

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING HELD 7/23/2019.

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, and Commission Member Jacob Linares. Absent were Commission Member Robbie Palmer and Commission Alternate Shane Watson. Also present were Zoning Administrator Kristy Clark, Attorney Coombs, Shay Stark with Aqua Engineering, Fred Roberts, Kerri Anderson, Frank Anderson, Debbie Spilman, Mike Colson, Wade Sandberg, Barry Bunderson, Marla Spencer.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. Proposed Amended general plan.

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. and called for comments.

Frank Anderson stated his name to the Commission and said: I've lived here probably 45, 47 years. I moved into Salt Lake for a couple years after I got married, but didn't enjoy it; it was too busy for my lifestyle and with what I wanted to do. I keep hearing talk about rural atmosphere and what they want to do with this plan. To me rural is the country, I mean five, ten, 15, 50, 100 acres of farm ground. We're talking hay, grain, corn. That's the country to me. See the mountains. I don't want to walk out my back porch and see the neighbors putting their shirts on in their bedrooms. That's what you get in Salt Lake City. I don't want that. If people want that, go to Salt Lake City, go to Ogden, go to Utah Valley. That's kind of where I'm at.

Jaime thanked him for voicing his opinion.

Marla Spencer stated to the Commission: I'm Marla Spencer. We moved out here probably 25 years ago from West Jordan, which was a small rural community at that point. We moved from there because it got to be so big. We looked all over from Ogden to Lehi and decided on Grantsville because it was a place we wanted to raise our kids. We had two girls. One was starting in kindergarten and the other one was in fourth grade. Grantsville was just, I don't know what to say, it was just THE place. When we got here, it was amazing. The girls did wonderful. They did their sports, they did junior jazz, they did all the things that they'd never be able to do in, I believe, in Salt Lake. Now, I have grandkids that are here in Grantsville, which I would like them to be able to do the same things that my girls were able to do. I guess my first question on this would be when you say "a future general plan", what does future mean? Does that mean tomorrow? To the community, as far as

I'm concerned, I need to know what that means. We bring in quite a few developments. Right now, half-acre seems to be the big one. Just like Frank said, I agree with him, I don't think that's rural community. There's a little board outside that says "country is living" or whatever it says right there. It does mean country. We're not Tooele, we're not Stansbury, we're certainly not Salt Lake. The reason we came out to Grantsville was to live that life. I want to retire here. I want to be able to do all these things. I also really, really want my grandkids to be able to do things. I don't know with the development we have planned if we have schools or street signs yet. I work in Salt Lake every single day. I drive there, I don't know if all of you do, but what used to take me 45 minutes is now taking me 90 to 100 minutes to get home. It's really difficult even to make these meetings at seven o'clock. You probably know that you have to leave a little early to get off at five. I can't make it here at that time. So anyway, I guess what I'm saying is the rural community is what I moved out here for. It's what I long for. My husband came from a little town of 200 people out in Missouri. That's kind of what we wanted to do. This was our settling point. And Grantsville has just been wonderful for the past 25 years. So, I just want you guys to consider that. Thank you.

Kerri Anderson stated to the Commission: My name is Kerri Anderson. I kind of go along with these guys. I've lived here my whole life. We did move to Salt Lake for a couple of years. I'm saying that they can go to Stansbury. They have the smaller lots. They can go to Tooele, they have the smaller lots. We have a field behind us where they cut grass. I hear people complain about allergies or hay fever. I have it too, but guess what? I love this town. That's why I'm here. I talked to Kristy yesterday a little bit, and she said that there is one subdivision with one acre or larger lots that has two lots left. Everything else is a half-acre or smaller lots. What are we doing to our town? We have plenty that are open right now, already ready and in the plans to build. Why don't we slow down? See if our roads can handle that? Our police department, can they handle it? Can our schools handle that? Can our sidewalks? We don't have sidewalks to all of the schools yet, and yet you're wanting to put more children on those roads that are very busy to get to school and we do not have the sidewalks or the infrastructure yet. Can our water handle it? There are so many different things. We're going to need stoplights. It's going to change the way our town feels and that's not what I'm here for. Thank you.

