with this project. He stated that developments of this type should be located on the outskirts of the city where similar higher-density projects already existed and believed the area should instead continue with ranchette, half-acre, or quarter-acre lots. He also expressed concern about the impact the development would have on local schools, questioning whether existing schools were large enough to accommodate the additional children. He stated that traffic was already difficult along the roadway and explained that it could take him up to 10 minutes to turn left from his property due to traffic congestion. He stated that he did not believe adequate traffic studies had been completed to support a development of this size and that he was completely opposed to the proposal. He stated that Grantsville should maintain its country lifestyle and smaller-scale development, adding that preserving the community's appearance was important. He commented that when he moved to Grantsville, he realized how beautiful the community was and expressed concern that introducing large-scale, higher-density development at the entrance to the city would change that character. He stated that he appreciated seeing homes along Main Street rather than large apartment buildings or similar developments and questioned how tall the proposed homes would be, stating that he was concerned about the future view from his backyard. He also

questioned the height of the proposed commercial building at the front of the development, stating that it would become the primary view from his property. He pointed out that the proposed parking lot would be located behind his garage and expressed concern that the parking lot lighting would shine onto his property at night. He stated that instead of seeing the moon and stars, he would see parking lot lights. He also expressed concern that the development would increase noise and unwanted activity in the area.

Dylan Nish: Dylan Nish was present to comment on this item. He stated that he agreed with many of the comments made by previous speakers. He recalled the prior development proposal from 2022, which included lower-density development and a transition in density, and stated that he believed that proposal was reasonable. He stated that the current proposal was significantly different. He explained that his concern was not with growth itself but with whether the proposed density and land use pattern were compatible with the existing neighborhood and the Grantsville General Plan. He stated that the proposal requested numerous exceptions and that, taken together, they represented a substantial departure from existing standards. He referenced the Planning Commission's December 2024 discussion regarding the Warm Springs Ranches project, where the applicant sought to change the land use from Rural Residential Two to Medium Density. He stated that the meeting minutes reflected that the Planning Commission was not in favor of approving a project that conflicted with the General Plan and Future Land Use Map. He stated that the existing one-acre residential lots in the Sun Valley area would be directly adjacent to a Planned Unit Development with an approximate density of 8.46 units per acre, creating what he described as an abrupt density transition. He encouraged the Planning Commission to first determine whether the proposal was compatible with the surrounding one-acre residential properties and to apply the same standard used during the December 2024 discussion. He stated that if the proposal was not compatible with the General Plan, Future Land Use Map, and surrounding land uses, the Planning Commission should either deny the proposal or continue the item until the applicant submitted a revised plan that included a lower-density transition, perimeter buffers, larger perimeter lots, increased setbacks, open space, fencing, and visual cross sections. He stated that he had lived in Tooele County his entire life and had chosen to move to Grantsville because of its lower housing density and community character. He asked the Planning Commission to consider the proposal as though it were being developed adjacent to their own neighborhoods or the neighborhoods of someone close to them. He stated that he did not believe the proposed abrupt transition was the direction Grantsville should take and suggested that a gradual transition in density would be more appropriate.

Trista Favors: Trista Favors was present to comment on this item. She thanked the Planning Commission for the opportunity to speak and first expressed concern regarding

the public notification process. She stated that very few residents in her neighborhood had received mailed notice of the proposal or the public hearing. She stated that this was concerning given the significance of the proposed development and believed comprehensive notification should be a mandatory part of the process so residents had the opportunity to be informed and involved when changes of that scale were being considered. She then shared her experience as a homeowner who had already experienced the effects of a similar high-density development. She stated that her first home was built in 2020, was well maintained, and was located in a neighborhood of comparable single-family homes with large yards. She explained that shortly after moving in, a high-density development was constructed directly across the street from her home. She stated that since that time she had experienced significant difficulty selling her home. She explained that she had listed the home for sale twice and, during the first listing, had been forced to remove it from the market because she could not afford to continue paying for two homes while it remained unsold. She stated that every realtor she had spoken with identified the high-density development across the street as the primary reason for reduced buyer interest. She stated that prospective buyers expressed concerns regarding traffic, noise, parking overflow, neighborhood stability, and light pollution. She explained that she, like many other residents, had chosen to move to Grantsville for the peace, open space, and relief from city congestion. She stated that even when prospective buyers liked the home itself, they hesitated because of the surrounding development. She explained that she was not speaking hypothetically but from personal experience and expressed concern that another high-density development would negatively affect the resale value of her current home. She stated that for most homeowners their home represented their largest financial investment and that the impacts of developments placed adjacent to single-family neighborhoods were measurable and personal. She stated that she understood the need for growth and additional housing opportunities and was not opposed to development, but she asked the Planning Commission to consider the long-term impacts on existing homeowners who had already experienced the effects of high-density development on property values. She stated that once property value was lost, homeowners had no recourse.

