

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 4, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

AGENDA

1. Presentation, **Public Hearing**, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of a proposed amendment to Chapter 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to add the R-1-21 Zone as a zoning designation for Micro-Entrepreneurship.
2. Presentation, **Public Hearing**, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.
3. Approval of the minutes from the July 21, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.
4. Report from City Staff.
5. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.
6. Report from City Council.
7. Adjourn.

Shelby Moore
Zoning Administrator
Grantsville City Community & Economic Development



**Scan QR code
to join Zoom
meeting.**

Join Zoom Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4358843411>

By Phone, Dial: 1-253-215-8782

Meeting ID: 435 884 3411

AGENDA ITEM #1

Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of a proposed amendment to Chapter 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to add the R-1-21 Zone as a zoning designation for Micro-Entrepreneurship.



STAFF REPORT

To: Grantsville City Planning Commission

From: Shelby Moore, Zoning Administrator

Meeting Date: August 4th, 2026

Public Hearing Date: August 4th, 2026

Re: Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Consideration of a proposed amendment to Chapter 15 of the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code to add the R-1-21 zoning district as an eligible zoning designation for Micro-Entrepreneurship.

Background

Chapter 15 currently allows Micro-Entrepreneurship within the RM-7 zoning district. The City currently has one approved Micro-Entrepreneurship permit in that zone.

The proposed amendment was requested by a future applicant seeking to operate a qualifying Micro-Entrepreneurship use on property located within the R-1-21 zoning district. Because the R-1-21 zone is not currently listed as an eligible zoning district, the use cannot be considered without first amending Chapter 15.

The proposed amendment would add the R-1-21 zone as an eligible zoning designation. It would not approve the future applicant's business or any specific property. Following adoption of the amendment, the applicant would still be required to submit a separate application and comply with all applicable requirements.

Proposed Amendment

The proposed amendment would add **R-1-21** to the zoning districts in which Micro-Entrepreneurship may be considered.

All existing Micro-Entrepreneurship standards, application requirements, operating limitations, and approval procedures would continue to apply.

Staff Analysis

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

The R-1-21 zone consists of residential properties with a minimum lot size of approximately one-half acre. These larger lots may provide sufficient space to accommodate qualifying small-scale business activities while maintaining required parking, setbacks, and separation from neighboring properties.

The amendment would apply to all qualifying properties within the R-1-21 zone and should therefore be considered based on its general compatibility with the zoning district—not solely on the circumstances of the future applicant.

Each future application would be reviewed separately to determine compliance with Chapter 15 and other applicable City requirements. Adding the R-1-21 zone would only allow an applicant to seek approval; it would not guarantee that a particular use or location will be approved.

Findings

Staff recommends the following findings:

1. The proposed amendment is legislative and would apply generally throughout the R-1-21 zoning district.
2. The amendment would allow qualifying Micro-Entrepreneurship applications to be considered without approving any specific business or property.
3. All existing Micro-Entrepreneurship standards and approval requirements would remain applicable.
4. The larger residential lots within the R-1-21 zone may provide adequate space for appropriately scaled Micro-Entrepreneurship uses.
5. Each future application would be reviewed individually for compliance and potential impacts on surrounding properties.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Before

15.7 Codes And Symbols And Use Table 15.1

(1) In the following sections of this chapter, uses of land or buildings which are allowed in various districts are shown as "permitted uses," indicated by a "P" in the appropriate column, or as a "conditional use," indicated by a "C" in the appropriate column. If a use is not allowed in a given district, it is either not named in the use list or it is indicated in the appropriate column by a dash, "-." If a regulation applies in a given district, it is indicated in the appropriate column by a numeral to show the linear or square feet required, or by the letter "A." If the regulation does not apply, it is indicated in the appropriate column by a dash, "-." No building, structure or land shall be used and no building or structure shall be hereafter erected, structurally altered, enlarged, or maintained in the multiple use, agricultural, or rural residential districts except as provided in this Code.

Table 15.1 Use Regulations

USE	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to permitted residential uses, when the residential use has been previously established or is constructed simultaneously with the residential use.	P	P	P	P	P
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to permitted uses, when the residential use has not previously been established.	C	C	C	C	C
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to conditional uses.	C	C	C	C	C
The tilling of the soil, the raising of crops, horticulture and home gardening.	P	P	P	P	P
Fruit/Vegetable Stand	-	C	C	-	C
Farm	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Accessory Farm Employee Housing. Each accessory farm employee housing unit must be located on a contiguous parcel that contains at least 10 acres or more for each such unit and which must have at least 10 additional acres if it is located on	-	C	C	C	-

**** Disclaimer:** Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

the same property as the primary residential dwelling.					
Family Food Production and the Keeping of Large, Medium and Small Animals The first large animal (fully grown) shall have 10,000 sq ft of open area, each additional large animal shall have an additional 2,000 sq ft of open area. Each medium sized animal (fully grown) shall have 1,000 sq ft of open area not to exceed more than 6 medium animals per half acre. Each small sized animal (fully grown) shall have 100 sq ft of open area not to exceed more than 6 medium animals per half acre. The area of stables, barns and pens accessible to regulate animals may count towards the open area requirements. No animal shall be kept, corralled, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an adjoining lot. measured at the nearest corner There is no setback requirement from neighboring residential dwellings if a C.U.P. has been issued prior to the start of construction of a residential dwelling on an adjoining lot.	-	C	C	-	-
Class "A" Kennel (4-15 animals only). No animal shall be kept, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an lot measured at residence the nearest corner. Each animal shall have a minimum area of 1,000 sq. ft. and must have 4,000 sq ft for each additional animal over 5.	-	C	C	-	-
Sportsman's Permit for 4-6 dogs. No dog shall be kept, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an adjoining lot measured at the nearest corner. Each animal shall have a minimum area of 1,000 sq. ft..	-	C	C	-	C
Raising of Rabbits, Ducks, Chickens (hens only), or Turkeys with not more than six (6) such animals in any combination, provided that appropriate cages, pens, coops, houses, etc. shall be provided for when these animals are kept outdoors. (Amended 04/11, 02/13)	P	P	P	P	P
<u>RESIDENTIAL</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15

**** Disclaimer:** Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Single-Family Dwellings Detached	P	P	P	P	P
Single-Family Attached Dwellings	P	P	P	P	P
Two-Family Dwelling (Amended 5/97)	-	C	C	P	P
Twin Home Dwellings (Amended 5/97)	-	C	C	C	C
Multiple Family Dwellings	-	-	-	C	C
Congregate Care Facility	-	-	C	C	C
Nursing Care Facility	C	C	C	C	C
Group Home, Small	C	C	C	C	C
Group Home, Large	C	C	C	C	C
Transitional Treatment Home, Small	C	C	C	C	C
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	C	C
Mobile Home Subdivisions	C	C	C	C	C
Residential facilities for handicapped or elderly	P	P	P	P	P
HOME OCCUPATION	P	P	P	P	P
Micro Entrepreneurship				C	
Household pets, other than Sportsman Permit	P	P	P	P	P
<u>INSTITUTIONAL</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Child Day Care Center (in a home, no more than 12 children at any one time with 1 provider and up to 16 with 2 providers, including those residing in the home with no more than 2 children under the age of two)	C	C	C	C	C
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	C
Preschool (in a home, no more than 10 children from the ages of 4 to 6 years in age, including those	C	C	C	C	C

**** Disclaimer:** Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

residing in the home, with a maximum length of four hours for those who do not reside there)					
<u>POWER GENERATION</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
<u>RECREATION, CULTURAL & ENTERTAINMENT</u>					
Private Recreational Grounds and Facilities not open to the public, in which no admission charge is made	C	C	C	C	C
Natural Open Space Areas	P	P	P	P	P
Community & Recreation Centers	C	C	C	C	C
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	P
<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Public/Private Utility Transmission Wires, Lines, Pipes and Poles	P	P	P	P	P
Public/Private Utility Buildings and Structures	C	C	C	C	C
Government Uses and Facilities	C	C	C	C	C
Municipal Service Uses, including City utility uses, Police and Fire Stations	C	C	C	C	C
Temporary Buildings for uses incidental to construction work, including living quarters for guard or night watchman, which buildings must be removed upon completion or abandonment of the construction work	C	C	C	C	C

