

Action Summary:

Agenda Item	Item Description	Action
#1	Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement with VT Grantsville Land Co, LLC, for the Deseret Subdivision.	Approved
#2	Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 16 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for a CatRescue.	Approved
#3	Consideration of a request for a Plat Extension for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision.	Approved
#4	Recommendation for the second proposed Plat Amendment for Stansbury Shadows Phase 3 Subdivision, located approximately at 256 S Liberty Landing.	Approved
#5	Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for Animal Encounters Facilities.	Approved
#6	Recommendation of the proposed rezone for the property located at 848 N Cooley Street from RR-2.5 to RR-1 for the Storybook Subdivision, resulting in approximately 6.34 acres being zoned RR-1.	Approved
#7	Recommendation of the 1st amendment to the Amended and Restated Master Development Agreement (ARMDA) for the Highlands Subdivision.	Approved
#8	Approval of the minutes from the September 1, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON OCTOBER 6, 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 Jason Hill, Commissioner Gary Merrill, Commission Cameron Moulton

On Zoom:

Commission Members Absent:

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

On Zoom: City Council Member Derek Dalton

Citizens and Guests Present: Matthew Camacho, Scott Kimrough, Amy Walter, Nicole Cloward, Dale Fisher, Diane Fisher, Benjamin Fisher, Cameron Ordakowski, Rich Phelps, Shawn Holste, Shaun Johnson, Diane Rowberry

Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom: Guy Haskell

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, October 6, 2026 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. Recommendation of a proposed Master Development Agreement with VT Grantsville Land Co, LLC, for the Deseret Subdivision.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore introduced the proposed Master Development Agreement (MDA) with VT Grantsville Land Co., LLC, for the Deseret Subdivision. Shaun Johnson was present to provide additional information and answer questions.

Shaun explained that the purpose of the MDA was to formalize the provisions previously approved through the Development Zoning Overlay District (DZOD). He stated that the agreement largely reflects the approved DZOD but also establishes a timeframe for the development and addresses how the agreement's requirements and obligations would transfer to future subdevelopers or builders.

The Commission discussed the parks and open space within the development. Shaun explained that certain parks and designated areas would be dedicated to the City. He reviewed the development exhibits, identifying the community park, detention pond, and drainage corridors. He explained that the detention pond would extend toward Walmart and that the development had been designed with consideration of FEMA's ongoing floodplain studies. He stated that the drainage corridors would be expanded to approximately 105 feet in width to accommodate stormwater and debris flow while also incorporating trails and landscaping.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the access issues involving the road through the development had been resolved. Shaun stated that they had not and explained that the developer was currently focused on the portion of the project anticipated to develop over the next 10 to 15 years. Chair Sarah Moore expressed concern about access to the commercial flex area. Shaun explained that a cross-access agreement provides legal access to that portion of the property. He also stated that the developer was working with a neighboring property owner regarding a possible additional easement or connection between developments that could provide secondary access.

Chair Sarah Moore asked how water rights would be handled when portions of the development were sold to subdevelopers. Shaun explained that water credits associated with platted lots would transfer with those lots. Outside Counsel Abe Mitchell clarified that subdevelopers would not acquire ownership of the water rights themselves but would receive the applicable water credits attributed to the development.

Abe explained that the MDA was intended to govern the development over approximately 30 years and provide protections for both the City and the developer's investment. He stated that the agreement had been negotiated over several months to establish the developer's obligations while providing assurances regarding vested development rights.

Abe reviewed Section 2.1 and explained that the development must comply with applicable laws, the approved development plan, and the MDA. He stated that the agreement establishes a maximum of 6,997 residential units but does not guarantee that number, as the development must still comply with applicable City requirements. He also noted that the developer had agreed to provide 25 acres of moderate-income housing, exceeding the requirements established through the approved zoning provisions.

Abe discussed the provisions requiring future subdevelopers to acknowledge and comply with the obligations of the MDA. He also reviewed the landscaping provisions, which were intended to streamline the review process, and the vested rights provisions under Section 3, including limited circumstances in which future changes to applicable laws could affect the development.

Abe reviewed the approval process, modifications, and fees. He clarified that the MDA does not exempt the developer from applicable application fees or impact fees. He also explained that the

agreement includes provisions allowing the City to request a status report if active development ceases for four years and potentially terminate the agreement under the applicable provisions.

Abe discussed the infrastructure obligations and noted that separate agreements regarding certain off-site improvements were still being negotiated to ensure compliance with the Impact Fee Act. He reviewed Section 6.7, which addresses the timing of public amenities, including trails, neighborhood parks, moderate-income housing, and off-site improvements. He emphasized that these obligations would remain enforceable if portions of the development were transferred to other developers.

Abe also reviewed the default provisions under Section 16, explaining that the agreement provides opportunities to correct violations while preserving enforcement options for the City. He noted that certain defaults could result in judicial remedies or the withholding of building permits for affected parcels.

Abe discussed the assignment provisions, including the developer's obligation to conduct due diligence and obtain transfer acknowledgments when selling portions of the development. He also clarified that Section 33 had been revised to establish that the Master Water Services Agreement would remain separate from the MDA and that its termination would be governed by its own provisions.

Public Hearing

No public comments were received.