Mike Colson stated his name to the Commission and said: I'm guessing two-way to talk on the PUD because you guys actually had a work meeting at 6 to do that. I've never heard of having a public comment at a work meeting before, but I thought it was going to be at 7. I'm 100 percent for the changes that are proposed on that PUD. As far as our general plan and moving forward, we're leaving two groups of people out. We're leaving our young people who have no place to live and we're leaving our retired people who have no place to go either if they wanted to move down in size or go into some other type of a smaller community. Having been on City Council for eight years, I've heard numerous people coming in and saying that we want to keep Grantsville small. It's interesting how a lot of people who moved here are the ones who say "let's shut the gate behind me and I don't want anyone

else moving in here because I want to have my open fields and I want to have this stuff.” That's not reality. What I'd really like to see with our general plan is to try to make sustainable communities and sustainable subdivisions where you're going to start trying to minimize the water usage to conserve our resources. I would just emphasize that we need a place for our young people. My kids can't afford to live out here because all we have are half-acre lots. It seems to be what you do out here in Grantsville. That seems to be a good compromise that's still some open space, but that's not a realistic, sustainable future. I think we need to look into flexibility of living spaces here because we're not going to be able to just shut the door on people. Personal property rights are going to prevent or allow people to develop property and you know as well as I do that that can't be stopped, but we can control it and do it smartly. Thanks.

Jaime asked if anyone else would like to be heard.

Fred Roberts stated to the Commission: Hello. I'm Fred Roberts and I live down on South Hale. I've lived there for about 50 years. So I'm old. I'm concerned. Grantsville has a code out that says it's titled "Nuisance.” And I'm just looking around and I've seen that it's very bad in the last 50 years I've lived here. I took this little survey back in '17 and all these people were all as concerned as I was as to what's going on just within my little area. But the people that orchestrated this document ought to be commended; they've done a very, very, good job. I've worked in this area for 30 years with the federal government and this document is very good. It says here they have an office for an inspector. That's all good, but I believe, due to all this, we need more inspections made. I just go through the town and I see things that are fire hazards. Right now we're in the middle of this firecracker season and if something goes up, they're not going to be able to put it out by the time it burns somebody's house down. So I think if we go by this document board, it's very good and it tells us what to do and who's responsible. It talks about wrecked vehicles sitting in the yard. I see this all over town. Why is this? There are a lot of licensed vehicles sitting on City property. I know they've been there for 30 years or 50 years, as long as I've been here. I'm asking why, you know? Anyway, I don't want to throw any stones at anybody. I think on the general plan here, we ought to be looking at this and thinking of doing more inspections or something that precludes fire hazards. Thank you.

Jaime asked: Anyone else like to be heard?

Barry Bunderson stated to the Commission: I'm Barry Bunderson. I moved here in 1994. I like that we have some maps for recreation, ordinances, and open space. But we need to dip our toes into reality, which is that we want all of these amenities, but certainly they cost money, right? The City has to maintain them. There's infrastructure that needs to be put in, and I know this General plan doesn't necessarily address that, it just makes plans for those kinds of amenities and where they all go. The other thing is that I like some of the changes we have. I like this town. It feels nice. It doesn't feel too busy. I'm not sure if open space and things

like that are directly connected to that, but there's a feeling here that I appreciate. There's also a balance of "if I don't want it to change then maybe I shouldn't have had any kids," right? "I don't want it to grow then maybe I shouldn't have populated the earth." So there's a balance of what we are going to do in the next 50 years and think "maybe they're not our kids, but they're somebody's kids" and as population growth, that's an exponential curve, it just keeps doubling and doubling and doubling. I like what we're doing and I like that there's a downtown plan. I made this comment before in other meetings that for now I think it's a good phase to get some attractions downtown. But sooner or later the traffic congestion, if everybody's trying to go to one spot for all those services, is just going to be like any other congested town. Also think about long term so that we have other commercial corridors and we don't have to go tear down 100 houses on the streets so that we can have some commercial space. I think that's maybe too far out for this time, but I think that's something that we need to be thinking about as well. Thanks.