Amended 08/02 by Ord. 2002-15, 10/02 by Ord. 2002-20, 02/09 by Ord. 2008-43, 02/11 by Ord. 2010-27, 04/11 by Ord. 2011-14, 08/11 by Ord. 2011-26, 09/11 by Ord. 2011-30, 09/11 by Ord. 2011-31, 09/12 by Ord. 2012-16, 03/15 by Ord. 2015-05

HISTORY

Amended by Ord. 2022-14 on 8/3/2022

Amended by Ord. 2025-05 on 1/30/2025

Amended by Ord. 2025-31 on 7/9/2025

Amended by Ord. 2026-18 on 5/6/2026

**** Disclaimer:** Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

After

15.7 Codes And Symbols And Use Table 15.1

(1) In the following sections of this chapter, uses of land or buildings which are allowed in various districts are shown as "permitted uses," indicated by a "P" in the appropriate column, or as a "conditional use," indicated by a "C" in the appropriate column. If a use is not allowed in a given district, it is either not named in the use list or it is indicated in the appropriate column by a dash, "-." If a regulation applies in a given district, it is indicated in the appropriate column by a numeral to show the linear or square feet required, or by the letter "A." If the regulation does not apply, it is indicated in the appropriate column by a dash, "-." No building, structure or land shall be used and no building or structure shall be hereafter erected, structurally altered, enlarged, or maintained in the multiple use, agricultural, or rural residential districts except as provided in this Code.

Table 15.1 Use Regulations

USE	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to permitted residential uses, when the residential use has been previously established or is constructed simultaneously with the residential use.	P	P	P	P	P
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to permitted uses, when the residential use has not previously been established.	C	C	C	C	C
Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to conditional uses.	C	C	C	C	C
The tilling of the soil, the raising of crops, horticulture and home gardening.	P	P	P	P	P
Fruit/Vegetable Stand	-	C	C	-	C
Farm	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Accessory Farm Employee Housing. Each accessory farm employee housing unit must be located on a contiguous parcel that contains at least 10 acres or more for each such unit and which must have at least 10 additional acres if it is located on	-	C	C	C	-

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

the same property as the primary residential dwelling.					
Family Food Production and the Keeping of Large, Medium and Small Animals The first large animal (fully grown) shall have 10,000 sq ft of open area, each additional large animal shall have an additional 2,000 sq ft of open area. Each medium sized animal (fully grown) shall have 1,000 sq ft of open area not to exceed more than 6 medium animals per half acre. Each small sized animal (fully grown) shall have 100 sq ft of open area not to exceed more than 6 medium animals per half acre. The area of stables, barns and pens accessible to regulate animals may count towards the open area requirements. No animal shall be kept, corralled, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an adjoining lot. measured at the nearest corner There is no setback requirement from neighboring residential dwellings if a C.U.P. has been issued prior to the start of construction of a residential dwelling on an adjoining lot.	-	C	C	-	-
Class "A" Kennel (4-15 animals only). No animal shall be kept, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an lot measured at residence the nearest corner. Each animal shall have a minimum area of 1,000 sq. ft. and must have 4,000 sq ft for each additional animal over 5.	-	C	C	-	-
Sportsman's Permit for 4-6 dogs. No dog shall be kept, penned, or raised within 100' from any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an adjoining lot measured at the nearest corner. Each animal shall have a minimum area of 1,000 sq. ft..	-	C	C	-	C
Raising of Rabbits, Ducks, Chickens (hens only), or Turkeys with not more than six (6) such animals in any combination, provided that appropriate cages, pens, coops, houses, etc. shall be provided for when these animals are kept outdoors. (Amended 04/11, 02/13)	P	P	P	P	P
<u>RESIDENTIAL</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Single-Family Dwellings Detached	P	P	P	P	P
Single-Family Attached Dwellings	P	P	P	P	P
Two-Family Dwelling (Amended 5/97)	-	C	C	P	P
Twin Home Dwellings (Amended 5/97)	-	C	C	C	C
Multiple Family Dwellings	-	-	-	C	C
Congregate Care Facility	-	-	C	C	C
Nursing Care Facility	C	C	C	C	C
Group Home, Small	C	C	C	C	C
Group Home, Large	C	C	C	C	C
Transitional Treatment Home, Small	C	C	C	C	C
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	C	C
Mobile Home Subdivisions	C	C	C	C	C
Residential facilities for handicapped or elderly	P	P	P	P	P
HOME OCCUPATION	P	P	P	P	P
Micro Entrepreneurship			C	C	
Household pets, other than Sportsman Permit	P	P	P	P	P
<u>INSTITUTIONAL</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Child Day Care Center (in a home, no more than 12 children at any one time with 1 provider and up to 16 with 2 providers, including those residing in the home with no more than 2 children under the age of two)	C	C	C	C	C
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	C
Preschool (in a home, no more than 10 children from the ages of 4 to 6 years in age, including those	C	C	C	C	C

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

residing in the home, with a maximum length of four hours for those who do not reside there)					
<u>POWER GENERATION</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
<u>RECREATION, CULTURAL & ENTERTAINMENT</u>					
Private Recreational Grounds and Facilities not open to the public, in which no admission charge is made	C	C	C	C	C
Natural Open Space Areas	P	P	P	P	P
Community & Recreation Centers	C	C	C	C	C
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	P
<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>	R-1-8	R-1-12	R-1-21	RM-7	RM-15
Public/Private Utility Transmission Wires, Lines, Pipes and Poles	P	P	P	P	P
Public/Private Utility Buildings and Structures	C	C	C	C	C
Government Uses and Facilities	C	C	C	C	C
Municipal Service Uses, including City utility uses, Police and Fire Stations	C	C	C	C	C
Temporary Buildings for uses incidental to construction work, including living quarters for guard or night watchman, which buildings must be removed upon completion or abandonment of the construction work	C	C	C	C	C

Amended 08/02 by Ord. 2002-15, 10/02 by Ord. 2002-20, 02/09 by Ord. 2008-43, 02/11 by Ord. 2010-27, 04/11 by Ord. 2011-14, 08/11 by Ord. 2011-26, 09/11 by Ord. 2011-30, 09/11 by Ord. 2011-31, 09/12 by Ord. 2012-16, 03/15 by Ord. 2015-05

HISTORY

Amended by Ord. 2022-14 on 8/3/2022

Amended by Ord. 2025-05 on 1/30/2025

Amended by Ord. 2025-31 on 7/9/2025

Amended by Ord. 2026-18 on 5/6/2026

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

AGENDA ITEM #2

Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.



STAFF REPORT

To: Grantsville City Planning Commission
From: Shelby Moore, Zoning Administrator
Meeting Date: August 4th, 2026
Public Hearing Date: August 4th, 2026

Re: Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation regarding proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.

Background

Staff is proposing targeted amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 to clarify existing standards, remove conflicting or unnecessary language, and improve the administration of land-use applications.

The proposed amendments address:

- Frontage requirements in Chapter 2.
- Residential driveway standards in Chapter 6.
- Planning Commission review of conditional use permits in Chapter 7.

Proposed Amendments

Chapter 2—Frontage

The existing language provides that a property is not eligible for a home occupation permit unless it has at least 100 linear feet of continuous frontage along a public or private road providing legal access.

The proposed Chapter 2 amendment removes the requirement that a lot have a minimum of 100 linear feet of continuous frontage. The amendment continues to require frontage along a public or private road that provides legal access to the property.

