

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Consideration of a request for a Plat Extension for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision.	Tabled
#3	Recommendation of proposed amendments to Chapter 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.	Denied
#4	Approval of the minutes from the August 18, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON SEPTEMBER 1, 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, Commissioner Gary Merrill

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent:

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 Recorder Alicia Fairbourne, Council Member Rhett Butler, Fire Lieutenant Brad Deleeuw, GIS Analyst/City Planner Tae-Eun Ko, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman.

On Zoom: Derek Dalton

Citizens and Guests Present: Nicole Cloward, Jessica Perschon, Scotty Perschon, Cameron Ordakowski

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: J Contreras, Cavett Eaton

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 September 1, 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. Consideration of a request for a Plat Extension for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore explained that the applicant was requesting additional time based largely on current market conditions and the difficulty of moving forward with development and home sales. The existing extension remained valid until November, so the applicant was requesting another extension before the current approval had expired.

Shelby reviewed the developer's active projects within the City and the outstanding obligations associated with those developments. She explained that Matthews Meadows Phase 1 and Matthews Meadows Phase 2 were separate projects with separate outstanding items. Matthews Meadows Phase 1 still required installation of the chain-link fence around the retention basin. Matthews Meadows Phase 2 was the subdivision currently before the Commission for the extension request and still required the plat to be recorded and the applicable fee-in-lieu and bonding requirements to be addressed.

Shelby also discussed outstanding items associated with Canyon View. She explained that the development agreement established a fee amount, but the applicant had submitted an appraisal that resulted in a substantially different value. Staff had drafted a development agreement to address the matter, but the agreement could not move forward until the applicant reviewed and agreed to the proposed language. The development agreement would then need to proceed through the applicable Planning Commission and City Council review process.

Shelby displayed the locations of the developer's projects and identified Matthews Meadows Phase 1, Matthews Meadows Phase 2, Cowboy Estates, Townhomes on Willow, Canyon View, and Heritage Farms. She explained that several of the developments were located relatively close to one another.

Shelby explained that staff was not recommending that the Commission make a final determination on the extension at that meeting. Because the current extension did not expire until November, staff was requesting that the item be tabled to give the applicant additional time to address outstanding obligations and demonstrate progress before the Commission considered whether another extension should be granted.

Discussion and Consideration

Vice Chair Hill stated that he understood the difficult market conditions and the applicant's request for additional time but was concerned with the number of outstanding obligations associated with the developer's projects. He stated that if the City continued considering

extensions, he wanted to see a clear schedule identifying outstanding items, expected deliverables, and when they would be completed. He noted that the applicant had expressed a commitment to completing the projects, but that commitment had not yet been demonstrated through performance.

Commissioner Merrill acknowledged that the housing market was difficult and that builders were facing challenges selling homes. However, he questioned why another extension needed to be considered when the existing extension did not expire until November. He expressed particular concern that the retention basin fence for Matthews Meadows Phase 1 had not been installed while the developer continued opening additional developments. Commissioner Merrill stated that he preferred to table the request and give the applicant an opportunity to demonstrate progress before the Commission considered another extension.

Chair Sarah Moore asked Shelby to clarify the outstanding obligations associated with Matthews Meadows Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the developer's other projects. Shelby explained that Matthews Meadows Phase 1 required the chain-link fence around the retention basin, while Phase 2 involved the requested extension, recording of the plat, and outstanding fee and bonding requirements. Shelby identified several other nearby developments associated with the same developer.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that she was willing to table the request because she did not yet have enough information to support a final decision. She expressed concern with the number of developments the applicant currently had underway and did not want a City decision to negatively affect completion of those developments. At the same time, she agreed that the Commission needed to see progress, stating that actions demonstrating compliance were more meaningful than statements of intent.

Commissioner Moulton expressed concern regarding the size of the Matthews Meadows retention basin and the lack of a fence, particularly because of the potential safety risk if the basin filled with water.

Vice Chair Hill stated that he supported giving the applicant an opportunity to return but would not support another extension without seeing meaningful progress. He agreed that installation of the retention basin fence was one example of an outstanding obligation that could demonstrate the developer's commitment to completing previously approved requirements.