Debbie Spilman stated to the Commission: Debbie Spilman. My husband and I moved away in 1994. We came back in 2000 and we opted to not move to Tooele because Tooele had just exploded. It was so huge compared to what it was like when we left in '94. I couldn't believe the changes in six years. We've lived here in Grantsville since 2000. We came out here because we like the small-town atmosphere. I'm realistic enough to understand that growth is going to happen. The Salt Lake Valley has completely filled up and there's no place for them to go except to come out west. They're going to come to Tooele County. They're going to come out to Grantsville. They're going to come all over the areas. We need affordable housing. We do need to be able to have a place where people's children can live. I don't have kids, but for those who have children and their kids grow up out in this area and they want to stay in the local area, there needs to be affordable housing. We need to have open space. We need to have green spaces and parks. We need to look at having a trail system. I love that we have gone to update the General plan and I think from this point forward, once the plan is adopted and approved, whatever the plan ends up being, we need to stick to that plan. I think development from here forward is someone wants to come in and look for a zoning change. Because I'm going to tell you quite honestly, I moved back here and came to some of these meetings and then I just quit coming to because they just seemed to be totally worthless. Then I started going to City Council meetings. For a long time, I felt like there was a rubber stamp. Someone comes in, they want a zoning change, approved. "I want to change this zone", approved. While I know there's a lot that goes on in the background and I know you guys do a lot of studying of it and you look at things that we don't see, it just felt like there was a haphazard "let's just approve whatever anyone wants, however they want it." Once this plan is adopted, from this point forward, unless we modify the plan, I think anytime someone comes in with a request to change zoning or to try to make any change or any growth that's outside of the plan, they should have to include in their proposal a justification for how that change is going to benefit the community as a whole. Before you guys approve it and before City Council approves it, there needs to be a discussion about that. Property owners have rights, yes. I have no right to stop

someone from selling their property. But we are a community and we have to look at the growth of that community. If I have a plot of land and I just want to sell it, but it is not in compliance with the way the General plan is and the future that we see for Grantsville City...If you disapprove my zoning, you're not stopping my right to sell my property, you're just stopping me from changing the plan when I don't have the right to change that plan. Once we approve this plan then it is everybody's plan. This plan won't belong to the City Council, it doesn't belong to the Planning and Zoning committee, it doesn't belong to the Mayor. It belongs to the City of Grantsville and all its residents. Thanks.

With no further comments, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

CHAIRMAN JAIME TOPHAM OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:20 P.M.

1. Consideration of the amended general plan for Grantsville City.

Jaime stated: Mike Hansen is here with us from Rural Community Consultants. He was the consultant that helped us develop this plan and he is prepared to present at this time.

Mike Hansen stated to the Commission and the audience: Sorry my back's to more people than it is to the front. I wanted to just give you a very brief overview of how we got to the document that you're looking at right now. It hasn't been a short road, but it's been a good one. So we'll talk about the process, some highlights, it's definitely not all the highlights, but some of the things we saw as definite themes that came out, and I want to spend some more time on the maps. As you know we did delay this hearing in the adoption process because there was some concern with the maps and we heard some of that again tonight. Maybe I could help clean up some of this confusion a little, or I'll just let you guys decide where you want to go with things. I'll talk, procedurally, very quickly about the next steps. Just as a reminder, we have been trying to involve the public as much as we can. I can tell you with other projects I do in the communities that they are not as active as Grantsville and that's a great thing. When we had that first open house, both Ben and I and our consultant team said, "Wow! Everybody here has something to say," which is great. So we did try to post everything on a central information hub. It's still there. I updated it again today. We'll let that stay open till it has run its course on that website.

