

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 7/11/2019.

The meeting was held in the Grantsville City Council Chambers at 429 East Main Street in Grantsville, Utah. Those present were Commission Chairman Jaime Topham, Commission Member Gary Pinkham, Commission Member Erik Stromberg, Commission Member Robbie Palmer, and Commission Alternate Shane Watson. Absent were Commission Member Jacob Linares and Attorney Coombs. Also present were Zoning Administrator Kristy Clark, Shay Stark with Aqua Engineering, Fire Marshal Brad Clayton, Doug Higley, Tyson Erickson, Ashley Erickson, Tashaya Held, Kurt Held, Robbie and Jolynn Fackrell, John Clay, Todd Castagno, Adam Geldmacher, Dennis Hawker, Dylan Nash, Shay Penney, Tim Brown, Rosalie York, Barry Bunderson, Shaun Johnson, and DeAnn Christiansen.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a. Proposed Amendments to Grantsville Land Use and Management Code (GLUDMA) Pertaining to Chapter 21 Subdivision Regulations – Section 7 Financial Assurance and associated definitions in Chapter 2, including subdivision improvement agreements.**

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

- b. Proposed Animal Conditional Use Permit Application for Gina Adams located at 852 North Cooley in the RR-5 zone.**

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. and called for comments. She stated: We have an email comment, so I will read that into the record. This is from Cory Hawks to Kristy. It states: "Hello, Kristy. My name is Cory Hawks. My husband Randy Hawks and I live at 821 Cooley Street, next to where Gina Adams has requested keeping 27 large animals at 852 North Cooley Street, 100 feet away from our residence. My concerns and questions are as follows: What would be their land management in regards to managing the newer livestock yards and the small 65,000 square foot (1.549 acres) pasture with 27 large animals being kept here? We would like to see what their plan is to manage proper manure storage and recycling, livestock, yard management, pasture management, or pond and stream lever. Number two: We are not on City water, we are on a well. My concern is that they will not manage proper manure storage and recycling. Being only 100 feet away, it is possible that our drinking water or well may become contaminated or polluted without proper land management. 27 large animals will produce a significant amount of manure each year. Three: It is typically recommended that there are at least two acres for the first large animal and one additional acre for each additional large animal as this will allow the implementation of different management plans for not over-grazing, which could cause issues if we have severe rainy weather. Number four: Are

the 27 large animals for a business they will be running, or for boarding? Pioneer Rose Lane, 836 North, is a private lane that is currently maintained by us, the Held's, and the Erickson's. My concern is that if they are running a business, the additional traffic is coming and going on the private lane, which will increase the times per year we will have to maintain the road. If they are boarding, will they have a separate entrance so the private road is not utilized? Number five: 27 large animals on 1.49 acres increases the risk of unhealthy animals due to the bacteria they produce from their manure and urine with improper land management, not to mention the additional flies in the area. Thank you - Cory Hawks and Randy Hawks." Jaime added that they have their telephone numbers listed.

Jaime then asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to be heard on this item.

Gina Adams said: I just want to say I only have two horses and I do not plan to run a business.

Jaime replied: Okay. This is the time for the public to comment on this item. When I call for consideration of this item that is when you will come up and respond to the public's concerns. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to come up and comment on this item?

Robby Fackrell said: They have the wrong address. Jaime responded: Can you tell us your name, please? Robby Fackrell stated: My name is Robby Fackrell. I live at 848 North Cooley Street, which is the lot that is north of this 852 North. That is the wrong address. Our address is 848 and it has been that way for twelve years. I was told that there would be three families living in this house. I want to know if this is zoned for multi-family use. And it looks like it is a 120ft by 100ft house. That is just on one floor. I am not sure whether they have a basement and a second floor. I want to know when Grantsville made it possible to make it a multi-family dwelling down here on this five-acre lot. I hope she does not plan on having more than two horses because my well is just across the fence from where her pasture is and we have some concerns. Jaime said: What is on the agenda before us today is about whether she should be able to have 27 animals or not. Do you have concerns about the animals? Robby Fackrell replied: Yeah, I do not want her to have 27 large animals on that 6,500 square feet because she's not going to fence it. What are large animals? I would like a definition of that. Jaime said: Well, when she gets up here, I will have to ask her what her request is because she is the one that asked for this. Robby Fackrell said: Okay, and ask her how many families are going to live in this single-family dwelling because it sounds to me like we have a multi-family dwelling going in. And it is not zoned for multiple dwellings.

Jaime said: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else wanting to be heard on this item? Please state your name.

Ashley Erickson stated: My name is Ashley Erickson. I live just neighboring from the property you mentioned. In regards to Gina Adam's request for 27 large animals, we just have some concerns as neighbors to the property that I would like the Commission to hear. I was able to talk to Ms. Adams last night to inquire about the request because we were not sure what kind of animals that she would like to have there. And she did state that she only had two horses at this time, but that could grow to maybe four or five, depending on how things go in the next few years, but she just did not want to be limited to how many

she could have there. That news was a relief at the time, but I still question why you would request that high of a number on such a small lot. I think when you do consider this decision, rather than passing the 27 animals, you might consider lowering it to a smaller amount that the property can sustain. Speaking of the property, it is a five-acre lot. That land, I think as most of you know, cannot sustain that number of animals. Before too long, it will become over-grazed as Cory mentioned in her letter. It takes at least two acres for one horse, and then another acre for each additional horse, so even if she had all of it for her horses, she should not have more than five or six. I know that her request has shown there is sufficient square footage to support that, but maybe they would be in stalls. There is no great grazing or exercise space for those horses. In addition to that, Mr. Fackerell mentioned the fence improvements. The fencing that is there currently is questionable. The safety of the horses, as well as the traffic going by, needs to be considered if those horses were to get out. There do need to be some fence improvements for the few horses going in, let alone 27 of them. We as the current homeowners, since we moved in, have spent a substantial amount of money improving the lane to our residence. So if it were to become a boarding facility in the future, we would like them to consider a different entrance than our private lane for any potential boarders. Recently, Ms. Adams and her husband mentioned they did not really have the means to mow down any of the weeds that were on the property that have grown to establish a fire break. It is especially concerning given the recent two fires that were set right across the road from the property in recent weeks. Another concern that we have is if there was a similar emergency, how do you plan to relocate 27 animals off of the property for their safety? Also, in question, as Cory and Robbie have mentioned, is the amount of manure that her horses would create. Not only is the manure dirty for the water that they would be consuming in their wells, but it also comes with flies. Flies are a nuisance and carry diseases that are transported from one horse to the other. It is not just a curable disease - usually it can be fatal. I have several horses there that I spend a lot of time and money on and vaccinate. When others are negligent, it is not very helpful for my business or operation, either. I would like them to consider how they plan to regularly maintain and remove manure from the facility. Lastly, I think a big concern, whenever you have that many animals, is the water that they are going to consume in a day. At least 20 gallons, per animal, per day, times 27, means you are talking over 400 gallons a day. They would be on City water, without any well rights, and with that, your bill adds up quite quickly while they are consuming that water. These are just a few points that we as the neighborhood would like you guys to consider when you are going over this decision later in the night.

