

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 6/11/2020. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM.

Commission Members Present: Chairman Jaime Topham, Commission Member Gary Pinkham, Commission Member Brian Pattee, and Commission Member Erik Stromberg

Commission Members that were present on Zoom:

Commission Members that were absent: Commission Member Jacob Linares

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Zoning Administrator Kristy Clark, Attorney Brett Coombs, Grantsville Fire Marshal Brad Clayton, Shay Stark with Aqua Engineering, and City Council Liaison Darrin Rowberry

Appointed Officers and Employees that were absent or present on Zoom:

Citizens and Guests Present: Shawn Holste, Monte Kingston, Bill Castagno, Dustin and Kimber Neil, Mike Colson, Wade Sandberg, Barry Bunderson, Lindsay Nikolaus, and many members of the community attending the meeting through Zoom.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a. Proposed Animal Conditional Use Permit Application for William Castagno to keep up to 150 Cows and 5 Horses on his property of 10 acres located at 4778 Highway 112 in the A-10 zone.**

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

With no comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

- b. Proposed Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit Application for Lindsay Nikolaus to operate a hair salon business out of her home located at 535 West Cardon Ridge Circle in the R-1-21 zone.**

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

Chairman Jaime Topham read into the record an email from Mykenzie Nelson: My

name is Mykenzie Nelson and I live at 454 South Cardon Ridge Way. We just received a letter about an application received by our neighbor Lindsay Nikolaus for a hair salon business to be run out of her home. We wanted to let you know for the planning commission meeting that we don't have any concerns regarding this. We would be happy to have her be able to run her business from her home. Thank you, Mykenzie and Dustin Nelson.

With no additional comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

c. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg on the Presidents Park PUD Subdivision located at Worthington and Nygreen for the creation of two hundred and ninety-six (296) lots in the R-1-21 zone.

Chairman Jaime Topham opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m. and called for comments.

Chairman Jaime Topham read into the record an email from Joseph Cange: Clark Realty LLC owns 10 acres immediately south of the proposed Presidents Park PUD. After reviewing the plan, I believe this PUD creates an opportunity for the creation of an outstanding real estate development. If this opportunity is realized, it will be extremely positive for both Grantsville City and the neighboring properties. I request therefore that the PUD be approved.

Chairman Jaime Topham read into the record an email from Joshua Cummings: Greetings. First, thank you for volunteering your time and efforts on behalf of Grantsville City. I understand and appreciate that you dedicate a lot towards what you believe is good for the community. As a property owner in the area of the proposed Presidents Park PUD, I wanted to voice my support of the project. I believe that Mike Colson is genuinely concerned with putting out a good product. I reached out to Mike with some connectivity concerns. Mike listened to my concerns, explained his point of view, and we were able to come to common ground. I believe that he is looking out for the good of his neighbors as well as the future residents in his project. For that reason, I wanted my support heard and recognized. Thank you. Regards, Josh Cummings.

With no additional comments offered, Chairman Jaime Topham closed the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.

CHAIRMAN JAIME TOPHAM OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:06 P.M.

- 1. Consideration to recommend approval of the Final Plat for DRP Management, AW Hardy Family, and Monte Kingston on the Wells Crossing Subdivision Phase 3 located at Williams Lane and Hale Street for the creation of twenty-five (25) lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

Monte Kingston and Derek Ellis were present for this agenda item.

Monte Kingston stated to the Commission: I'm here on behalf of Mountain Vista Development. I believe Derek Ellis is here through Zoom in case we need to bring him in for questions.

Gary Pinkham asked: How are you going to fix the two issues that we discussed last week?

Monte Kingston answered: So Eric, our construction partner, has looked at the issue, and he's talking with Derek with Tycon. He stated that in phase two, we show minimum 12 inch under each pipe for the bottom of the catch basin. Any that are out of compliance will be fixed. We will meet with the City and make sure the City is okay with any changes that need to be fixed.

Gary Pinkham asked: Were they going to be brought into compliance with the APWA standards?

Monte Kingston stated: That's my understanding. The frustrating thing that I see in these situations is that developers pay the City quite a bit of money for their inspector to verify that those are there and catch them during that construction phase. They were inspected, and we thought they were in compliance.

Gary Pinkham stated: That doesn't relieve you and/or the contractor of complying with the ordinances and the drawings you submitted. When you build something that doesn't match the drawings, you can't blame the City for it.

Monte Kingston stated: Right. And I think you mentioned in phase one that there are no details on the storm drain boxes in those plans, but they did show it in phase two, showing 12 inches. It'll be addressed.

Chairman Jaime Topham asked: What's the difference between the maps that you provided us and the maps that were provided previously?

Shay Stark replied: So we were feverishly trying to get a few things addressed so I could provide you a clean memo last Friday. We had a meeting with the developer last week, and talking about what Gary brought up about this 12 inch on the sumps. And the details in the drawing package call it out, but we just wanted to make sure that it was detailed somewhere else, so that there's no question as the contractor hands out drawing pages to the people who are going to construct these that they would see that note so it wouldn't get lost. So they added a note, for instance on sheet C4 if you look at the middle of the page, over to the left, there are two boxes there. And the very bottom line they added in is with a one-foot sump below invert so that they know that they've got to have one foot of clearance between the bottom and the pipe coming in. I would have loved to have that by Friday, but it didn't work out that way and it ended up being the first of the week that they sent it in. I didn't realize that Kristy hadn't received a copy of it, or else I would have forwarded it on to her, and she would have gotten it to you earlier.