Kimberly Smith: Kimberly Smith was present to comment on this item. She stated that she understood the need for development and explained that she and her husband had previously sold two and one-half acres of property in Magna that was later developed into a smaller residential subdivision. She stated that they had originally wanted to build a home on that property but ultimately sold it to a contractor after difficulties with the city. She stated that she believed property owners had the right to develop their land to a point. She explained that she and her husband had invested their savings into purchasing a home on an acre lot in Grantsville, had built a shop, and intended to remain there. She stated that when they purchased the property, they expected additional homes would eventually be built nearby and were comfortable with half-acre lots, but they did not anticipate a

development of the proposed density. She stated that Grantsville had a large amount of undeveloped land and questioned why a project of this type could not be located in an area that was not immediately adjacent to established neighborhoods. She expressed concern that placing the proposed development next to existing higher-value homes would negatively affect surrounding property values. She stated that she supported the developer's right to make use of the property but asked the Planning Commission to consider how they would feel if they had recently purchased a retirement home on an acre lot and then learned that a high-density development would be constructed immediately adjacent to it. She asked the Planning Commission to consider whether another location would be more appropriate for the project. She also expressed concerns regarding the proposed homeowners association, stating that she had heard the monthly HOA fee would be approximately \$50. She questioned whether that amount would be sufficient to maintain the development and expressed concern that inadequate maintenance could cause the neighborhood to deteriorate over time. She stated that her realtor had suggested developments with insufficient maintenance could eventually resemble a mobile home park. She also questioned whether young homeowners purchasing homes in the proposed price range would have sufficient financial resources to maintain and improve their properties, noting that her son had purchased a \$350,000 home and that the monthly mortgage payment, including taxes and insurance, was approximately \$2,300. She stated that if homeowners were financially stretched, they might not be able to maintain their homes, which could negatively affect future property values.

Teresa Jensen: Teresa Jensen was present to comment on this item. She stated that she had lived on East Main Street since 1997 and expressed concerns regarding existing traffic conditions. She stated that she had witnessed numerous accidents in front of her home caused by speeding drivers who were unable to stop for vehicles turning into Tooele Valley Meats. She explained that during the morning and evening commute it took her an average of 17 minutes to leave her driveway. She also described a recent medical emergency in January during which emergency responders had difficulty leaving her driveway despite using their sirens because motorists would not pull over. She stated that although the posted speed limit was 40 miles per hour, many drivers were traveling between 55 and 60 miles per hour by the time they reached her home after passing through the traffic signal. She expressed concern that accidents on Main Street would continue to occur and questioned whether UDOT's future evaluation of traffic concerns would adequately address the proposed development's access location, which she noted was less than one-half mile from the existing traffic signal. She expressed concern that vehicles making left turns into and out of the proposed development would create additional traffic hazards and increase the likelihood of accidents. She stated that she agreed with previous comments regarding preserving the peaceful character of the area. She explained that she enjoyed the quiet surroundings, sunrises, sunsets, and nighttime

views and expressed concern that the proposed roadway expansion would bring traffic closer to her home. She stated that she already could not open her front or side windows because vehicle exhaust entered her home, aggravating her asthma. She explained that those who did not live along Main Street may not understand the daily impact of traffic-related pollution. She also stated that drivers frequently accelerated near her property because the speed limit increased to 50 miles per hour just beyond her home. She shared that her niece had been killed in a head-on collision on the nearby curve and stated that excessive speed continued to be a serious problem. She suggested that additional law enforcement presence or even a stationary patrol vehicle could encourage drivers to reduce their speeds.