Jaime asked: Is there anyone else that would like to be heard?

Tashaya Held spoke on behalf of herself and her husband: I think they kind of covered it all. And we are just east of the property. Our biggest concerns are pretty much what everybody else stated. Fire is huge. We have had two fires set within two days. How are you going to get that many animals out safely? Water is also a concern. There is no well. How you are going to water that many animals? And then there are the bugs and flies. Kurt Held added: With us right now, we have two horses as well. With how warm it has been outside, they are consuming quite a bit of water. In fact, our neighbors, the Erickson's, have horses as well, so they know exactly what I am talking about. 27 animals on City water? It will drain this town dry. We go through quite a bit of water as it is at our own house. Especially if they are going to be tapping into City water, there is the possibility of reduction of water flow to our homes.

Jaime stated: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to be heard on this item? Seeing none, I am going to close that item and move on to the next item.

c. Proposed Commercial Conditional Use Permit Application for Rosalie York located at 822 East Main Street, Building A, Suite #4 in the CD zone.

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:17 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

d. Proposed Rezone of .73 acres for Doug and Roseann Higley located at 5 North Center Street to go from a CS zone to an RM-15 zone.

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

e. Proposed Rezone of 6.21 acres for Todd and Deborah Castagno located off of SR-112 and Durfee Street to go from an A-10 zone to an RR-1 zone.

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m. and called for comments.

Dylan Nash stated to the Commission: My name is Dylan Nash. I live on Sun Valley and I was given notice about this. I was not able to find a plot or anything showing what is being done. I think I know where the property is at, but I am not sure what the road situation is going to be like. If they did rezone this, I do not have a problem with one home per acre. I am just worried about the road situation. How are the people going to get in and out? The street that I live on, especially now that Main Street has been torn up, has turned into a shortcut to Durfee Street. Everybody that is tired of getting rocks and tar and being told to stop comes flying down my street. I don't want this to turn into more of that. Jaime said: When we get to the section where the applicant actually comes up, there will be a broadcast. Kristy Clark said: It is not working today, but the packet for this meeting is on the website, so if you have access to the internet on your phone, you can look it up on our website. It's grantsvilleut.gov under public notices. Gary added: Regarding the roads, if we approve the rezoning, and he wants to come in at that time to do something, he will have to bring an application in for the subdivision and the roads will all have to be looked at and designed. Dylan Nash said: So that is undecided - it is just a rezone only? Gary replied: There will probably be another public session for that. Dylan Nash said that was okay. Gary said: That is when we will actually get a chance to look at what they intend to do with the roads.

Jaime: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to be heard on this item? Seeing none, I am going to close that item and move on to the next item.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

- f. Proposed Final Plat Amendment for Gary Fuhrman to change the name of the original Subdivision and to move some lot lines. Property is located at approximately 425 South West Street in the RM-7 zone.**

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

- g. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Adam Geldmacher on the Hale Place Subdivision located on the corner of Hale Street and North Street for the creation of nine (9) lots in the RM-7 zone.**

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

- h. Proposed Preliminary Plan for John Clay, Glenda Brafford, and the Tooele Housing Authority on the Blue Lakes Subdivision located at approximately 445 East Clark Street for the creation of 12 lots in the split zone of RM-7 and RR-1.**

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. and called for comments.

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:22 p.m.

CHAIRMAN JAIME TOPHAM OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:22 P.M.

- 1. Consideration to recommend approval of the Amendments to the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code (GLUDMA) Pertaining to Chapter 21 Subdivision Regulations – Section 7 Financial Assurance and associated definitions in Chapter 2, including subdivision improvement agreements.**

Jaime said: I am going to be looking to Shay from Aqua Engineering to direct us in this conversation. Shay stated: I went in on the previous memo and noted some things in blue based on our discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting. I do want to bring up on 21.7.1, on the Improvement Installation Guarantee, item number two under that. After a discussion with the City Attorney, we think that we ought to just maintain the 110% and not

bring it down to 100% on there. Looking at what other cities are doing, they seem to be holding at 110% and we will just see how this law gets interpreted over the next few years and see if any court cases come up and if they do, then we will look at it again. But right now, the fact is we use a contractor's estimate from a developer. They can get things at a lower price than the City because a City has to vet it out. The City would be short in the first place, so the extra 10% in there helps. Jaime said: Sorry, I am going to jump in really quick. You have in here about a cash bond and then there is a question about what if the City does not accept cash bonds, and then there is an answer: yes? What does that mean? Shay responded: The City does accept cash bonds. So that question was answered. Gary asked: Are we adding the cash over to the tax bills? Shay said: Correct. Yes, as an option.

Jaime asked: Are there any other questions? Gary said: Not on 7.1. On 7.3. In regards to the belonging, during construction, they are putting the guarantee out there to make sure the off-sites and improvements are done. I guess I am a little confused here. We talk about releasing the bond, and then we talk about retaining 10%. So we are not really retaining 10% warranty - don't they have a warranty bond available? Shay confirmed: Yes, so the way this typically works is during construction, you have some sort of performance bond. And then once the construction is finished, you have the warranty bond which in our code is called the maintenance guarantee. So that is where this is coming from. During the construction, what some developers like to do is use a letter of credit and then release that down and they will maintain that letter of credit through the warranty period at that 10%. So part of what we are doing is making sure we have the 10% in the end if they choose to go that direction. Or if they do an escrow or something, they will release down to that 10% and then they will just roll that into an ORD. By retaining 10% through the construction, we are making sure that we are covered with that warranty amount. Technically, if something happened right at the end and they defaulted but got most of it done and we had some small issues to deal with on performance, you want to make sure you have something there to cover that. Gary said: Where might we label them complete? And the City's Utility Director is going to write the letter to the Mayor or the Council saying it is complete and to release the bond. How does it get converted to a warranty bond? It would make more sense if they completed the work on a released construction bond and issued in its place a warranty bond. Shay stated: That is basically what happens. I guess there are situations where they will do the bonding through the same financial institution. We allow them either through the letter of credit or the escrow to just roll that over. Gary said: After looking at the second paragraph, wouldn't it make more sense to have them issue a warranty bond to the City for a year, or two years, whichever the case may be, and allow them to terminate the construction bond? Jaime said: But if they don't have a bond, if they are doing it by an escrow, this will cover both. Is that kind of what you are thinking, Shay? Shay replied: Yes, this is pretty standard language. In most cases, that is exactly what they do. They have their final inspection. In our case, what we are talking about doing is having the Public Works Director write a letter that would be provided to City Council, saying, "We have inspected this. This is complete. We recommend accepting the improvements and releasing the performance bond and entering into durability or into the warranty period on such-and-such a date." And then City Council would act on that. At that point, we would work out ahead of time if it is going to just be a roll-over of that escrow or if it is going to be a new bond. At the time that the letter goes in, that is all in place. Once the City Council approves that, then we receive a copy of the new bond if it is a new bond. Or even if it is the escrow, the financial institution will send a letter or something stating that now this is no longer performance, this is warranty.