Gary Pinkham stated, on that same point, go to the cross-section that has been revised that reflects what James and the engineers said on their notes there regarding that sub-grade. It also shows the road face under the curb, which is required. So, they've cleaned that item up. Also, the item with regards to temporary diversion of the channel into the system- the only comment I'd make is on your slip whenever we have a rainstorm somebody needs to check that and clean that, and there needs to be a two-foot basin to trap sand.

Monte Kingston replied: Right, and we have a construction manager out there daily. So we'll bring this to his attention and make sure it gets done. This is our third phase, so hopefully it'll get better each phase, and cleaner. And just so you know we've got 22 out of the 27 lots in phase two that are already sold.

Gary made the motion to recommend approval of the Final Plat for DRP Management, AW Hardy Family, and Monte Kingston on the Wells Crossing Subdivision Phase 3 located at Williams Lane and Hale Street for the creation of twenty-five (25) lots in the R-1-21 zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Discussion of a Concept Plan for TP Grantsville, LLC and Shawn Holste on the property located north of South Street in the R-1-21 zone.

Shawn Holste was present for this agenda item:

Gary Pinkham stated: One thing that kind of popped out, on the south side of the property, it appears that previous developers have done a half-width development, but I don't see any provisions in your plan to finish that street.

Shawn Holste said: That was a question we had, whether you'd want us to do that.
Gary Pinkham stated: It has to be done.

Shawn Holste said: Okay. How far to the east would it go? It kind of dead-ends and then you have houses. That street's never going to go through there to Quirk street is it?

Shay Stark said: It is a through street and a Collector, so ultimately the street needs to be 90 feet wide, which I know their side they didn't provide 90 feet, and that's one thing that the City's going to need to discuss and decide what they want to do there.

Gary Pinkham stated: To the east there appears to be a structure that is going to be right in the middle of the street too. I don't know how far back that structure goes.

Brian Pattee stated: The other thing on that street is that the south curb is just a flat curb. It's not a standard curb and gutter. That whole subdivision is that way. I don't think that would look good to have that on one side, and then standard curbing and gutter on the other. I would want that to be matched on that street. I think that's the only way that can be done.

Gary Pinkham said: I think with regards to the existing conditions to the east with the buildings, we need to decide what we want to do with that street, if we want to keep it going through or not because I don't know if that was thought through.

Shawn Holste stated: You have the same challenge with Pear. That land owner is not going to let you put Pear through there. That land owner definitely is not going to let you, or anyone in the future put that road through.

Erik Stromberg stated: We're going to run into that problem everywhere. There's going to be a building, there's going to be something, there's going to be a land owner. So we just adjust as we go.

Shawn Holste said: Our thoughts were to make this self-contained where it's giving you two exits, but just contain it within itself. The second question I had is, Shay took a look at this and replied back, about having a two-acre park. That seems a little big for that little area compared to everywhere else. So, I wasn't quite sure what you wanted your open space to look like.

Brian Pattee asked: How many acres is this total?

Shawn Holste replied: 23.

Brian Pattee asked: What's this little strip of land between the backs of these homes off Brockway?

Shawn Holste replied: We think it's actually part of our piece; we're just working on some clarity to that. So, back to South Street, would your thoughts match what we have on the plan, and not count on it ever going through to Quirk?

Attorney Coombs said: So, the way our current street master plan is, we have to plan it to go all the way to Quirk. That doesn't mean that it has to be done now, but we have to at least make the assumption that one day it will, unless we want to amend our street master plan.

Jaime Topham said: We probably should plan for it, but does it need to be a Collector? It's not particularly long, and where it hits Hale and turns into that jog? Right now we have to plan for that, but it might be something to look at.

Shay Stark said: South Street, if I remember right, Hunter Estates, we required the street that's running along the south edge of that to be named South Street knowing that there would be a little bit of a jog between Hale Street and onto that alignment. Which that shows as a local street going west to Mormon Trail. Can I just point out that we've run into a similar situation with Adam Nash on his 265 Cooley Street project? He's got a collector street that's going to cut through his property. Right now if you look at the alignment of it, there are three properties along that collector street that there's a home or some sort of building within that right of way that's been shown. But the consensus in the meetings as we've sat down with him and with the mayor and the City is that the City needs to preserve the right of way because at some point if we really need a collector street, it's one less piece that's going to have a structure on it at the time to have to take down. So another thought with this is that you preserve what future right of way you can. Like with Wells Crossing, we didn't have them develop out all of Nygreen Street along the back of their property, because it didn't make any sense. It didn't go anywhere, and we don't want to maintain it. And so we made the trade-off with them on that saying, "Okay, instead of doing that, we're going to have you help us pave this trail on Hale Street with what it would have cost to construct those improvements." And then we had something that was useful, and it was beneficial to that community. So maybe at least preserving the piece of the corridor it allows it to occur at some point in the future when the need is there.

