

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL, HELD ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.**

**Mayor and Council Members Present:**

Mayor Heidi Hammond  
Rhett Butler  
Derek Dalton

Brittany Skinner  
Jake Thomas  
Jeff Williams

**Council Members Excused:** none.

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:**

Michael Resare, City Manager  
Alicia Fairbourne, City Recorder  
Tysen Barker, City Attorney  
Bill Cobabe, Community Development Director  
Shelby Moore, Planning and Zoning Admin.

Police Chief Robert Sager  
Christy Montierth, Public Works Director  
Aspen Clegg, Finance Director

**Citizens and Guests Providing Public Comment or Presenting:** Kristen Nestegard, Ken Goodrich, Nadine Hunt, Clay Barney, Robert Smith, Marti Grant, Dylan Nash, Jolene Jenkins, Mike Fleming, Geoff Nestegard, Michelle Marriott, Michael VanWight, Ken Saunders, Ira Mongram, Kayla Cameron, Trista Favor, Kaycee Foster, Dan Snarr, Joe White and others who may not have signed in or used their full name via Zoom.

Mayor Hammond called the meeting of the Grantsville City Council to order at 7:09 p.m. and conducted a roll call of Councilmembers present. She led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA:**

**1. Public Comment**

Mayor Hammond opened the floor for public comment at 7:10 p.m.

*Kristen Nestegard*, a resident of Sun Valley Drive, expressed concerns regarding the proposed Alington development and the cumulative impact of residential growth in the surrounding area. She raised concerns about increased traffic on Sun Valley Drive, particularly from nearby developments, and the potential impact on neighborhood safety. Ms. Nestegard supported a lower-density layout and a design that would place residential lots adjacent to existing Sun Valley properties rather than common areas, citing concerns regarding pedestrian activity, property impacts, and interactions with livestock.

*Ken Goodrich*, a longtime Sun Valley Drive resident, thanked Mayor Hammond and the Council for providing an earlier opportunity to discuss the proposed Alington development with the developer. Mr. Goodrich stated that he preferred the concept showing homes adjacent to the existing Sun Valley properties and expressed disappointment that the development had moved

away from the previously contemplated lower-density concept. He raised concerns regarding the Planning Commission's recommendation and the broader impacts of continued residential growth, particularly traffic and pedestrian safety. Mr. Goodrich expressed concern regarding the adequacy of sidewalks, curb and gutter, traffic controls, and other infrastructure along SR-112, SR-138, and Durfee Street. He encouraged the City to work with UDOT and consider infrastructure and safety needs associated with current and future development throughout the community.

*Nadine Hunt*, a Sun Valley Drive resident, expressed concern regarding the density of the proposed Alington development, particularly the number of vehicles that could be generated by approximately 250 homes with a single access point to a two-lane highway. She stated that existing residents already experienced difficulty accessing the highway and questioned how the additional traffic would affect the surrounding area and the City as a whole. Ms. Hunt also raised concerns regarding emergency access and evacuation in the event of a fire, noting the potential conflict between residents attempting to evacuate and emergency vehicles entering the development. She stated that her primary concerns were the proposed density, traffic impacts, and fire safety.

*Clay Barney* acknowledged that growth was inevitable but emphasized the importance of controlled and responsible development. He expressed concern that increased residential density near existing agricultural uses could result in nuisance complaints involving animals, odors, barking dogs, or interactions between pets and livestock, creating additional demands on law enforcement. Mr. Barney also expressed concern regarding the proposed 50-foot open space area adjacent to existing properties, stating that it could become a gathering area and potentially create additional noise, nuisance, and law enforcement issues.

*Robert Smith*, a Sun Valley Drive resident, expressed concern regarding the proposed density and its potential impact on children and pedestrian safety. He stated that growth was inevitable and that he did not oppose the developer's right to develop the property, but encouraged the City to consider the capacity of its sewer system, Fire Department, Police Department, and transportation infrastructure. Mr. Smith advocated for additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout Grantsville to provide safer connections for residents. He also supported placing residential lots adjacent to existing Sun Valley properties rather than the alternative layout, and expressed concern that the development needed additional recreational space. He encouraged the City to prioritize infrastructure and public safety as development occurred.

