

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 12/12/2019.

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 Jacob Linares, Commission Member Erik Stromberg and Commission Member Brian Pattee. Also present were Zoning Administrator Kristy Clark, Attorney Coombs, Shay Stark with Aqua Engineering, Fire Marshal Brad Clayton, Jennifer and Kelly Ross, Cole Ross, Guy Brown, Mike Johnson, Kaylie Buhl, Allison Crosby, Camille Curtis, Theresa Critchlow, Eric and Susan Johnsen, Keith and Robin Dodge, Kelly and Kelly Clark, Kolten Kinsman, Michelle and Paul Callister, Roger and Annette Haynes, Antoinetto Romano, Craig Turner, Gerald Webster, Terry Anderton, V Anderton, Scott White, Heather Pattee, and Dana and Steve Lee.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a. Proposed Rezone of 9.64 acres for Adam Nash located at approximately 265 North Cooley Street to go from an A-10 zone to an R-1-21 zone.**

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

Mike Johnson: I own property, approximately 36 acres to the east of this rezone proposal. I just first one to start out, I'm against the half acre zones. I think the one-acre zone is more applicable to that area. We've got developers that have developed. Joe Cange did one acre lots. Ken Hale did five acre lots, and myself, I did two and a half acre lots. I've been around Mr. Nash for a bit and I know he knows the infrastructure and how he's going to do that but I just want to talk about a little bit of the structure that he has no control over. Grantsville City has control over. And that would be Cooley Street, going north. As you go down there farther, it goes into, basically, a one lane road after the asphalt. And if anybody spends any time down there, which I used to walk down there a lot, it's a zoo down there from, 6:00 to 8:00 in the morning. I think we've got to consider the traffic in that area and what it has been zoned for and how the housing fits that area. Thank you.

Susan Johnsen: My name's Susan Johnsen. I live at 291 North Cooley Street. I'm also opposed to changing the zoning from agricultural to R-1-21. That area of town, like Mike said, it's just not that kind of a neighborhood. I just want to preface what I'm going to say by saying that if any of this comes off irritated, I'm not irritated at any of the members of the commission. It's the situation only and I appreciate what you guys do. The access is Cooley Street. At the moment, Cooley Street is a narrow road where people walk, ride horses, kids ride their bikes, they play out there all the time. It's a quiet street. I mean, trying to make that into an access for more houses, would be a nightmare to the people who live there. On the future land use map that I saw online, it seems like after the new master plan is adopted that that area of town is going to be zoned for one to 10 acre lots, which I feel is much more amenable to the neighborhood. I'm asking for this to be tabled until after the new master plan is adopted because I think it's morally reprehensible to try and squeeze in a zoning change with the knowledge that that is going to change. One of the main purposes for having a master plan is to help Grantsville establish its identity. Can we please

stop letting developers who only have money invested and not any emotional investment to the neighborhoods, can we stop them determining what our neighborhoods should look like? I'm not saying I'm against change and development. I know it's going to happen. There's no way of stopping that, but let's just wait for the master plan to make those kinds of changes. As much as we'd like it to remain a field, we know that that's pie in the sky. But planned and controlled growth and low-density housing with large lots is more acceptable than having high-density housing and much more acceptable to the people who have already built a life there in this quiet little neighborhood. Thank you.

Camille Curtis: Hi, my name is Camille Curtis. I live directly across the street from this lot and my family's been there for over 100 years. I live in my great-grandmother's house and I have wanted to live down there my whole life, spend the rest of my life there. My daughter just built her house behind me on my family land. I'm just asking you not to change the way it feels down there. I mean, let's put several homes over there, but nothing like what he's wanting to do. Thank you. Jaime stated, Camille, you submitted an email, as well. Did you want to have that read into the record, as well? Or, are you happy with your comments tonight? Camille asked Jaime to please read her email into the record.

Jaime read into the record an email from Camille Curtis: My name is Camille Curtis. My family has lived down Cooley Lane for over 100 years. I beg you to please keep the ruralness of my street. I own and live in my Great Grandmothers house, and I own my Great, Great Grandmothers house, it has always been really important to my family to keep our land in our family. My Mother's house is to the south of my house. My sister and daughter built their forever homes behind mine and my Mothers. I have never wanted to leave Cooley lane. Please help me to keep it that way. Please don't change our way of life just to pad the pockets of some (not from a Grantsville developer). Thank you for your consideration and your service.