This change allows lots with less than 100 feet of frontage to qualify, provided they maintain lawful frontage and access. It removes an inflexible dimensional standard while preserving the requirement that the property connect to a qualifying road.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Chapter 6—Residential Driveways

Section 6.14.5 currently requires driveway approaches to be located at least 60 feet from a road or street right-of-way intersection. The section also requires compliance with the applicable front-yard setback and the clear-view requirements of Section 4.16.

The proposed amendment removes the fixed 60-foot separation requirement. Driveways near intersections would instead be evaluated according to:

- The front-yard setback applicable to the zoning district; and
- The clear-view requirements of Section 4.16.

When the two standards differ, the greater required setback would apply. This amendment removes potentially conflicting measurements while preserving standards necessary for intersection visibility and public safety.

All other residential driveway standards contained in Section 6.14.5 would remain unchanged.

Chapter 7—Conditional Use Permits

Section 7.6 currently provides that a conditional use permit must be referred to the Planning Commission when public comments identify a potential compliance issue under Chapter 7 or another applicable provision of the Land Use Ordinance.

The proposed amendment would require referral to the Planning Commission when comments are received indicating a concern regarding the proposed conditional use. This provides a clearer administrative process and allows publicly raised concerns to be considered by the Planning Commission.

The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or designee would continue to provide the required notification and retain the authority established elsewhere in Section 7.6.

Staff Analysis

The proposed amendments are limited in scope and are intended to improve the clarity and administration of the Land Use Ordinance.

The Chapter 2 amendment separates the frontage standard from home occupation permit eligibility and removes an additional access provision that may be unnecessary or duplicative.

The Chapter 6 amendment eliminates a fixed driveway measurement that may conflict with site-specific setback and clear-view requirements. The revised language continues to protect visibility and safety near intersections while allowing the applicable development standards to determine

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

the required driveway location.

The Chapter 7 amendment establishes a clear process for referring conditional use applications to the Planning Commission when public comments raise concerns. Referral does not establish that the concern is valid or require denial of the application. The Planning Commission must still review the application according to the applicable conditional use standards and determine whether reasonably anticipated detrimental effects can be substantially mitigated.

Findings

Staff recommends the following findings:

1. The proposed amendments clarify existing provisions of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.
2. The Chapter 2 amendment removes the minimum 100-linear-foot frontage requirement while continuing to require frontage along a public or private road that provides legal access to the property.
3. The Chapter 6 amendment removes the fixed 60-foot driveway separation requirement while retaining applicable setback and clear-view standards.
4. The Chapter 7 amendment provides a clear process for Planning Commission consideration when public comments raise concerns regarding a conditional use application.
5. Referral of a conditional use permit to the Planning Commission does not determine the outcome of the application, which must be reviewed under the applicable approval standards.
6. The proposed amendments support consistent and effective administration of the City's land-use regulations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a **positive recommendation** to the City Council regarding the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Before

(128) **HOME OCCUPATION.** A home occupation is a profession, or other economic activity conducted within a dwelling or its accessory structures by persons residing on the premises. The use must remain subordinate to the primary residential use of the property and shall not alter the residential character of the dwelling or neighborhood.

(a) **Permitting Intent:** Any conditional use permit issued for a home occupation shall ensure that the residential character of the premises and neighborhood is preserved. In cases of uncertainty, the protection of neighborhood residential values shall be paramount.

(b) **Frontage:** No property shall be eligible for a home occupation permit unless the lot has a minimum of 100 linear feet of continuous frontage along a public or private road that provides legal access to the property.

i. **Measurement:** Frontage shall be measured along the property line abutting the road right-of-way.

ii. **Road Type:** The frontage may be on either a public street maintained by the municipality or county, or a private road that meets applicable access standards.

iii. **Access:** The frontage must provide direct vehicular access to the dwelling or principal structure.

(c) **Area Restriction:** The occupation shall occupy no more than 25% of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit or 500 square feet, whichever is less.

(d) **Client Traffic:** No more than two clients or customers per hour may visit the premises.

(e) **Deliveries:** Deliveries shall be limited to those normally made to a residence (e.g., postal service, small parcel carriers).

(f) **Employees:** Only residents of the dwelling may engage in the occupation, unless otherwise authorized by permit.

(g) **Advertising & Signage:** No on-site advertising or signage is permitted, except as specifically allowed by ordinance.

(h) **Public Display:** No outdoor display, storage, or activity related to the occupation shall be visible from adjoining properties or public rights-of-way.

(i) **Noise & Nuisance:** The occupation shall not produce noise, vibration, odor, smoke, traffic, or other impacts detectable beyond the property boundaries.

(j) **Exceptions:** Deviation to this requirement may only be granted by the Planning Commission upon a finding that adequate access and neighborhood compatibility are maintained.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

(128) **HOME OCCUPATION.** A home occupation is a profession, or other economic activity conducted within a dwelling or its accessory structures by persons residing on the premises. The use must remain subordinate to the primary residential use of the property and shall not alter the residential character of the dwelling or neighborhood.

(a) **Permitting Intent:** Any conditional use permit issued for a home occupation shall ensure that the residential character of the premises and neighborhood is preserved. In cases of uncertainty, the protection of neighborhood residential values shall be paramount.

(b) **Frontage:** ~~No property shall be eligible for a home occupation permit unless~~ The lot ~~shall have~~ ~~has a minimum of 100 linear feet of continuous~~ frontage along a public or private road that provides legal access to the property.

~~——i. Measurement: Frontage shall be measured along the property line abutting the road right-of-way.~~

~~ii. Road Type:~~ The frontage may be on either a public street maintained by the municipality or county, or a private road that meets applicable access standards.

~~iii. Access:~~ The frontage must provide direct vehicular access to the dwelling or principal structure.

(c) **Area Restriction:** The occupation shall occupy no more than 25% of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit or 500 square feet, whichever is less.

(d) **Client Traffic:** No more than two clients or customers per hour may visit the premises.

(e) **Deliveries:** Deliveries shall be limited to those normally made to a residence (e.g., postal service, small parcel carriers).

(f) **Employees:** Only residents of the dwelling may engage in the occupation, unless otherwise authorized by permit.

(g) **Advertising & Signage:** No on-site advertising or signage is permitted, except as specifically allowed by ordinance.

(h) **Public Display:** No outdoor display, storage, or activity related to the occupation shall be visible from adjoining properties or public rights-of-way.

(i) **Noise & Nuisance:** The occupation shall not produce noise, vibration, odor, smoke, traffic, or other impacts detectable beyond the property boundaries.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Before

6.14.5 Residential Districts

(1) Residential Districts

- (a) The following restrictions shall apply to all residential developments:
 - (i) Parking on driveways located between the front or corner side lot line and building shall not be allowed for satisfying the requirements stated in this Chapter.
 - (ii) Unless an exception is granted by the City Council, driveway approaches in front and corner yards shall not be greater than thirty feet (30') in width.
 - (iii) The provision of parking spaces elsewhere on the lot shall conform to the other applicable requirements of this Chapter. Requirements for garages shall be specified in each zoning district regulations.
 - (iv) No parkway right-of-way adjacent to or near the lot shall be used for parking.
 - (v) For each single-family residential lot no more than two driveway approaches shall be permitted. In all instances, the total width of two or more driveway approaches may not exceed one-third of the lot frontage in which the drive approaches are constructed. A drive approach shall have a minimum width of twelve feet (12') between them, not including flares.
 - (vi) The second driveway cannot access an arterial or collector street, unless approved by the City Engineer and City Council.
 - (vii) Drive approaches shall not be closer than:
 - A. Twelve feet (12') to each other; and
 - B. Sixty feet (60') along the right of ways to a point of a road or street right-of-way intersection as measured from back of sidewalk or property line to edge of driveway.
 - (viii) Circular driveways shall only be permitted on local residential streets. A minimum lot frontage of one hundred feet (100') or greater is required of if located on a corner lot, at least thirty-five feet (35') of spacing from the curb line to the leading edge of the driveway.
 - (ix) Secondary driveways must be no closer than 10' from the adjacent property line, as measured from the property line to the edge of driveway, not including flares.