Discussion and Recommendations

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether any additional environmental concerns had been identified during the development's planning and engineering process. Shaun stated that no additional environmental concerns had been identified and noted that the developer had been working with FEMA and conducting engineering and water-related studies.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about the proposed wells. Shaun stated that the developer was preparing to drill the first well and that the number of additional wells would depend on the results.

Chair Sarah Moore asked what would happen to the water credits if development ceased for four years and the MDA was terminated. Abe explained that the credits were restricted to use within the designated geographic area. He stated that possible outcomes could include negotiations for the City to purchase the credits or another developer acquiring the project and obtaining the ability to use them. He reiterated that Section 33 separates the MDA from the Master Water Services Agreement, which contains its own performance and termination provisions.

Shaun explained that the Master Water Services Agreement establishes deadlines for purchasing additional water credits. He stated that the developer had acquired a portion of the credits during the summer and had seven years to acquire the next portion or risk losing the right to purchase those credits. He also explained that the financing used to acquire water credits was connected to the financing for infrastructure improvements, providing an incentive to continue development.

Chair Sarah Moore asked when construction of the infrastructure was expected to begin. Shaun stated that the development had recently received City staff approval for the West Bench Interceptor sewer project, which would extend approximately three miles from the development. He explained that the development was nearing completion of the contractor selection process for Mack Canyon Road and was preparing to present the contractor selection to the Public Infrastructure District Board.

Shaun also stated that the well plans were nearing approval and that drilling was anticipated to begin in November 2026. He noted that the water tank location was still in the design phase and that the first tank was anticipated to have a capacity of approximately 2.3 million gallons.

Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed Master Development Agreement with VT Grantsville Land Co, LLC, for the Deseret Subdivision, as 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. Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 16 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for a Cat Rescue.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 16 of the Grantsville City Land Use Ordinance to establish Animal Rescue as a new use. Shelby explained that the application was submitted following a complaint regarding an existing animal rescue operation. Since Animal Rescue was not currently identified as a permitted or conditional use in the Land Use Ordinance, the proposed amendments would establish a definition, operating standards, and appropriate zoning districts for the use.

Shelby reviewed the proposed definition, explaining that an animal rescue would be a nonprofit or state-registered animal welfare organization operating a fully enclosed indoor facility for the temporary housing and care of stray, abandoned, and homeless cats and dogs. She explained that the proposed standards addressed permitted activities, animal capacity, staffing, recordkeeping, hours of operation, and operational requirements.

Shelby stated that the proposed use would be conditional within the C-S Commercial Shopping District. She reviewed the proposed requirements, including a minimum lot size of 60,000 square feet, parking requirements, accessible parking, and landscaping buffers. She also noted that the proposed maximum capacity would be 75 cats, with public appointment hours between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the existing rescue was operating in violation of City Code because the use was not currently allowed. Shelby confirmed that there was no established use classification for the operation.

Commissioner Moulton expressed concern that the proposed standards established a minimum lot size but did not specify a minimum building size based on the number of animals. He questioned whether housing up to 75 cats in a small apartment would provide adequate space. Shelby acknowledged his concern and explained that the facility had been inspected and that staff had received positive feedback regarding its cleanliness and condition.

Commissioner Moulton also asked about the original complaint and whether the City had an established fine schedule for similar violations. Shelby stated that she was working on developing a fine schedule. Commissioner Moulton expressed concern about businesses or individuals operating without approval until a complaint was received and emphasized the importance of consistent code enforcement.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that the City previously had limited code enforcement resources and that enforcement had generally been handled as an additional responsibility rather than through a dedicated position.

Vice Chair Hill asked how the proposed animal rescue use differed from an animal pound or kennel and why it could not be addressed under an existing kennel classification. Shelby explained that kennel permits have specific animal limitations and primarily address dogs, while the proposed animal rescue classification would establish separate standards for nonprofit rescue operations.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the letters of support received in April and May and whether they had been submitted voluntarily. Shelby explained that the proposed use had been under consideration for several months and that the public comment process allowed both supportive and opposing comments.

Public Hearing

Mark Lawrence: Mark Lawrence, Grantsville City Animal Control Officer, was present to comment on this item he spoke in support of the proposed animal rescue use. He explained that Belle Furever Friends had been assisting Animal Control by accepting cats, coordinating spay

and neuter services, and helping reduce the number of stray and feral cats in the community. Mark stated that without the rescue's assistance, cats could remain at the shelter for months while awaiting transportation to veterinary services in Orem. He explained that the rescue was often able to accept cats within three to five days, significantly reducing the time animals remained in the City's care. Mark discussed the challenges of transporting cats to Orem for veterinary appointments, explaining that a single trip could require approximately 12 hours, taking up a substantial portion of his part-time workweek. He stated that having a local rescue available had made his work more manageable and allowed him to focus on other Animal Control responsibilities. Mark also discussed the feral cat population near the rescue facility. He explained that some cats in the surrounding area did not belong to the rescue and that the organization was helping address the broader feral cat population. Mark stated that he previously collected approximately seven or eight cats per week but had recently seen that number decrease to approximately one cat per week. He attributed part of that reduction to the rescue's efforts and expressed appreciation for the assistance the organization provided to the City.

Discussion and Consideration

Matthew Camacho was present to answer questions on this item.