Antoinetto Romano: I apologize. Mine is a little long-winded, but I will do my best. My name is Antoinette Romano and most people just call me Annie. I'm a resident on Cooley Street and the property in question adjoins my backyard. I'm against the re-zoning of the agricultural land behind me for several reasons. Before I get to those, if I could just make a recommendation? Having the applications and the zoning code available only Monday through Friday from 9:00 to 4:00 at the City Building doesn't really work people who are at work. So, if we could maybe have those available at the library or online so everybody could look at them? I know that we are not currently discussing the RM-7 zone, but I just have a quick question on that. If someone could just tell me when that was rezoned? I came down to the city twice now and I just happened to miss Kristy both of those times. The only answer I was able to get was, "Well, it's been that way for a while." I'm just kind of a curious person by nature, so I would just like to know when that was re-zoned and if we can't actually see the petition and the approval for that, I would say that we put it back into agricultural zone. And then, just to clarify some things because I was confused, I heard that there was going to be a sewer system and the only reason that we needed to install that sewer system along Cooley was for the benefit of the new subdivision. There was talk that the residents that are currently hooked to septic would be allowed to remain on septic in perpetuity if their units are properly maintained. Is that correct?

Jaime Topham stated, that's not a question we can answer.

Antoinette continued, well, then, I am going to highly suggest that if we are forced to hook to sewer, then that needs to be considered an impact fee and given to the developer, not to the residents. According to Grantsville's Community Vision Statement, and I quote, that, "Grantsville is a community that preserves values and provides an improved quality of life for its residents." Rezoning/sub-dividing land does not support the goal of this statement. It definitely improves the quality of life for the developers, but the statement doesn't say "improvements for developers." It also doesn't say "improvements for future residents." It says "residents." We are the residents, and we are right here, right now, voicing our concern. I have spoken with over 30 of the residents between Hale and Cooley Street who have either shown up tonight or have added their names to this petition stating that we do not want to rezone and to add housing developments. While I know a single sheet of paper cannot convey each person's opinion, it should be noted that they do agree with the following statement: "We do not want agriculture land rezoned into smaller residential lots." Could you explain to me, then, how this rezone can move forward if all of the neighbors here today who are residents of Grantsville say no, but one person who is not a member of our city thinks he can tell you guys what to do and us how to live our lives? Additionally, as Susan mentioned, the proposed zoning change would not even follow the guidelines of the future land map. It says it's recommended of one dwelling per one to 10 acres. I would just like to say that I do not find fault with the sellers for wanting to sell their property. A million dollars is a lot of money and I hope it makes them have a very nice life. I do not find fault with the real estate agents who look to potentially make \$60,000 commission from this sale. And I truly do not find fault with Mr. Nash. He is just doing his job, a working cog in the system of property and land development. Where I do find fault is where greed takes first place and we no longer make a choice for the greater good. When a person's self-indulgence takes advantage of a community and when the people who are able to protect us somehow justify voting the opposite of the community's overwhelming, if not unanimous, response against the rezone and development of the land. My question to you, Mr. Nash, is when is enough going to be enough? How much money do you need to make off the backs of the citizens of Grantsville until you are satisfied? You have several developments here. You have taken from us, but what have you given to the city in return? I guess it only makes sense that until every piece of vacant land has houses, subdivisions, apartments, stores, or other buildings, a developer will be there. What do we want for Grantsville? I know that we have spent the last two years trying to figure out and develop a master plan for our city. We've had meetings and community participation and while we are making strides towards the plan, we are not quite there yet. I think there is still room for improvements with the overall plan. We know we don't want to be a bedroom community to Salt Lake, but that is what is happening as we continue to add house after house. What makes Grantsville, Grantsville is the openness we have, the friendships with our neighbors, the recreation, the farming, our livestock, and our horses. I mean, after all, we are the home of the Cowboys. Yet, with every rezone and every new subdivision that does not support our values and our way of life, we lose a little bit of what Grantsville was. Taking away from our agriculture land and open spaces is not the answer. Agriculture land is good land and it should be used as such. Once it is gone it is gone and we cannot make more of it. As the city slowly encroaches upon the land, we are not the only ones who lose our peacefulness. We are also displacing all of the animals. I chose the spot I live in because there was nothing behind my house but beautiful fields. If I wanted to live surrounded by houses, I would have stayed in a city. I made the choice to live where I live, surrounded by nature. It is not my choice to live surrounded by houses, but through rezoning and allowing houses to be built behind us, forcing someone else's choice upon us, that, my friend, is called a dictatorship. Some of the other concerns I have with approving this rezone are the