The Commission discussed bringing the item back at the October 6 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Merrill stated that he wanted to see the retention basin fence completed and progress on the other outstanding items before considering the extension. Shelby agreed that completion of the fence and progress on the outstanding Canyon View items would demonstrate movement toward compliance.

Vice Chair Hill stated that the developer's performance on the other projects was relevant when considering whether another extension should be granted. He wanted the applicant to return with a plan showing how the outstanding obligations would be addressed. Commissioner Merrill stated that the City was providing ample opportunity for the applicant to demonstrate intent

through action and that, if meaningful progress had not occurred when the item returned, he would be inclined to deny the extension.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the Commission could identify expected outcomes when tabling the request. Shelby clarified that the Commission could communicate its expectations, but those expectations would not constitute formal conditions. It would ultimately be the developer's decision whether to address those items before returning for consideration of the extension.

Chair Sarah Moore also asked whether the City should consider limiting the number of active projects or extensions one developer could have at one time. Shelby explained that required bonds provide protection to the City if a developer is unable to complete required infrastructure. Commissioner Moulton and Vice Chair Hill indicated that they preferred evaluating extension requests individually rather than establishing a predetermined limit.

Gary Merrill made a motion to table the consideration of a request for a Plat Extension for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision, until the October 6, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting based on the recommendations presented in the staff report. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Gary Merrill "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussion of a proposed new use for an Animal Encounters Facility within the Chapters 2, 8, and 15.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for an Animal Encounters Facility. Shelby explained that the concept had been discussed at the previous Planning Commission meeting to determine whether the Commission was comfortable allowing the use within the R-1-21 zoning designation. Based on the direction received at that meeting, staff prepared proposed ordinance language for the Commission to review and provide additional direction before proceeding to a public hearing.

Shelby reviewed the proposed definition of an Animal Encounters Facility as a facility where members of the public may observe, handle, feed, or otherwise interact with domestic farm animals. She explained that the agricultural operation would be required to remain the primary use of the property and that permitted activities could include supervised animal interactions, workshops, photography sessions, educational programs, demonstrations, guided tours, family-oriented recreational activities, and accessory sales of agricultural products or merchandise. The proposed use would exclude commercial kennels, veterinary hospitals or clinics, breeding and boarding facilities, slaughter facilities, and exotic, wild, or injured animals.

Shelby explained that the draft limited visitor groups to one to ten people per 45-minute period, with proposed operating hours from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. She stated that the 45-minute

scheduling requirement was intended to provide separation between groups and reduce overlapping traffic, parking, restroom use, and circulation issues.

The draft established a minimum site area of two acres with at least 125 feet of frontage and legal access to a public street. A property of at least two acres could maintain up to 20 domesticated farm animals associated with the use, while a property of at least five acres could maintain up to 40, with a maximum of 40 under the proposed language. Shelby explained that animals associated with the Animal Encounters Facility would also be considered when determining the total number of animals otherwise permitted on the property.

Shelby further explained that applicants would be required to address noise, lighting, traffic, parking, sanitation, pedestrian circulation, accessibility, and animal welfare. The Planning Commission could impose additional buffering, landscaping, screening, parking, or circulation requirements based on the characteristics of the property. An Animal Encounters Facility would require a Conditional Use Permit and applicable application materials, including a Chapter 11 site plan and parking and circulation plans. The use would then be added to the Chapter 15 use table as a conditional use.

Discussion

Vice Chair Hill stated that staff had done a good job developing standards for the agricultural component of the use but questioned whether the proposed language sufficiently addressed its commercial component. He noted that an Animal Encounters Facility would operate as a business with members of the public coming onto residential property and wanted to ensure the ordinance adequately addressed that distinction. He expressed concern about establishing a precedent for other commercial activities within R-1-21. Shelby agreed that commercial uses were not generally intended for R-1-21 but explained that the proposed use was being specifically created to address a home-based agricultural business that did not fit within the City's existing home occupation, micro-entrepreneurship, or similar classifications.