Chair Sarah Moore asked about the organization's history, noting that some public comments referenced involvement extending back approximately 11 years. Matthew explained that the organization operates a network of foster homes throughout Tooele County, including locations outside Grantsville. He stated that the rescue had been operating as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit for approximately five and a half years, although some individuals involved had been assisting with animal rescue efforts for much longer.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the proposed maximum capacity of 75 cats and whether the existing facility could accommodate that number. Matthew explained that approximately 46 cats were currently housed at the facility. He stated that the original request had been for approximately 50 adult cats, with an additional allowance of 25 kittens to accommodate seasonal increases.

Matthew explained that kitten populations fluctuate throughout the year and that the organization had experienced periods when several kittens were brought in daily. He stated that the higher capacity was intended to provide flexibility during those periods rather than maintain 75 adult cats at all times.

Matthew described the facility as a former apartment building consisting of four separate units. He explained that the units remained divided into individual rooms, allowing cats to be separated based on age, temperament, and care needs. He stated that one area was used for younger cats and mothers with kittens, while another was designated for feral cats requiring additional time to adjust to human interaction or awaiting transportation.

Matthew also explained that the facility included an enclosed outdoor patio, or catio, allowing cats supervised access to an outdoor area. He stated that the enclosure was secured and that cats were not permitted to remain outside overnight out of consideration for neighboring properties.

Matthew addressed concerns regarding the original complaint and explained that some of the cats observed in the surrounding area were part of existing feral colonies and were not animals belonging to the rescue. He stated that the organization was working to reduce those populations through trap-neuter-return efforts and adoption when appropriate.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether euthanasia or medical procedures were performed at the facility. Matthew confirmed that neither was performed onsite and explained that animals requiring veterinary treatment were transported to licensed veterinary providers.

Commissioner Moulton asked how the organization provided water to the animals since the building did not have running water. Matthew explained that water was brought to the facility in five-gallon containers. He stated that the building had not had an active water connection for approximately ten years, although electrical service had been established.

Matthew also discussed the organization's efforts to reduce the stray cat population. He reported that approximately 623 cats had been spayed or neutered throughout Tooele County during the first half of the year and estimated that approximately 300 cats had been removed from the streets in the Grantsville area over the previous two years.

Commissioner Gary Merrill questioned why the City had not addressed animal rescue operations or established regulations for cats sooner, particularly given the existing regulations limiting the number of dogs permitted at a residence.

Bill explained that code enforcement was generally complaint driven and that the City had only recently become aware of the operation through a complaint. He stated that the complaint provided an opportunity for staff to evaluate the use and work toward establishing appropriate regulations.

Commissioner Merrill expressed concern that the City had established detailed requirements for dogs while having limited regulations addressing cats, despite the longstanding presence of stray and feral cats in the community.

Chair Sarah Moore acknowledged the concerns but noted that cats have historically been common in rural communities, particularly around agricultural properties where they help control rodents. She shared her experience living near a property where an individual conducted cat rescue activities and noted that while the presence of numerous cats could be frustrating, she recognized the role they played in a rural setting.

Matthew explained that the rescue was also working to address feral cat colonies near new development areas, where displaced cats could face additional risks.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether the rescue's animals were fully contained within the facility. Matthew confirmed that the catio was enclosed on all sides and across the top, with secured gates and controlled access between the indoor and outdoor areas. He clarified that the rescue did not maintain free-roaming barn cats.

Vice Chair Hill expressed concern about sanitation and odor control, particularly because the building lacked running water. Matthew explained that the organization had increased the frequency of dumpster service to multiple times per week and had adjusted its waste management practices to address those concerns.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether the Health Department had identified any issues during its inspection. Matthew stated that the primary item identified was an update to a safety data sheet. He explained that volunteers maintained the facility and that certain areas were restricted to trained individuals because they housed newly captured feral cats.

Matthew stated that volunteers brought water to the facility and took food and water dishes home to wash between shifts. He also explained that volunteers used restroom facilities at nearby businesses when needed.

Vice Chair Hill questioned whether the C-S Commercial Shopping District was the most appropriate location for an animal rescue. He stated that while he appreciated the organization's work, he wanted to ensure the proposed use was compatible with the purpose of the zoning district.

Matthew explained that the current location had been selected because the property owner had offered the building for the nonprofit's use at no cost. He stated that the location was accessible while being set back from the main roadway and that the rescue did not operate as a typical retail business with regular customer traffic.

Vice Chair Hill acknowledged that the location offered some advantages but continued to express concern about potential odors and the lack of running water. Matthew explained that the organization had implemented cleaning procedures and odor-control measures, including separating newly captured feral cats from other animals and using appropriate ventilation.

Commissioner Merrill raised concerns regarding restroom availability and whether the facility met applicable workplace and building requirements.

Shelby clarified that the item before the Commission was a proposed amendment to the Land Use Ordinance to establish Animal Rescue as an allowable use. She explained that if the amendments were approved by the City Council, the applicant would then be required to apply

for a Conditional Use Permit and comply with applicable zoning, building, and accessibility requirements.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the organization had the financial resources necessary to bring the existing building into compliance. He expressed concern that the City could establish the new use only for the applicant to discover that the required improvements were too costly.

Matthew acknowledged that he would need to review the organization's finances and determine what improvements could be completed. He explained that the organization was also searching for a permanent location because the current property arrangement was temporary and the building could eventually be sold.

Commissioner Moulton asked how much time the applicant would have to obtain the necessary approvals if the amendments were adopted. Shelby stated that the typical timeframe was approximately 30 days.