This is very typical for any General plan. We started as a consultant team and we gathered everything we could find. Anything that had been written down, we started there and then we started to write that down in our words. It's a "are we hearing you" kind of thing in what we'd call a community assessment report. You can see that on the left side if you want to. I think my numbers might be out of order because there was a survey and we had a big public meeting over there in the auditorium. From that, we

came out with a draft. We posted that publicly, told everybody about it, and asked through surveying how close we are, and the comments that we got back were pretty good. I know there's what they call "planning fatigue" or "normal people don't live and breathe this sort of stuff every day" and so if a couple months go by they might lose interest or lose focus and not be as involved. But, the other way to look at that is if you have a drop in attendance, you also could say that people are feeling heard and not feeling concerned. For when we did our second meeting, we had half those people come to that, so we were fighting again. Then we had a third meeting in there specifically focused on maps, and again you're just getting less and less people coming with real big concerns saying "you completely missed the whole thing." That's where we're at now. We're on the draft. I would add that there's a number 10 which is after the planning commission. Say the planning commission loves it as is or whatever they want to do with it. The next step doesn't mean it's adopted. It means it goes to the City Council for their consideration. There are more steps but my slide's already got too many words on it. Zone highlights: we wanted a little clearer definition on who has what property rights. That's something that our team said too is that we need to do some more work on future projects as well. We are helping communities understand that this document that we're adopting is your vision, your advisory document. The zoning rules are your rules today, so if you come in with an application tomorrow, it needs to be checked against the zoning. Now again, the zoning rules need to be checked against plans. My understanding is that the City is trying to do what's right and you do the General plan first and then get the ordinances to tighten up. So that's that first bullet.

We also heard a lot about the retail situation and services. Not a lot of people are loving driving to Tooele or Salt Lake for certain things. I heard restaurants mentioned more times than I'll admit. When we started to float this idea of commercial notes, the biggest note you'd have in Grantsville of course would be in Downtown, but smaller neighborhood kind of notes. This is a corner market. This is not a large store. It's a corner market or gas station inside these large tracks of essential development. We tried to incorporate that but we gave the City a lot of flexibility because we know the market needs a lot of flexibility to make that work. What we also heard are some concerns that are a little outside of city purview directly and that is schools. Cities don't have jurisdiction over schools in Utah, so the City's strategy needs to be to continue to work with the schools. From what I've heard, the schools and cities have a pretty good relationship now. That can only be enhanced. That's a very wise thing to do. I know I did some consulting for a town up in Cache County and they were informed that there was a high school that was coming in on their major road. They had no idea the thing was coming. It required a bridge and all kinds of stuff. The school district just kind of didn't tell the town or the town didn't listen when they told them. Anyway, we think there's a need to continue that dialog with them.

Parks. That's always a very positive thing and I appreciate the comment about "and you've got to pay for parks," but strategically spreading out some of your parks and changing the types of parks you have, like pocket parks and you also have some plans for future trails, gives you an idea of what developments can help pay for these parks

and when. Then the last one is traffic. Of course the City is not UDOT and the City is not the County. Those are your big road-builders for arterials like this. There needs to be more study and everybody knows that. Coming into town is a lot of hoping you left early because that road's going to be congested there.

More highlights: we talked about delineated property uses. There wasn't a huge appetite in Grantsville for what we've seen in other more urban areas with "mixed use." That's where you leave the market to kind of do whatever as long as it's not out of control. We didn't hear that here. An example would be if you have a shop on the first floor but housing on the second floor. We didn't hear a lot of clamor for that. We heard "I want a quiet neighborhood. I bought a quiet neighborhood and I want to keep it that way." That kind of thing. You'll see that in the map. That's why our amenities designations are so long and linear rather than wide. Regarding civic gathering places, I'm sure the City if they have the budget would love to expand this park and town hall and all that kind of thing. We know there's demand for that so the City needs to not forget the civic and institutional land usage for the future. For dining and restaurants, everybody talked about a Costco, especially in the survey. So those were the highlights.