Commissioner Merrill questioned the proposed 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. operating hours and asked why they differed from other City operating-hour standards. Nicole Cloward, property owner and applicant, explained that she had proposed those hours as parameters she believed would work for both her business and her neighbors but would appreciate flexibility to operate earlier or later when appropriate. Vice Chair Hill noted that the Commission should consider the residential nature of R-1-21 when determining appropriate operating hours for a commercial activity.

Commissioner Moulton asked how the two-acre minimum would apply and whether multiple smaller parcels could be combined to meet the requirement. Shelby clarified that a single parcel would need to contain at least two acres. Commissioner Moulton stated that the acreage requirement addressed his concern about this type of use appearing on a typical half-acre lot within a subdivision. He also asked whether the Land Use Ordinance defined exotic animals, and Shelby confirmed that the City's code contained standards addressing those animals.

Chair Sarah Moore discussed the agricultural character of the proposed use and noted that many traditional agricultural activities can have a business component while still being considered agricultural uses. She expressed support for creating a mechanism that would allow this type of activity while maintaining the agricultural nature of the property.

Nicole Cloward was present to answer questions on this item she presented three items within the proposed language that she wanted the Commission to reconsider.

First, Nicole questioned the proposed limitation of one to ten visitors every 45 minutes. She explained that her business plan contemplated groups arriving every 30 minutes, with one group participating in an orientation while another interacted with the animals. The groups would arrive and depart at staggered times so vehicles would not need to pass one another on the private lane. Nicole stated that she did not necessarily want her specific operating schedule incorporated into the ordinance but wanted enough flexibility to operate the business efficiently.

Shelby explained that staff's concern involved the approximately 22-foot-wide access, emergency and ADA access, parking, restrooms, and the potential impacts if a future Animal Encounters Facility had a less favorable site configuration. Vice Chair Hill and Commissioner Moulton expressed concern with writing Nicole's specific business operations into the ordinance and favored establishing broader standards that could accommodate different properties while still addressing parking, accessibility, and safety.

The Commission discussed establishing a maximum number of visitors per hour rather than prescribing how frequently groups could arrive. City Manager Michael Resare cautioned that leaving the standard undefined could create enforcement difficulties and recommended establishing a specific number. Commissioner Merrill suggested allowing up to 40 visitors per hour, with individual businesses retaining the ability to operate below that maximum. Shelby stated that she would revise the language to consider a maximum of 40 visitors per hour tied to applicable parking requirements and would verify that the number did not trigger County or City mass-gathering requirements.

Second, Nicole questioned language stating that activities not expressly approved as part of the Conditional Use Permit would be prohibited. She used bottle-feeding a calf as an example of a normal animal-related activity that might arise after approval and stated that she did not want minor agricultural or educational activities to require an amendment to the permit. She proposed allowing similar activities provided they did not substantially increase the nature, size, intensity, or impacts of the approved use.

Vice Chair Hill suggested adding animal husbandry to the permitted activities, explaining that the term would encompass the general raising and care of animals, including activities such as feeding and interacting with them. Commissioner Merrill supported adding animal husbandry to the list of permitted activities. Shelby agreed and noted that the term would need to be appropriately defined within Chapter 2. Nicole supported the change because it would keep the ordinance more general rather than attempting to identify every possible animal-related activity.

Third, Nicole questioned the proposed animal limits. She noted that the draft allowed up to 20 animals on a two-acre property and 40 animals on a five-acre property but did not provide an

incremental increase for properties between those sizes. Nicole explained that her property contained approximately 4.57 acres, with approximately 4.2 acres available for calculating animal area, which would leave her subject to the 20-animal limitation despite being close to five acres.

The Commission discussed whether the number should increase proportionally with acreage. Nicole suggested an approach such as 20 animals on two acres, 30 on three acres, 40 on four acres, and 50 on five acres. Commissioner Moulton and Vice Chair Hill supported providing an incremental increase rather than an all-or-nothing threshold.