adverse effects on the residents, which include but are not limited to: Increased traffic on an otherwise small street, increased noise, disturbances, loss of privacy, and light pollution. It will visually change the character of our neighborhood. The smaller the lots, the more overbearing and out of character it will be, in terms of its appearance compared with the existing houses and their larger lots. The loss of existing views from neighboring properties would adversely affect many residents. In addition to this, the discontent and hostility fostered between new builds versus the established residents would be a reality, as some of the established residents that I spoke to attempted to shame me, saying I probably live in Palomino. It is clear based on that statement there is still discontentment from the building of that development. If our goal is to promote community environment, we will not succeed as there would be an annoyance with the lifestyle between the new residents and the established residents, such as those who do not have animals or know what farming entails may become frustrated with the noise and smell. They could even accidentally hurt an animal or their selves by attempting to feed the animals, throwing items into their pen, or trying to pet an animal. A rezone and development would place undue stress on our community and further increase the competition for our limited resources. So, what I'm asking you is: What is the better choice here? I guess that depends on who you are and what you're getting out of it. If you're the one getting money and then skipping town? Are you the one who gets to teach kids how to garden and raise horses? Are you the one who is going against all of our neighbors and friends? Or, are you the one who gets to leave a legacy of preserving the land and of the values? Thank you.

Kelly Ross: My name's Kelly Ross and I live directly across the street from your proposed land change. I can't follow what she just said but I agree 100% with everything she said. You can't have people coming in and what are they going to do? I came home a couple of weeks ago, there was a cow in my backyard. Not my cow. I laugh it off, but what's going to happen when somebody moves across the street? Some big cow gets out; they're not going to appreciate it. It's going to cause problems. It's going to affect my view. And I agree with her. I don't know when that first part of the property was rezoned. I never got a notice. Can we find that out? Does anybody know? **Jaime Topham:** That's going to take some research. I don't know that anyone sitting at this table knows at this moment. **Adam Nash stated,** I do know. **Kelly Ross continued,** I mean, I've only been here three years. **Adam Nash stated,** I'll address it when I come up. **Jaime Topham stated,** Mr. Nash is indicating that he'll address it when he comes up. **Kelly Ross asked,** you're Mr. Nash? **Adam Nash answered,** I am. **Kelly Ross stated,** nice to meet you. Please don't do this to us. **Jaime Topham stated,** let's keep it just the comments directed at us, please. Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Eric Johnsen: I live at 291 North Cooley. I want to oppose the zone change. That area on the map, the general plan that we've been working so hard at for the last couple of years, indicates larger lots, one acre through 10. I see no reason to hammer a square peg into a round hole. I oppose it.

Gerald Webster: My name is Gerald Webster. I live at 227 North Cooley. I'm not against growth and development, we need houses for our children. But I think that the development should be conducive and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, rather than putting a high-population density development right in the middle of a lower-density neighborhood. I don't think it's very compatible with the neighborhood. It needs to be more closely aligned with what is actually there, in my opinion. Thank you.

