

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	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.	Approved
#2	Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.	Approved
#3	Approval of the minutes from the July 7, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON AUGUST 4, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ON ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members Present: Chair Sarah Moore, Vice Chair Hill, Commissioner Cameron Moulton

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent: Commissioner Gary Merrill

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Community and Development Director Bill Cobabe, Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, Mayor Heidi Hammond, City Manager Michael Resare, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Rhett Butler, Fire Marshal Nicholas Critchlow, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman.

On Zoom: City Recorder Alicia Fairbourne

Citizens and Guests Present: Kelli Pearson, Matt Pearson, Mikie Janwyck

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom:

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

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday August 4, 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.

1. 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.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the City had received a request to amend Chapter 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to allow Micro-Entrepreneurship as a conditional use within the R-1-21 Zone. She stated that Micro-Entrepreneurship was currently allowed as a conditional use within the RM-7 Zone and that the proposed amendment would expand the use to the R-1-21 Zone.

Commissioner Moulton asked why the R-1-21 Zone had not been included when Micro-Entrepreneurship was originally added to the ordinance. Shelby explained that the original amendment resulted from a request involving a property in the RM-7 Zone and, at that time, the use was only added to that zone.

Commissioner Moulton asked why the City would not consider adding Micro-Entrepreneurship to other zoning districts at the same time rather than addressing additional zones individually as future requests were received. Shelby stated that the use could be expanded to additional zones if the Planning Commission wished to recommend doing so.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether adding additional zoning districts would be within the scope of the current amendment. City Attorney Tysen Barker confirmed that the Planning Commission's recommendation could include adding Micro-Entrepreneurship to additional zones and that an additional public hearing would not be required.

Chair Sarah Moore requested that the definition of Micro-Entrepreneurship be reviewed before considering whether to expand the use. Shelby reviewed the definition, which described Micro-Entrepreneurship as a low-intensity, small independent business operating at a limited scale with minimal off-site impacts and designed to be compatible with surrounding residential or rural uses. City Attorney Barker also directed the Planning Commission to Section 8.9 for the additional standards applicable to Micro-Entrepreneurship.

Commissioner Moulton asked how many Micro-Entrepreneurship uses currently existed within the City. Shelby confirmed that there was currently one.

Vice Chair Hill confirmed that Micro-Entrepreneurship would remain a conditional use, rather than becoming a permitted use, in any additional zones. Shelby confirmed that it would be conditional in the zones listed in Chapter 15.

Public Hearing

No comments

Discussion and Consideration

Chair Sarah Moore stated that she had no concerns with expanding the amendment beyond the R-1-21 Zone. Vice Chair Hill agreed with Commissioner Moulton's suggestion to consider allowing Micro-Entrepreneurship in additional zoning districts.

Chair Sarah Moore asked Attorney Tysen Barker if he had any additional comments regarding allowing Micro-Entrepreneurship as a conditional use in all zones listed in Chapter 15. City Attorney Barker referred the Planning Commission to Section 8.9(3) regarding accessory structure standards. He explained that Micro-Entrepreneurship could include a freestanding movable accessory structure not exceeding 10 feet by 10 feet for accessory storage and incidental on-site sales associated with the approved use. He encouraged the Commission to consider how those standards would function within the different zoning districts before recommending that the use be expanded throughout the City.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the typical lot size within the RM-7 Zone. Shelby explained that single-family lots are generally 7,000 square feet, with corner lots at 10,000 square feet, and noted that some attached housing could have smaller lot areas depending on applicable standards. Commissioner Moulton noted that Micro-Entrepreneurship was therefore already allowed within one of the City's smaller residential zoning districts.

Vice Chair Hill stated that if Micro-Entrepreneurship were expanded to all zones, applicants would still be required to comply with all other applicable City standards and ordinances. He noted that designation as a conditional use would not guarantee approval if the proposed use could not meet the applicable requirements.

Chair Sarah Moore asked Attorney Barker whether language should be added specifically requiring compliance with the other applicable City standards. City Attorney Barker explained that the ordinance already required compliance with applicable setback, visibility, compatibility, and underlying zoning standards.

Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the 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. With the following modification: Apply the proposed amendment to all zoning designations within Chapter 15. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.

- 2. Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.**

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 had previously been discussed by the Planning Commission and had been revised based on the Commission's direction.

Shelby reviewed the proposed amendment to Chapter 2 regarding Home Occupations. She explained that the existing minimum lot frontage requirement had been removed and replaced with language requiring the property to have frontage along a public or private road that provides legal access to the property.

Shelby then reviewed the proposed amendments to Chapter 6 regarding driveway approaches. She explained that driveway approaches would continue to be required to maintain a minimum separation of 12 feet. The proposed language would also require a driveway to be located no closer to the side property line than the minimum side yard setback for the applicable zoning district, measured from the side property line to the nearest edge of the driveway, excluding the flares.

Shelby explained that the existing requirement for a driveway to be located 60 feet from an intersection had created difficulties on properties with limited frontage. The proposed amendment would instead use the applicable zoning district setback and the City's clear view requirements to determine the appropriate location, with the greater requirement applying.

Shelby reviewed the proposed amendment to Chapter 7 regarding the referral of Conditional Use Permits to the Planning Commission. She explained that the existing language required a Conditional Use Permit to be referred to the Planning Commission when public comments indicated a concern about the proposed use. The revised language would require referral when comments identified a potential issue regarding the proposed Conditional Use Permit's compliance with the approval standards of Chapter 7 or other applicable provisions of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.

Vice Chair Hill stated that he supported the revised language. Chair Sarah Moore agreed and stated that the amendment was clearly worded.