Jaime Topham said: So, we would need a plan. Your map, your drawings would need a plan for that 60 feet there, not 45.

Shawn Holste said: what we could do is match what South Street is now and then work out some kind of compensation or whatnot to give you guys that right of way so that one day you could have that whole South Street. So we'd be giving up a bunch of property right there that we could work something out.

Gary Pinkham said: You've got three sides of this property that border streets, north,

south, and east side. I think those need to be improved half-width.

Shay Stark stated: The city code requires that in the improvement section on the subdivision.

Gary Pinkham said: I think the starting point is the concept needs to provide for at least half width dedications. Where existing streets are half width construction, to preserve those right of ways for us. That'll change the layout on this thing somewhat.

Shawn Holste said: That's what we are trying to figure out. What you guys want, so we can make the layout work. Back to the green space, the park, do I have to have the green space?

Gary Pinkham replied: You don't have to provide it. You can provide the fee in lieu.

Shay Stark stated: Essentially the code requires 10% of the overall parcel as an open space. There are a lot of options with that, maybe something hybrid. If you wanted to put trails around the parcel, if the right of way from the trails is at least 20 feet wide, it counts as an open space. You could pay in lieu and that money would go towards a city park that is within a half mile of this. So, there are a lot of different ways to look at it and work through.

Shawn Holste said: Okay. Perfect. One last question. Would there be any consideration to let us do a third acre here? The reason I like the third acre is simply with what we're going through right now, the water shortage. I mean, these half acre lots are awesome. I think there is a lot of expense in how they do the water, with people taking care of it. There's a good majority of these half acres around town where people are unable to get to their backyards. And I see the third acres being more affordable for people to finish out their homes.

Gary Pinkham stated: It's currently not zoned for that, so you would have to look at a rezone or perhaps a PUD that would incorporate some of the other issues we've been talking about with parks and open space and so on, to offset that. That's kind of up to you how you want to go and take the time doing it.

Shawn Holste asked: If I tried to rezone it, do you think that would be something?

Jaime Topham responded: If the future is half acre, and I think you've seen a lot of comments about the community wanting us to stick to the plan we just created.

Shawn Holste said: Okay. If I do a PUD, is there some room for variance?

Jaime Topham answered: Yes.

Shay Stark added: It will require more open space, though.

Shawn Holste asked: What percentage?

Attorney Coombs answered: At least 50% of the total parcel acreage shall be open space, with at least 30% of the total parcel acreage dedicated to open space and improved open space.

Shawn Holste said: 30% open. All right, thank you guys so much.

3. Consideration to recommend approval of a Secondary Access for Dustin Neil located at 515 East Fiona Circle in the Lookout Ridge Subdivision.

Dustin Neil was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission: Hi. Dustin Neil, owner of the residence under consideration.

Jaime Topham asked: Where's Fiona Circle?

Dustin Neil answered: It's behind the stake center off Durfee.

Jaime Topham asked: What does it back? What road?

Kristy Clark said: It doesn't back a road. It's not backing a collector road like what we've had issues with. It's a city road.

Gary Pinkham asked: Do you know if we sent out a notice with our utility bills several months ago cautioning people about this?

Kristy Clark responded: I don't know the answer to that, but I want to say that we think we did.

Gary Pinkham stated: There was something in there cautioning people about doing driveways and getting permits. I suspect nobody read those because we seem to have a lot of people ignoring that. There are several things I want to bring up. Number one, when you leave your property and enter on a city street and start taking out city property – curb or sidewalks and stuff - you have a whole list of things that technically are happening. First of all, you're trespassing. Second, you're destroying city property when you cut off the curb and gutter. Thirdly, even if you were permitted by the City to do a driveway, there is a legal process through which you go through a permit application. I believe the City requires a bond to work on the city street. At least the last time I worked in the street around here, they charged me for one. We've had several people coming here lately. It's getting to be where people go do as they darn well please around here

and then wait and see if they get caught. We have people say, "Well, the real estate agents said I could do it." Or the contractor said it was okay. Or the homeowners' association said it was okay. Heck, if my wife told me it's okay to build a house on the back end of your property, I doubt you'd agree with that. My wife doesn't have the right to tell me what to do on your property. The HOA doesn't have the right to tell you what you can do on our property. So there's really no justification for allowing this. And it's becoming a real problem. I've seen a half dozen in the last month or two that have gone in. And those people did not talk to the City about it.

Dustin Neil stated: In my defense, I was unaware that it was breaking the law and stealing property and things of that nature. I'm just pleading ignorance. It's been in there a year. If I had known there was a process to go through, I sure enough would have done it. I wasn't trying to step on anybody's toes or steal anybody's property.

Gary Pinkham said: The problem I have as an individual here is that in P&Z I swore an oath to uphold the laws and ordinances of Grantsville. This is in violation, so I personally would have to say no.