Gary said: At the time we are doing this maintenance guarantee or warranty, if you look at the second paragraph, it talks about it being based on costs to completion. Technically, the job is to be completed at this point in time. There should be no cost to completion. Shay said: This comes straight out of state law. Gary said: But if we can't get them to issue a warranty bond until after completion, what cost of completion are we talking about here? Shay said: So this is the original engineer's estimate that was approved at the beginning. We have to maintain that through the warrant. We have to use those same numbers for both the performance and the warranty agreement. That is what it is basically talking about. The reason they use the words "cost to completion" is because some developers will start the process without a bond with the intention that they are not going to record, because they have the option to complete all the improvements before they record and not have to bond for it. So sometimes what happens is you get partway through, and so then your construction costs are based on a partial and not on 100%. It is a rare case that it ends up working out that way because you want warranty to cover everything that has been completed. That is why that language was put in there. There are situations where it ends up being a partial and not 100%. He added: We talked about this previously and the Planning Commission seemed to be in favor of having the Public Works Director provide these letters in a more formal acceptance and release of the performance bond and then also at the end of the warranty doing the same thing coming back. Do we want to write that into the ordinance formally, or just make that practice? Attorney Coombs stated: I do not think it needs to be in the ordinance, per se. Unless you want it that way. Jaime asked: Attorney Coombs, what would be the benefit of writing it into the ordinance or the benefit of leaving it as policy? Attorney Coombs replied: If it is in the ordinance, people who have not ever come to Grantsville City to build can go online and read it and understand it. Other than that, I don't know that there would be any particular benefit I can think of. Jaime said: For me it seems like a lot of the issues that come before the City are because of lack of notice. So if it is in our code, then they are notified because it is in the code. Attorney Coombs said: It doesn't hurt to put it in there. It is just not required. Jaime said: Perhaps it would be a good idea so that we have more clarity so that if a person wants to see what is expected and required of them, they have access to that wherever they are at any time and are not reliant on whatever City official is available to speak with them to talk about policy. Gary mentioned: It is similar to some of the discussion we have had in the past year about verbal communications not being formalized. By the time they go through several different parties, whether it be PLC, transfer, utilities, or engineering, it seems like a whole lot of things get left out. I think if we are going to rely on public utilities to tell the City when their inspection indicates something is eligible for a reduction and/or completion, it should be in writing. Shay asked: So you would like to see reductions go to City Council also? Gary replied: It is a financial issue. If the City is going to give away their legal right, their financial right, I say yes. The point of the bond is to insure the City against laws. And if we are going to reduce the insurance, I would say the Council or somebody should have some documentation or basis upon which to make that decision.

Shay stated: With Gary's concern about partial release, the timing issue for the developer is that we would have to be able to get that to the Council quickly. Attorney Coombs said: I am not sure if there are any other cities that do it for partial. I will have to look at that. Shay said: I have not seen a situation within the cities I work with where the partials have gone to City Council. But I am not against it either. Gary mentioned: If I remember last month, we said that the Mayor or somebody at that level is a signatory party of the City on this bond. It is a fairly recent bond. We can't have an inspector do it. Shay stated: I am sure this occurs in other cities. There is a formal document that occurs on a partial release and I am sure that a copy of that at least goes to the Mayor or the signatory on this. Jaime said: As long as the partial

release is going to the Mayor or the official signing party, I don't know that it necessarily has to go to an entire City Council where you need to have an actual meeting to get through that, for a partial. On a complete, that is appropriate. Shay said: On a complete, part of what City Council is saying when they vote is that they are accepting the improvements. Jaime replied: Right, so that makes sense. But on a partial, it might make more sense from a process perspective to just have whoever the signatory was in the first place who was designated, like the Mayor. Attorney Coombs stated: I actually think it would be up to City Council to decide if they want to consider all of the partials. We can certainly write it in that way. Jaime said: I guess that would be a question for them, not particularly us.

She then said: On the 21.7.4, Item 3, there is a question about whether it is 15 days, 30 days, or 45 days. I know we had this discussion last time. I am just kind of concerned about how quickly we need to move. Is 15 days too short of a period that there might be something that is missed that the City is putting themselves into some kind of liability, or is a 30-day period a better time period? Do you have any thoughts, Shay? Shay replied: I was leaning towards 30 or 45 days myself. Gary mentioned: In the paragraph there, we used 45 days for the warranty period. Shay said: Ultimately, that is going to City Council to officially release that warranty period. We need the 45 days on that one. I guess you could say the same thing on three. Because they are accepting the improvements, it needs to go to City Council.

Gary asked: Are there any questions on exceptions? There in 21.7.5? Was it about certain pieces not requiring any bonds? Attorney Coombs asked: Can I make a recommendation here to shorten that exact guarantee language to "The City does not require the developer to provide an improvement guarantee for any exceptions listed under Utah State Code?" Jaime replied: That works. So in these questions, are we going to write it into code? Attorney Coombs said: No, these are just questions to you. Jaime asked: So I think we have answered them all, right? Shay said yes.

Jaime made the motion to recommend approval of the amendments to the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code (GLUDMA) Pertaining to Chapter 21 Subdivision Regulations – Section 7 Financial Assurance and associated definitions in Chapter 2, including subdivision improvement agreements with the understanding that 21.7.4 will be a 45-day period for each of the periods listed and that all of the blue changes will be accepted with the exception of 21.7.1, Section 2, the guarantee amount will be 110%. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Consideration to recommend approval of the Mining, Quarry, Sand, and Gravel Conditional Use Permit Application for Ardero to conduct a gravel excavation business on 563.65 acres located at approximately 1100 North SR 138 in the MG-EX zone.

Shaun Johnson was present for this item and stated to the Commission: I'm Shaun Johnson with Ardero. So we had our meeting up on the site. Gary was there, Jewel Allen was there, Kristy was there, and Aqua was there. We do want it rescheduled, because it was in the middle of a work day and we would like to get an opportunity for the rest of the City Council to come. We will work with them individually as we are still working through these issues with Aqua Engineering. Once we get this approval today, we will continue to coordinate with City Council to do that. Jaime stated: I understand that we are considering a temporary approval conditional use permit to allow you to get all of the approvals and you will

eventually come back seeking a permanent conditional use permit where we will be able to review that you have done all the things you needed to do and have all the permits and licensing and everything. Shaun Johnson said: Yes, that is correct. Gary stated: When we met out there, we talked about putting together a written narrative of how this was going to proceed and what pieces fall on what days. Aqua recommended that we table this again until we get that deal between you guys and the City. Shaun Johnson stated: I was not aware that we were supposed to be putting that together. Our understanding was that from that meeting, we were going to go forward with this preliminary approval and from that moment on, we would go and continue our meetings with the State and once we have those items, we would basically turn the new information in for review to the City to be put on the agenda when that comes. It is hard for us to put any time frames to UDOT or any of these other jurisdictions that are totally unpredictable on these things. I was unaware that we were supposed to provide that if that was the case. Gary said: I know that UDOT says the City is working with the applicant to draft an agreement that would allow for a temporary approval. So that agreement as to how this process is going to move forward is off the recommending table until we see that agreement. Shaun Johnson said: I think the process is still clearly stated in the application requirements. We just need to be able to meet those application requirements by going forward and spending the money. I do not think anything is new as far as what we need to do to get the approval. It is all laid out in the conditional use permit.