Michelle Barney: Michelle Barney was present to comment on this item. She stated that the proposed development would directly border the rear of her property. She explained that she owned livestock that represented a substantial financial investment and expressed concern that the estimated traffic generated by the proposed development would create a nuisance for those animals. She stated that the volume of vehicle traffic, along with vehicle lights and increased activity, would negatively affect neighboring properties. She also stated that other nearby residents owned valuable livestock and believed the proposed development would have similar impacts on their properties. She concluded by stating that she believed the proposal would not be appropriate for the area.

Corey Clark: Corey Clark was present to comment on this item. He stated that he agreed with the comments made by previous speakers. He recalled that the developer had met with neighboring residents in 2022 and presented a plan that he believed worked for both the developer and the surrounding property owners. He stated that because the earlier proposal had been approved, he believed the developer had also supported that concept at the time. He described the project area as the gateway into Grantsville and stated that, based on what he had heard during the meeting, the current proposal appeared to be an experiment. He questioned whether the entrance to the community was the appropriate location for an experimental housing concept, noting that it would be one of the first things people would see when entering the city. He stated that planning involved creating a balance between accommodating new growth and protecting existing residents and acknowledged that achieving that balance was not always easy. He stated that if Grantsville wished to experiment with this type of housing, the project should be much smaller and include a transition of varying lot sizes rather than introducing approximately 240 higher-density units in one location. He also expressed concern that higher-density housing could contribute to increased crime, stating that greater distance between homes generally promoted better neighborhoods. He stated that he believed studies would support the conclusion that concentrating a large number of people into a small area could create additional issues over time. He explained that many residents purchased one-acre lots because they valued privacy, space, and separation from neighboring

properties and believed a gradual transition in density should be provided rather than placing high-density development directly adjacent to existing homes. He further stated that higher-density housing should be located closer to community amenities such as grocery stores and entertainment because residents of those developments were more likely to walk to those destinations. He stated that placing the proposed development between two highways without convenient pedestrian access to services made it a poor location regardless of whether he lived nearby. He also expressed concern that the location would create safety hazards for children due to its proximity to the highways and referenced a previous fatal motorcycle accident involving a child near the area. He concluded by stating that he believed placing a development of this size adjacent to a highway would create unnecessary risks.

Kathy Baker: Kathy Baker was present to comment on this item. She stated that traffic was already difficult when attempting to turn onto the highway from her neighborhood and that adding the proposed number of homes did not seem feasible given the existing traffic conditions. She stated that, based on the discussion, it appeared the Planning Commission may have already formed an opinion on the proposal but asked the Commission to reconsider and not approve the development. She asked the Planning Commission to listen to the concerns of existing residents. She stated that she and other residents chose to live in Grantsville because they wanted a country setting. She acknowledged that growth was occurring and that other developments had already been approved, but she believed the proposed density was too high for the area. She stated that she understood the need for more affordable housing but did not believe this proposal was the appropriate way to provide it. She asked the Planning Commission to consider the concerns of existing residents and stated that while she wanted to see Grantsville continue to grow, she wanted that growth to occur in a positive manner and did not believe the proposed development would accomplish that.

Trevor Brimley: Trevor Brimley was present to comment on this item. He stated that, based on the proposed site plan, the commercial portion of the development would back directly onto his property. He expressed concern that the City should complete an assessment of the project's anticipated water usage. Drawing on his public works background, he stated that the City should calculate the expected water demand for each household, determine the nearest available well, evaluate whether booster stations would be necessary, and identify where stormwater runoff from the subdivision would be directed during rain and snow events. He also stated that the City should receive appropriate benefits from the development because growth would continue to occur. He requested that the previously approved development plan be brought forward and compared to the current proposal before any decision was made.

Christopher Fields: Christopher Fields was present to comment on this item. He stated that although he did not live near the proposed development, he wanted to offer a different perspective. He explained that he had lived in Grantsville for 51 years and had nine children, none of whom could afford to purchase a home in Grantsville. He stated that one daughter had moved to Virginia, another had moved to North Carolina, and two of his sons had moved to Missouri in search of more affordable housing. He stated that while he was not necessarily in agreement with the proposed development, he believed Grantsville needed more affordable housing. He stated that providing affordable housing was something the City Council and Planning Commission should work toward. He noted that proposed home prices between approximately \$350,000 and \$369,000 were still difficult to afford and stated that the median household income in Grantsville was approximately \$68,000. He explained that many families required two incomes to purchase a home. He stated that if the project were developed with only half-acre or one-acre lots, home prices would likely increase to between approximately \$590,000 and \$700,000, making homeownership even less attainable for young families. He stated that the City needed to make responsible decisions that would allow developers to build housing that was affordable for local residents. He expressed concern that, without additional affordable housing options, more families would continue moving away from Grantsville and Utah to be able to afford a home. He stated that he did not want to see other parents experience having their children leave the area because they could not afford to remain in the community. He concluded by stating that it was the responsibility of the City's leaders to ensure housing opportunities existed that were affordable based on the community's median household income.