After

6.14.5 Residential Districts

(2) Residential Districts

- (a) The following restrictions shall apply to all residential developments:
 - (i) Parking on driveways located between the front or corner side lot line and building shall not be allowed for satisfying the requirements stated in this Chapter.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

- (i) Parking on driveways located between the front or corner side lot line and building shall not be allowed for satisfying the requirements stated in this Chapter.
- (ii) Unless an exception is granted by the City Council, driveway approaches in front and corner yards shall not be greater than thirty feet (30') in width.
- (iii) The provision of parking spaces elsewhere on the lot shall conform to the other applicable requirements of this Chapter. Requirements for garages shall be specified in each zoning district regulations.
- (iv) No parkway right-of-way adjacent to or near the lot shall be used for parking.
- (v) For each single-family residential lot no more than two driveway approaches shall be permitted. In all instances, the total width of two or more driveway approaches may not exceed one-third of the lot frontage in which the drive approaches are constructed. A drive approach shall have a minimum width of twelve feet (12') between them, not including flares.
- (vi) The second driveway cannot access an arterial or collector street, unless approved by the City Engineer and City Council.
- (vii) Drive approaches shall not be closer than:
 - A. Twelve feet (12') to each other; and **no closer to the side property line than the minimum side yard setback established for the applicable zoning district, as measured from the side property line to the nearest edge of the driveway, not including flares; and**
 - B. ~~Sixty feet (60') along the right of ways to a point of a road or street right-of-way intersection as measured from back of sidewalk or property line to edge of driveway.~~ **The required front yard setback established for the applicable zoning district, as measured from the front property line to the nearest edge of the driveway, not including driveway flares, or the required setback necessary to comply with the Clear View of Intersecting Streets requirements of Section 4.16, whichever is greater.**
- (viii) Circular driveways shall only be permitted on local residential streets. A minimum lot frontage of one hundred feet (100') or greater is required of if located on a corner lot, at least thirty-five feet (35') of spacing from the curb line to the leading edge of the driveway.
- (ix) Secondary driveways must be no closer than 10' from the adjacent property line, as measured from the property line to the edge of driveway, not including flares.

Before

7.6 Application

(1) The Planning Commission may authorize the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee to grant, attach conditions to, or deny conditional use permits, subject to such limitations or qualifications as are deemed necessary. The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee is also authorized to issue conditional use permits for family food production, the raising of animals and commercial uses in existing buildings, when appropriate, but may also defer any such application to the Planning Commission for its determination, in the sole discretion of the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee.

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and

(3) The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee does not have authority to approve commercial conditional use permits requiring construction of new facilities or requiring exceptions or variances to the city ordinances and standards.

(4) All applications for a conditional use permit shall include:

- (a) The applicant's name, address, telephone numbers and interest in the property;
- (b) The owner's name, address and telephone number, if different than the applicant, and the owner's signed consent to the filing of the application;
- (c) The street address and legal description of the subject property;
- (d) The zoning classification, zoning district boundaries and present use of the subject property;
- (e) A vicinity map with North, scale and date, indicating the zoning classifications and current uses of properties within 500 feet of the boundaries of the subject property. When a conditional use permit will be considered by the Planning Commission, the application shall also include a current plat map showing the names and addresses of all property owners appearing on the tax rolls of the Tooele County Assessor within 500 feet of the boundaries of the subject property.
- (f) A plat or a survey of the parcel of land, lots block, blocks, or parts or portions thereof, drawn to scale, showing the actual dimensions of the piece or parcel, lot, lots, block, blocks, or portions thereof, according to the registered or recorded plat of such land;
- (g) The proposed title of the project and the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the architect, landscape architect, planner or engineer on the project;
- (h) A complete description of the proposed conditional use;
- (i) A plan or drawing drawn to scale of twenty feet to the inch (20' = 1 inch) or larger which includes the following information of the proposed use:
 - i. actual dimensions of the subject property;
 - ii. exact sizes and location of all existing and proposed buildings or other structures;
 - iii. driveways;
 - iv. parking spaces;
 - v. safety curbs;
 - vi. landscaping;
 - vii. location of trash receptacles;
 - viii. drainage features and environmental features.
- (j) Traffic Impact Analysis;
- (k) Geotechnical Report;
- (l) Sewer and Water Modeling
- (m) A statement indicating whether the applicant will require a variance in connection with the proposed conditional use permit;

*** Disclosure: The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

- (k) Geotechnical Report;
- (l) Sewer and Water Modeling
- (m) A statement indicating whether the applicant will require a variance in connection with the proposed conditional use permit;
- (n) mailing labels and first class postage for all property owners located within 500 feet of the subject property when a conditional use permit will be considered by the Planning Commission: and
- (o) Such other further information or documentation as the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator or their designee may deem to be necessary for a full and proper consideration and disposition of the particular application.

Amended 01/03 by Ordinance 2003-02

HISTORY

Amended by Ord. [2021-12](#) on 4/28/2021

Amended by Ord. [2022-06](#) on 5/4/2022

Amended by Ord. [2024-35](#) on 12/4/2024

Amended by Ord. [2025-39](#) on 12/3/2025

Amended by Ord. [2026-18](#) on 5/6/2026

After

7.6 Application

(1) The Planning Commission may authorize the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee to grant, attach conditions to, or deny conditional use permits, subject to such limitations or qualifications as are deemed necessary. The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee is also authorized to issue conditional use permits for family food production, the raising of animals and commercial uses in existing buildings, when appropriate, but may also defer any such application to the Planning Commission for its determination, in the sole discretion of the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee.

(2) The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee shall send out the appropriate notification for all conditional use permits. If comments are received ~~that indicate a concern about the proposed conditional use, the conditional use shall be sent to~~ that identify a potential issue regarding the proposed conditional use's compliance with the approval standards of this Chapter or other applicable provisions of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance, the conditional use shall be referred to Planning Commission for its consideration.

(3) The Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or their designee does not have authority to approve commercial conditional use permits requiring construction of new facilities or requiring exceptions or variances to the city ordinances and standards.

(4) All applications for a conditional use permit shall include:

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

- (d) The zoning classification, zoning district boundaries and present use of the subject property;
- (e) A vicinity map with North, scale and date, indicating the zoning classifications and current uses of properties within 500 feet of the boundaries of the subject property. When a conditional use permit will be considered by the Planning Commission, the application shall also include a current plat map showing the names and addresses of all property owners appearing on the tax rolls of the Tooele County Assessor within 500 feet of the boundaries of the subject property.
- (f) A plat or a survey of the parcel of land, lots block, blocks, or parts or portions thereof, drawn to scale, showing the actual dimensions of the piece or parcel, lot, lots, block, blocks, or portions thereof, according to the registered or recorded plat of such land;
- (g) The proposed title of the project and the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the architect, landscape architect, planner or engineer on the project;
- (h) A complete description of the proposed conditional use;
- (i) A plan or drawing drawn to scale of twenty feet to the inch (20' = 1 inch) or larger which includes the following information of the proposed use:
 - i. actual dimensions of the subject property;
 - ii. exact sizes and location of all existing and proposed buildings or other structures;
 - iii. driveways;
 - iv. parking spaces;
 - v. safety curbs;
 - vi. landscaping;
 - vii. location of trash receptacles;
 - viii. drainage features and environmental features.
- (j) Traffic Impact Analysis;
- (k) Geotechnical Report;
- (l) Sewer and Water Modeling
- (m) A statement indicating whether the applicant will require a variance in connection with the proposed conditional use permit;
- (n) mailing labels and first class postage for all property owners located within 500 feet of the subject property when a conditional use permit will be considered by the Planning Commission: and
- (o) Such other further information or documentation as the Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator or their designee may deem to be necessary for a full and proper consideration and disposition of the particular application.