*Marti Grant*, a Cook Lane resident whose property bordered the southeast corner of the proposed Alington development, expressed concern regarding the transition from existing one-acre properties to the proposed higher-density lots. He requested that lots along the south and west boundaries, including Cook Lane, transition through approximately one-third to one-half acre lots before moving into higher-density areas. Mr. Grant stated that one concept continued to place eight flex homes adjacent to his one-acre property and requested that any alternative concept provide a transition near his property similar to that proposed along Sun Valley Drive. He also requested fencing along his property comparable to fencing offered to a neighboring Cook Lane property. Mr. Grant asked the Council to table the Alington development until residents could review a final rendering incorporating the proposed changes before a decision was made.

*Dylan Nash*, a Sun Valley Drive resident, supported the concerns expressed regarding the transition between existing properties and the proposed higher-density development. He stated that existing

property owners had purchased their properties based on the surrounding conditions at the time, while future residents would be able to make an informed decision about purchasing within the proposed development. Mr. Nash requested that the Council table the proposal until more detailed drawings and measurements were available for comparison. He encouraged the Council to carefully consider the long-term and cumulative impacts of density and development rather than evaluating the property in isolation.

*Jolene Jenkins* supported providing an appropriate buffer and transition between higher-density development and existing larger properties. She also expressed concern regarding increasing traffic congestion on Main Street and the highways serving Grantsville as additional residential development occurred. Ms. Jenkins suggested that the City partner with developers, the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and other state leaders to advocate for UDOT to address transportation needs proactively rather than after congestion and safety problems developed.

*Mike Fleming*, a Cook Lane resident, formally requested that the City commission a comprehensive area-wide traffic study for the Sun Valley Drive, SR-138, and SR-112 area. He stated that traffic studies conducted for individual developments did not account for the cumulative impact of multiple approved or proposed developments in the area, which he estimated could collectively add more than 2,300 residential units within approximately 1.3 miles of Sun Valley Drive, in addition to commercial development. Mr. Fleming expressed concern regarding potential congestion, emergency response delays, and pedestrian hazards. He encouraged the City to evaluate cumulative traffic impacts and identify infrastructure improvements, including turn lanes, signal optimization, and traffic-calming measures, before buildout occurred. Mr. Fleming stated that he had submitted a formal letter detailing his request for the official record.

*Geoff Nestegard*, participating via Zoom, requested that the Council ask the developer how many phases were proposed for the Alington development and whether the development agreement could establish a firm timeline for recording the entire plat to avoid future changes similar to those that occurred following the 2022 approval. Mr. Nestegard also expressed concern regarding the City's mixed-use zoning provisions and encouraged the Council to consider amendments to open space requirements, setbacks, zoning standards, or other development regulations to better protect existing properties and preserve open space as future development occurred.

*Michelle Marriott*, a Willow Street resident participating via Zoom, expressed concern regarding the cumulative impacts of residential growth on existing residents and City services. She stated that substantial increases in population would create additional demands for police, fire, and other municipal services and could result in increased taxes. Ms. Marriott encouraged the City to evaluate development impact fees to ensure that new development contributed toward the additional infrastructure and service costs associated with growth rather than placing those costs on existing residents.

*Michael VanWight*, a Grantsville resident, expressed concern regarding the cumulative effects of continued residential development and the City's transportation network. He stated that Grantsville lacked adequate east-west and north-south thoroughfares and encouraged the City to take a more proactive role in addressing traffic concerns rather than relying solely on state agencies for improvements to SR-112 and SR-138. Mr. VanWight also questioned the emphasis on high-density development as a solution to housing affordability and expressed concern that such development

could affect Grantsville's small-town character and sense of community. He encouraged the Council to accommodate property owners' development rights while preserving the community character valued by existing residents.

*Ken Saunders*, a Sun Valley Drive resident, stated that he had purchased his property approximately 20 years earlier because of its rural residential character and ability to accommodate livestock. He expressed concern regarding placing high-density residential development adjacent to existing properties where horses, pigs, sheep, and other livestock were permitted. Mr. Saunders stated that close proximity could create conflicts involving residents feeding or interacting with livestock, nuisance complaints, and increased calls for City or law enforcement response. He requested that the Council consider a larger buffer or lower-density transition adjacent to existing rural residential properties to help protect established agricultural uses and reduce potential conflicts.