As far as the limits, there's a big concern about density and traffic. It's a concern that the Wasatch Front will just grow and absorb Grantsville and Grantsville will lose its more traditional small-town feel. We struggled with that concept of rural because that is in the eye of the beholder. There isn't really a good legal definition of that. It does seem like when we started talking about small-town feel, everybody started to nod their head. We thought, "We're getting closer. That's a little better." Nobody was a big fan of unplanned, reckless multifamily housing. They don't want giant apartment complexes with one entrance and exit. Nobody's excited about that. We didn't see a lot of demand for the small lot. There seemed to be a thought process of, "Well if we have to have townhouses here, maybe those, but not really small house lots." With some of the recommendations of affordable housing, with the economy, we want to have large lots and an open community but we also want it to remain affordable. That's outside the control of the town, those are some of the recommendations which just happen to be mandated by the state. We wanted to comply with that, but I think we did it in a way that will work for Grantsville, still preserving large lots but adding housing options as well. As we said earlier, connecting the amenities is a critical recommendation. One of the things I love about Grantsville is that we talked about trails and every town wants to talk about trails, but when I got to Grantsville, they said it wasn't just for kids who walked to school or joggers in mornings, or things like that, it was "I need equestrian trails so don't get rid of those." I thought that was pretty cool. We don't get that a lot. Even in some of the small towns, they don't seem to think about that. We talked about this alternative transportation a little bit already. Your alternative transportation chapter does talk about equestrian which is pretty awesome. Another recommendation you'll see in the plan is "community character is important." The problem is that character is hard to define and again is in the eye of the beholder. Do we go with the downtown? Do we go with a Costco complex? What about the outskirts of town? It's hard to define in a town as large as Grantsville, but I think we

did it. It's in the early part of the plan.

Then we did it here and I know this isn't a land use issue but it was more of a procedural issue is more transparency and better communication. I know it's really hard to do because everybody's so busy to pay attention to what a town is doing and it is not always the first thing in mind, I'm sure. But we think that's a good recommendation. Another one: sustainable development. Water. Regulated water rights in your statewide or state-level. And UDOT does your major highways and freeways and interchanges and so forth. We do need to keep that in mind. Locally as well. And what things you can do to make sure you don't have water shortages that you talked about and experienced recently and kind of find a way to get in front of all that traffic.

Well, here are the maps and hopefully these are boring. You'll see big blocks of land that match the key here, and you can get all this online where you can download it and see it normally. Here is a significant change: this kind of brownish color here is a flex zone. It's not sited as mixed use, but it provides that flexibility that could go a few ways, but it does seem like there's some demand for something with a little more intensity there, especially if you hook in that highway. So we left the town with flexibility to do what they want to do when things ripened in that area. Then you'll see in the maps when you go look at the other versions that we did come up with these notes. The green stars are to find a way to get a park or an open space amenity or something like that. Red is an indicator of a good space, generally, for most commercial notes we're talking about. We've called out the downtown area and that's my partner in this project, that's his expertise. He's all over the nation doing this kind of work where he focuses on downtowns and that's the refinement that he came back with. I think in the last time we looked, this gray also has some more flexibility in it. We talked to property owners here and they liked that change a lot. They also put blue on the correct parcel for the city hall - I think that was the mistake. But again, you can kind of see what we were trying to show with our map - it doesn't follow parcel lines. That's deliberate in the future line of this map because what we're trying to do is see patterns. We're trying to say that here's the goal, the vision. Not your property rights as dictated by this map. That's your zoning stuff, that's a little different. I know you need to be consistent with the plan but at least it gives you a way to be consistent with the vision if something needs to go a little bit one way or the other. That was probably pretty vague. That was planned this week, sorry.

Next up, our consulting team has asked that the planning commission consider it tonight and get us the recommendation soon. Again, it's a living document, it's an advisory document. It doesn't change anyone's property rights, or I would suggest, property values that much. What it does is it lays the groundwork for your future work with your infrastructure and your zoning and other capital investments and things like that. If we got those comments by the end of this month, we want to give it back to the City Council, assuming the comments aren't too significant through August. That's the plan. I think that's all I've got.

Jaime stated: So I've participated in about all of this, so I probably have the fewest questions at this point, so I'll turn it over to my other commission members. For questions or comments, now's the opportunity to ask Mike for any clarification.

Gary asked: Are you looking for us to compare something and then send that back to you by the 29th?