Gary stated: There are some issues with regards to construction you had out there, one being where is the water? Shay mentioned: They did show rights in the application. The question is the quantity. Gary said: The only problem with that is on site, they said they do not have it. They have identified it, but they do not have it. I am not in favor of gravel being put up there. It will just be a dust storm. There has to be dedicated water. We are talking a lot of water. Shaun Johnson said: But this conditional approval just allows us to continue the process to meet the conditional use permit. It is not going any further. It just allows us to continue to spend the money so we can meet the requirements of the code. Jaime asked: Attorney Coombs, where are we at with an agreement? Has he been working on that? Attorney Coombs replied: I didn't know about that. Shay said: I want to try to clarify this a little bit. The thought process here was that this can be a really simple agreement. We allowed something similar with the Charcoal, Sand, and Gravel where we let them bring the CUP in at the same time as the site plan and they were considered and approved at the same time. I think the point of the agreement, and one of the things we had asked for with this, is how long is it going to take to get these permits? A temporary should have a finite period to that. I have not heard anything back from the applicant on how long they feel they need to have this temporary in place. Is six months long enough? Is a 1 year long enough? I think the agreement is really simple, based on that. We just agree to enter into a temporary permit to allow them to continue forward with this process that also makes sure the application does not expire so they do not have to re-apply again. I think it can be a simple, one-paragraph letter that everybody signs off on. Shaun Johnson said: A lot of those requirements that we have to meet, we can't go and get until we have approval from the City. Jaime said: And that is what I was going to say. You cannot really give us timelines about how long it is going to take because you do not have any control or ability to speak to those outside parties. Shaun Johnson added: But I do think we could put something on there in six months. Gary stated: And then come down for review. Shay said: Yeah, and we can state that in there. Gary mentioned: Working a little quicker too. I think the main concern I have is whatever we say yes to today is not necessarily saying yes to all the different things we saw in your preliminary sketch and so on. There are a lot of things, a lot of details, to be worked out regarding dust control, landscaping, and access. Shaun Johnson said: And all of those things are within the code that we have to maintain

requirements. Gary said: I think if we issue one tonight, it would be purely for the understanding that they can have a gravel permit pursuant to the rest of the requirements of the City. Shay said: If we basically allow that temporary for six months and if something occurs, they can come back at the end of the six months and request additional time if they need to. Part of this is that we do not want the application to expire either. Shaun Johnson asked: And we would follow the same process where we turn our information in to Kristy, get on the agenda, and show up again for the final approval? Jaime stated: Right. You had all the requirements.

Gary made the motion to recommend a temporary approval of the Mining, Quarry, Sand, and Gravel Conditional Use Permit Application for Ardero to conduct a gravel excavation business on 563.65 acres located at approximately 1100 North SR 138 in the MG-EX zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Consideration to approve the Animal Conditional Use Permit Application for Gina Adams located at 852 North Cooley in the RR-5 zone.

Gina Adams was present for this item and she stated her name to the Commission. Jaime asked: Do we have your address correct? Gina Adams responded: That is the address that was given to me in the documents when I first purchased the land. Jaime stated: You heard the community's concerns. Would you mind addressing some of those concerns for us? Gina Adams replied: Sure. Currently, I have two horses. I really do not intend on having 27 horses. Basically, I did not want to be limited if I do grow. I would like to not have to come back and file another permit for additional animals. Jaime asked: So when you are asking for large animals, what do you define as a large animal? Gina Adams answered: A horse or a cow. I kind of got that definition from Kristy. Jaime asked: And why 27? Gina Adams said: Basically that was the amount that was already fenced off that Grantsville City allowed in that square space. I have more than enough to cover that amount of animals in that square space as per Grantsville City Code. Kristy stated: So our code is 10,000 square feet for the first large animal, and 2,000 square feet for any additional animal. And then there is the 100-foot buffer. So with what is in our code, she has more than enough for 27. She could actually have more than 27. Jaime asked: What about water? How do you get your water? Gina Adams replied: Currently, I have a building permit put in for water. I had an excavator come today and that will be for culinary water just for the livestock at this point. There is no house on it. Jaime asked: So your house is not on a well? Gina Adams said: There is not a house there. It is a vacant lot. It is not on a well. Jaime stated: Some of the other questions were about manure control. I understand that you only have two horses now, but if we were to grant this, you could have up to 27 animals at any time. So your neighbors have concerns about how you are going to handle that if that were the case. So can you address what you would do about controlling manure and the flies? Gina Adams said: Yes, I will be a responsible neighbor. I am not going to leave a bunch of manure around that is going to smell. I am not going to want to smell it. If I have to I will haul it off or do whatever I need to do to contain the flies or the manure if it comes to that. I do not think it will ever come to that. Jaime said: And so you understand that the conditional use permit would grant you 27 horses, but that would not entitle you to do any type of business. You would have to come back before us for a conditional use permit if you were to do any type of business. Gina Adams said: I do not intend to do any business. Like I said, the main purpose was that if I were to breed my horses and get a colt, I do not have to come back and get a new permit. And as far as the fire, I would make sure the animals were safe. I have a four-horse horse trailer, so I could haul them off.

Obviously, I would not be able to get 27 in one, but I do not ever plan on having that many animals, honestly. Jaime stated: You are wanting to protect your rights. Gina Adams said: Yes. Was there anything else that you wanted me to address? Jaime responded: Just let me address the notes. Do you guys have any questions? Thoughts?

Erik stated: You know, it was probably eight years ago that we had a similar situation where someone took it and calculated it to the exact amount. Fortunately, that individual realized he did not need to go to the extreme and I guess came up with a more reasonable number. You are right. You are within your rights to go to the 27, and you continue to say you do not have any intention of doing that many. You just wanted to not have to come back. I think you could have probably picked a number smaller that might have made it so you did not have to come back that everyone would have felt better about, but you are within your rights to have the 27. I'm not a horse person, so I look at the horse people and question why you would really want to put 27 horses on 1.5 acres. Gina Adams said: It is five acres. It is 5.23. It is not in the plan to fence off, but we plan to fence it off. Jaime said: I think, from my viewpoint, you have the five acres and you are entitled to that space. I know that there was a comment saying that you are not going to fence it. But I do not think it is appropriate for other people to be making judgements about what you would or would not do. It certainly is not our job to decide whether you are going to fence that or not. Gina Adams said: Right. Thank you. Jaime said: I think you need to recognize safety concerns. Gina Adams: Yeah, absolutely. I love my animals just like anybody else does. Erik said: And that is the thing, if you look at five acres versus 1.5, the conversation makes a little more sense. Jaime asked: You are seeking this conditional use permit for the entire acreage, correct? Gina Adams replied: Yes, that is correct. Jaime clarified: Not for what is currently fenced. Gina Adams said no.