Amended 01/03 by Ordinance 2003-02

HISTORY

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

Amended by Ord. 2021-12 on 4/28/2021
Amended by Ord. 2022-06 on 5/4/2022
Amended by Ord. 2024-35 on 12/4/2024
Amended by Ord. 2025-39 on 12/3/2025
Amended by Ord. 2026-18 on 5/6/2026

*** Disclaimer: Please be advised that at no point should the comments and conclusions made by The City staff or the conclusions drawn from them be quoted, misconstrued, or interpreted as recommendations. These inputs are intended solely for the legislative body to interpret as deemed appropriate.*

The information provided is purely for the legislative body to interpret in their own right and context. It is crucial to maintain the integrity and context of the information shared, as it is meant to assist in the decision-making process without implying any endorsement or directive, but it is essential that it is understood within the appropriate scope.

AGENDA ITEM #3

Approval of the minutes from the
July 21, 2026 Planning
Commission Regular Meeting.

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Lauren Trista Favor to keep up to seven (7) horses and a Kennel Permit to keep up to four (4) dogs on the residential property located at 947 East Durfee Street, in the R-1-21 Zone.	Approved
#2	Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Gabriel Laura Castaneda to keep up to one (1) horse on the residential property located at 249 W Cowdery Drive, in the R-1-21 Zone.	Approved
#3	Recommendation of the adoption of the 2026 APWA Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and Standard Plans as the official Grantsville City Construction Standards, together with any City-specific amendments, revisions, or modifications deemed necessary by the City Engineer and the Community Development Director.	Approved
#6	Approval of the minutes from the July 7, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON JULY 21, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ON ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members Present: Chair Sarah Moore, Commissioner Gary Merrill, Commissioner Cameron Moulton, Commissioner John Montgomery

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent: Vice Chair Jason Hill

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe, Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Rhett Butler, City Recorder Alicia Fairbourne, Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman.

On Zoom: City Planner/GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko

Citizens and Guests Present: John Wright, Laura and Gabriel Castaneda, Camille Burt, Trista Favor, Madison Petersen, Cameron Ordakowski, Truman Lancaster, Jeanette Lancaster, Kody Moser, Many Smith

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Kayla Cameron, Chance Peterson, Unknowns

Chair Sarah Moore called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 21, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Sarah Moore reviewed the Planning Commission's meeting format, explaining that each agenda item would begin with a staff presentation, followed by a public hearing, when required, and then Planning Commission discussion and consideration. She also reminded those in attendance that public comments during public hearings would be limited to three minutes to help the meeting proceed efficiently.

AGENDA

1. Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Lauren Trista Favor to keep up to seven (7) horses and a Kennel Permit to keep up to four (4) dogs on the residential property located at 947 East Durfee Street, in the R-1-21 Zone.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the application was initiated after Code Enforcement observed seven horses on the property without the required Conditional Use Permit amendment and issued a violation notice on April 29. She stated that staff anticipated receiving public comments because of the violation, however, no comments were submitted during the public notice period.

Shelby reviewed the applicable ordinance requirements, explaining that the property was required to provide 10,000 square feet of open area for the first large animal and an additional 2,000 square feet for each additional large animal, with all animals located at least 100 feet from any pre-existing residential dwelling. She also reviewed the requirements for a Class A Kennel, explaining that four to fifteen dogs required a minimum of 1,000 square feet per dog, with an

additional 4,000 square feet required for each dog over five, along with the required 100-foot separation from neighboring residences.

Shelby explained that the property contained approximately 22,000 square feet dedicated to the horses and an additional 5,753 square feet designated for the dogs, meeting the City's minimum area and setback requirements. She stated that staff had no concerns with the proposed locations and that the application.

Chair Sarah Moore confirmed that the applicant already held a Conditional Use Permit for two horses and clarified that the request before the Planning Commission was to amend that approval and issue a separate Conditional Use Permit for the kennel. Shelby explained that the horse permit and kennel permit would remain separate approvals.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the areas designated for the horses and dogs could overlap. Shelby explained that each use must have sufficient dedicated area to satisfy the ordinance requirements but acknowledged that the animals could occupy the same general area if the required square footage for each use was maintained.

Commissioner Montgomery expressed concern that the applicant had exceeded the conditions of the previously approved permit before seeking an amendment. Shelby explained that the applicant would need to address the reason for the violation.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether any penalties had been issued when the violation was discovered. Shelby explained that no fines had been imposed. She further explained that staff anticipated receiving public comments because of the number of animals involved and, rather than requiring multiple rounds of public noticing, brought the application directly to the Planning Commission to allow the matter to be addressed through a single public hearing process.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the designated dog area represented the required kennel location or simply demonstrated that sufficient area existed to comply with the ordinance. Shelby explained that the exhibit identified an area that met the ordinance requirements and clarified that the dogs could use other portions of the property provided they were not permanently kept within the required setback area.

Public Hearing

No comments received

Discussion and Consideration

Lauren Trista Favor, the property owner, was present to answer questions on this item. Chair Sarah Moore asked whether any future violations or nuisance complaints related to additional animals would require the Conditional Use Permit to return to the Planning Commission.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby confirmed that any future enforcement action affecting the Conditional Use Permit would be brought back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Montgomery asked why the applicant had exceeded the conditions of the previously approved permit. Lauren explained that she had begun rescuing horses after obtaining the original permit and occasionally cared for additional horses before relocating them. She also explained that while she owned three dogs, she occasionally provided pet-sitting services through Rover, which required the kennel permit.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the applicant anticipated keeping more than seven horses in the future. Lauren stated that she did not have sufficient space for more than seven horses and did not intend to exceed the requested limit.

Commissioner Merrill stated that his primary concern was the applicant's previous violation of the Conditional Use Permit. He explained that while he supported amending the permit because the property met the ordinance requirements, he expected the applicant to remain in compliance moving forward.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the applicant had been rescuing horses when the original permit for two horses was approved. Lauren explained that she became involved in horse rescue after learning about horses being sent to slaughter and began temporarily caring for rescued animals.

Chair Sarah Moore reminded the applicant that any future violations or nuisance complaints could require the Conditional Use Permit to return to the Planning Commission for review. Lauren acknowledged that she understood.

Commissioner Moulton asked Shelby to explain how the required 100-foot setback radius shown on the exhibit had been calculated. Shelby explained that the setback was measured from neighboring residential dwellings rather than the applicant's home, which was why the restricted area did not surround the applicant's residence.

Commissioner Montgomery made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit amendment allowing up to seven horses and the Conditional Use Permit for a Class A Kennel allowing up to four dogs on the property located at 947 East Durfee Street in the R-1-21 Zone, subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Merrill proposed adding a condition that future violations would permanently prevent the applicant from obtaining another Conditional Use Permit for the property.

City attorney Tysen Barker explained that such a condition would not be appropriate because Conditional Use Permits must be evaluated using the standards established in the Land Use Ordinance. He stated that any future application would still need to be considered based on

whether the ordinance standards were met and whether any detrimental impacts could be mitigated.

Commissioner Montgomery acknowledged that repeated violations could be considered during any future review if they demonstrated detrimental impacts that could not be mitigated.

Commissioner Merrill withdrew his proposed modification and seconded Commissioner Montgomery's original motion.