Attorney Tysen Barker clarified the purpose of the Commission's consideration. He explained that the item was not an approval of Belle Furever Friends' existing facility or operations. Rather, the Commission was being asked to determine whether Animal Rescue should be established as a use within the City's Land Use Ordinance and whether such a use would be appropriate for future applicants.

Tysen emphasized that the proposed amendment would apply generally to animal rescue operations and not exclusively to the current applicant.

Commissioner Merrill agreed that the City needed to address the use within its ordinances. He stated that while he had concerns about the existing operation and the need for compliance, he believed animal rescue was a worthwhile service and supported establishing appropriate regulations.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 16 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for a Cat Rescue, as presented in the staff report. 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.

3. 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 provided an update on the progress made toward meeting the requirements previously discussed for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision plat extension.

Shelby stated that she had visited the property earlier that day and confirmed that installation of the fencing had begun. She reported that the north side had been fenced and that concrete work had been completed along the west side of the detention basin.

Shelby also stated that the proposed amendment to the Master Development Agreement was scheduled for the October 20, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Moulton asked about the additional outstanding requirements previously discussed. Shelby clarified that these included the appraisal associated with the fee in lieu, the development agreement amendment, and the fencing.

Commissioner Gary Merrill expressed appreciation for the progress being made. He noted that some of the outstanding issues had been discussed during the open house and stated that he felt the development was moving in the right direction.

Discussion and Recommendation

Gary Merrill made a motion to approve the consideration of a request for a Plat Extension for the Matthews Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision, as 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.

4. Recommendation for the second proposed Plat Amendment for Stansbury Shadows Phase 3 Subdivision, located approximately at 256 S Liberty Landing.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reviewed the proposed lots, noting that they would be approximately one acre or slightly larger. She discussed the applicable development requirements, including setbacks, fire access, fire hydrant proximity, and necessary infrastructure improvements.

Shelby explained that the development included primary water, secondary water, sewer, and drainage improvements. She also discussed the existing private lane serving the property, noting that it was an older roadway that did not currently meet the City's updated private lane standards. She referenced previous discussions and correspondence regarding the roadway.

Shelby reviewed the existing fire turnaround and its location in relation to the surrounding properties.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the hammerhead turnaround extended onto an adjoining property and whether it was part of the proposed improvements. Shelby clarified that the turnaround was already in place as part of the existing private lane and that an easement existed for the portion extending onto the neighboring property.

Public Hearing

No public comments were received.

Discussion and Consideration

Gary Merrill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the second proposed Plat Amendment for Stansbury Shadows Phase 3 Subdivision, located approximately at 256 S Liberty Landing, with the following conditions: The final plat shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Ensign Engineering and approved through the City's development review process in August 2026. The amendment shall create no more than the two lots shown on the proposed final plat: Lot 304 and Lot 305. Department, or other reviewing agencies shall be completed before the plat is recorded. All required culinary water, secondary water, sanitary sewer, drainage, utility, and access improvements shall be installed or appropriately bonded before the plat is recorded, as required by City ordinance. All required water rights, water shares, fees, impact fees, and other applicable development charges shall be satisfied before recording or issuance of a building permit, as applicable. The ingress, egress, utility, drainage, and emergency-access easements shown on the plat shall be recorded with the subdivision amendment and shall remain unobstructed. Liberty Landing and the existing fire-apparatus turnaround shall be maintained to provide continuous and unobstructed emergency access acceptable to the Grantsville Fire Department. No fencing, parking, landscaping, structures, storage, or other obstructions shall be placed within the required emergency-access or turnaround area. cThe applicant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, county, and City requirements.. 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.

- 5. Recommendation of the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for Animal Encounters Facilities.**

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 City Land Use Ordinance to establish Animal Encounters Facility as a new use. She explained that staff had worked closely with the applicant to develop the proposed ordinance language. The amendments were intended to establish regulations for animal encounter facilities and provide a process for allowing this type of use within the City.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe stated that staff had discussed the proposed amendments extensively to ensure the regulations were appropriate and addressed the intended use.

Chair Sarah Moore thanked staff for their work and acknowledged their efforts to develop regulations that would allow property owners to make appropriate use of their properties.

Public Hearing

No public comments were received.

Discussion and Recommendation

Nicole Cloward was present to answer questions on this item. Nicole thanked Grantsville City staff for their assistance in developing the proposed ordinance amendments and stated that she had no additional comments.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the applicant would be required to return for a Conditional Use Permit if the proposed amendments were approved.

Shelby explained that the proposed amendments would first need to receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval from the City Council. Once approved, the applicant could submit a Conditional Use Permit application, followed by the applicable business licensing process.

Cameron Moulton made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 8, and 15 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance to establish a new use for Animal Encounters Facilities as presented in the staff report. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

6. Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation: Recommendation of the proposed rezone for the property located at 848 N Cooley Street from RR-2.5 to RR-1 for the Storybook Subdivision, resulting in approximately 6.34 acres being zoned RR-1.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed rezone for the property located at 848 N. Cooley Street from RR-2.5 to RR-1. Shelby provided background on the property, explaining that the original parcel consisted of approximately 9.7 acres and had previously been considered by the City Council for a zoning change. She reviewed the history of the property, including the subsequent division of the original parcel, and identified the portions that would remain under the existing RR-2.5 zoning and those included in the current rezone request.