Gary mentioned: Looking at the entire acreage, you could probably have 100 out there. Gina Adams said: Exactly. Shoot me if I have over ten, really. Gary asked: I guess, in reality, would you ever envision yourself having more than ten? Gina Adams said no. Gary asked: So if we said ten, would you be okay with that? Gina Adams replied: I would be okay with it. I just do not want to have to come back and pay another \$50 to get more when I clearly have the land, according to the code, and the ability to do it. But if it is a difference of you declining it and me taking ten? Yes, I would take ten. Jaime added: We do need to make sure to balance property rights with owner versus community interest. I think you are well within your rights. You could come here and ask for a whole lot more. You are not. You made representations that you are not going to ever have that many animals, but you have the right to do so. I think you need to understand that obviously, if we grant this and you do have that many animals, your neighbors are going to be concerned and they are going to be paying attention and you need to make sure that you are following our codes about making sure there is not a nuisance or animals who are dirty or anything along those lines. Gina Adams stated: Like I said, I do not think that will be a problem. As far as the water line, he mentioned connecting out of their water. There is an eight-inch pipe on the other side of the fire hydrant, which they asked us when we talked to them individually to connect into the eight-inch side. We are connecting on that side of the water to accommodate what they had asked for initially when we talked to them. Jaime asked: And you paid for the right to have that water put into your property and you have the rights? Gina Adams replied: Yes. And as far as the mowing of our address, we did talk to them yesterday and said we would take care of it. That was never, ever a thought that we would not do that. We said we do not have that kind of industrial mower right now to mow it, so I was trying to find somebody to come do it and we are looking at buying one, actually, to take care of that.

Jaime made the motion to approve the Animal Conditional Use Permit Application for Gina Adams located at 852 North Cooley in the RR-5 zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Consideration to recommend approval of the Commercial Conditional Use Permit Application for Rosalie York located at 822 East Main Street, Building A, Suite #4 in the CD zone.

Rosalie York stated her name to the Commission. Jaime asked: Are you currently in that space? Rosalie York replied: Yeah. Jaime asked: What is the name of your business? Rosalie York responded: Rose and Co. Boutique and Beauty.

Jaime made the motion to recommend approval of the Commercial Conditional Use Permit Application for Rosalie York located at 822 East Main Street, Building A, Suite #4 in the CD zone. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

5. Consideration to recommend approval of the Rezone of .73 acres for Doug and Roseann Higley located at 5 North Center Street to go from a CS zone to an RM-15 zone.

Doug Higley was present for this item and he stated his name to the Commission. Jaime asked: So you bought the old house? Doug Higley answered: Years ago. Jaime asked: What do you intend to do with the property? Doug Higley replied: I would like to put some nice town homes on it. Jaime asked: What will you do with the house? I do not remember the RM-15 allowing commercial buildings. Shay said: It would have to just be residential. I guess if someone wanted to do a home business out of it they could, but obviously there is a big difference between a home business and commercial buildings. Doug Higley asked: What about Airbnb? Jaime said: That is commercial. How would that work, Shay? Shay said: I do not know that we have anything specifically in code about it. Because an Airbnb still has the owner living there, it is not like an apartment or that type of rental. A bed and breakfast is purely commercial and has to be rezoned as commercial. If they are not living in the home and they are renting it out, it is either commercial or would be an apartment or something like that. Doug Higley stated: We would subdivide the single lot it and make two more lots. Jaime said: I guess my concern is losing that commercial space. Gary added: Going to CS, if you try to subdivide it, the lot is going to be too small for the CS zone. You would not be able to subdivide it. Doug Higley said: Right. Jaime said: Well, they are a CS zone. Doug Higley said: It is CS now. Gary asked: Going to RM-15? Shay said: So it is 8,000 square feet minimum for RM-15. Gary asked: So 8,000 would be minimal for RM-15? Kristy answered: Yeah, and then to do the town homes, or the duplexes, or whatever he wants to put there, it would be 2,300 square feet. So he would have to have, what per unit? Shay answered: 3,100. So you need 10-3 for each. Doug Higley stated: That is why I was saying one or two lots or three lots depending on the size of what is allowed to be put on there. Jaime said: Well, our future land use map as it currently stands has that as commercial, but also as a medium density residential and our upcoming map is anticipating that area to be commercial and possible high density residential. I am just concerned about losing a commercial space so close to Main Street. Doug Higley mentioned: It is for sale. Jaime said: I understand that. So if you are wanting to subdivide it so you can use it for town homes that are medium density, are you planning on keeping the house? Doug Higley answered: If we did the town homes, we are planning on keeping it. Jaime said: I do not know if it has been designated as historical. Erik asked: Are you guys aware of how the lot is set up down there? Jaime said: Yeah, long

and skinny? Doug Higley said: Yeah, the house is all the way in the one corner in the pocket. Erik added: You know, for years, we kept saying we cannot give up the commercial, but yet I do not really see a lot of commercial happening for what we have. Something versus an empty lot might be a better solution. Jaime stated: Yeah, we do need more multi-family housing. Gary stated: From our discussion at the public meeting a couple of weeks ago, consultants were looking at higher density housing as well in this area. Higher density housing is going to perhaps help her along. Some more shops or such. Jaime said: Yeah, more along Main Street, maybe. I assume that salon is still there, right? Kristy answered: Yeah, it is still there and open and running. Gary asked: Is our fire department okay with high density housing across the street? I think they are going to squawk about the sirens and want you to move. Doug Higley said: That is part of moving in next to a fire station. There is going to be activity there 24 hours a day. They are going to have to understand that.

Erik made the motion to recommend approval of the Rezone of .73 acres for Doug and Roseann Higley located at 5 North Center Street to go from a CS zone to an RM-15 zone. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

6. Consideration to recommend approval of the Rezone of 6.21 acres for Todd and Deborah Castagno located off of SR-112 and Durfee Street to go from an A-10 zone to an RR-1 zone.