John Montgomery made a motion to approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit for Lauren Trista Favor to keep up to seven (7) horses and a Kennel Permit to keep up to four (4) dogs on the residential property located at 947 East Durfee Street, in the R-1-21 Zone. With the following conditions:
Compliance with City Code: All requirements of the Grantsville City Code shall be met. **Payment of Fees:** All applicable permit fees shall be paid. **Health and Safety Standards:** All applicable health, safety, and animal welfare regulations shall be maintained. **Regulatory Permits and Licensing:** The permit holder shall obtain and maintain all required permits, licenses, and approvals, including approval from the Grantsville City Animal Control Department, the Grantsville City -Tooele County Health Department, and any other agency having jurisdiction. **Business License:** The permit holder shall maintain a current business license if required by law. **Scope of Use:** The use of the property shall remain within the parameters approved by the Conditional Use Permit. Any expansion of the approved use shall require additional approval. **Administrative Review:** This Conditional Use Permit may be periodically reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and/or upon receipt of complaints. **Non-Compliance:** Failure to comply with these conditions or applicable City ordinances may result in revocation of the Conditional Use Permit. **Number of Animals:** The number of animals shall not exceed seven (7) horses and four (4) dogs unless additional approval is obtained from the Planning Commission. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

2. Consideration of a proposed Conditional Use Permit for Gabriel Laura Castaneda to keep up to one (1) horses the residential property located at 249 W Cowdery Drive, in the R-1-21 Zone.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore she explained that a violation was issued after staff observed one horse being kept on the property without the required Conditional Use Permit. The applicant subsequently submitted a Conditional Use Permit application, which had completed staff review. Shelby stated that public notice had been provided and one public comment had been received during the noticing period.

Shelby explained that the property contained 10,037 square feet of qualifying area, which met the minimum requirement to keep one horse. She also noted that the proposed location complied with the required 100-foot setback from neighboring residential dwellings. Other than the initial violation for keeping the horse without a Conditional Use Permit, staff had no additional concerns with the request.

Public Hearing

Email Received 06/06/2026

Hello,

I live at [REDACTED], two homes away from the Castanedas. They are applying to keep a horse on their property at 249 W Cowdery Drive.

I have no complaints about them having a horse. I disagree with Grantsville's overly restrictive and ever-changing zoning laws considering our neighborhood is 1/2 acre lots.

-William Babcock

Email Received 06/16/2026

Hello,

We have members of our family that have severe allergies to horses that cause asthma attacks. We bought on Maxwell Dr in part because we did not think this area was zoned for horses. While we would love to see others be able to do as they wish, under these circumstances affecting health and breathing, we are concerned a horse this close to our property may become a health issue.

Camrin Wheeler

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Moulton commented that many people assume a property must be specifically marketed as "horse property" in order to keep horses. He explained that the determining factor is whether the property meets the requirements established in the Land Use Ordinance, allowing a property owner to apply for a Conditional Use Permit. He noted that because the applicant met all applicable ordinance requirements, he had no concerns with the request.

Chair Sarah Moore thanked Commissioner Moulton for the clarification.

Gary Merrill made a motion to approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit for Gabriel Laura Castaneda to keep up to one (1) horses on the residential property located at 249 W Cowdery Drive, in the R-1-21 Zone. With the following conditions: Compliance with City Code: All requirements of the Grantsville City Code shall be met, including that animals shall not be kept, corralled, penned, or raised within 100 feet of any pre-existing residential dwelling located on an adjoining lot. Payment of Fees: All applicable permit fees shall be paid. Health and Safety Standards: All applicable health, safety, and animal welfare regulations shall be maintained. State Licensing: The permit holder shall maintain any required state licensing. Business License: The permit holder shall maintain a current business license if required by law. Scope of Use: The use of the property shall remain within the parameters approved by the Conditional Use Permit. Any expansion of the approved use shall require additional approval. Administrative Review: This Conditional Use Permit may be periodically reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and/or upon receipt of complaints. Non-Compliance: Failure to comply with these conditions or applicable City ordinances may result in revocation of the Conditional Use Permit. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

3. Recommendation of the adoption of the 2026 APWA Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and Standard Plans as the official Grantsville City Construction Standards, together with any City-specific amendments, revisions, or modifications deemed necessary by the City Engineer and the Community Development Director.

Presentation by City Planner / GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko and Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

City Planner / GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko explained that the APWA Utah Manual is a well-established set of engineering and construction standards used by municipalities throughout Utah and that adopting the updated 2026 edition would provide consistent standards for the City's infrastructure projects. Due to technical difficulties Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore continued the presentation, explaining that Grantsville already utilizes the APWA standards and was requesting adoption of the updated 2026 edition. She stated that the standards are widely used by municipalities, with approximately 66 municipalities having formally adopted them, and noted that Grantsville would also be listed as an adopting agency. Shelby explained that using the APWA standards provides consistency during construction projects, establishes

clear expectations for developers and engineers, and allows the City to continue applying its own city-specific amendments where necessary, such as sidewalk thickness, roadway widths, and other construction standards.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the American Public Works Association standards and the Utah APWA Manual were separate documents. Shelby explained that APWA develops standards that are tailored to individual states, with the Utah manual containing standards applicable to Utah.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the Utah manual functioned as an amended version of the national standards. Shelby confirmed that state-specific standards are incorporated into the manual.

Commissioner Merrill also asked how adoption of the manual would reduce administrative costs. Shelby explained that using an established set of standards eliminated the need for the City to continually create and update its own construction standards, allowing staff to rely on an existing, consistent framework.

Commissioner Moulton indicated he had no questions regarding the proposal.

Commissioner Montgomery commented that he had reviewed the changes between the 2025 and 2026 editions and noted that the updated standards included improvements related to asphalt materials, pavement performance, durability, and construction practices. Chair Sarah Moore noted that Grantsville had recently received recognition for roadway improvements, and Shelby added that previous projects completed while she worked for Salt Lake City had also received awards for roadway construction.

Public Hearing

No comment

Discussion and Consideration

Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the adoption of the 2026 APWA Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and Standard Plans as the official Grantsville City Construction Standards, together with any City-specific amendments, revisions, or modifications deemed necessary by the City Engineer and the Community Development Director. With the following conditions: Grantsville City Construction Standards: The official Grantsville City Construction Standards shall consist of: The adopted 2026 APWA Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and Standard Plans; and All Grantsville City standard drawings, supplemental

specifications, engineering requirements, policies, interpretations, amendments, revisions, and modifications established by the City Engineer and the Community Development Director. Together, these documents shall constitute the official Grantsville City Construction Standards. Where a conflict exists between the APWA Manual and the Grantsville City Construction Standards, the Grantsville City requirement shall govern unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Community and Development Director. The adopted 2026 APWA Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and Standard Plans shall include all City-specific amendments, revisions, modifications, supplemental specifications, standard drawings, and engineering requirements approved or established by the City Engineer and the Community Development Director. Such amendments shall be incorporated into and administered as part of the official Grantsville City Construction Standards unless an amendment would conflict with an adopted ordinance. Resolution of Conflicts: Where a conflict exists between the APWA Utah Manual and the Grantsville City Construction Standards, the Grantsville City Construction Standards shall govern. Where a conflict exists between the Grantsville City Construction Standards and an adopted City ordinance, the ordinance shall govern. Future Updates: The City Engineer and the Community Development Director are authorized to administratively adopt, reject, or modify future revisions to the APWA Utah Manual that are technical in nature and consistent with City ordinances and policies. Effective Date: The adopted standards shall become effective on the date established by the City Council through the applicable adopting ordinance or resolution. John Montgomery seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of a proposed use for Advanced Technology and Data Infrastructure Center.

Presentation by Community Development Director Bill Cobabe

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe presented the proposed discussion item regarding Advanced Technology and Data Infrastructure Centers. He explained that the purpose of the discussion was to proactively evaluate whether this type of use should be permitted within Grantsville and, if so, what regulations should be established before an application is submitted. He noted that some jurisdictions, such as Box Elder County, have limited zoning regulations addressing these types of uses, and staff wanted to avoid being reactive if an application were received in the future.