Mike Hansen: Yeah so statutorily, and I don't know how everyone else wants to go, but I can tell you the state minimum requirements. Every town has to put their draft general plans through the planning commission. And the planning commission doesn't approve or deny it. What they do is they make a recommendation to the City Council. So, you could take this document and say every word of this is perfect and recommend approval to the Council and they could deny it. They could do whatever they want. Or you could say "fix page 5, 6, and 7." Or you could just do nothing with it. As a team, we've had public surveys and we've seen interests start to quiet and the comments that were coming back were consistent at first and now they're just scattered. As consultants we just kind of have to make the best guess and break the tie. That's the document you have in front of you.

Gary asked: So if the changes are recommended it won't come back here?

Mike Hansen: No. Unless you don't formally act on it, it would go to the Council. Did I say that right? I don't think I said that right. Once you make a formal recommendation, then you're done with it. And you don't have to make your recommendation tonight. We would recommend you do, of course. We like your plan. But it's your plan though.

Jaime asked: And if we don't make the recommendation then it would come back to us with all of your changes before it goes to City Council?

Mike Hansen: Yes. And you could do this. I had a general plan for a town and I just found out they forgot to adopt it. It went to the planning commission, they just never got it on the council agenda, and I moved on. Anyway, you can do what you need to with this. The City Council, I don't know what they would do, if they wanted to adopt, then you'd give it to them. I don't think that's happened, but anyway, statutorily the City Council is looking for your advice on those documents.

Jaime said: Shay Stark from Aqua Engineering has reviewed it, he's our city engineer for the project and I had an opportunity to read through some of it, and from his recommendations I think that there're some changes that I definitely agree with. He had a different perspective. If you want to go to page 14 under the threats. So one of the threats is a lack of adequately trained workforce to support further development necessary to create a sustainable community. He says, "I believe that this statement "a lack of trained workforce" is disingenuous to Grantsville. I actually really agree with that statement. This is our plan for the future and it would be important that we aren't putting our community in a negative connotation. I think we need to change that.

Mike Hansen agreed.

Erik stated: I don't think it needs to be changed, I think it needs to be gone completely. I don't think there should be any mention at all whether it's adequate or diverse. It just comes across as very negative.

Mike Hansen agreed.

Jaime said: I don't think it's actually accurate either, or true. And a lot of the people that live in our community are working professionals. They're commuting. We have a lot of trained workforce. We just don't have the jobs and employers here yet.

Mike Hansen agreed.

Jaime then said: There's another comment for page 23 and 24 which is the future land use map. Maybe this got changed, I'm not sure, let me look. It's talking about how large lot residential is shown in the flux area and that's currently zoned for mining. We definitely don't want to be mixing those things. Shay, was your comment based on what's currently in front of us?

Shay Stark replied: My comment was based on the plan I was given Friday, which I believe this is what we have here. Yeah, I don't think we changed it.

Jaime said: I think you were probably referring to this little corner of yellow.

Shay Stark said: What I'm referring to is that whole flux annexation area. Right now we've got a temporary CUP in place for somebody who's trying to finish off the process to get a full CUP for a gravel pit that is in that larger green area, right in the middle of the flux area, up on the hill. It's probably a third of that green area that's shown there. The other piece, that's located to the far north, if I understand correctly, is owned by the active mines that are right to the west of it.

Gary said: I think they are.

Shay Stark: My recommendation right now is to keep that flux area the way the land use currently shows it and then let's let things play out for the next few years. The other concern that I have is that we go in and we show this on the land use with residential, commercial, and all this, and we have no infrastructure out there. If we have somebody come in out there, we've got to build a new sewer treatment plant down at the north end of the flux. We don't really want to do anything to promote growth of development if it's going to require additional, very expensive infrastructure. You say to them, "Great, provide your own water, you've got to treat your own water." And they'll either come in and do it or they won't. It's a little bit of a different story with residential and commercial.

Jaime: Thank you, Shay.

Mike Hansen: I'd love a redline version of that map. I remember we changed that area in the last meeting, but I don't know if we hit the target in that sense. Great. It's a good comment.

Gary said: I've got enough redline comments here to last us till Friday. So firstly I would like to take the 29th to at least do a color copy of what I have here and give it back to you. I, like Shay, have seen a lot of things here that aren't consistent with what is currently going on in the City with regards to this proposed plan, especially in the northwest side of town here.