Shelby displayed the property on the City's GIS map and reviewed the surrounding zoning and lot sizes. She explained that the proposed RR-1 zoning was consistent with the density anticipated in the City's General Plan.

Commissioner Moulton asked why the property owners were requesting the rezone. Shelby explained that the applicants wanted to create smaller lots to allow additional family members to build homes on the property.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the property could be rezoned again in the future to allow even smaller lots. Shelby confirmed that another rezone application could be submitted but explained that a request for greater density would also require an amendment to the General Plan.

Public Comment

Emailed 09/13/2026:

Planning Commission,

When we moved into this area we were told that no land in this area would be zoned less than RR-5. In the past few years we have seen RR-1 lots added without our notification and apparently there was a rezone of RR-2.5 that we are just finding out from this notice. Roads are a big concern. We personally had to put a lot of money into Pheasant Run Lane (Hale Street) and it is not maintained well. Some years we have had to call several times before anyone showed up to grade it. We had an engineered road put in with a crown that helped the water drain off and down into the ditches on each side. All of that is completely gone. What we have now is a bumpy road with pot holes that form constantly. Zero crown has been maintained. Cooley street is no better, actually usually worse. So why bring in more homes with extra cars to drive these roads on a daily basis when they aren't maintained as it is? We choose to go to Burmester when we want to travel anywhere, even if we are needing to go west because Hale Street and Cooley Street cause too much wear and tear on our vehicles. Vegas street is so narrow that you have to get over to the side when another vehicle is coming, especially any kind of truck with a trailer (which do belong

down here). So how is that road going to maintain more traffic? If more lots are going to be allowed in this area the land owners need to be accountable to improve the surrounding roads and the city needs to have a plan to maintain them for years afterward by qualified persons. Tax payers should not have to pay for these improvements. We just don't understand why there can't be one area of Grantsville that can stay wide open spaces like we were told years ago. Will there ever be a slow down to the building or is it just when we run out of water?

Thank you

Rachel Cowan

Email Received 09/14/2026:

Grantsville City Planning Commission,

This engineer (the author) owns the property butting up to the north boundary of the property at issue, the property seeking a zoning change (a.k.a, 848 Cooley Street). The diagrams below are excerpts from Central Area Zoning Map. As indicated, this engineer owns 2 lots, which he intends to consolidate into a single lot to be zoned RR-2.5. Currently, this engineer's upper lot is zoned RR-1, but it is being built out as a RR-2.5. The lot at issue (the lot for which a zoning change is requested) is currently zoned RR-2.5. Notice it is currently surrounded by RR-2.5 and RR-5 properties.

Objections: This engineer objects to the proposed zoning change (i.e., to rezone the lot at issue as RR-1) for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rezone is contrary to the General Plan and Future Land Use Map, which indicates rural residential. The proposed rezone would create a density mismatch, a zoning island, a conflict with the established rural residential character.
2. Permitting the proposed rezone would establish a precedent for piecemeal upzoning. How will the Planning Commission refuse other requests for upzoning? They are putting in place a mechanism for the destabilization and gradual destruction of the current rural environment, which is currently fostered by the RR-2.5 (and above) zoning.
3. The proposed rezone will have a negative impact on my property. Remarkably, since the proposed rezone does not characterize what will be done with the property at issue, once it is rezoned, it is hard to predict the problems they will create. How can the impact of a rezone be weighed when no details are given. However, by the requirement that I cannot graze animals on my property if they are closer than 100 feet from any residence built on the property at issue, if the developers later decide to place residential structures close to the property line separating the property at issue from my lower lot, that can effectively prevent the grazing of animals on this

engineer's property. Where residential structure might be placed on the property at issue could have ramifications regarding where this engineer can place farm structures on his property.

Increasing the density of housing on the perimeter of this engineer's property will undoubtedly create negative impacts, such as increased traffic, increased noise, reduced agricultural compatibility, and reduced rural character. Remarkably, the rezone proposal admits that the petitioning owner anticipates an increase in his property value; there is no concern about what the rezone proposal would do to neighboring property values.

Indeed, this engineer may be compelled to abandon his plans for his property.

4. The proposed rezone would result in incompatible interfaces between the properties. The current fences are there to stop the passage of horses and cattle; they are not designed to prevent children and cats and dogs from going through them. Also, along the fence lines equipment and supplies are stacked, and safety might require their removal if children will have access to them.

5. The proposed rezone (especially since it is absent any details on what is to be done with the property) leaves critical questions about hydrology, runoff, erosion, and impact on water sources. Without further details, the public cannot meaningfully evaluate the request.

Closure:

This engineer only learned about the rezone proposal a week ago, so this letter had to be rushed. This engineer intends to speak at the Commission meeting if allowed.

The proposed rezone should be rejected because: 1) it creates a precedent that will lead to the destruction of the existing rural atmosphere, 2) it benefits the petitioning land owner's property value but neglects any diminishment of adjoining property values, and 3) it will reduce the quiet enjoyment of this engineer's property. This is spot zoning at its worst.

Best Regards

Scott Kimbrough, Ph.D., P.E., C.F.I.