The discussion then turned to whether a separate animal limit was necessary for an Animal Encounters Facility when the City's existing animal standards already regulate the number of animals permitted based on available square footage. Nicole noted that the existing standards require 10,000 square feet for the first large animal and 2,000 square feet for each additional large animal. Vice Chair Hill questioned what benefit was gained by limiting the number of animals participating in the business when additional animals could otherwise remain on the same property under the existing animal standards.

Shelby reminded the Commission that the proposed use was a commercial business being introduced into a residential zoning designation and that the standards needed to account for impacts beyond simply the number of animals permitted for personal agricultural use. Chair Sarah Moore added that the Commission also needed to consider the health, safety, and welfare of members of the public visiting the property. Commissioner Moulton stated that he understood the distinction but questioned why the number of animals should be more restrictive simply because the animals were part of a business when the same number could otherwise legally be kept on the property.

The Commission ultimately directed Shelby to revise the animal limitation language to tie the number of animals to the City's existing square-footage requirements. Commissioner Moulton noted that nuisance and mitigation standards would still provide a mechanism to address impacts on neighboring properties if problems arose.

Discussion item only no action taken.

3. Recommendation of proposed amendments to Chapter 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed amendments to Chapter 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance. Shelby explained that following the Commission's previous discussion, staff decided to rewrite Chapter 9 in its entirety rather than continue making individual amendments to what had become a patchwork of provisions. She stated that the rewrite was intended to address the Commission's previous concerns, meet the State's minimum water-wise landscaping requirements, improve the organization and internal references within the chapter, and establish standards that encouraged responsible water use while maintaining compatibility within the community.

Shelby explained that the proposed ordinance was intended to be flexible, protect existing property owners, and primarily regulate new construction. She emphasized that existing property owners would not be required to convert their existing landscaping. For new development, however, developers would be required to install landscaping that complied with the standards, and future property owners would be required to maintain compliance with the applicable City requirements.

Chair Sarah Moore asked what would occur if the Planning Commission did not approve the proposed amendments. Shelby clarified that the Planning Commission was making a recommendation and that final consideration would be by the City Council.

Commissioner Moulton asked how the requirements would interact with subdivision CC&Rs and HOAs. Shelby explained that CC&Rs are recorded with the County and generally enforced through the HOA. City Manager Michael Resare clarified that although an HOA may impose standards that are more restrictive than City requirements, City Code Enforcement would enforce the City's adopted requirements rather than an HOA's additional restrictions. Shelby further explained that whether or not a development had an HOA, applicable City landscaping standards would ultimately apply to the property.

Commissioner Moulton asked for clarification regarding a future homeowner who purchased a newly constructed home and later wanted to install lawn in an area where turf was prohibited under the proposed ordinance. Shelby confirmed that if the property was subject to the new standards, installing turf in a prohibited area would constitute a violation of City Code. Commissioner Moulton stated that he wanted that distinction clearly understood because the requirement would ultimately apply to the future homeowner and not only the original developer.

The Commission discussed whether those restrictions represented an appropriate land use regulation. Commissioner Merrill stated that an HOA could be more restrictive than City Code but could not authorize something prohibited by City Code. He noted that the City already regulates many aspects of property development and use. Commissioner Moulton disagreed that this made the proposed restriction appropriate and stated that many existing land use regulations address health, safety, and welfare, while he did not believe prohibiting grass within a particular area of a residential yard served the same purpose.

Commissioner Merrill stated that water conservation required the City to begin somewhere. He expressed concern with the City's long-term water supply and stated that preserving water for essential uses was more important than maintaining turf within small areas such as park strips. Vice Chair Hill agreed that water availability was connected to the City's long-term health and ability to accommodate future growth. He stated that Grantsville could not continue managing outdoor water use in the same manner it had historically and that the City had a responsibility to plan for future municipal water needs.

Commissioner Moulton agreed that water conservation was important but stated that he did not believe regulating the placement of residential turf was the appropriate method. He suggested that water consumption could instead be addressed through growth management or water pricing. Vice Chair Hill acknowledged that cost could influence water use but stated that

increasing water rates was simply another form of regulation and that the City still needed to address long-term water management.