*Ira Mongram*, a Sun Valley Drive resident, expressed concern regarding the availability of water to support continued residential growth. He questioned where the water necessary to serve the proposed development and other growth would come from, particularly in light of broader concerns regarding limited water resources.

*Kayla Cameron*, a Grantsville resident, expressed concerns similar to those raised by Sun Valley Drive residents and additionally addressed the impact of residential growth on local schools. She questioned whether existing elementary, junior high, and high school capacity would be sufficient to accommodate children from the additional developments and expressed concern that future school construction could require additional bonds and increased taxes. Ms. Cameron also described existing traffic congestion on Main Street during school dismissal and shift changes at the Walmart Distribution Center and expressed concern that additional development would further increase congestion.

*Trista Favor*, a resident near Durfee Street and Sun Valley Drive, expressed concern regarding whether City infrastructure and services were keeping pace with residential growth. She encouraged the City to provide information regarding plans for fire protection, recreational amenities, roads, and other resources needed to serve new development. Ms. Favor suggested developing pedestrian and bicycle pathways along SR-112 and SR-138 and providing appropriate transitions between rural residential properties and more intensive uses. She encouraged the Council to consider the cumulative impacts of growth and plan for the additional public services and infrastructure that would be required.

There being no further comments from the public, Mayor Hammond closed the floor at 7:55 p.m.

## **2. Summary Action Items**

### **a. Approval of Minutes from the August 19, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

The minutes were not ready for this meeting. They would be presented at the next meeting.

### **b. Approval of the bills**

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve the invoices.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**3. Consideration of Resolution 2026-65 appointing Shana Nelson to the Historic Preservation Committee**

Mayor Hammond introduced Resolution 2026-65, appointing Shana Nelson to the Historic Preservation Committee. The Council noted that the appointment had been tabled at the previous meeting to allow Ms. Nelson to attend; however, she was unable to attend this meeting due to a scheduling conflict. Mayor Hammond stated that she had spoken with Ms. Nelson, who remained enthusiastic about serving on the Committee. Councilmember Butler noted that the Historic Preservation Committee had a meeting scheduled for the following week and supported proceeding with the appointment.

**Motion:** Councilmember Dalton moved to approve Resolution 2026-65 appointing Shana Nelson to the Historic Preservation Committee.

**Second:** Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**4. Presentation from the Veterans Committee of the Grantsville Veterans Memorial Statue, 1<sup>st</sup> Model to Grantsville City**

Kaycee Foster, Chair of the Grantsville Veterans Memorial Park Committee, presented Grantsville City with the first of six limited-edition replicas of the Veterans Memorial Park’s centerpiece statue, along with a signed certificate of authenticity. Ms. Foster recognized Grantsville City as the project’s first and largest qualifying Diamond Sponsor and thanked City officials, staff, committee members, residents, volunteers, and donors for their contributions to the project.

Mr. Dan Snarr, sculptor of the Veterans Memorial statue, recognized the Committee’s work and dedication and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to help bring its vision to life. The Veterans Memorial Park Committee presented replica number one of six to the City, and Mayor Hammond thanked the Committee for its continued work on the Veterans Memorial Park.

**5. Consideration of Ordinance 2026-27 approving the Alington Planned Unit Development located at approximately 948 E Main Street (SR-138)**

Mayor Hammond introduced Ordinance 2026-27, approving the Alington Planned Unit Development located at approximately 948 East Main Street and SR-138. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reviewed the revised concept, and the Council discussed the proposed density, housing types, open space, buffers, setbacks, commercial area, traffic impacts, recreational amenities, and requested deviations from City development standards.

The Council discussed the proposed flex-home product and whether the benefits of the PUD

justified the requested deviations and increased density. Councilmember Dalton raised concerns regarding compliance with the City's PUD standards, including the requirement for a balanced mix of residential types, and questioned whether the proposed street system provided an adequate level of safety and service based on traffic conditions identified in the project's traffic study. The Council also discussed the moderate-income housing requirements associated with the additional density. Ms. Moore explained that 50 percent of the additional density granted through the PUD would be subject to the applicable moderate-income housing requirements and that the Tooele County Housing Authority would assist with the required income calculations and deed restrictions.