Todd Castagno was present and stated to the Commission: I'm Todd Castagno. This property is what would be the extension of Durfee Street going east from Sun Valley Drive. The general plan apparently calls for ten-acre to one-acre lots. We did not want to change the general plan. Part of the subdivision process now requires a traffic study. We have reached out to Hales Engineering and they have provided us with that. I cannot remember the total trips generated by five lots. It was apparently minimal but all of that is part of the subdivision process, and we have done some preliminary work there. Jaime asked: So this is behind that red brick house? Todd Castagno answered: It is. Jaime asked: So then you would continue Durfee Street that does not currently continue out? How is that going to tie into that next section of your mapped property? Todd Castagno stated: It would just end there until they decide what they are going to do. Jaime asked: So you heard the concern of one of the neighbors? I think that was about the road situation. I guess when you come back for a preliminary you can go over the entire process and have all the information about the street and how you are going to do this. Todd Castagno said: Yeah, we would dedicate the extension of Durfee so there are some major subdivisions they would have to do. Preliminary plot, final plot, all of that, which would require all the water dedication and straining programs, traffic studies, all of those. And that timing would probably have Main Street completed by then. Jaime said: So, Neil, Councilman Critchlow, we have had a lot of requests for a rezone that we recommended and it died in City Council, or at least temporarily. Do you have a feeling where we are at? Neil Critchlow responded: We absolutely would like to do this. Jaime added: And it seems like it is appropriate. I know the community has been asking for larger lots, not smaller, so you are definitely following what the community's requests are. And that area may be better having Durfee actually finished out, not encouraging people to take Sun Valley. I understand that people are probably taking Sun Valley right now, but that is not going to be forever. Gary said: The only thing I would volunteer is that we are looking at this zoning issue and at a glance, the preliminary layout, the blocks and stuff, have a cul-de-sac down on the end, and that is probably going to reconfigure your lots a little bit. Also, you are offering a 59-foot-wide street. Our current ordinance requires probably 66. There are some

initial issues on your sketch here as far as the zoning goes. Councilman Neil Critchlow stated: All of that was no doubt intended to serve on our side that must comply with City ordinances for streets and fire access and the international fire code as well. Gary said: I am just bringing it up because with having this sketch stored on the application, I do not want someone to think we are approving the sketch. Kristy said: It was only because we did not have a very good picture of where the location is. But where he is already working on the subdivision process, it was a perfect picture. So do not look at any detail on there. Just look at the location. Jaime asked: You are aware of the open space requirement? Todd Castagno answered: Yes.

Erik made the motion to recommend approval of the Rezone of 6.21 acres for Todd and Deborah Castagno located off of SR-112 and Durfee Street to go from an A-10 zone to an RR-1 zone. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

7. Consideration to recommend approval of the Final Plat Amendment for Gary Fuhrman to change the name of the original Subdivision and to move some lot lines. Property is located at approximately 425 South West Street in the RM-7 zone.

Removed and moved to the August 8th P&Z meeting

8. Consideration to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Adam Geldmacher on the Hale Place Subdivision located on the corner of Hale Street and North Street for the creation of nine (9) lots in the RM-7 zone.

Adam Geldmacher and Barry Bunderson were present for this item. Adam Geldmacher stated his name to the commission. Gary said: We had some discussion in the review about drainage out there in the street design and having to get together with the City to figure out what was going to be coming up the street. We talked about what is going to happen with the drainage since someone has plugged the ditch down below and how we are going to bring drainage and things like that. Your property has been receiving the drainage? Adam Geldmacher said: Correct. Gary said: You could build on it if you went with that. Adam Geldmacher said: Correct. Gary stated: But you do not have any way of transferring that drainage that is stored to the north. There were also some issues about the street and the fact that it is under construction now and to what extent the streets will be reconstructed and what configuration the curb and sidewalk width are and so on. Has that been settled? Adam Geldmacher replied: As far as I know it is going to be in the development agreement. In the notes I was given from those meetings, it was agreed that we would go to the nineteen feet with the ditch. Well, the nineteen feet with a ribbon curb and a ditch. And then the note on the final plat saying that in the future there would be a sidewalk if anyone in the City decides there should be one. Gary asked: And where does the drainage go? Adam Geldmacher said: In the street. Gary clarified: So basically, the ditch on the road is going to become a retention basin? Because there is no outlet to the north. Right? Adam Geldmacher answered: Yeah. Barry Bunderson said: Sorry, I will chime in. We certainly have not done full engineering at this point. We have given some thought to that, but I do not know how far it has been filled in. Maybe you do? But there may be an opportunity to convey it to the north still. Gary stated: It sounded like 1,000 feet or more though. The ditch had been filled in from what I heard in that meeting. Adam Geldmacher said: Yeah, it is hard to know where it comes back into play. Gary asked: Where are we on the development agreement? Adam Geldmacher said: I have not seen it yet. Shay

mentioned: Well this is preliminary. So right now we are just trying to come up with items that may be on that development agreement and then when we go to final, we have the specific terms of the agreement. So right now, in the memo that you received from me, you will notice at the bottom some potential items listed in there. Jaime asked: All the blue, right? Shay answered: That is correct. Jaime asked: Those are the responses from the DRC? Shay stated: Yes. We had the initial review memo that was taken at DRC and then these items in blue are what were discussed in the DRC and in some cases, responses where there were questions that we have been able to answer. There are a few issues with the street right now that were discussed. The City is looking at possibly taking some of the extra money from the sewer project and instead of just patching this portion of the street, going in and doing an overlay because the street is all torn up. The patches would need to be almost the full width. Basically, where we left it with the DRC and talking with Public Works is we needed to find out if the City allowed us to move a little further forward. I got the impression at the DRC that this had not been discussed yet. It was just something that was being talked about so that we can give the applicant a little better direction on exactly what will be required in that final. The drainage, there again, in discussion with Public Works, needs a bit of coordination. What is happening here is all flow off the intersection at Main Street is coming down the street and right now, that property is acting as the basin that is receiving all this flow. This has to be resolved one way or another. And so that was going to be kind of coordinated, at least with Public Works. Does that ditch get opened back up down through there and pass down through the way it historically used to flow? Adam Geldmacher asked: Is there any kind of storm water master plan? Gary replied: No. I have been harping on that for some time. The City does not have any plan for storm water. Barry Bunderson said: I would say this is an engineering design issue that I think we are willing to work through. But this is draining up large portions of the City, right? The impact that we are making on that storm water system is a small portion of what the issue really is. So we are willing to work with the City to come up with a solution. We have not solved that yet, but I think that is a thing that has to happen going forward. Gary said: You guys are in the unfortunate position of being the detention basin for that part of the City, like Shay says. And to work in the whole lots now, the last thing you want is all that water spilling out in the yards and basins and everything. And it is the City's water and the City has the responsibility to some degree, upstream to you. It is a problem that I have seen here for a number of years. I remember the discussions we had on the mini mall. The City has had to have its hand on storm water for a long time here. We've got a street that some ways will turn into a retention basin because you are over on your lots. So now the street becomes a retention basin because we do not have an outlet for them. I guess those are things we will need to address in the final. During that time, the issues regarding the degree of which we improve, and the manner in which we improve the straight end of the storm drains are going to have to be resolved in partnership between you guys and the City and put into the development agreement.