Scott Kimbrough: Scott Kimbrough was present to comment on this item, he stated that he owned two properties near the proposed rezone, including property zoned RR-1 and approximately three acres zoned RR-2.5 that he had purchased from the neighboring estate. He explained that his intention was to combine the properties and maintain a rural residential use consistent with the RR-2.5 zoning. Scott expressed concern that approving the rezone from RR-2.5 to RR-1 would establish a precedent for additional rezoning requests throughout the surrounding area. He stated that the neighborhood was characterized by larger rural properties, agricultural uses, and open pastures, and he believed allowing smaller lots could gradually change the character of the area. Scott also expressed concern that rezoning properties to smaller

lot sizes could create an economic incentive for property owners to purchase larger parcels, seek higher-density zoning, and subsequently sell the land for development. He felt this could undermine the rural character of the neighborhood and conflict with the community's long-term planning goals. Scott questioned why the rezone was being considered without a specific development proposal identifying how the property would ultimately be divided or developed. He stated that without knowing the proposed locations of future homes, it was difficult for neighboring property owners to evaluate how the change might affect their properties. Scott explained that he intended to use his property for agricultural activities, including growing crops and raising animals. He expressed concern that new residences constructed near his property boundary could affect his ability to maintain animals because of the City's 100-foot separation requirement from neighboring dwellings. He stated that depending on the placement of future homes, portions of his property could become unavailable for animal-related uses. Scott also raised concerns regarding fencing and compatibility between agricultural and residential properties. He explained that existing fences were intended to contain livestock such as horses and cattle and might not be suitable if additional homes were constructed nearby, particularly with children and dogs. He questioned who would be responsible for installing more restrictive fencing if needed. Scott concluded by reiterating his concerns about establishing a precedent for smaller lots, changing the rural character of the neighborhood, and considering a rezone without a specific development plan.

Discussion and Recommendation

Vice Chair Hill acknowledged Scott Kimbrough's concerns but stated that she believed the proposed rezone was consistent with the intent of the City's General Plan. He explained that protections existed for established agricultural uses and that neighboring development would not automatically require property owners to discontinue existing lawful activities.

Vice Chair Hill stated that the Planning Commission's responsibility was to evaluate whether a request complied with the City's adopted ordinances and planning policies. He noted that the surrounding area already contained one-acre residential lots and believed the proposed rezone was consistent with the existing development pattern.

Vice Chair Hill encouraged Scott to share his concerns with the City Council, which would make the final decision on the rezone.

Commissioner Moulton asked whether the construction of a new residence on a neighboring property could restrict an existing property owner's agricultural activities, particularly when animal separation requirements applied.

Shelby explained that existing agricultural uses would be considered and that future residential development would still be required to comply with applicable setbacks, fire access, driveway requirements, and other development standards. She noted that these requirements would

influence the placement of future homes and help address potential conflicts with neighboring properties.

Commissioner Moulton then questioned whether the City's current General Plan accurately reflected the community's preferences regarding residential density. He asked when residents would have an opportunity to provide input on the General Plan and potentially request different density designations.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe explained that the General Plan was intended to reflect the community's values and priorities at the time of adoption. He stated that the City generally aimed to complete a significant update approximately every five years and that the current update was occurring within that timeframe.

Bill explained that while community values may change over time, he did not anticipate substantial changes to the City's overall priorities within a five-year period. He emphasized that a good General Plan should provide flexibility while maintaining policies that reflect the community's long-term vision.

Bill also discussed the upcoming General Plan update and stated that extensive community outreach was anticipated. He emphasized the importance of public participation to ensure the updated plan accurately reflected the values and priorities of Grantsville residents.

The Commission discussed the role of the General Plan as a guiding document. Bill explained that although the General Plan was not a zoning ordinance, consistency or inconsistency with its policies could provide a reasonable basis for supporting or denying a rezone request.

Diane and Benjamin Fisher, were present and available to answer questions. Commissioner Moulton asked whether the applicants could construct additional homes under the existing RR-2.5 zoning. Shelby explained that the property already contained a residence and that additional residential development would require compliance with the minimum lot size and subdivision requirements of the existing zoning district.

Diane Fisher clarified that they were not proposing to create six or eight residential lots simply because the property contained several acres. She explained that the intent was to create four residential lots of approximately one and one-quarter acres each.

Chair Sarah Moore asked what the next step would be if the rezone were approved. Shelby explained that the applicants would need to submit a subdivision plat for review and approval through the applicable City process.

Chair Sarah Moore acknowledged the concerns raised by the neighboring property owner but emphasized that the Planning Commission was responsible for considering the property rights of all residents within the City's adopted regulations. She stated that she did not see how the

proposed rezone would necessarily prevent neighboring property owners from continuing to use their properties.

Chair Sarah Moore stated that she believed the request was reasonable and encouraged the applicants and neighboring property owners to work together. She reiterated the importance of allowing residents to use their properties to the fullest extent permitted under City Code.

Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council the proposed rezone for the property located at 848 N Cooley Street from RR-2.5 to RR-1 for the Storybook Subdivision, resulting in approximately 6.34 acres being zoned RR-1, as presented in the staff report. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Gary Merrill “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Cameron Moulton “Aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

7. Recommendation of the 1st amendment to the Amended and Restated Master Development Agreement (ARMDA) for the Highlands Subdivision.

Presentation by Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented the proposed first amendment to the Amended and Restated Master Development Agreement (MDA) for The Highlands Subdivision.

Shelby explained that the amendment was intended to establish a more detailed phasing plan for the development, allowing the City and developer to better coordinate infrastructure improvements, utility capacity, and future construction. The amendment would also provide flexibility in the sequence of development phases while addressing requirements related to the timing of subdivision plat recordings.