Carrie Gregerson: Carrie Gregerson was present to comment on this item. She stated that she agreed with the concerns expressed by previous speakers and wanted to raise an additional concern regarding the local schools. She stated that Twenty Wells Elementary School was only a few years old and already had a teacher-to-student ratio of approximately 22 to 25 students per teacher, which she believed was already at or near the state average. She stated that the proposed development of approximately 256 homes would likely generate a significant number of additional students. She explained that even using a conservative student generation rate of 0.4 children per home, the project could add approximately 100 students to the current school boundaries. She noted that because the homes were being marketed as starter homes, the number of children could be even higher. She stated that an additional 100 students would require at least four more classrooms at Twenty Wells Elementary. She shared that her children had attended Twenty Wells and that she had always had positive experiences with the teachers and principal. She praised the teachers for the work they were doing but expressed concern that increasing class sizes could lead to teacher burnout. She also expressed concern about school transportation, stating that students along Main Street were already bused to Twenty Wells Elementary, the junior high, and the high school. She explained that traffic

was already congested during morning bus pickups and stated that some motorists failed to stop for school buses. She questioned how additional students who could not safely walk to school would affect bus routes, pickup locations, transportation capacity, and the ability of teachers to effectively educate the increased student population. She also requested clarification regarding whether the proposed Flex Ready Homes would pay property taxes, noting that a portion of education funding was supported through property taxes. She stated that property taxes had increased during the five years she had lived in Grantsville and expressed concern that if the proposed homes did not contribute property tax revenue, it could further affect the City's ability to adequately fund education for additional students.

Ira Malmgren: Ira Malmgren was present to comment on this item. He stated that he agreed with many of the comments made by previous speakers. He shared that his daughter lived in a higher-density development in Herriman with her seven-year-old son and stated that, when visiting, he found the streets so narrow that it was difficult to travel through the neighborhood. He expressed concern that children in that development were unable to ride their bicycles or play outside without parental supervision because of the amount of traffic. He compared that experience to his own childhood growing up in a rural community, where children were able to ride bicycles and play outdoors more freely. He stated that in developments of this type, children often had to remain indoors because of traffic and safety concerns. He also noted that the development his daughter lived in did not have sidewalks. He stated that he did not believe that was a desirable way for children to grow up and expressed concern that children in those neighborhoods spent more time inside using their phones rather than participating in outdoor activities. He concluded by stating that he did not believe children in the proposed development would have the same opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Mike Fleming: Mike Fleming was present to comment on this item. He stated that he had moved to Grantsville approximately five years earlier after selling his home in Taylorsville and building what he intended to be his permanent home. He explained that he had not expected a development of this type to be constructed nearby. He expressed concern about traffic in the area, stating that drivers traveled too fast, were often inattentive, and referenced witnessing the fatal accident involving a child several years earlier. He stated that the area was already too dark and that increased traffic would create additional safety concerns. He also questioned whether the proposed Flex Ready Homes would truly be affordable. While he acknowledged that the initial purchase price might be lower, he stated that his own property taxes had increased from approximately \$3,800 to more than \$5,000 since building his home and noted that his neighbors had experienced similar increases. He questioned whether homeowners in the proposed development would still be able to afford their homes if property taxes continued to increase. He also expressed concerns regarding the City's sewer and water infrastructure, noting that

Grantsville had recently been in the news regarding needed sewer system improvements. He questioned whether the existing infrastructure would remain adequate after accommodating the proposed development or whether additional improvements would eventually be required, resulting in increased costs and higher property taxes that could make the homes less affordable. He also stated that information he had reviewed indicated Flex Ready Homes could potentially be used as rental properties and questioned whether those homes would be required to meet the same safety standards as other rental housing, including fire sprinkler systems and emergency egress requirements. He concluded by stating that his primary concerns were public safety and preserving the character of Grantsville as a small community.