Jaime added: One of their questions was about the open space and whether they are planning on doing anything with it. You do not have any curb and sidewalk on any of Hale Street, I do not think. Adam Geldmacher stated: Well, it ends at our street, from North Street down. Jaime said: That might be an opportune area for a trail. I know that we have talked about having more of a trails plan and paths to get around the town for riding and biking.

Gary made the motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Adam Geldmacher on the Hale Place Subdivision located on the corner of Hale Street and North Street for the creation of nine (9) lots in the RM-7 zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

9. Consideration to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for John Clay, Glenda Bradford, and the Tooele Housing Authority on the Blue Lakes Subdivision located at approximately 445 East Clark Street for the creation of 12 lots in the split zone of RM-7 and RR-1.

Barry Bunderson was present for this item and stated to the Commission: I am Barry Bunderson, representing the owner and the developer. If you have any questions, I would point out that there has been some modeling taking place on the sewer water system to anticipate the impact that this subdivision would have on those systems. The conclusions are that there is sufficient capacity both for fire flow and sewer. Gary mentioned: One thing that I noticed is that the street there is pretty much dead level all the way across from east to west. And we are putting in curb and gutter, which going flat as it is, could make water or ice hazard issues. We talked about utilizing the park strip for parking because of the narrow lots. Rather than curb and gutter, what about ribbon curb? Protect the asphalt so the park strip could be used for parking and water could shoot off on the park strip? As opposed to trying to figure out how to get catch places and piping in, to maybe take it to the ribbon curb? Barry Bunderson said: Yeah. So, I do not know that the developer would be opposed to the ribbon curb as it is discussed in the DRC. Gary said: If I remember, she mentioned something about having to do a certain amount of curbs now because funding would not be readily available at a later date. Would the ribbon curb take care of you guys in that aspect? DeAnn Christiansen said: I believe we could consider that. Our main concern is that if the City came back on us, say in ten years, and said, "We require you to put curb and gutter in," and we don't have the financial resources at that time to do that, there could be a problem." Barry Bunderson said: So we are just saying, instead of the curb with a gutter, just a flat curb and let the water sheet flow. I think we can solve this. If we put even a half percent slope on that curb towards the west, that would be sufficient. I don't know if the City has a minimum curb requirement for gutters. What that would mean, potentially, is the cross slope of the new pavement would have a varying slope and we would look at that a little closer to make sure the tolerances on that could be within guidelines. Meaning, if we wanted a 2% cross slope to get it to drain, we probably won't want more than a 4 or 4.5% cross slope. Because then you have issues of keeping people in the lane. Gary said: That half a percent in the gutter would drop you about three and a half feet on the west end, which would put a pretty big hole on our west end. You need to have an outlet of some sort. Barry Bunderson said: Sure. Gary said: And again, curb precludes anyone using the parking lot and throwing something in the gutter and driving over the gutter. Just something to discuss at our DRC. Barry Bunderson said: So, just imagine then, that we have got some sort of a swell and then some driveways that would not necessarily follow that contour. We could try and make them follow somewhat of the contour of the swell, but then you are going to get this damming action from the driveways. But those are all things that I think are within reality of design that we can look at and see what that really means if we try to put curb and gutter. That is, putting it in a hole with no outlet. And then I think the next best solution is to go with the ribbon curb and just kind of let it percolate into the ground or convey over the tops of driveways in huge lot events and save them right away. You know we are going to protect the structures and all of that.

Jaime made the motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for John Clay, Glenda Bradford, and the Tooele Housing Authority on the Blue Lakes Subdivision located at

approximately 445 East Clark Street for the creation of 12 lots in the split zone of RM-7 and RR-1. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

10. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held April 11, 2019.

Jaime asked: Do we have enough people here for the April? I was not here in April. Erik said: It was just Gary and I. Kristy Clark said: Yes. You guys did those public hearing minutes that we did back in May and it was just the two of you. So, yes, let's do it because I am going to have six sets of minutes if we do not approve something. Jaime said: I will make the motion to approve the minutes. Kristy said: Wait. So on the April 11th, did we get a motion and a second on that one? Jaime said: That is the one that I just read. I asked the question before I actually read the agenda item. Kristy Clark said: Okay, you just said you got April and then you said the 23rd, so I was confused. Jaime said: Let me do that again.

Jaime made the motion approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held April 11, 2019. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

11. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held May 23, 2019.

Gary made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held May 23, 2019. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

12. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held June 13, 2019.

Erik made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held June 13, 2019. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

13. Report from Council Liaison Member, Neil Critchlow.

Neil Critchlow said: The development down there for the physical therapist is supposed to be on this agenda for his geotechnical. Kristy Clark said: It was recommended for approval on the condition that he had the geotech for your meeting on the 17th, but I have not gotten that geotech from Barry. I was going to have a conversation with him tonight and let him know I need that by tomorrow or I can't put him on the 17th meeting for City Council.

Neil Critchlow said: We talked last time about the DRC letters being the things that need to be carried through. Is that still the plan? Kristy Clark said: Yeah, that is going to be the plan. And we have started recording those meetings, by the way. If anybody wants to listen to them, all they have to do is email me and I will send it to them. Neil Critchlow said: Okay. Then have we discussed getting the P.U.D. Ordinance back on so we can take care of those best things that are kind of left out there? You were going to draft an ordinance? Attorney Coombs

stated: It is drafted. Neil Critchlow said: Evidently, we are having another meeting on the 23rd. Jaime said: Let's talk about that because the idea was that it wasn't going to be a work meeting. It was going to be a public hearing on the general plan update so we could then consider at that 23rd meeting if it could go up for review in August. That was the plan when I got it set up for the 23rd. I do not know if that has changed. Kristy Clark said: It is actually probably back on. Brett sent an email to Jewell reminding them that if three or more Council members come to that, then we have to notice that it is going to be a combined meeting. I think that we will be okay with keeping it the way we have planned. It is just going to be a special meeting where we are going to have the public comments and do the consideration and send it to City Council for the 7th. Neil asked: Can we get the P.U.D. ordinance? Attorney Coombs answered: We would need to change it to a work meeting to do that. Jaime said: We would prefer not to do that though because we need to get the general plan done and in front of the City Council. Attorney Coombs stated: You could still hold a public hearing at that meeting. Jaime clarified: Oh, and then have a work meeting ahead of it? Attorney Coombs said yes. Neil asked: Can we work out those details? Attorney Coombs said sure. Kristy Clark said: I have to do it by tomorrow. Attorney Coombs said: No, that is just for the public hearing. For a work meeting, you do not need to do that. Jaime asked: So would we have City Council here for that work meeting? Or just us? Attorney Coombs said: No, it would just be you. This is just a proposed ordinance for City Council to consider on the P.U.D. items. I do not anticipate it taking a lot of time, but it is something that we have been requested to have you guys consider as soon as possible. Jaime said: Okay, I am just concerned whether all of our members will be able to be here early enough on that day. Neil asked: We are not going to have this meeting too early are we? Jaime said: It is at 7:00. Kristy Clark added: On the 23rd. So then we will do a work meeting at 6:00? Everybody okay with that? Gary said: 6:00am? No problem. Jaime said: Not 6:00am! Gary said: Oh, I got that wrong? Kristy said: You can have a work meeting at 6:00am. I will not be here. Gary said: I am fine with 6:00pm also. Neil Critchlow mentioned: I have been approached by a young lady who is doing a paper for the Utah State University. She wants to do a light study of the neighborhoods in Grantsville. You good with this? We do not have one at this point. Jaime said: Sure.