Attorney Coombs asked: Why have we set the 29th as the date that we have to have all this done?

Gary said: He gave it to us.

Shay said: Council packet, something.

Jaime said: So, it's currently on the council agenda for review, then the other consultant is going to be available to address with the City Council on the seventh. It's only for discussion on the seventh. So I think we have to have all the changes and everything to have that by the 29th. So, I guess the question is if we're wanting to make all of these changes, then we can't really take formal action tonight, which means it can still move to City Council for discussion because it's not going to be for approval.

Kristy said: That was kind of going to be my question. Could we get all the changes to you before the City Council meeting on the 21st? We would need all our comments by the 16th of August. We would need it to them before then so they can submit the updated draft to City Council by the 16th of August. If we did the 8th or the 2nd or the 9th to rural communities, then they could probably generate the changes pretty fast.

Mike Hansen: The 2nd works for me. Why don't we get them?

Councilman Neil Critchlow stated: I'd like to see it come back to you guys personally because you're our body to make these kinds of decisions and I'd like to see you guys discuss this one more time and go over the changes together.

Attorney Coombs stated: I agree with the councilman. My advice would be to not rush it to try to get it into a certain deadline. Let the City Council work out what they need to work out. You guys take the time that you feel is necessary to do whatever you need and then when you feel comfortable with it, then you send it on. The City Council cannot put a deadline on you to have it in.

Jaime said: I think that's accurate, but I think it's good to have a deadline so that we get it done and it's just not lingering.

Gary said: I think that we can probably respond easily within the 29th and address the comments and bring it back here.

Mike Hansen added: Sure. Especially if these are the types of comments we're going to get. That's awesome. Those are the good ones. That's the stuff we're looking for in addition to those.

Erik said: One question just to understand about when we actually say, "This is approved. This is now the General plan, the document that's going to be the official document." I'm looking at the draft and there are a lot of things. I would not want to see the analysis that was done in 2019 sitting out there till the next one's done. I guess, where is it that, "Hey here's the general plan that's really the plan and here's the stuff that we used to create it." It just eliminates that concern. I don't want it out there five years and someone is looking at it for whatever reason and that's not us anymore but they still see that as a weakness or a threat. I think there's a lot of things in the early pages.

Mike Hansen said: Things that were included in the assessment material. It's not the plan, it's justification of the plan.

Erik said: Right, it's what we need to help understand this but it's not going to be in the final document.

Mike Hansen said: Yeah. Appendix.

Jaime said: I was just going to say that we could just move all that to the appendix.

Mike Hansen: We can totally do that. I do that in some of my other plans where they want a reading system to find.

Erik said: I think that would be great. Another thing, as I look at the zoning and the areas, there's a lot of area that looks like it's half acre lots. Two per acre, the yellow, that is most of the undeveloped, available area that's kind of south. Is that really based upon what you were hearing people say that that's as small as we want to go?

Mike Hansen: To answer that question, it depends on who you're talking to.

Erik said: Exactly and it is. We've heard a lot about affordable housing, but we want large lots, and those don't make sense. As we've heard from some of the public, my kids that are still young, if we continue this, can't afford it. I started on what I thought was a big lot; I was on a quarter acre. I managed to get one of the few quarter acres in the development. There's no way I could be where I'm at today whenever I built the

first place. That's my concern is that I look at this and say that the only places that new developments can go in are half acres. No one's going to be able to do that because with the smaller zonings, there's no land available.

Mike Hansen: Exactly. That trade-off is one that every town and state is wrestling with. Just trying to figure out where and how.

Erik said: I would like to see maybe a little more of that area and be able to have some smaller things.

Jaime said: I know that in the different public meetings I was at and listening to the comments, they did want it scaled back and they didn't want to have the smaller acreage in such big periods, they wanted to leave it as half acre lots. That's the communication from the people that actually attended the meeting. If you read the survey, a lot of it is about wanting larger lots and less people and more open space but also more amenities.

Erik asked: I'm just curious, how many people responded to this survey?