Dustin Neil said: From what I understand, there's another resident on Lookout Ridge Road that did the same thing, who has been in contact with the City Council and the Mayor and it was going to be further discussed. But I was here at the direction of Mr. Waltz who directed me that this is the forum I should come to.

Jaime Topham said: Yes. And you're definitely in the right forum. And like I said, you're not alone in this. Like he had stated, ignorance of the law isn't an excuse for violating the law.

Dustin Neil said: Right.

Jaime Topham said: What we can do as a planning commission is make a recommendation if it should be permitted or not. If it's not within our ordinance, we can't permit it. After this process, you have the right to take it to City Council and address it with them.

Dustin Neil said: Okay.

Jaime Topham asked: Any further discussion on this?

Jaime made the motion to recommend denial of the Secondary Access for Dustin Neil located at 515 East Fiona Circle in the Lookout Ridge Subdivision. Brian seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Discussion of the process to create an Agricultural Protection Area.

Shay Stark was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:

Jaime Topham stated: This ties in with item number five. Perhaps we could run them together. So we'll also be considering item number five.

5. Consideration to approve an Animal Conditional Use Permit Application for William Castagno to keep up to 150 Cows and 5 Horses on his property located at 4778 Highway 112 in the A-10 zone.

William Castagno was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:
William Castagno.

Jaime Topham said: Hi, William. So I understand you're here seeking this conditional use permit. I think the reason that we're having this discussion about these two different things, is you don't actually need a conditional use permit for what you're already doing. You're permitted to do what you're doing already. But I get the sense that you're trying to protect your right from all of the developments that are planned to come around you, correct?

William Castagno said: Right.

Jaime Topham said: Okay, so that brings us to this concept of the Agricultural Protection Area. And so the little bit of knowledge that I have I'll say what I can and then Shay can fill it in, but my understanding is if you make that election to make your property a part of the... or actually I guess your application, a part of an Agricultural Protection Area, it would remain protected for 20 years. And so anything that's developed around you on their plats, it would have to be discussed. Is that correct?

William Castagno responded: Correct.

Jaime Topham said: The potential downside to that is the property is protected for 20 years in an agricultural zone. And so then if you want to develop it in the near future, you'd have to go through a whole different process and different set of applications in order to develop it. So we just wanted to talk with you and see what your thoughts and plans are and what you'd like to do.

William Castagno asked: When you're talking about this Agricultural Protection Area, what does that entail?

Jaime Topham said: We're going to turn that over to Shay.

Shay Stark stated: So the process with that, each county was required by the State to set up a board and to review these areas. Because as we said this protection lasts for 20 years and then it's reviewed again. If the agricultural use is still continuing at that point, it's extended for another 20-year period. The first thing that the City would need to do on their side is decide a minimum acreage that they will allow for an Agricultural Protection Area.

The City hasn't had anybody come in and request this previously, at least not formally. And so we don't have anything in our code stating how large the area has to be, the minimum size that it has to be. There's a process. You come to the City, you request that. And then the City has to go to this county board with that area. And this county board doesn't have legislative authority - that authority is within the City, but it's their job to be the experts on this, to review it and come back and make recommendations. Should this be done or shouldn't it.

They may ask a series of questions. So it's going to occur over a process of a few months to get to that point. And then once that's done, if everything is favorable, then the City Council can move to create that protection zone, that protection area. And so then anybody who develops within 300 feet of that protection area, or if somebody tries to develop within that protection area, if there were multiple landowners, if somebody tried to develop within that area, they have to put on plats and language that the state created; it's in our code. And that language that they put on the plat is: "This property is located in the vicinity of an established Agricultural Protection Area in which normal agricultural uses and activities have been afforded the highest priority and use status." That's why we're thinking of it in your situation. "It can be anticipated that such agricultural uses and activities may now or in the future be conducted on property included in the Agricultural Protection Area. The use and enjoyment of this property is expressly conditioned on the acceptance of any annoyance or inconvenience, which may result from such normal agricultural uses and activities." So that's put on a plat when people sell houses in their developments. They're supposed to notify people of that; that is their protection area, it's allowed, and it's being protected.

William Castagno asked: What's the advantage of that over a conditional use permit?

Shay Stark answered: Well, the issue is that the conditional use doesn't protect you at all because you're already a committed use. All the conditional use is saying is that you have an area that does not have a permitted use, that based on a certain group of conditions, you're permitted to be able to do whatever you've applied for in that.

So if we had somewhere else in town that was residential in order to have the animal rights on their property, they had to go through a conditional use process and they would go through that process and they would be told they have to have certain height fences or that there'd be a whole list of stipulations on what they would have to do in order to

meet that conditional use. And that as long as they met those requirements, they would be able to keep animals on that property.

Right now, you don't have to do that. You're permitted. It's a permitted use in the zone that you're in. So it doesn't afford any extra protection for you.

Gary Pinkham added: Under our current city code, you're also grandfathered on that, so people can't come in and say, "Well, I bought a house. I don't want to have to listen to the cow at night. It's tough luck. They should've thought about that before they bought the house. You're grandfathered and what you have is permitted, which means they can't argue what you have on there. With the conditional use, I don't think it gets you anything, but maybe less protection.