Bill explained that the proposed definition would require any Advanced Technology and Data Infrastructure Center to provide its own water, power, and other utilities and not rely on the City's water system. Commissioner Montgomery asked how a facility would provide its own water. Bill explained that the method would depend on the site and could include using an existing well or acquiring water rights. He noted that water usage for these facilities is generally minimal compared to other industrial uses.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the General Plan would play a role in determining where these facilities could be located. Bill stated that it would and emphasized that this was an appropriate time to begin evaluating how this type of use fits within the City's long-term planning goals.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the proposed definition could include other similar uses. Bill explained that the definition was intentionally broad so it could encompass future technologies while still allowing the City to establish regulations specific to the use.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that discussions such as this allow the Commission to separate public perception from factual information so residents can better understand the potential impacts and benefits.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the proposed language was written specifically for Grantsville. Bill stated that it was and explained that staff was attempting to be proactive by establishing regulations before an application is received rather than responding after the fact. He noted that while he did not know when or if a proposal would be submitted, the City's industrial areas could become attractive locations in the future. He reviewed several factors the City would need to consider, including lighting, noise, security, safety, and other operational impacts.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether these facilities typically employ a large workforce. Bill explained that, despite their size, they generally employ relatively few people. He compared a large data center to a Walmart Distribution Center, noting that while the buildings may be similar in size, a data center may employ approximately 200 people compared to several thousand employees at a distribution center. As a result, he would not anticipate significant traffic impacts.

Bill referenced a proposed data center in Tooele County of approximately 500,000 square feet and discussed the potential noise impacts associated with these facilities.

Bill asked the Commission for direction on whether staff should continue researching and developing regulations for Advanced Technology and Data Infrastructure Centers or whether the Commission preferred not to allow the use within the City.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that he supported continuing the process so the City could establish regulations to protect the community.

Commissioner Moulton stated that he did not fully understand the benefit to the City, noting that construction jobs would be temporary and permanent employment opportunities appeared to be limited. Bill responded that these facilities would contribute to the tax base, although if located within a Redevelopment Agency or Inland Port area, the City may not receive the full tax benefit until those agreements expire.

Commissioner Moulton asked how these facilities are taxed. Bill stated that he would need to research that information further. Commissioner Moulton also asked whether other communities actively recruit data centers. Bill responded that it depends on the community, but Grantsville has industrial areas where the use could be appropriate.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that developing regulations would be beneficial even if the City ultimately decided not to permit the use. Bill agreed, explaining that adopting regulations would allow the City to determine appropriate locations and standards rather than having an applicant drive the code amendment process. He noted that even if the use is not currently listed in the ordinance, an applicant could still request a code amendment. Developing regulations in advance would allow staff to inform future applicants that the City has already evaluated the issue.

City attorney Tysen Barker stated that establishing regulations would allow the City to define where these facilities would and would not be appropriate.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the City could limit the number of facilities permitted, such as allowing only one. Bill responded that while it was an interesting concept, it would create questions about how to distinguish between allowing one facility versus multiple facilities. He noted that some uses are simply identified as prohibited.

Commissioner Merrill asked about the anticipated wages for employees working at these facilities. Bill stated that positions would likely range from entry-level employees to administrative and technical staff.

Commissioner Merrill stated that beginning the discussion now was a positive step because it allows the City to establish parameters before a proposal is received rather than reacting afterward.

Bill stated that he was not advocating either for or against permitting the use. Instead, he wanted the City to intentionally evaluate the issue and determine whether to allow the use and, if so, under what standards, rather than making decisions in response to a future application.

Chair Sarah Moore encouraged everyone to read the staff report to better understand both the potential benefits and impacts of Advanced Technology and Data Infrastructure Centers and emphasized the importance of evaluating the issue before the City is faced with a proposal. She also noted that the world's largest data center is currently under construction in Delta, Utah.

Bill stated that the next step would be for staff to continue researching the topic and return to the Planning Commission with more detailed information. He noted that the next time the item is brought before the Commission, it will also be a discussion item.

Commissioner Merrill stated that, if the City moves forward, the regulations should be supported by statistical analysis and remain 100 percent neutral.

Discussion item only no action was taken.

5. Discussion of proposed amendments to Chapters 6, 7, and 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.

Presentation of Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 proposed amendments by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the proposed Chapter 6 amendments were intended to update residential driveway standards by revising how driveway setbacks are measured from street intersections, clarifying measurement methods, maintaining minimum separation requirements between driveway approaches, clarifying standards for secondary driveway access, and improving consistency with the City's clear view triangle requirements.

Shelby explained that the current ordinance requires driveways to be located at least 60 feet from an intersection, but staff had encountered difficulties applying that standard to corner lots with limited frontage. Staff proposed instead measuring the setback from the required front yard setback of the applicable zoning district while also requiring a minimum 30-foot separation from the intersection or whatever distance is necessary to comply with the clear view triangle requirements, whichever is greater. She noted that the proposed amendment would better accommodate smaller lots while continuing to protect traffic visibility and safety.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the proposed standard would be more restrictive than current roadway design standards. Shelby explained that the amendment would be less restrictive than the City's existing ordinance while remaining more restrictive than the AASHTO standards because it continued to require compliance with the City's clear view triangle requirements.

Commissioner Montgomery commented that the proposed changes would help address situations where driveways could not reasonably fit on certain corner lots.

Shelby then reviewed the proposed amendment to Chapter 7 regarding Conditional Use Permit referrals. She explained that the current ordinance requires an application to be referred to the Planning Commission whenever public comments indicate a concern but does not define what constitutes a concern. Staff proposed revising the language so that only comments identifying a potential issue regarding compliance with the Conditional Use Permit approval standards or other applicable provisions of the Land Use Ordinance would require Planning Commission review. She explained that the amendment would focus the review process on ordinance compliance rather than general objections.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that the revised language clearly required comments to identify a specific ordinance-related concern rather than simply expressing opposition and felt it would improve the review process.

Commissioner Merrill compared the proposed amendment to requiring a coach to cite a specific rule when questioning an official's decision. He stated that the amendment would require residents to identify the specific ordinance provision they believed was not being met, helping reduce unnecessary referrals while saving applicants both time and expense.

Presentation of Chapter 9 proposed amendments presented by Grants Administrator Alexis Stewart

Grants Administrator Alexis Stewart presented proposed amendments to Chapter 9 related primarily to water-wise landscaping. She explained that staff had reorganized and clarified the chapter while incorporating additional water-wise landscaping requirements to allow Grantsville City to participate in the Utah Division of Water Resources landscape rebate program. She emphasized that the proposed changes would apply only to future development and would not affect existing residential landscaping.

Alexis explained that the proposed amendments would prohibit turf grass within park strips, limit turf areas narrower than eight feet, restrict turf to no more than 50 percent of front and side yard landscaping in new residential subdivisions, and limit turf to 20 percent of common landscaped areas within new commercial, industrial, and multifamily developments. Parks and recreational areas would be exempt from those requirements.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the restrictions would apply to both front and back yards. Alexis explained that the restrictions applied only to front and side yards within new developments and that homeowners would continue to have flexibility in their backyards.

Commissioner Montgomery commented that many new homeowners already appeared to be installing less turf than in previous years.

Chair Sarah Moore asked what benefit participation in the state program would provide to residents. Alexis explained that homeowners replacing turf in existing park strips with qualifying water-wise landscaping could receive a rebate of approximately \$2 per square foot through the state program.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether homeowners could still install plants as part of water-wise landscaping. Alexis confirmed that landscaping could include plants, shrubs, mulch, and other approved materials as long as turf grass was not used in prohibited areas.

Commissioner Moulton expressed concern that the proposed ordinance restricted homeowner landscaping choices rather than encouraging voluntary participation through incentives. He stated that he preferred allowing property owners to make their own landscaping decisions.