Mayor Hammond questioned whether individual traffic studies adequately accounted for the cumulative impact of other approved and proposed developments in the area. Ms. Moore stated that the individual development studies did not collectively analyze all anticipated units in the surrounding area but that the City's master transportation plan addressed the broader transportation network. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe recommended that improvements identified by the project's traffic engineer be incorporated as conditions of approval.

At approximately 9:03 p.m., Mayor Hammond called for a recess. The meeting reconvened at approximately 9:10 p.m.

Following the recess, the Council continued its discussion of the proposed development and potential revisions to the concept. The Council considered concerns raised by neighboring property owners regarding the transition between the proposed development and existing properties along Sun Valley Drive and Cook Lane. Developer Joe White discussed several potential revisions, including changes to lot sizes and housing types along the perimeter, additional buffering, fencing, and relocation of recreational amenities. Mr. White stated that the development was anticipated to proceed in approximately five or six phases, beginning from SR-138, and that utilities would be extended to the commercial area, although the timing of commercial development would depend on market demand.

Following an extended discussion, the Council determined that additional revisions were needed before taking action. The Council provided direction for Mr. White to return with a complete revised concept showing single-family lots along the west and south boundaries adjoining existing residences, with approximately quarter-acre lots discussed as a potential compromise; appropriate buffers and fencing; the location and configuration of open space and recreational amenities; and a reduction in the number of flex homes. The Council also requested that the revised concept attempt to accommodate the three existing residences along the south boundary. Mr. White agreed to work with his engineer and return with a revised plan.

**Motion:** Councilmember Williams moved to table Ordinance 2026-27 approving the Alington Planned Unit Development located at approximately 948 E Main Street (SR-138).

**Second:** Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**6. Consideration of Resolution 2026-62 approving a Master Development Agreement for the Alington Flex Homes Planned Unit Development located at approximately 948 E Main Street (SR-138)**

**Motion:** Councilmember Thomas moved to table Resolution 2026-62 approving a Master Development Agreement for the Alington Flex Homes Planned Unit Development located at approximately 948 E Main Street (SR-138)

**Second:** Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**7. Consideration of Resolution 2026-57 declaring certain personal property surplus and authorizing its sale or disposal**

Mayor Hammond introduced Resolution 2026-57, declaring certain personal property surplus and authorizing its sale or disposal. Staff explained that the Road Department had been approved to purchase a new sweeper as part of its capital equipment purchases and that the resolution would declare the Department’s existing sweeper surplus.

**Motion:** Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-57 declaring certain personal property surplus and authorizing its sale or disposal

**Second:** Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

**8. Consideration of Resolution 2026-67 awarding the Durfee Street Widening Project to Black Forest Paving Maintenance, LLC and authorizing the execution of the necessary contract documents**

Mayor Hammond introduced Resolution 2026-67, awarding the Durfee Street Widening Project to Black Forest Paving Maintenance LLC and authorizing execution of the necessary contract documents. Staff explained that three bids had been received and recommended Black Forest Paving Maintenance LLC, which submitted the lowest bid and met the project requirements. The project was intended to improve the merge lane on Durfee Street before the opening of Soelberg’s and the anticipated increase in traffic. Staff explained that completing the project with City crews would significantly extend the timeline due to current equipment limitations and other ongoing City projects. Councilmember Thomas disclosed that he had previously worked with the contractor and had positive experience with its performance but stated that he had no affiliation with the company.

**Motion:** Councilmember Skinner moved to approve Resolution 2026-67 awarding the Durfee Street Widening Project to Black Forest Paving Maintenance, LLC and authorizing the execution of the necessary contract documents.

**Second:** Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

## **9. Closed Session – (Imminent Litigation, Real Estate Negotiations, Personnel)**

There being no further public business and the need to go into a Closed Session, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion.

**Motion:** Councilmember Skinner moved to proceed into Closed Session to discuss imminent litigation, real estate negotiations, or personnel.

**Second:** Councilmember Butler seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

The City Council entered Closed Session at 10:04 p.m.

## **10. Adjourn**

There being no further business, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to adjourn.

**Motion:** Councilmember Skinner moved to adjourn.

**Second:** Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:28 p.m.