Jaime Topham asked: How many acres is this?

William Castagno answered: 10.

Jaime Topham said: So that just brought a different thought to my mind. What does our city code allow? Two large animals per half acre?

Kristy Clark answered: So it's 10,000 square feet for the first large animal and then 2,000 square feet for any additional.

Jaime Topham asked: So he'd be fine with his 150 cows on 10 acres?

Kristy Clark said: I was going to do it, the math, but didn't get time. I could figure it out. So it's 10,000 square feet for the first, and then 2,000 square feet for any additional. And so 10 acres, that was what I was trying to figure out. 440,000 square feet. So it'd be 15 per acre.

Jaime Topham said: So with 150 cows, you can do exactly what you're doing, no more. If you're doing more than you would need to do conditional use.

Gary Pinkham said: You've got the best of what we have to offer along with the agricultural set-aside to this. If you try to sell it, whoever buys it is stuck with that set-aside for the next 20 years as well.

Jaime Topham said: That's what I was thinking.

William Castagno said: I'm not concerned about selling it for the next 20 years.

Attorney Coombs added: So a comment on being grandfathered. You are grandfathered in for the uses that you've been using. If you expand the uses, so if you're adding a whole

lot more livestock to it, then if it creates a much greater nuisance level, then the property owners may have a nuisance claim.

The agriculture protection zone would give you that buffer. It doesn't matter if you have 150 cows on your property, that's what it's built for. They couldn't come in and say, "You know what? The smell is that much worse because there are 150 cows instead of 10 cows." That's what the land is protected for.

The drawback is that you're bound for 20 years. So if you want to do something with it, you can have it removed from the agricultural protection zone, but there's a whole process to do that. And so from the City's perspective, we have no problem with the route you're taking right now. It depends what kind of protection you want for yourself.

William Castagno said: So basically I don't really need a conditional use permit.

Attorney Coombs confirmed: You don't.

William Castagno said: Okay. Then I'd just like some more information on this agricultural projection thing when it's available.

Kristy Clark said: I can email you.

William Castagno said: Okay.

Jaime Topham said: Well, and if you have an interest in it that helps us know that we need to actually be looking at it and making decisions on how we define that.

William Castagno said: That'd be a good idea.

Gary Pinkham asked: This time do you want to table this for a later discussion? Or do you want to withdraw for now?

William Castagno said: I'll just withdraw at this point.

William Castagno withdrew his application.

6. Consideration to approve the Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit Application for Lindsay Nikolaus to operate a hair salon business out of her home located at 535 West Cardon Ridge Circle in the R-1-21 zone.

Lindsay Nikolaus was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:
Thank you. Lindsay Nikolaus.

Jaime Topham said: Hi, Lindsay. Looked over what you submitted. What are you going to do about parking for the people that are going to come?

Lindsay Nikolaus responded: All parking will be in the driveway and my husband will eventually add more to the driveway for any parking that we have. We'll have all open space because we'll already be in the garage space. So there'll be space for that. There won't be any parking on the street. And most of it will just be kids walking to our house instead of any parking involved with them. So that's my plan.

Jaime Topham asked: Questions? Comments?

Jaime made the motion to approve the Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit Application for Lindsay Nikolaus to operate a hair salon business out of her home located at 535 West Cardon Ridge Circle in the R-1-21 zone. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

- 7. Consideration to recommend approval of the P.U.D. for Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg on the Presidents Park P.U.D. Subdivision located at Worthington and Nygreen for the creation of two hundred and ninety-six (296) lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg were present for this agenda item.

Jaime stated: So your plan looks pretty good, but what about Worthington Street? Worthington is planned to be a collector and it's planned to go all the way out to the boundary of the City.

Erik Stromberg said: So we've had some discussion about this in the past and the current adoptive map shows it as a dashed line - no potential future in the planning. I think we're going to direct you to the traffic study that's been submitted with the application.

The end determination is that the land South of Nygreen, we've included all of that in the analysis, and there just isn't enough traffic to warrant anything going through the property to anywhere. The traffic that it would move would be within the boundaries of everything south of Nygreen. So if you look at some of the volumes, what a typical lane in each direction type of street could carry, I think it's 1700 or 1900 daily vehicle trips. I've got to check the numbers there, but yeah. The traffic study will tell you what the numbers for traffic are, and the answer to the question is, we've looked at that, even discussed it in some of the planning meetings, and just didn't warrant that collector street to be continued, especially if all the traffic is going to the north.

Shay Stark said: In fact, I think it was at planning and zoning that we discussed that, and

that's what was requested is that we do a traffic research and see what it came back as.

Erik Stromberg said: So again, the nature of the collector road is to move larger volumes of traffic, right? Bigger streets. You want to reduce access for safety reasons or whatever. And the traffic volumes just aren't there to warrant this segment that's dashed on the map.

Jaime Topham said: Okay, but they're not there now.

Erik Stromberg said: No, for the future.

Jaime Topham said: Well, in the future, you think that there's not going to be the volume there? I didn't find the traffic study in this.