Shelby noted that the development was originally approved in 2020 and that subsequent amendments expanded the project to include additional phases and residential housing types. She explained that the proposed amendment did not increase the previously approved number of residential units.

Attorney Amy Walker, representing the applicant, explained that the amendment would clarify the phasing requirements and allow the developer to proceed with different phases based on infrastructure availability and construction needs rather than following a strictly sequential schedule.

Amy also discussed a proposed modification to the loop road near the City park, reducing the previously proposed 94-foot width to the City's standard 90-foot width. She explained that the original width had accommodated parking on both sides of the roadway and drainage improvements.

Vice Chair Hill asked whether the amendment would allow the developer to proceed with phases based on construction feasibility rather than requiring each preceding phase to be completed first. Amy confirmed that the additional flexibility was a primary purpose of the amendment.

Diane Rowberry, representing the development, explained that water pressure limitations and infrastructure requirements had affected the development schedule. She stated that flexibility would allow construction to continue in areas where infrastructure was available while improvements in other portions of the development were completed.

Vice Chair Hill asked about the City's water and sewer capacity and whether the development's water pressure issues resulted from inadequate infrastructure.

Shelby explained that the development crossed multiple water pressure zones due to changes in elevation. She stated that development in the higher western portions would depend on additional water infrastructure and adequate fire flow. Until those improvements were available, construction would need to remain in areas where the required water pressure and fire flow could be provided.

Amy clarified that the development connected to public water infrastructure and that the developer had previously contributed to improvements. Shelby explained that any proposed phase would still be required to meet applicable fire flow and infrastructure standards before proceeding.

Vice Chair Hill expressed concern about the City's potential responsibility if the developer could not proceed because of insufficient water infrastructure. Shelby explained that the MDA required adequate fire flow before development could occur and that the City would not be obligated to allow construction without those requirements being met.

Amy further explained that the amendment was intended to clarify the phasing flexibility that the developer had understood to be available under the previous agreement.

Commissioner Gary Merrill asked about the anticipated buildout timeline and the number of remaining residential units.

Amy stated that the MDA allowed approximately 1,887 residential units, with roughly 150 constructed to date. The representatives estimated that full buildout could take approximately 10 to 15 years.

Diane explained that portions of the infrastructure were already in place and that development could continue for the next several years. However, later phases would depend on additional water infrastructure and financing through a Public Infrastructure District (PID).

Diane reviewed the anticipated construction sequence, which included Phase 7, the T1 townhome area, Phase 8, and potentially T2. She explained that the developer had worked extensively to establish a proposed phasing schedule but needed flexibility to adjust the sequence based on infrastructure availability and financing.

Vice Chair Hill asked about the request to reserve 378 equivalent residential connections (ERCs) for sewer capacity.

Shelby explained that an engineering analysis identified available capacity in an existing eight-inch sewer line, although portions of the system would eventually require upsizing. She expressed concern about committing that capacity to one development because it could affect the availability of sewer capacity for other properties connecting to the same system.

Diane explained that reserving the capacity was necessary to secure PID financing for major infrastructure improvements. She stated that the developer had previously contributed significant funding toward sewer improvements and was requesting that the identified capacity be reserved for the project.

Public Hearing

No public comments were received.

Discussion and Recommendation

Guy Haskell, representing the development, participated remotely to address questions regarding sewer capacity and infrastructure financing.

Guy explained that the developer had previously invested approximately \$400,000 in improvements to the sewer system near 850 North and Silver Fox Drive. These improvements included lowering the sewer line and extending infrastructure beneath the highway to provide sufficient depth to serve the development.

Guy stated that the existing sewer system had capacity for approximately 378 additional ERCs and explained that the developer was requesting a commitment of that capacity to secure PID financing.

He explained that traditional financing could be obtained for individual residential phases but was not generally available for major public infrastructure improvements, such as sewer line upsizing, water tanks, and roadway construction. He stated that PID financing was necessary to fund those improvements and that investors required assurance that the development could proceed with the residential units supporting repayment.

The Commission clarified that the 378 ERCs were part of the development's previously approved residential unit count and were not additional units being requested.

Chair Sarah Moore acknowledged the developer's need for assurance that the identified sewer capacity would be available to support the proposed infrastructure financing.

Commissioner Merrill asked whether waiving requirements related to the number of units sold before recording subsequent phases was common. Shelby explained that the City had allowed similar flexibility in previous developments and that the proposed agreement would continue to include limitations and requirements governing the recording of additional phases.

Commissioner Moulton expressed support for the proposed flexibility, stating that it would allow the developer to proceed with construction and respond to practical development needs.

Chair Sarah Moore asked whether the proposed apartment units would be rentals and whether any units were committed to meeting the City's moderate-income housing goals. Diane confirmed that the apartments were anticipated to be rental units but explained that construction timing remained uncertain because of water pressure and other infrastructure requirements.

Guy explained that the apartment areas could potentially obtain adequate fire flow through water line improvements, but a second access would also be required. He stated that construction of the loop road and its connection to Matt Canyon Road would be necessary before the apartments could proceed. He reiterated that PID financing would help fund those improvements.

Chair Sarah Moore expressed concern that phasing flexibility could sometimes result in amenities or other development commitments being delayed until the final stages of a project. She specifically wanted to ensure that any required moderate-income housing commitments would be completed alongside other residential development rather than postponed.