Kaylie Buhl: My name is Kaylie Buhl and I just barely built a house on 245 North Cooley. When I rezoned or subdivided my family property just a few years ago, my family wanted me to only get, like, a half-acre for my house because then more people could live on it. And so, we came here trying to do that and I didn't even have the option of doing smaller lots. That was a big no. "We cannot do it. You have to have an acre. You have to have a septic tank." So, I just put an \$8,000 septic tank with a really expensive pump that's going to pump it up into my septic tank if it gets backed up, so probably about \$10,000. So, if they bring the sewer down, I'm going to be out a lot of money when I wasn't even given the option to do a half acre. So, I'd like to know why I wasn't given that and all of Cooley Lane having to pay for the sewer to be brought down to my property, but he's able to do it. What's the difference? I had to comply with what's been around on Cooley Lane in the acre lots or more. I had to comply, so why doesn't he have to comply? That's what I'm confused about. **Jaime Topham stated,** Kaylie, thanks for your comments. You also sent in an email. Did you want me to read that into the record, as well? Or, are you happy with your comments tonight? **Kaylie Buhl answered,** I'm happy with my comments, but Allison Crosby is back there, and she would like you to read her email. **Jaime Topham stated,** very well.

Jennifer Ross: My name is Jennifer Ross. I live at 187 North Cooley. I don't really have anything else to add with what's already been said, just to add my agreement and let you know that I do oppose the rezoning.

Teri Critchlow: I'm not exactly sure how this works. My name is Theresa Critchlow. I live at 294 North Cooley, directly north of the field in question. It is next to my property on two sides. My husband and I wrote a letter and I just wanted to make sure that it makes it into record. We are both very opposed to this. We do not want it.

Jaime read into the record an email from Teri and Neldon Critchlow: To Grantsville City Council and Planning and Zoning committee, we would like to voice our opinion, questions and concerns regarding the application to rezone the land next to our property. The rezoning application is from Adam Nash for the land at approximately 260 North Cooley Street, Grantville UT 84029 to change to an R-1-21 zone. We are very opposed to this rezoning request. We do not want to see our neighborhood or the property next to us contain high density housing of any kind. The property around us are mainly one acre or more with many of the new homes being built on greater than one acre. We would like to see our area stay more rural and large animal friendly. Our neighborhood is currently very animal and child friendly. We as well as many around us own horses. Currently people can safely ride their horses up and down Cooley Street. As well as kids play and ride bikes on this street. If high density housing is allowed to be built here it will greatly impact the safety and general atmosphere of this neighborhood. The additional traffic would also greatly impact resources for our neighborhood. The additional street traffic will impact the road and require the city to do more maintenance. This has already been an increased need since the Palomino subdivision has gone in. We are also told that if High Density housing is build next door, that the city will have to bring the sewer up to that property. As tax payers we do not want the city to use resources for the installation and maintenance of bringing the sewer to this property, nor do we as tax payers do not want to pay for that. The homes in our neighborhood are on septic systems and do not want to be forced to hook in to a city sewer system and incur those costs. We feel requiring current residents to do this is wrong so that a developer can profit. We feel this zoning change

would be done strictly to benefit the developer and not the city, the residents and tax payers of this neighborhood. We ask that you please listen to the residents, voters and tax payers of this area and not the desires of an outside developer. Thank you.

Dana Lee: My name is Dana Lee. I live at 325 North Hale Street. I just wanted to state that my husband and I moved out here about 11 years ago when we discovered this lovely valley. We have felt blessed ever since finding Grantsville and our home on North Hale Street. Because the properties have been open, large properties, we're on the smallest one, I think, on our street, you have vistas, you have views here, that are what make Grantsville quite quaint and people love it here because of that. And pretty soon, what you're going to make this into is what people were trying to get away from. So, they'll just move further out, maybe Rush Valley. You have a gem here and the north side of Main Street is that gem. As we watch the construction in the southern area of Grantsville, I wouldn't want to live there. That's what I left to come here to Grantsville. So, please keep that in mind when you're looking at changing the whole nuance and appeal of what's been existing in that neighborhood for quite some time. Thank you.

Craig Turner: I'm Craig Turner. I have the piece to the north of Adam Nash's. If you go half acre lots, is this going to be zoned for animals, and what are you going to do when the flies get up on the neighbor's property? We're going to have a problem with my animals. It always seems to be an issue as time goes on. Has that been addressed? **Jaime Topham stated**, he'll address the comments that we all have when it's his turn to come up and speak. If you have other comments, we'd take them at this time. **Mr. Turner stated**, that's it. I just wonder what they're going to do about the flies. It always seems to become an issue as time goes on. Thanks.