The Commission also discussed the potential heat impacts associated with water-wise landscaping. Commissioner Merrill stated that he preferred landscaping using desert-adapted plants and natural soil rather than extensive hardscape or rock because rock can retain and radiate heat. Shelby referenced a parkway within Northstar Ranch that used gravel, shrubs, and trees as an example of water-wise landscaping that remained visually attractive.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the State's landscaping requirements, including requirements for water-wise plant material, were incorporated into the proposed rewrite. Shelby confirmed that the draft had been reviewed to ensure that it met the applicable State requirements. Shelby reiterated that she was proposing a complete rewrite of Chapter 9 rather than continuing to make individual amendments so the chapter would flow consistently and properly reference related provisions of the Land Use Ordinance.

Commissioner Merrill expressed concern that requiring developers to install the landscaping could increase the cost of new homes. Shelby explained that the City already provided incentives for water-wise development through reductions in required water credits because water-wise landscaping has a lower anticipated water demand. She stated that the reduction could help offset the developer's landscaping costs.

Vice Chair Hill asked how the landscaping installation requirement would be enforced for new construction. Shelby explained that installation would be tied to occupancy requirements and that during seasons when landscaping could not reasonably be installed, the required improvements could be bonded and completed within the allowed timeframe.

Vice Chair Hill also asked how the City's approved tree list would be maintained and whether it would continue to rely on lists from other jurisdictions or outside recommendations. He expressed concern that trees suitable elsewhere along the Wasatch Front may not necessarily perform well under Grantsville's soil, heat, and wind conditions. He specifically expressed concern with allowing pine trees within park strips because of visibility and pedestrian safety issues as the trees mature and requested that pine trees not be allowed within park strips.

Vice Chair Hill also questioned allowing bark within park strips because it could blow or wash into streets during Grantsville's wind and storm events. Shelby explained that bark and mulch were easier for City crews to clean up than materials such as pea gravel but stated that the provision could be revised. Vice Chair Hill stated that his primary concern was ensuring that approved materials remained stable and that landscaped areas did not eventually consist of exposed landscape fabric or dirt because the original material had blown away.

Commissioner Moulton requested that staff compare the proposed tree list with the trees sold by the City to ensure the City was not selling species that would be inconsistent with its own landscaping standards. Vice Chair Hill suggested that instead of maintaining an approved tree list, the City could consider identifying trees that were specifically prohibited or discouraged and allow property owners greater flexibility with other species.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that she had applied the State's incentive program to her own front yard and estimated that she could potentially receive approximately \$6,000 for converting the existing lawn. However, she believed hiring a professional to design and install the water-wise landscaping could cost substantially more than the available incentive. She stated that while she supported water conservation, she continued to have concerns with requiring future homeowners to landscape their property in a particular manner.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that she did not believe it was irresponsible to allow property owners to determine how they wanted to landscape their property and felt the proposed requirements represented an overreach into private property choices. She was also concerned that developers would pass the cost of required landscaping on to homebuyers, potentially increasing the price of new homes at a time when the City and State were also attempting to address housing affordability. She noted that developers were already proposing water-wise landscaping in many new developments and questioned whether additional restrictions were necessary to encourage that practice.

Chair Sarah Moore also raised concerns regarding the ambient temperature created by hardscape compared with lawn and questioned the definition of turf. She noted that some homeowners use clover, Bermuda grass, creeping thyme, or other groundcovers instead of traditional lawn and questioned how those alternatives would be treated under the proposed standards. She stated that she remained uncomfortable imposing those restrictions on future homeowners.

Public Hearing

Cameron Ordakowski: Cameron Ordakowski was present to comment on this item, he stated he is opposed to mandating the proposed water-wise landscaping requirements. He stated that he supported water conservation and incentive programs but opposed placing the requirements into City Code. He discussed his own efforts to reduce irrigation and stated that homeowners could conserve water without being prohibited from choosing lawn for portions of their property. He expressed concern with the effect of mandates on private property rights and questioned how much water would ultimately be saved by restricting residential turf. He also discussed the environmental benefits of vegetation and trees and questioned whether all plants identified as water-wise were necessarily appropriate from a water-consumption standpoint. He recommended that the City consider alternatives such as watering-hour restrictions or temporary watering limitations during drought conditions rather than permanent landscaping mandates.