Shelby stated that the revised language would also provide clearer direction to staff when determining whether public comments warranted referral of a Conditional Use Permit to the Planning Commission.

Public Hearing

No comments

Discussion and Consideration

Commissioner Moulton stated that he had no concerns with the proposed amendments, noting that the Planning Commission had previously discussed the changes and that the revisions made sense.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 6, and 7 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

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

Cameron Moulton made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 21, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

4. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reported that Holiday Oil was preparing to break ground the following week. She also stated that another project located nearby would soon be coming before the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe provided an update regarding the previous discussion on data centers. Bill reiterated that the City had not received any applications, plans, or other indication that a data center was currently proposed within Grantsville City. He explained that staff's intent was to be proactive by developing regulations and performance standards before receiving an application. He stated that if the City ultimately decided to allow data centers, the standards would be intended to minimize potential impacts and provide appropriate mitigation requirements.

Bill reported that staff had recently met to begin developing potential performance standards and regulations. He stated that the topic would return to the Planning Commission at the next meeting as a discussion item.

Bill also stated that he had met with the Tooele County Manager, who was anticipating a data center proposal and was working on regulations for that use. He explained that Tooele County had provided him with its draft information and that he intended to incorporate some of those concepts into the proposal brought back to the Planning Commission.

Bill reminded the Planning Commission of the upcoming APA Conference scheduled for September 9–10 and asked any commissioners who had not yet registered and wished to attend to contact staff.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether Bill had received much public feedback following the previous discussion regarding data centers. Bill stated that despite providing his contact information and inviting residents to contact him with questions or concerns, he had not received any calls, emails, or other direct communication.

Chair Sarah Moore expressed appreciation for Bill's willingness to have open conversations with members of the public. Bill reiterated that his goal was to be proactive and available to discuss concerns with residents.

5. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the role of the Planning Commission and whether all matters reviewed by the Commission ultimately required City Council approval. He questioned whether having both bodies review many of the same matters created an unnecessary level of bureaucracy and additional cost to the City.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that not all Planning Commission decisions proceed to the City Council. She stated that the Planning Commission makes final decisions on certain administrative matters, including many Conditional Use Permits, while legislative matters, such as amendments to the Land Use Ordinance, require final action by the City Council.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that there had been discussions regarding whether certain matters could be handled solely by either the Planning Commission or City Council to streamline the process. He stated that one benefit of the current process is that it provides the public with two opportunities to participate in legislative matters. If someone is unable to attend one meeting or disagrees with the Planning Commission's recommendation, they have another opportunity to provide input before the City Council.

Bill stated that it was rare for the City Council to reach a different conclusion than the Planning Commission's recommendation, although he had seen it occur. He explained that the Planning Commission also serves a unique role because commissioners are appointed rather than elected and are therefore able to independently evaluate land use matters without the same constituent considerations faced by elected officials. He stated that this provides an additional level of credibility and impartiality to the review process.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about the appeal process for decisions made by the Planning Commission. Shelby explained that the City has a Board of Adjustment as an initial appeal level, followed by additional appeal processes where applicable.

Bill clarified that administrative decisions made by staff or the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment, which acts in a quasi-judicial capacity. He explained that the Board also considers variance requests when strict application of the Land Use Ordinance creates an undue hardship due to unique circumstances associated with a property. Decisions of the Board of Adjustment may ultimately be appealed through the courts.

Commissioner Moulton stated that the discussion helped clarify the Planning Commission's role. He explained that he had previously believed everything considered by the Planning Commission also went before the City Council, which made the process appear repetitive. He

stated that he better understood the distinction after learning that some matters are decided solely by the Planning Commission and that the two-meeting process provides additional opportunities for public participation.

Vice Chair Hill added that the Planning Commission also provides an additional level of review before matters proceed to the City Council.

Vice Chair Hill discussed the potential impacts of data center development occurring outside Grantsville City limits but near the community. He stated that even if a proposed facility was located within Tooele County's jurisdiction, the impacts could still directly affect Grantsville. He asked whether the City should become more involved in discussions with the County to address infrastructure, water, and other potential impacts before development occurred.

City Council Member Rhett Butler stated that the City remained engaged with Tooele County and had met with County representatives the previous evening. He agreed that a proactive approach was important but noted that development within the County remained under the County's jurisdiction. He stated that the Mayor and City Manager maintained regular communication with County officials.

Vice Chair Hill emphasized that the City's opportunity to influence potential impacts was during the planning stages rather than after development occurred. City Council Member Butler stated that the City's relationship with Tooele County was as strong as it had ever been and that communication was ongoing.

6. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler reported that the City Council had not met since the previous Planning Commission meeting and that its upcoming meeting would primarily consist of the Truth in Taxation hearing.

City Council Member Butler reported that City representatives had attended a growth summit with Tooele County the previous day, where the Utah Department of Energy provided a presentation. Based on the information presented, he suggested holding a joint work session between the City Council and Planning Commission to discuss a potential nuclear lifecycle innovation campus and its possible impacts on the area. He suggested inviting one of the presenters from the summit to provide additional information to both bodies and the public.

Vice Chair Hill stated that he had heard there could be additional nuclear-related development in the area even if Utah was not selected as the primary location for the larger project. He expressed support for the proposed joint work session.

Commissioner Moulton also expressed support for the work session and noted that the information would be valuable for current and future Planning Commission members.

City Council Member Butler stated that the City anticipated appointing an additional Planning Commission member by the first meeting in September. He suggested potentially holding the joint work session on September 29th or 30th and having the meeting publicly noticed so residents could also attend and hear the presentation.

Chair Sarah Moore expressed interest in attending the proposed work session and supported providing the public with an opportunity to learn more about the topic.

7. Adjourn.

Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” and Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.