Jaime read into the record an email from Alison Crosby: Hi my name is Alison Crosby. I am writing to you to ask you to please reconsider the rezoning of the property on Cooley street. I have many concerns about this. I know that growth is inevitable but I don't think Cooley street is the right place to build town homes or break off small quarter acre lots. All of us that have lived on this lane our whole lives have only ever known open space, quiet strolls and a way of life that is low key. If you approve this kind of development you will be taking this away from us, not to mention the fact that this lane is nowhere even close to suitable for this kind of growth or traffic. I believe that the reason most people love Grantsville is because of its small town feel, the safety it offers and the quiet open space. You are changing everything that us longtime residents love about Grantsville by bringing in these small compressed subdivisions. I hope that you can consider how this will affect the people that have lived on this street their whole lives for generations, the fact that this street is not equipped for this kind of growth and that all of us chose to live here because we didn't want to live in West Valley City.

Jaime read into the record an email from Nancy J Clark: "Grantsville City Zoning Committee, I fully disagree with the request at hand to allow building in our agricultural neighborhood. It is time to stop the building of multiple homes in small areas. If the purchasers of the land and builders lived in our community, they would know that this part of town has always been for agriculture. For city dwellers who find agriculture a problem, shouldn't move to the west side of Grantsville. We already have enough cookie cutter

houses in our small town. And, where does the water come from for more housing? It seems that the only good that would come from this change is money in the pockets of the landowners and builders, leaving fields to grow produce or run animals is a far better choice than building. As a member of the neighborhood, I don't want any more traffic on our streets. This town is not set up for so much traffic. Bottom line, I do not want more building in this neighborhood. Thank you, Nancy J. Clarke."

Jaime read into the record an email from Justin Linares: Kristy and Planning Commission-I wanted to drop you an email stating my feelings in regard to the proposed rezone on the property on Cooley Street as I am unable to attend the meeting this evening. I currently own approximately 50 acres to the north of this piece of property. I am not opposed to the rezone; I would also be supportive of 1-acre zoning which I believe better fits the area. The current zoning of 10 acres is unrealistic when you consider the price of property and not to mention the cost of water. It continues to become more expensive and difficult to farm small pieces of property, I know firsthand as I have been farming these two parcels for 10 years now. When a citizen wants open space the only way to assure this is to purchase the property. As I read the flyer that was attached to the mail boxes in the area in several places it refers to "OUR" beautiful fields, these fields are not community property. Just as I would not refer to other people's yards as "OUR" yard. Development is a natural process as the community grows and there will continue to be in-fill, nobody gets to move in to the community and shut the gate behind them. I think the important consideration is to develop in a fashion that maintains the way the area has already been developed. I do have some concerns about irrigation, but I would think those could be addressed in the planning of the development if it makes it that far. Thank you for you reading my letter and the time that you dedicate to making Grantsville the great place that it is. Thanks.

Jaime read into the record an email from Peggy Ahlstrom: "Grantsville Planning and Zoning, this letter is in regard to the rezoning of lot A-10 zone at 260 North Cooley. I am against someone coming into our agricultural neighborhood and putting more housing in. Whether it be houses on small lots or apartments, I am against it and I feel it would be wrong to zone it so that it can happen. If it ever were to have houses on it, it should be at least five acre lots, which could be a small ranch or a farm. This area is now an alfalfa field and which it has been an agricultural lot for as long as I can remember. I have lived in my house for 45 years and I know it was an alfalfa field even before that. I am surrounded by farms and I enjoy the peace that it brings. I don't want it to change, as there is no way we can support that kind of traffic or noise. If there are going to be more apartments built, it needs to be on the outside of Grantsville's infrastructure. The only ones that would benefit from this change is the developer. Bottom line, I do not want more building in this neighborhood. Thank you, Peggy Ahlstrom, 266 West Clark Street."