Neil Critchlow then stated: Just got to put out a reminder, the 27 animals is a conditional use permit, so if there are too many that are causing a problem you can go say, "Nope. You are down to five." Neil Critchlow added: And as far as the developer up there, if it fits into the neighborhood, that is what it was. And Tom came to the City Council and had a pipe put across his dad's field to take some down that place. Isn't that right, Tom? Tom stated: Yeah, we put a ten-inch water line so that there would eventually be a feed line. Neil Critchlow asked: So it goes under his field before his dad planted the alfalfa on it, so that sort of lines up though, right? Tom stated: Correct. Gary asked: Where is that line? Tom replied: It would be the extension of Durfee, straight. Neil Critchlow added: Right through Dill's field that is out there. The alfalfa field. So for his next subdivision, which is further east. Gary asked: So it has crossed the highway over to the east? Neil Critchlow said: They just took it onto the field. Tom said: There is an eight-inch line that comes to Sun Valley and goes down Sun Valley. So the proposal is ten-inch going east from Sun Valley, but then bring, what's Main Street? 12? Gary said: Way back when you and I were doing the Oquirrh Hills or whatever, they were going to take sewer water both across 112 to Durfee and go down that dirt field. Tom stated: Water will run through the sewer and will go to the north and Main.

Neil Critchlow stated: I still have a problem with the subdivision up by Dennis McBride's, Hunter Estates. Did we ever get that road lane fixed? He has no right-of-ways to get to his

property. Kristy Clark said: As of today, it is not going on your August 7th meeting. It got pulled. They cannot get the changes made in time. Shay added: An issue with their property boundaries has also come to light. It is all being addressed. Kristy Clark said: And it may actually come back to us. Shay said: What they thought and what Mr. McBride thought he was selling them were two different things. Mr. McBride wants to keep his trees and so they have gone in and worked something out. And I think it actually ended up working out beneficially towards being able to address this street issue because Mr. McBride has something that he wanted.

Neil Critchlow then stated: Clayton here went to the water test on Scott Hazard's thing and came up with 1,000 gallons. I don't know what his requirement is going to be for that. Just so you are aware of that. Kristy asked: So it is up from what it was? Tom replied: It was up a little bit. It will be better once it is tied into Main Street. I could redo it if he wants after it is hooked up. Shay said: I just saw these emails going back and forth between Scott Hazard and the City engineer the last couple of days. He is trying to put together a fixture count right now to determine what the water needs are. He needs to determine what lines he needs to bring in to the street, because I think he is probably going to have to loop it to be able to get your fire flow up, even once the 12-inch line is connected. I do not know for sure until we get all these numbers. That is being worked through, but once that 12 inches is connected, then he is going to be required to do the test again and based off that test things will be determined. Erik asked: Where are they talking about looping the two? Out of Sun Valley? Or where? Shay said: There is actually a right-of-way between two of the lots on Sun Valley that ties to that property. So that may be a possibility. Personally, I think that would be a good move, even for just providing regular water service. Neil Critchlow said: That is a consistent supply. Shay said: Exactly. But, if he can get it off of SR-112, I know that is what he would prefer to do right now. Gary asked: If we are marching along his current building, what is he going to do when he does more buildings? Erik said: That is the issue. Maybe you are fine for the current building, but when the other three are built, it is not going to be good. Gary said: We should be looking at the old terms so we don't end up digging up the highway and the street and all the other stuff again. Neil Critchlow mentioned: The State gets a little angry when we do that. Erik asked: So there was not any significant difference between your test and the third party? Erik replied: Not a lot. Neil Critchlow added: And then I drive by Guy Haskell's place out there. He has got the asphalt down. He measures out right as far as the width and the asphalt and all that. Shay, this one is for you. Does he have to take the asphalt across that for 100 feet? Shay asked: This is on the highway? Neil Critchlow said: Desert Highland is what it is called. Shay said: Yeah, Desert Highland, but the apron is on the highway. It is basically either an acceleration or a deceleration lane that they required in there so that people don't just turn. I have to look at the drawing to know. He did tell me they have not paved that yet because UDOT is requiring a different pavement for that. Neil Critchlow said: It is paved clear out to the highway right now as entrances at about 100 feet, I can tell you that. Its right-of-way is about 60 feet. Shay said: We will take a look at it and see. I just don't know which side it was required on. Neil Critchlow added: And there were no temporary turn ramps on either of those two.

Neil Critchlow said: There are some things we have to just make sure. I talked to James Waltz about that and he says they have done some pretty good inspections on his road and patch and those kind of things. We are doing better that way. Anything you want me to take back to the Council other than the 23rd meeting? Attorney Coombs said: If there are three or more coming, then you need to have notice. Only 2 can come without notice. Kristy Clark stated: I am noticing it tomorrow. Kristy: But you are our liaison, so I do not know if he counts. Does

he? If he comes? Oh so he still counts. Neil Critchlow asked: Anything else you want me to take back? Other than the storm drain? Gary said: There was something when we very first started this last round of discussions on the general plan, when I mentioned that maybe we should have some general planning. Overall, City-wide storm drain thoughts. The fellows that are here this evening, they are not going to be the last ones. Neil Critchlow said: We should have passed a rule years ago saying you can't fill the stupid irrigation ditches. That was the best thing that ever happened to us. Gary said: The irrigation system was our storm drain system as we got pressurized, everyone fills the ditch and now we've got flooding problems and nowhere to put our water. The pasture used to be the retention basin because they wanted the water, but now that they've put a house on it, they don't want the water. Somewhere we need to think about the City having somebody do a storm water plan City-wide and putting up where we are going to put some basins and the water. Main Street is not putting in any pipe. If we are going to do a three-inch overlay out here, which is a waste of money and we are not putting any pipe on Main, we are not improving ourselves there. Neil Critchlow said: But they are going underneath a couple of intersections. Gary said: They told me you all are going to do a three-inch overlay. Neil Critchlow said: They were doing something going under the road. Gary asked: Where did it start? Neil Critchlow replied: At the Coulson's. Neil Critchlow stated: I got that all on there. I will be at the 23rd meeting. Nothing else? We are good. I appreciate you. Thank you.

- 14. Gary made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:58. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.**

Kristy Clark
Zoning Administrator