Kristy Clark said: No, I think I attached it to the email because it was a lot of pages.

Jaime Topham said: Okay. Unfortunately, my iPad is in use, so I can't look that up.

Erik Stromberg stated: So the traffic study took into account all the way south to the City's border. So what the potential future build-out could be then.

Shay Stark said: So Worthington was designated a collector back in 2001 when we did the original street master plan for the City, and the thought process back then was that the boundary line road is what it was being called at that time, the road would come across from a trail and head east along the edge of the DOD property. And it would continue east and eventually tie into 112. And the idea was that Worthington would serve as a collector for people to be able to come up Worthington and tie onto that boundary line road.

There's an interesting twist to this though. That boundary line road, sometimes when it's brought up its supported and other times it just depends on who is in the room and what time of day it is, I guess. It's something that some people support and other people think that it's too complex and it's never going to happen. So, because of that, even from 2001 that wasn't shown on the master plan.

So the collector that was put in purposely to try to pick up traffic and carry it to a road that was considered too far out or the chances of that being completed was, in some people's minds, it was slim to none, and in other people's minds, it was yeah we know, if we get enough people here, this would be a no-brainer that this will go through.

I do remember in one of the discussions with the general plan, somebody in the general public brought that up and there was additional discussion about it, but you notice that it still didn't end up on the map.

Jaime Topham said: Well, then I don't think we actually changed anything in the street plan and our master plan. Well, I know we didn't.

Shay Stark said: There were a few minor changes, but yeah, for the most part.

Jaime Topham said: It wasn't the focus on the plan.

Shay Stark said: Yes. So the City has received grants to do a street. I don't know what to call it because it's really not a street master plan. You're going to look at a traffic study and try to understand what the demands will be in the future and what the effects of that are. Unfortunately, with COVID and with what's happened, that grant has now been put off for another year. Otherwise, we'd be under way with that, but we won't know until then, and even that, that's just a murky crystal ball to try to understand, but at least it gives us some idea of the validity of these.

The traffic study, so they've taken into account the south area, looking at Worthington as a collector that would carry the traffic from that south area onto Durfee into the north, essentially moving it. And there, again, as this was originally looked at in 2001, it was actually looking the other direction, moving traffic to the south, to this boundary line road.

Jaime Topham said: Right. Well, I've got two points. I'm not a traffic city person, but we now have the Midvalley Highway, and it wasn't a part of this study either. And it looks like we've got a whole lot of undeveloped area. And then we're also looking at a larger annexation policy that can take us even farther south, where if we have that Worthington, it could come up and go to Nygreen, that then goes east that can connect to 112 that can get people out to Midvalley Highway. Aren't we kind of shooting ourselves in the foot if we allow this big development to just go right smack dab in the middle of that and preclude us from doing that?

So that's my first question. The second question is how we just talked about with South Street, making them plan for that to be a collector when South Street's this long, and there's not a whole lot of development on either side. So what's the difference?

Erik Stromberg said: I think Nygreen is shown to be an east-west.

Jaime Topham said: Yeah, and I agree. I'm talking about, like South Street, we just had this big long conversation about making the developer, and I don't know if you were here Gary, but making the developer plan that to be a collector at 90 feet, when South Street doesn't particularly go anywhere, but the potential for Worthington going out to a potentially future boundary line or bringing all that south traffic up to Nygreen to go across could be quite high, and your development blocks that entirely.

Mike Colson stated: As you're discussing this, I'm thinking of that fence there, is where you're talking to that future goal. That sounds to me like it's going to tie onto 112 also. So Nygreen's going to 112, that old fence would be going to 112. What've we got there? It's all Durfee going across there. So you've got your collectors going to 112 there, and with the study that Barry did, it's showing the need to not have it, even if there wasn't a road along that whole fence, just going to Nygreen.

So there's a collector on both sides. To me, wouldn't it say, okay, you really don't need that because you have two collectors going east and west, with Durfee.

Erik Stromberg added: Yeah, and then collectors don't go north. You need to tie them in south. And that's what Worthington is. To me the big thing is just what we talked about, right? We just made a concept plan and said you're only going to get 200 feet, but we're going to make you do a collector road because it's a dashed line. And it's the same thing. You're talking a lot more space. So how do we tell you guys it's okay not to, but they're telling other people that they have to comply with the collector road.

Mike Colson stated: There are two issues with that collector road right there. One is the City. You don't have the property to put a collector road along that boundary, on that fence. There's not enough room, enough easement. The federal government's going to give Grantsville City property to create a road there. And South Willow has encroached on that. And you haven't left enough right of way to do a collector street there. And the second thing, why are Grantsville City citizens going to pay for a 17-mile road that's going to divert people from Grantsville? Wouldn't that be a county function? Why do we want to put all that money right there?

Jaime Topham said: Maybe it is. Maybe it is for our perspective here. We're talking about approving this big subdivision that's going to change something that's already on our master street plan. And it seems like we need to have a little more conversation about that.

Attorney Coombs stated: So, for this body, you have to abide by the street master plan, unless the street master plan is amended by their body.