Jaime read into the record an email from Mekenzie McMann: The final letter is from Mackenzie McMahon, dated December 12th, 2019. "To whom it may concern, regarding the consideration of property rezoning at 260 North Cooley Street. There are many repercussions of which I would like to inform you of that would negatively affect the residents nearest to the property and the community. There are safety risks that could affect the area and residents if the property were to be rezoned and homes built. It is apparent

what the repercussions could potentially be by looking at the houses and road near the property. The road has had dips that just got re-filled due to the severity of the issue a sinkhole. This is a large concern when proposing more traffic caused by new development. Some houses adjacent to the property have had to be re-leveled, due to sinking. This is a concern for the new area, as well, based on the map included provided by Tooele County. It is clearly the natural underground waterline that has been causing the issue most directly into that property at question. The property proposed and the sinkhole in that area should require an independent civil engineer to ensure the safety of the community before any rezoning or development is considered. A new subdivision or houses could bring families and children. There are also new concerns with this because there is no infrastructure for it. A lack of sidewalks, gutters, poor street lighting, crosswalks, could make it hazardous for children walking to school and back. The infrastructure of the new buildings would require a sewer line to be placed down the street. The current residents have septic tanks. They would be forced to connect to that new one at their own expense. Many people do not have the ability to come up with such a large sum of money. An independent environmental impact study would also be beneficial. The area is home to large herds of deer, a community of feral cats, and other wildlife that help maintain the balance of the ecosystem. Rezoning would displace these animals and crowd them closer to residents. The community has chosen to live in this area for rural living. Other parts of town that have introduced new subdivisions or high-density housing no longer have the home town feel and diversity. Preserving the different parts of Grantsville that showcase country rural living is something I believe we can all enjoy. Cooley Street provides a beautiful and quiet place for horseback riding, regular runs by the high school track team, and a calm and beautiful place to go for a walk. If we wish to preserve what everyone loves about this town, I hope we can protect the places of this wonderful community. Mackenzie McMahon."

With no additional comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

CHAIRMAN JAIME TOPHAM OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:32 P.M.

1. Consideration to recommend approval to amend the General Plan for Grantsville City.

Erik stated that on page 11, in the text, it says, "All the information and graphics outlined above..." Actually, I think it really should say below, not above. And then, I brought this up before, about the graphic, that the average spent on Mortgage and Basics Monthly is \$8,502. There's no data that supports this. I am wondering if we could just white that out somehow.

Jaime made the motion to recommend the approval to amend the General Plan for Grantsville City, based on the corrections that have been made, including the correction to page 11 to change the fourth sentence to change the statement, "All of the information in graphics outlined above are based on the information," to change it to say that it's below. And then, removing the green portion of the housing part of that graphic. And all other changes be adopted as they are. Jacob seconded the motion. Brian Pattee abstained. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Consideration to recommend approval of the Rezone of 9.64 acres for Adam Nash located at approximately 265 North Cooley Street to go from an A-10 zone to an R-1-21 zone.