Cavett Eaton: Cavett Eaton was present via zoom to comment on this item, he stated that he and his wife had taught water-wise landscaping in Grantsville for approximately three years. He supported the proposed ordinance, congratulated the City for considering the standards, and stated that water-wise landscaping would conserve water and was well suited to Grantsville's conditions.

Discussion and Recommendation

Vice Chair Hill stated that he supported the proposed amendments because the City needed to consider long-term regional drying trends, continued growth, and the availability of municipal water. He stated that if the City waited until its water supply became critically limited, substantially more restrictive measures could become necessary. He viewed the proposed

standards as a proactive effort to protect the City's ability to accommodate future residents and development over the next 10, 20, and 30 years.

Chair Sarah Moore reiterated her concern that future homeowners may not fully understand the restrictions applicable to their property when purchasing a home. She discussed her own experience purchasing property without understanding all of the HOA requirements and noted that buyers do not always receive or understand all applicable restrictions. She was concerned that a future homeowner could purchase a property, install lawn without realizing it was prohibited, and later face City enforcement requiring its removal.

Vice Chair Hill acknowledged the concern but stated that other growing communities with limited water supplies had implemented similar restrictions while continuing to experience significant residential development. He stated that developers and homeowners would adapt to changing standards and reiterated that the City's water-management decisions needed to account for anticipated growth and increasing scrutiny of water resources.

Gary Merrill made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed amendments to Chapter 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance, as presented in the staff report, with the modifications discussed by the Commission. Jason Hill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Nay," Gary Merrill "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," and Cameron Moulton "Nay." The motion failed on a 2–2 vote, resulting in a recommendation of denial to the City Council.

4. Approval of the minutes from the August 18, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

Gary Merrill made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 18, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Gary Merrill "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye." The motion passed unanimously.

5. Report from City Staff

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe reminded the Commission of the Utah APA Fall Conference scheduled for September 9–10, 2026, in Layton and encouraged Commissioners to attend. Vice Chair Hill noted that he had attended previously and found the conference beneficial. Commissioner Merrill requested additional information, and Bill stated that he would email the conference information to the Commission.

The Commission and City staff discussed possible dates for a public open house regarding data centers and agreed to schedule the open house for September 30, 2026. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe also clarified that the City currently has no active applications for a data center.

6. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the City's responsibility for enforcing violations at the tire recycling facility and whether fines could be imposed. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe stated that the City was currently working on a fee schedule for code enforcement violations.

Bill explained that enforcement is generally focused on bringing a property or business into compliance. He shared an example from his time working for Pleasant View City where the mayor had a cow that was in violation of City ordinance. Bill contacted him and advised that the cow needed to be moved. He explained that when someone is actively making an effort to correct a violation, the City typically works with them toward compliance. In some situations, however, efforts may be made but other circumstances can prevent the violation from being corrected immediately.

Bill stated that Code Enforcement had been inspecting the tire recycling property weekly and that the City had also been conducting drone flights to monitor the site. He explained that the tire accumulation presents fire and environmental concerns and is not a violation the City can simply correct in the same manner as mowing weeds or cleaning up a property. The City must work with the company as the tires are processed and removed. He stated that another enforcement option would be for the City to have the tires removed and place a lien on the property for the associated costs.

7. Report from City Council.

City Council Member Rhett Butler provided an update regarding the Alington Development, which had previously received a recommendation of approval from the Planning Commission. He stated that the City Council was continuing to work with the developer and residents located west of the proposed development to reach an agreeable compromise. Discussions included providing additional open space and amenities within the development and improving buffering between the development and the existing residents to the west.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether the City had received a response from the Lieutenant Governor's Office regarding the Six Mile annexation. City Manager Michael Resare stated that a hearing had been held the previous week and that the City was awaiting a ruling.

8. Adjourn.

Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. Cameron Moulton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," "Gary Merrill "Aye" and Cameron Moulton "Aye." The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

APPROVED