Mike Hansen: Yeah it was crazy. My email list for this outreach group is 430, which is pretty good for people that say, "No, I literally don't want anyone to talk to me. Send me an email." We have that in the appendix where we show the survey results.

Jaime said: There were actually quite a lot of people who responded in those three days. You just have it as a hyperlink in here. Anything else to add that would direct us to what to be looking at in the next meeting? Jacob?

Attorney Coombs asked: I did have a question: why is the city cemetery not marked as municipal?

Gary said: Whether you should have it as this downtown deal, the Clark Farm, the city cemetery, the portion of city ground, North Clark Street, a whole lot of municipal that's not called municipal. There are a couple of pieces marked in blue, I don't know.

Jaime asked: Are you talking about the ones right on Main Street?

Gary confirmed: Yes.

Mike Hansen said: Yeah, we're missing stuff on that for sure. That better get fixed. Those were good comments.

Jaime asked: Shay, do you happen to have those maps that marked where the different municipal areas are that you can send to the consultants?

Shay Stark responded: I'll look and see what we have and then I'll definitely get with somebody here and we'll make sure we get them good information on what properties

are considered part of that. How are schools being designated?

Jaime said: That would be helpful. I don't know that they're specifically designated.

Mike Hansen said: I don't think they're called out.

Gary said: I would think that green parcel right in the middle is the high school.

Erik said: It's the high school and I think the city park. It stops short of the park – it only goes to Cherry.

Mike Hansen asked: So include schools in civic? Is that what I'm hearing?

Jaime said that would be helpful. Everyone agreed.

Attorney Coombs added: There is one other note to consider if the planning commission is going to consider this further. I would counsel you guys to look at the Utah code, section 10-9a-403 if it's delineated some in this plan, but it particularly provides guidance to you as a planning commission on general plan preparation and what you are required to have on a general plan that you recommend approval for. Particularly there's a whole section in there on moderate income housing that we had some discussion on but I'm concerned that it didn't cover everything that we need to cover in that code section. So, I'd counsel you to take a look at that and see if you think there are any changes that should be made to that.

Mike Hansen said: Okay, let's look at that for sure. We have an alignment for this message about this in the appendix, but yet again you have to click into it so if you printed this you can't view it. We'll look at it as well and make sure we type that up.

Attorney Coombs said: This is all kind of new, but there's a whole list of things that you should consider in those moderate income housing areas.

Jaime asked: Didn't we have to specifically take three different plans which we did?

Mike Hansen answered: You have to show where employment and housing are and the connection between the two. Major employers, major residential areas, and how you're going to get people from A to B. You also have some population mass to look at, with that same center ability, after transportation.

Attorney Coombs stated: My biggest concern that I have in reviewing is in 10-9a-403-2.b.2 it says that "in drafting the moderate income housing element, the planning commission shall include an analysis of how the municipality will provide a realistic opportunity for the development of moderate income housing within the next five years." I think that that specifically needs to be emphasized a little bit more. What exactly are we doing within the next five years? Not just as a general plan but within the next five years how is this general plan going to help the city get more moderate incoming housing? Just by statute we're required to do that.

Erik asked: So as we're looking at that, is it going to define what moderate housing is?

Mike Hansen said: It's a formula based on an area median income and other things. It's very prescriptive, the state code, the five-year part, I agree. I'm starting now to step back and I don't know that we put in a step-by-step tactical planning to turn in to the state.

Attorney Coombs said: You have to catch up after your steps and say, "Here are some things you could do, but the statute says we need to have a five-year plan in what we will do."

Mike Hansen said: Alright.

Jaime asked: Any other concerns? Any further discussion? Do we need to table a discussion?

Attorney Coombs said: It's on for consideration today, right? So you will need a vote to table it, and then it'll be ready for next meeting.

Erik said: Sorry one quick thing - you said red stars are commercial? And then green are the open space?

Mike Hansen verified: Correct. Open space, parks. I think it's a list we'd call trail heads.

Jaime made the motion to table the consideration to recommend approval to amend the general plan for Grantsville City. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Jaime made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Jacob seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

Kristy Clark
Zoning Administrator