Adam Nash was present for this item and stated to the Commission: Thank you Jamie and commissioners. My name is Adam Nash. I own Land Development LLC. I'm actually happy to be here tonight and receive the comments that we've heard. I get some of these comments every single meeting so I just want to go on record here. I've been developing property in this city since 1996. I own land and water here and I have a great deal of investment in this community. I don't necessarily line my pockets with money and run home. That's a fallacy. My grandfather was the principal of the school here in the 1920s. To go on top of that, the people that we're buying the property from, they're related to the lady out front that's on the horse in front of this building because they're related to Hilda Erickson, that's how they got their property. They've owned their property since the 1940s and they certainly should have the opportunity to be able to liquidate some of their property and enjoy it as other people have. The RM-7 zone, we've researched this on several occasions with the city on other parcels, including this one. There's a zoning map that was ratified that had been in place since the 1960s. It was put in place, though, at the last change at 1978. So, in 1978, when that zone and that map was ratified. A lot of talk about the master plan. My application does follow the master plan. The city's in transition, I understand that. But the current master plan shows this area as being single-family residential with a density up to two units per acre. So, it wasn't like I came in with this application, trying to force a bunch of changes on the neighbors or on the city. I'm just following the maps and the guidelines that are provided to me. And property owners try and sell their property, of course, at the best price they can, which is not a 10-acre hay field. I think everyone here understands that. I'm not opposed to a lot of the comments by the neighbors. I just take objection to some of those. Has everyone seen the plan? Kristy Clark stated, I didn't include it. They have all the other maps, just not the last one that you gave me. Adam Nash continued, okay, that's fine. The front nine acres across of the parcel is currently zoned RM-7. The back nine acres, and I'm just saying some rough numbers here, is zoned A-10. So, the way it sits, I can't use the property. It's not even a 10-acre parcel. Following that line of reasoning, develop the property on Cooley Street in the RM-7 zone and I'll be able to provide the buffer from the RM-7 to the A-10 zone with the R-1-21 zone. That was the reason of our logic. Understanding that and having worked on several other properties in the community, I do understand the need for the sewer line. The sewer line needs to be installed for this type of a development and also for future development. There's hundreds of acres there that's ultimately going to be developed. I don't know what the city's position is on whether people will be forced to connect to the sewer. I know that the health department would like you to, but I don't know if the city will enforce that. The city certainly is not spending any money on putting this sewer line in. This is all being done with private money. We have had a survey done of the property. We have had environmental assessment done on the property. We've had geo-technical studies done of the property. So, we understand very well the qualities of the property and what we're getting into, as far as developing. I think it'll be a nice community. I think it's a beautiful setting. I agree with the neighbors on all of that. I don't see the stretch of the R-1-21 zone. There are lots of properties up and down the whole neighborhood and up and down Clark that do not have even 10,000 foot lots. So, saying that I'm putting in

something that isn't already in the community, I think, is wrong also. I know this is a zoning hearing, but because just the back piece isn't zoned right, that's what we're discussing today is that back piece. But our plan is to come in with a subdivision plat for that front part and run our roads into the back part and develop that. I know the RM-7 has the provisions that if you wanted to, I guess you could build townhouses, that's not my intent. Certainly, that's in the zone. My intent is to do single-family homes. And so, for whatever that's worth. Someone mentioned something about throwing the zoning map away and just starting from scratch. The city attorney can tell you that we're pretty much vested in what we have and as the date of our application is to what's there. So, what the future brings, as a developer, we're guided by your maps and we appreciate the effort that's gone into it. It's a long way from where we were 25 years ago, no question. And I appreciate the opportunity to be here. Can I answer any questions? Jaime asked, how many acres is the proposed R-1-21 zone? Adam Nash stated, it's 9.64 acres. Jacob stated, there are two different numbers on the application. In one spot you have 16 acres. Adam stated, the total property is 16 acres and the property that needs to be rezoned is the 9.64. Gary stated, with regards to the RM-7, it definitely predates me and I've been here 15 years now. It's something that's grandfathered back, probably 30, 40 years. And our existing master plan does show potential half-acre lots there, so he's complying with the existing plan. Adam stated, I know for sure that the zoning map shows that zone clear back to 1978. A couple more things I can add. There was some question about water and irrigation. We have substantial water here in the city that is available for this type of development. I own several shares of Grantsville Irrigation water, and we have our underground well water rights, as well. Jaime stated, I've got to say I'm kind of leaning with the community. There are no other half-acre lots around there. The RM-7 seems really out of place but that's not changing and that's not what you're asking of us here. But, the half-acre lots are out of place. Adam asked, what would you prefer? Jaime answered, one acre lots. If you're going to do anything, Palomino Ranch is across the street with one acre lots. Adam stated, So, if I changed to one acre lots you'd be good with that? I don't really mind. I mean, I'm going to develop it in such a manner that we're going to have green space in our community, as well. I'm going to adhere to what we've been talking about for the last five years about putting in some community parks and things. I don't know what Mr. Johnson's going to want to sell his property for when it's time for him to move down the road. He might not like one acre lots. I don't know. Brian Pattee asked, What's the total acreage of both properties you've got? 16? Adam answered, We're about 17.29, I believe. I think that that comment is germane because the property owner with 50 acres of property right next door, Justin Linares, he's saying the same thing. He's saying he doesn't want to sell it as A-10 property. Jaime stated, I think his comment was actually for one acre lots. Adam added, he said he's not opposed to my rezone and he says that he would be supportive of one-acre zoning, that he thinks it might better fit. So, you guys want one acre? That's okay. I don't mind. Half-acre, I would have preferred. Gary asked, you could bring it back next month with that? If we table, it? Adam answered, sure. Take a table versus a denial? Of course. If I can negotiate something like that with the community, I'm happy to. I provided other plans to staff to take a look at to help guide on developing a rural development plan. It's okay with me. I'm just trying to do my job like everyone else that shows up at their job. This is just what I'm good at. Jaime stated, that's where I'm leaning is that I wouldn't recommend approval for the R-1-21. So, if you would not like a denial, then if you'd prefer a table? Adam stated, I'm not sure I'd get a denial, but I definitely don't want the risk. I'm happy to work on some more plans and show you what we're