Mark Cox: Mark Cox was present to comment on this item. He stated that he had worked in construction throughout his career and had experience with utility planning for subdivisions and municipalities. He acknowledged that there may be a need for affordable housing developments but believed that, as with real estate, the most important consideration was location. He stated that previous speakers had correctly noted that this type of development would be better suited in an area closer to schools, shopping, grocery stores, and other community amenities. He also expressed concern regarding the traffic impacts, stating that the volume of vehicles entering and exiting onto the major highways from both ends of the development presented a significant safety concern. He concluded by stating that he opposed the proposed development at the proposed location.

Kristen Nestegard: Kristen Nestegard was present to comment on this item. She stated that she had a 16-year-old son who would likely be moving out within the next three to four years and acknowledged that she understood the need for starter homes and wanted her son to be able to remain in the community. She questioned whether the more than 2,300 affordable starter homes that had already been approved in Planned Unit Developments were sufficient and stated that the City should plan accordingly by spacing higher-density developments throughout the community so they would not negatively impact neighboring properties. She referenced Grantsville Planned Unit Development Code, Section 12.4, Chapter 10, which states that the architectural design, massing, scale, and height of development should be designed to fit the scale and aesthetics of surrounding properties. She expressed concern that the amount of affordable housing already approved would soon outweigh the number of traditional single-family homes available for sale. She also referenced comments made by her husband regarding the proposed walking path located along the rear of their property and stated that approximately 1,100 future residents would have direct access immediately behind their backyard. She expressed concern that the walking path would increase privacy and crime concerns for neighboring property owners. She concluded by thanking the Planning Commission for their time and expressed appreciation for her neighbors' participation and willingness to speak.

Michelle Marriott: Michelle Marriott was present to comment on this item. She stated that although she did not live near the proposed development, she regularly attended or watched Planning Commission meetings and believed that developers were continually requesting approval for additional high-density housing. She stated that a significant amount of higher-density housing had already been approved and expressed her belief that many Grantsville residents did not want additional developments of that type. She stated that homes were being built at a rapid pace and expressed concern that continued growth would require additional schools, infrastructure, and public services, resulting in increased taxes. She stated that she and her family had moved to Grantsville from Bountiful four years earlier after experiencing similar high-density growth there. She explained that a development similar to the one being proposed had been constructed near her former home and stated that, after approximately 15 years, it had significantly deteriorated. She stated that she had personally seen a similar project decline over time. She expressed her belief that most Grantsville residents preferred open space and lower-density development and stated that those who had purchased properties with open space did not want higher-density housing immediately adjacent to their homes.

Stephanie Wheat: Stephanie Wheat was present to comment on this item. She stated that she and her husband moved to Grantsville in 2019 and intentionally waited two years to purchase an existing home because they did not want to move into a new subdivision. She explained that they wanted to become part of the community without placing additional demands on local resources or contributing to the loss of agricultural land. She stated that they preferred purchasing an existing home rather than contributing to new development. She acknowledged that many families wanted to live near their children but stated that, in some circumstances, the better solution was for parents to relocate closer to their children rather than continuing to expand development.

Chad Wheat: Chad Wheat was present to comment on this item. He stated that property taxes had increased every year since they moved to Grantsville and that homeowners insurance costs had also continued to rise. He expressed concern that once taxes increased they rarely decreased and stated that many homeowners were being financially pressured by rising taxes, insurance premiums, and general maintenance costs. He stated that some residents were being forced to leave homes they owned because they could no longer afford the ongoing expenses and noted that not everyone had family members available to help them. He also expressed concern that higher-density development could contribute to increased crime. He explained that he had previously lived in West Valley City, where he had witnessed farmland and open space replaced by dense residential development over time. He stated that those changes affected his family and were one of the reasons they chose to move to Grantsville. He explained that they moved to Grantsville seeking a better quality of life and a stronger sense of community. He stated that while developments such as the proposed project might benefit developers

financially, he did not believe they would benefit longtime residents. He noted that several speakers had described moving to Grantsville because of its peaceful, rural character and stated that although he did not live near the proposed development, he believed its impacts would affect the entire community. He concluded by stating that he opposed the proposal and wanted to support the residents who would be most directly affected.

Discussion and Consideration

Vice Chair Hill opened the discussion by asking Commissioner Merrill for his comments regarding the proposed Planned Unit Development.