Shelby clarified that the proposed standards would apply during the review of new subdivision landscape plans submitted by developers and would not require existing homeowners to modify their landscaping.

Commissioner Moulton questioned how the standards would be enforced after homes were sold and expressed concern that enforcement could become similar to a homeowners association regulating private landscaping.

Chair Sarah Moore questioned whether enforcing the proposed standards throughout future development could require additional code enforcement resources as the City continued to grow.

Alexis explained that much of the existing Chapter 9 language already regulated landscaping, and her revisions primarily reorganized the chapter while adding water-wise provisions. She also expanded the City's approved plant and tree lists based on research from neighboring communities.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about the inclusion of male-only ginkgo trees on the approved tree list and questioned whether homeowners would realistically be able to distinguish between male and female trees. Alexis explained that nurseries typically identify the tree variety at the time of purchase.

Commissioner Moulton asked why the ordinance included approved tree lists if the City did not actively enforce tree species after development. Shelby explained that the lists are primarily used during development review when developers submit landscape plans to ensure appropriate species are installed in required landscape areas.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the City planned to provide demonstration projects or examples of water-wise landscaping similar to other communities. Shelby responded that future subdivisions would provide examples of compliant landscaping as the standards were implemented.

Commissioner Merrill also questioned whether restricting turf would conflict with developments that already possessed irrigation water rights. Shelby explained that developers seeking reduced irrigation demands through water-wise landscaping would incorporate those requirements into subdivision design and, where applicable, homeowners association requirements.

City attorney Tysen Barker clarified that the discussion item remained preliminary and that no public hearing had yet been held.

Commissioner Montgomery asked about the remaining legislative process. Shelby explained that the proposal would return to the Planning Commission for a public hearing and formal recommendation before being considered by the City Council.

Alexis offered to invite a representative from the Utah Division of Water Resources to a future meeting to answer additional questions regarding the rebate program and statewide implementation.

Chair Sarah Moore encouraged the Planning Commission to review the proposed amendments and submit comments to City staff before the item returned for future consideration.

Discussion item only no action taken.

6. Approval of the minutes from the July 7, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

John Montgomery made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 7, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” John Montgomery “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

7. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman asked the Planning Commission for feedback on a potential amendment to the Home Occupation standards regarding the existing 100-foot frontage requirement. She explained that staff had recently received several applications for low-impact home occupations that did not meet the frontage requirement, requiring applicants to apply for a deviation through the Planning Commission at an additional cost. Nicole noted that many of these businesses involved only administrative work with no customer visits, yet applicants were still required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit because of the frontage standard. She presented several possible approaches, including limiting the frontage requirement only to home occupations with customer visits, allowing administrative approval for low-impact home occupations, creating a separate category for administrative home offices, or removing the frontage requirement entirely.

Commissioner Montgomery recalled that the original purpose of the frontage requirement was to address parking impacts generated by customer traffic.

Commissioner Merrill requested that staff prepare draft ordinance language for the Planning Commission to review before making a recommendation.

Nicole explained that the draft language had not been included in the meeting packet because staff wanted to receive preliminary direction before incorporating the amendment into the larger package of proposed code amendments.

Commissioner Moulton asked how many properties currently met the 100-foot frontage requirement. Nicole explained that frontage is becoming increasingly limited as newer subdivisions with smaller lots are developed and provided an example of an applicant with only 70 feet of frontage who was required to complete the full Conditional Use Permit process despite having no customers visiting the home.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe added that frontage could also be limited on pie-shaped lots and cul-de-sacs even when adequate parking existed. He stated that the primary intent of the ordinance was to ensure that home occupations remained low impact and did not create noticeable traffic or parking issues within residential neighborhoods.

Chair Sarah Moore shared an example of a neighbor operating an online business with no customer traffic and agreed that businesses of that nature should not be subject to the same frontage requirement.

Commissioner Montgomery suggested reducing the frontage requirement to 60 feet before asking whether the standard could instead correspond to the minimum frontage required within each zoning district.

Shelby Moore suggested replacing the fixed 100-foot requirement with the minimum frontage required by the applicable zoning district. She noted, however, that this approach could create complications within Planned Unit Developments where frontage requirements differ.

Nicole explained that staff's preferred approach was to focus on the operational impacts of a home occupation rather than frontage alone. She noted that the existing home occupation standards already limit customer traffic and other operational impacts, making the frontage requirement less necessary for low-impact businesses.

Commissioner Montgomery suggested removing the frontage requirement entirely and relying on complaints if operational impacts exceeded the ordinance standards.

Chair Sarah Moore agreed that eliminating the frontage requirement would simplify the ordinance.

Commissioner Moulton also supported removing the requirement, stating that parking conditions already vary throughout residential neighborhoods regardless of home occupations.

Bill agreed that the ordinance should rely more heavily on measurable performance standards rather than frontage. He explained that if a home occupation generated excessive traffic or negatively affected the neighborhood, the City could investigate and pursue enforcement based on the operational standards already contained within the ordinance.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether complaints could ultimately result in revocation of a home occupation approval. Bill confirmed that unresolved violations could result in enforcement action, including revocation where appropriate.

City attorney Tysen Barker stated that while measurable standards make enforcement easier, he agreed that the current frontage requirement may unnecessarily restrict small home-based businesses. He suggested considering objective operational standards, such as limiting customer visits, rather than relying on frontage.

Nicole reminded the Commission that the existing home occupation standards already limit customer traffic to no more than two customer visits per hour, providing an objective standard for enforcement.

Commissioner Montgomery agreed that those existing performance standards provided an appropriate basis for responding to complaints.

Chair Sarah Moore added that complaints should be supported by objective evidence rather than anecdotal concerns.

Commissioner Merrill agreed that complaints should be based on factual information rather than opinions.

Bill stated that staff had received sufficient direction and would incorporate the Commission's comments into the proposed code amendment before bringing it back for formal consideration.

Bill then reminded the Planning Commission about the upcoming fall planning conference scheduled for September 9–10 and noted that early registration would close later that week. He asked commissioners to notify staff of their attendance plans. Commissioner Merrill indicated he planned to attend, Commissioners Montgomery and Moulton declined, and Chair Sarah Moore stated she would confirm her availability by the following morning.

8. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

No comments were presented during the Open Forum.

9. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler reported that the City Council had recently approved the Sun Sage Terrace MDA and Falcon Landing, incorporating several of the Planning Commission's recommendations into the final approvals. He explained that, during the Falcon Landing review, the City Council worked with the developer to revise the layout of five lots on the south side of the development by increasing alternating side-yard setbacks to create approximately 22.5 feet of separation between homes. He noted that the revisions addressed concerns raised during the public comment process and represented a positive outcome for both the City and the developer.

Rhett also reported that the City Council had discussed creating a historic district within Grantsville. He explained that the Historic Preservation Commission was pursuing grant opportunities to establish the district and that he would serve as the City Council representative on the commission.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether Grantsville currently had a historic district. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that while several historic properties within the City are individually listed on the historic register, Grantsville does not currently have an established historic district. Bill noted that creating a district could provide additional funding opportunities and certain protections related to historic resources.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the benefits of establishing a historic district. Bill explained that a historic district could make eligible properties more competitive for grants and provide additional consideration if future federal projects were proposed within the area.

Rhett added that some historic properties, including the Grantsville First Ward Church, had previously been unable to obtain certain grants because the City does not currently have a designated historic district. He explained that establishing the district would allow qualifying properties to pursue those funding opportunities in the future.

10. Adjourn.

**Gary Merrill made a motion to adjourn. John Montgomery seconded the motion.
The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

AGENDA ITEM #4

Report from City staff.

AGENDA ITEM #5

Open Forum for Planning Commissioners

AGENDA ITEM #6

Report from City Council.

AGENDA ITEM #7

Adjourn.