thinking. Typically for a rezone we don't typically come forth with our plans, but I'm happy to. Jaime stated, that's understandable, but I think a lot of the thing about the community is transparency. They're wanting to see what's coming down the pipeline, what they're going to be dealing with next to worry about. The public tried to comment and ask how they see the plans. Adam stated that they would be made available through Kristy Clark at the City Offices. Jaime stated to the public, To the community, first and foremost, please don't speak out of turn. This isn't the public portion. This is the time for the developer to speak, but we do hear your concerns. There aren't any plans at this point because that's not where we're at this stage. Where he's at is asking for a rezone. So, he doesn't have to have a plan. What he's offering to do is put together sort of a plan so that the community can see what he's talking about. But he's not required to do that. He doesn't have to do so. If he does, then it would be made available before the next meeting.

Jaime made the motion to table the consideration to recommend the approval of the Rezone of 9.64 acres for Adam Nash located at approximately 265 North Cooley Street to go from an A-10 zone to an R-1-21 zone. Jacob seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Consideration to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Land Development, LLC. and Adam Nash for the creation of three (3) single family lots in the Ginny Lane Subdivision located at approximately 623 East Durfee Street in the R-1-12 zone.

Adam Nash was present for this item: Gary stated, when you were here last time, you and the neighboring subdivision, Mustang Ridge had a conversation about the development on Durfee. Adam stated, I've been working with Shay and GTM to tie in the sidewalk going towards Worthington. GTM's going to work on the balance of the front that's on Durfee between us. Shay stated, I've been in discussion with the mayor and with public works to make sure that everybody was comfortable with this concept. The mayor was excited about it because they're looking at trying to get a couple grants, to extend the sidewalk east on Durfee and this provides an opportunity to extend the sidewalk and get a section of it done without having to wait for grants. So, it fits in really well. I do want to point out one thing with this. Mustang Ridge, you've got sidewalk, you've got a new drainage, and you've got an extension of the pavement. The Ginny Lane should have the same thing. All we're talking about between Ginny Lane and Worthington is simply a sidewalk tying into Worthington's sidewalk with an ADA ramp right at the intersection, kind of like was done over on South Willow with the sidewalk projects. So, we're not seeing full improvement in front of those two lots with the street and drainage and that. We're just simply trying to extend that sidewalk out. Gary asked, those other two lots between Adam and Worthington are going to be sidewalk only? Adam answered, that is correct. When the minor subdivision was approved it wasn't a requirement. Gary asked, did the utilities get put in? Adam stated, ours are in. I don't know if the two lots that front Durfee in the Mustang Ridge got done. Shay stated, the city as they've been going through this project, have been working specifically with one person at Whitaker and have done several spots on Hale Street and several other places where they knew there were lots pending that they get those utilities in. All it took was a phone call so it should've been done.

Jaime made the motion to recommend the approval of the Final Plat for Land Development, LLC. and Adam Nash for the creation of three (3) single family lots in the Ginny Lane Subdivision located at approximately 623 East Durfee Street in the R-1-12 zone. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held November 14, 2019.

Erik made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held November 14, 2019. Gary seconded the motion. Brian Pattee abstained. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

5. Report from Council Liaison Member, Neil Critchlow. City Council Liaison Neil Critchlow was absent for this meeting.

6. Jaime made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:06. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