Commissioner Merrill stated that his primary concern continued to be traffic along SR-138. He expressed surprise that the traffic study did not warrant a signalized intersection given the amount of existing traffic and questioned whether the study had accounted for other approved developments in the area.

Joe White explained that the traffic study had been completed by a licensed traffic engineer and that UDOT ultimately determined whether a signal was warranted. Vice Chair Hill asked Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore to explain the City's current transportation planning efforts. Shelby stated that the recently adopted Master Transportation Plan designated SR-138 and SR-112 as major arterial roadways and explained that UDOT retained authority over access management and future traffic signal warrants. She noted that detailed traffic studies would continue to be reviewed as projects advanced beyond the conceptual stage.

Vice Chair Hill also asked whether the proposed private streets complied with fire access requirements. Joe explained that the project had undergone three separate reviews with the Fire Department and confirmed that the roadway layout, alley access, and fire access met all applicable requirements.

Commissioner Merrill asked how the proposed development would affect neighboring properties in Tooele County that contained horses and other livestock. Shelby explained that the neighboring properties were located within Tooele County and were therefore governed by Tooele County ordinances rather than Grantsville City's Land Use Ordinance. She stated that the existing agricultural uses were considered legally established and would remain vested.

Commissioner Montgomery asked Shelby to explain what types of development could occur on the property under the existing Mixed Use zoning without a Planned Unit Development. Shelby explained that the zoning already permitted commercial development, detached single-family homes on 4,000-square-foot lots, and attached

housing at substantially greater densities than the proposal before the Planning Commission. She stated that the applicant had worked with staff to develop an alternative consisting of detached single-family homes rather than maximizing the density otherwise allowed under the zoning designation.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the applicant would consider installing a privacy fence adjacent to the Sun Valley Ranchettes subdivision. Joe White stated that he had no objection to installing a six-foot vinyl privacy fence if requested by the City. He explained that the development team had worked throughout the review process to create a project that balanced affordable housing, neighborhood compatibility, and the City's long-term planning goals. Joe also reviewed the history of the sewer agreement associated with the property and explained that the development would contribute toward sewer infrastructure improvements while utilizing previously approved sewer capacity.

Joe further explained that the project had secured the necessary water rights, sewer capacity, irrigation rights, and utility approvals during the year-long review process. He stated that the development was not intended to be an experiment but rather an opportunity to provide flexible housing options while allowing homeowners to build equity over time.

Vice Chair Hill asked Joe to clarify the minimum home and lot sizes proposed within the development. Joe explained that the smallest home would contain approximately 1,200 square feet with three bedrooms and two bathrooms and would be located on lots designed specifically for the Flex Ready product. Shelby displayed the proposed lot layouts to illustrate the smallest home sites.

Commissioner Merrill commented that while he understood many residents' concerns, he believed the proposal complied with the City's zoning requirements and property owners' rights. He stated that affordable housing opportunities continued to be limited throughout Tooele County and that the project provided an opportunity for young families, first-time homebuyers, and others seeking attainable homeownership. He also noted that housing prices naturally increased over time and stated that he had difficulty recommending denial of a proposal that met the City's adopted standards.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that he respected the concerns expressed by neighboring property owners but emphasized that the property had already been zoned Mixed Use through the legislative process. He explained that both existing property owners and the applicant possessed property rights that deserved equal consideration. He stated that substantially denser residential or commercial development could occur under the existing zoning and believed the proposal represented a reasonable balance between the applicant's property rights and the City's housing needs. Commissioner Montgomery

also emphasized the importance of providing attainable housing opportunities for future Grantsville residents.

Vice Chair Hill asked Shelby to explain whether the City's new wastewater treatment facility had been designed to accommodate future growth. Shelby confirmed that the new system had been planned to serve both vested developments and anticipated future growth. She explained that if capacity constraints ever occurred during the transition between the existing and new systems, the City could temporarily delay issuance of building permits until additional capacity became available. Joe White added that the project's sewer capacity had been vested through an agreement approved in 2021.

Vice Chair Hill thanked the residents who attended and submitted comments, stating that public participation helped the Planning Commission make informed decisions. He acknowledged that balancing neighborhood concerns with property rights was one of the Commission's most difficult responsibilities. He explained that, in his opinion, the proposal met the intent of the City's Mixed Use zoning and encouraged those in attendance to continue participating in the process by attending the upcoming City Council meeting.