Jaime Topham said: That's pretty much what I thought.

Attorney Coombs said: And that's just where you're at. Now, if the street master plan is approved and amended by these guys, then obviously you're going to do something different. You guys, your hands are tied a little bit more.

Jaime Topham said: So I think what I'm trying to say is that I don't know that we can give approval for this because our street master plan shows that being a collector in your development cuts it right off. Not without City Council; they need to change to that.

Erik Stromberg asked: In your package, are there any minutes from the City Council meeting for the concept plan that are improved? Because we discussed this.

Jaime Topham stated: Well, you may have discussed it, but City Council didn't take action necessary to allow us to do anything about it. So our hands are tied. Now I think what we can do is table it, and you can get on the City Council's agenda to have a discussion about this. Right? Potentially? See if they want to do something about making the change, but until they do, we can't approve it. When we have a plan that says that needs to be a collector, unless you're willing to open your subdivision and let the collector go through it.

Erik Stromberg said: Yeah. I mean, I agree. I think there are two options, right? We can table. I guess we have three. I think we can table it. Can see if the City Council wants to change the street master plan so this could potentially work. Or, the other thing, and obviously it takes a new design if this is what I'm looking at, I think it's Washington Avenue, it shifts east and really becomes Worthington and goes all the way through because you'd have Washington Avenue as going the whole length anyway. I mean, it's going to be a wider road if there's a collector there. I think that those are the options available.

Jaime Topham added: And I know the City's been having some talks about whether Worthington should be or shouldn't be, but they haven't done anything formally about it. So until they do, I don't think we can approve it.

Attorney Coombs stated: There are a couple of ways that this issue can get to the City Council. One is this body can make a decision whether to amend the street master plan or a recommendation to amend it or not. And then that would go to City Council for confirmation. Or you could submit a question to the City Council saying, "Do you want to amend the master plan to allow Worthington to do that?" And so I think that would probably be the easiest way at this point.

Jaime Topham asked: If we wanted to make a recommendation that they amend it, wouldn't we have to have a public meeting about it?

Shay Stark said: Just like the other streets that we're going to discuss in this general plan amendment, it has to go through at a public hearing, and then you make that recommendation, and then City Council.

Jaime Topham asked: Don't we have to do that anyway, whether we certify the question to them or not?

Attorney Coombs replied: No. So I mean, the question is more just you're just seeking if there's any desire from the City Council to go this route. I mean, even then they can't vote to make the decision. To make the change, it has to start here through that process.

If there were to be a change. By certifying the question, you're just asking the City Council is this something you want us to look at?

Mike Colson asked: So would that question be specific to Worthington Street or the whole road master plan in general?

Attorney Coombs said: As Shay mentioned, the City has funding and a plan to study this, and we were this close to getting started with it until the world ended.

Gary Pinkham said: Looking at our street master plan, I think it would be worthwhile to give it some thought. We've got South Street in the middle of town, the collector. It's like a ladder to nowhere. To me, South Street ought to be a collector over at 112 as well as Nygreen. If that were the case, then this particular region, Worthington, isn't that critical to us. It's like Hale, Clark, and Willow. And it may be worthy for us to have the council look at this and this southeast quadrant here and consider that.

Mike Colson said: Quirk Street's going to be, it's listed as a local street, but it acts like a collector. Right? We all know that, right? So Quirk Street's going to be a collector whether you like it or not.

Erik Stromberg added: I'll just say, I mean, our hands are a little bit tied with everything, right? I look at it and I personally, I agree we could stop the collector of Worthington coming into your development. That's fine. I look at this green street as a future street. To me, I could see that making sense as a collector. It's a little bit further and it's all wide open and undeveloped right now. So it would be easy just to designate it and we don't have to worry about what's sitting there, is it wide enough?

Jaime Topham asked: Does your plan end up at the backside of that green line or does it go beyond that?

Mike Colson asked: Are you talking about the one to the east?

Kristy Clark said: I think they've actually designated that 800 East. We could just continue that as an arterial road.

Jaime Topham asked: Do you know what's the one that goes east, west, that connects between Matthews, this one that ties into South Willow?

Erik Stromberg said: That's Shelly Lane. Besides the collector thing, are there other items?

Gary Pinkham asked: Did you fix that typo? I see where you moved some of those columns to the other side. We lose our sidewalk and cross system.

Erik Stromberg said: No, it stays there. So there's still some drainage.

Gary Pinkham asked: Any calculations we're doing to see that it fits? We'll still have our sidewalks and stuff?

Erik Stromberg answered: Yeah.

Gary Pinkham stated: Other than this issue here, the rest of it, I think I was okay with. I think we've fixed the issues that we brought up the other day.

Erik Stromberg said: So there is another question I had. Go ahead, Mike.

Mike Colson asked: What was the issue, Gary? Was that you talking to Barry on that?

Erik Stromberg said: Just a few of the red lines that we have.

Mike Colson said: Oh, okay.

Gary Pinkham stated: Details on the storm drain swells. You just need to make sure it fits and we still have a sidewalk.

Mike Colson asked: What was that, Erik?