Amy clarified that the residential uses and unit types had already been approved through the previous MDA. The current amendment was intended to address the timing and sequencing of development rather than authorize additional apartments or residential density.

Gary Merrill made a motion to recommend approval to City Council for the 1st amendment to the Amended and Restated Master Development Agreement (ARMDA) for the Highlands Subdivision. With the following conditions: The amendment shall not increase the maximum entitlement of 1,887 residential dwelling units. The July 21, 2026 phasing plan and accompanying development table shall be incorporated as the complete replacement Exhibit E, subject to final technical review and confirmation of all acreages, unit totals, land-use labels, open-space calculations, roadway dedications, and park areas. The amendment shall clarify how the 60-lot limit within a Development Area and the 200-lot project-wide

limit apply to single-family lots, twin homes, townhomes, apartments, condominiums, commercial parcels, and mixed-product plats, and shall define when a lot or unit is considered unbuilt. Out-of-sequence or concurrent development shall remain subject to adequate legal access, emergency access, utility capacity, drainage, fire protection, required off-site improvements, and all applicable final-plant and construction-plan requirements. The amendment shall clarify that notice of an out-of-sequence phase does not constitute City approval of that phase or its infrastructure. The provisions waiving the 70 percent sold requirement shall preserve the City's authority to require completion and acceptance of infrastructure, approved financial assurance, and compliance with applicable law before a plat is approved or recorded. The City Engineer, Public Works Department, and City Attorney shall verify and approve the sewer and water capacity language, including the 378 equivalent residential connections, the capacity required for commercial development, and all conditions applicable to the reservation. The capacity reservation shall not waive applicable impact fees, water dedication or acquisition obligations, connection fees, construction requirements, or other obligations imposed by the agreement, City ordinance, or state law unless expressly approved by the City Council. The internal loop collector-road right-of-way and the 10-foot minimum park-trail width shall be shown consistently on the applicable plans and exhibits and shall remain subject to final engineering approval. All provisions of the Amended and Restated Master Development Agreement not expressly modified by the First Amendment shall remain in full force and effect. 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.

8. Approval of minutes from the September 1, 2026 Planning Commission Work Meeting.

Cameron Moulton made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes from September 1, 2026. 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.

9. Report from City Staff.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore reminded the Commission of the upcoming rodeo and Honey Harvest Festival scheduled for the weekend. She noted that volunteers were needed to assist with preparing and serving food for rodeo contestants, committee members, and other participants.

Shelby explained that volunteers were needed from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and encouraged interested commissioners to contact her directly. She noted that the rodeo gates would open at 5:00 p.m., with the event beginning at 7:00 p.m.

10. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Moulton asked how the City covered legal expenses associated with development projects requiring additional legal assistance. Shelby explained that developers were responsible for those expenses and that the City billed them monthly as invoices were received.

City Manager Michael Resare explained that the City occasionally retained outside legal counsel for complex projects, potential litigation, or matters requiring specialized legal expertise.

Vice Chair Hill suggested that the City consider arranging a visit with another municipality that had experience with data centers. He explained that meeting with city officials and touring an existing facility could provide valuable insight into what had worked well, what challenges had arisen, and what regulations or safeguards should be considered before allowing similar development in Grantsville.

Mayor Heidi Hammond expressed support for the suggestion and stated that she had received contact information for the Mayor of Eagle Mountain. She explained that she intended to reach out to discuss the possibility of meeting with their staff and learning from their experience with data centers. She also mentioned the possibility of arranging virtual discussions with municipalities in other states that had significant data center development.

The Commission also asked about progress in filling vacant Planning Commission positions. Mayor Hammond explained that she had recently interviewed a potential candidate and was speaking with others. She hoped to have the vacancies filled and appointments approved by the City Council in time for the new members to begin serving in November. She also expressed an interest in obtaining representation from different areas of the City.

11. Report from City Council.

Council Member Rhett Butler provided an update on recent City Council actions and upcoming community events.

Rhett reminded the Commission of the upcoming Honey Harvest Festival and rodeo. He also announced a ribbon-cutting ceremony for Solberg's scheduled for October 22, 2026, and reminded the Commission of the City's Dumpster Days event scheduled for October 17, 2026. He noted that the recent community service event had been well attended and included cleanup efforts along several lanes.

Rhett reported that the City Council had approved the proposed amendments to Chapter 9 of the Grantsville Land Use Ordinance regarding water-wise landscaping.

He also provided an update on the Alington Planned Unit Development (PUD), explaining that the City Council had tabled the item to allow the parties involved to address concerns regarding multiple ownership entities within the Master Development Agreement. He explained that the Council wanted the parties to consider establishing a single entity, such as a joint venture LLC, to provide clear responsibility and accountability under the agreement. Rhett encouraged the Planning Commission to be mindful of similar ownership arrangements when reviewing future development agreements.

Rhett reported that the City's General Plan update was moving forward and that FFKR Architects had been selected to assist with the process. He noted that community outreach would be an important component of the update.

Mayor Heidi Hammond explained that the City had received grant funding from the Wasatch Front Regional Council to assist with the General Plan update, with the City providing a portion of the project funding.

The Commission also briefly discussed the City's seasonal decorations and upcoming Halloween activities.

12. Adjourn.

Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. Gary Merrill seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore "Aye," Jason Hill "Aye," Cameron Moulton "Aye," Gary Merrill "Aye." The meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.