Commissioner Merrill noted that 24 residents had participated in the public comment process, including those who submitted written comments.

Commissioner Montgomery reiterated that the Planning Commission had carefully considered the public comments but stated that the existing zoning established the property's development rights. He explained that the Commission was required to evaluate the application based on the City's adopted ordinances and applicable law.

Gary Merrill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Alington Subdivision on Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138. With the following condition: Installation of a privacy fence adjacent to the Sun Valley Ranchettes subdivision to be installed with phasing. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason Hill "Aye," John Montgomery "Aye," Gary Merrill "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.

- 5. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement for the Alington Subdivision on Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138.**

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reviewed the proposed Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Arlington Flex Homes Planned Unit Development. She explained that the agreement followed the City's standard MDA template previously approved by the Planning Commission and City Council. Shelby reviewed the recitals, including the project acreage, approved residential density, zoning designation, and the existing sewer development agreement between Ironwood and Lakeview Business Park.

Shelby explained that the agreement required each phase of the development to be completed within two years of approval and outlined the developer's responsibilities regarding construction, bonding requirements, project improvements, durability testing, material and labor payments, infrastructure upsizing, parks and open space, homeowners association responsibilities, and default provisions. She noted that these provisions were consistent with the City's standard development agreement requirements.

Shelby reviewed the project exhibits, explaining that Exhibit B contained the approved project layout and Exhibit C identified the zoning modifications previously discussed by the Planning Commission. She also reviewed the water and sewer service agreements, explaining that the developer would reimburse a total of \$495,000 toward the sewer development agreement at a rate of \$2,021.73 per residential unit, with the remaining balance required to be paid before issuance of the final ten building permits. Shelby stated that the reimbursement agreement updated the original 2021 sewer service agreement associated with the property.

Commissioner Montgomery asked how the City intended to address concerns regarding future nuisance complaints related to neighboring livestock operations. Attorney Tysen Barker explained that the City's nuisance ordinance specifically excluded lawful agricultural production, including livestock operations, from the definition of a nuisance. He stated that residents purchasing homes adjacent to existing agricultural uses would be expected to recognize those existing conditions and that the City's ordinances already protected lawful agricultural activities.

Shelby added that subdivision plats routinely included Right-to-Farm language notifying future property owners that surrounding agricultural uses could continue.

Commissioner Merrill questioned whether additional disclosures should be provided to future homeowners beyond the existing Right-to-Farm notice. Attorney Barker stated that he believed the City's ordinances adequately addressed the issue but acknowledged that additional disclosure language could also be considered.

Joe White, stated that including the information within the subdivision's CC&Rs or homeowner disclosure documents would likely be more effective than placing additional

restrictions on property titles. He explained that the development already utilized a homeowner information sheet summarizing important community requirements and indicated that similar language regarding neighboring agricultural uses could be incorporated.

Public Hearing

Dylan Nish: Dylan Nish was present to comment on this item. He stated that he wanted to ensure existing property rights were protected and that neighboring property owners had assurances beyond the initial sale of the proposed homes. He expressed concern about the long-term protection of adjacent property owners. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore thanked him for his comments and invited him to contact or visit the Planning and Zoning office if he had additional questions.

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Merrill asked Attorney Barker whether neighboring property owners would continue to be protected if agricultural uses changed in the future. Attorney Tysen Barker explained that Tooele County regulations governed the adjoining county properties and that the City could not regulate activities occurring outside its jurisdiction. He further explained that the City's ordinances were intended to protect existing residential property owners from new agricultural impacts while recognizing lawful existing agricultural uses.

Commissioner Montgomery suggested requiring future homeowners to acknowledge the presence of neighboring agricultural uses through the subdivision's CC&Rs. Joe White expressed support for including disclosure language within the CC&Rs rather than on individual property deeds, explaining that deed restrictions could create unnecessary complications during future property sales.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that the purpose of the disclosure was to ensure future homeowners understood they were purchasing property adjacent to existing agricultural uses and the associated rights of neighboring property owners.

Vice Chair Hill suggested that the CC&Rs include language acknowledging that the subdivision adjoined properties where livestock and agricultural activities were permitted, regardless of whether those activities were occurring at the time of purchase. Commissioner Montgomery agreed that such language would help protect existing neighboring property owners.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed Master Development Agreement for the Alington Subdivision on

Parcels 01-059-0-0040 and 01-059-0-0039, located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zone, approximately at 948 East and SR-138. With the following conditions: The development shall substantially conform to the approved Master Development Agreement and Concept Plan. All exhibits referenced within the Master Development Agreement shall be adhered to. The final residential unit count shall be consistent throughout all project documents. All public improvements shall comply with Grantsville City Engineering Standards. The applicant shall obtain all required UDOT approvals prior to construction of access onto SR-138. Future subdivision phases shall comply with the approved Planned Unit Development and Master Development Agreement. HOA documents shall clearly establish maintenance responsibilities for all private improvements and common open space. All applicable City, state, and federal permits shall be obtained prior to construction. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations contained within the approved Traffic Impact Study and Geotechnical Investigation. Any future amendments to the Planned Unit Development or Master Development Agreement shall require review in accordance with the Land Use Development and Management Code. All public improvements shall comply with Grantsville City Engineering Standards. Future subdivision phases shall comply with the approved Master Development Agreement. The agreement shall be recorded with the Tooele County Recorder following City Council approval. The subdivision CC&Rs contain language notifying future homeowners that the development adjoined existing agricultural properties where livestock and agricultural activities may occur. A privacy fence no less than six feet and no greater than seven feet in height along the western and southern boundaries adjacent to existing residential properties, with installation to occur as each phase of the subdivision was developed. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

6. Approval of the minutes from the June 16, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Gary Merrill made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 16, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Jason “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

7. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided an update on Community Development activity and permit revenues. Shelby reported that permit revenue had increased significantly over the past several fiscal years, growing from approximately \$200,000 during her first year to approximately \$1.2 million during the most recent fiscal year. She stated that the increase reflected both the City's continued growth and staff's efforts to ensure permit fees were properly collected to offset departmental operating costs.

Shelby also reported that the number of permits processed by the department had increased from approximately 25–50 permits annually to approximately 135 permits.

Commissioner Montgomery asked how permit revenue compared to the City's overall budget. Shelby stated that she did not have that information available but noted that permit revenue represented a significant contribution to Community Development operations.

Vice Chair Hill asked what percentage of permit fees remained uncollected. Shelby explained that while some fees remained outstanding, most were not delinquent but rather associated with projects that had not yet reached the stage when payment was required, such as Master Development Agreements that become payable upon recording of the final plat.

8. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Merrill complimented the City on the success of the Fourth of July celebration, including the parade, carnival, car show, and fireworks display. He recognized the efforts of City staff and volunteers who worked throughout the event and stated that the celebration was well organized.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore added that this was the first year the parade entries had been announced over the public address system. She stated that several attendees and parade participants expressed appreciation for the live announcements.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the City had ever considered coordinating parade times with Tooele City so residents could attend both celebrations. Mayor Heidi Hammond explained that the idea had been discussed previously but that many residents preferred the current schedule because it allowed them to participate in the flag raising ceremony, breakfast, race, and other morning activities before the parade.

Commissioner Merrill also complimented the Police Department for placing cones and signs along the parade route to discourage spectators from entering the roadway to collect candy. Mayor Hammond stated that the safety measures had been effective and noted that the City planned to increase the buffer distance during future parades.

Vice Chair Hill echoed Commissioner Merrill's comments, commending City staff for the successful community celebration. He thanked staff for the extensive preparation that went into each Planning Commission meeting and expressed appreciation for their continued support of the Commission.

9. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Derek Dalton reported that the City Council had not met since the previous Planning Commission meeting because the regular meeting had been canceled due to the Fourth of July festivities. He thanked City staff, volunteers, and Mayor Heidi Hammond for the significant amount of time dedicated to organizing the celebration and stated that the event had been very successful.

City Council Member Dalton also expressed appreciation for the large public turnout at the Planning Commission meeting. He stated that while lengthy meetings could be challenging, he appreciated seeing residents participate in the public process and respectfully share their opinions. He encouraged similar participation during the upcoming City Council meeting.

Vice Chair Hill thanked City Council Member Dalton for attending the meeting and providing an update.

City Council Member Dalton thanked the Planning Commission members for volunteering their time and for the work they performed on behalf of the community.

10. Adjourn.

Gary Merrill made a motion to adjourn. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.