Erik Stromberg said: You want narrower streets? I know it's in here somewhere.

Mike Colson stated: So the streets would be the same as what South Willow has. The same street section, is that with the swell system, instead of the gutter? To give an openness feel? South Willow, we feel is a great, successful subdivision. You drive up there, they don't have any signs that say "no parking"; it's in their HOA, but you don't see many people parking on the sides there. And my opinion it is a safer street section than what our standard is. You don't have cars blocking kids and stuff that could dart out between them. You have wide open vision on it.

Erik Stromberg said: The only thing is, I guess maybe generally it works, but if it's not posted, there's nothing that really keeps-

Mike Colson said: We plan on posting it.

Erik Stromberg said: So it would be posted, no parking. So then what's the enforcement of that?

Mike Colson stated: Just within the HOA. Yeah. You've talked about that in a previous meeting that the HOA would take care of that. However, it would be posted. I don't know if a sign at the entrance can say there's no street parking. I think a sign every 500

feet on both sides.

Gary Pinkham said: You've widened the streets. So in that last set of plans you brought in, you had some new drawing details.

Erik Stromberg responded: Well, you just didn't get them. You were the very first.

Gary Pinkham said: I think that what you're looking at is the older version. They've given us more street there.

Mike Colson stated: I drew a cartoon up. Because people think about 42 feet versus 34 feet. I mean, what does that mean to the average person? Probably not much. So we're talking 34 feet of drivable with no parking.

So on the left side is our city standard, which is designed with eight-foot parking areas on both sides. If you have cars parked there, you have 26 feet of usable space, which is the minimum requirement for the fire department. The middle one is what we're proposing, 34 feet would be in South Willow, and then the right side is our proposed. If there's car parking violation there, you still have 26 feet. That is the same as what you'd have in the city standard.

You guys have to agree when you drive up South Willow and driving around how open and you can see everything and how much safer that is, as opposed to that. And this still, even with one car, they're still going to meet the minimum of what the fire department needs for their access. That's where we're going. We're not just trying to narrow these streets up to save money and stuff.

In the long term, we're trying to save the City money because the bigger we make the streets, the more money we're paying for maintenance down the road. So there's a balance that the City needs to find to for maintenance costs.

Shay Stark stated: South Willow is 34 feet. And the other I think is at 32 feet. They're a little bit narrower, but same kind of concept. They're a little narrower on the streets.

Erik Stromberg asked: And is the plan still with this open space, the back is going to stay natural, undeveloped? Is that still the thought with that?

So I'm looking at it. It's bio grass on farms. Out in Tooele County is where their farm is and they have some mixes. One's called bio-meadow and you water it a few times and we could get information on this. They can stay green, it's low maintenance, it can grow 16 inches and tall stays green and it doesn't go dormant and turn yellow, with a few watering's during the dry season. So still it's low maintenance, but it can look good and it can be groomed, cut a couple of times a year, whatever, or there are some other

options too, but really, I guess, I'm just going to go back to the parking.

If this is an area that people are going to go and do something on, is there parking around to stop? And maybe there can be a place to have a practice. Football practice, soccer practice, anything like that. It's not a concern, but if all of a sudden, hey, let's go have a little league practice there because it's convenient. Now you've got 20 parents all showing up and they're parking on this street and there's no parking.

Shay Stark asked: What's there stopping you?

Erik Stromberg replied: That was just my thing. And then I would assume an actual park would be a full park with parking and whatever for that.

Shay Stark added: And that'll be up to the City.

Jaime Topham said: Yeah. So these other green spaces that the HOA is going to own and maintain.

Mike Colson stated: Yeah, so the HOA will maintain all the open space and also all the swells. So we're not going to have problems that you guys were well aware of, and a new subdivision, they start filling the swells in, and you lose all your drainage and for the subdivision. So all that's going to be controlled with the HOA. We're going to have a consistent look, and it will be nice.

Jaime Topham said: Now the plan looks nice, it's just, you've got to address this Worthington issue.

Attorney Coombs asked: Have you guys spoken with the school yet?

Mike Colson responded: Yeah. The school is under contract, the school's 100% percent. The superintendent signed off on it and the school board signed off, so it will be closed, or we have to close before July 1st because they want it in this fiscal year, so it's pretty much a 100% done deal with the school going there. But we need to figure out this Worthington thing because that's going to be right there.

Gary Pinkham said: With the school right there, that's another reason not to have a collector.

Mike Colson said: I had this conversation with Shay and Craig Neely, and when I came to your guys' office about eight months ago, Craig said it was a "yeah, that was something we put in there just in case" kind of a thing, but he had no problems with the plan at that time. We moved forward with it and we've had multiple meetings and no one has brought it up at all.

Jaime Topham said: That's unfortunate. As I said, I think you're really aware, the community is very concerned about us following the plans that we created and not venturing outside of them. So that's what we're dealing with.

Mike Colson said: Understandable.

Jaime Topham asked: So, do you want me to table it at this time, or send the question on to the council, or deny it?

Kristy Clark stated: No, if you recommend to deny it, it will go to the council.

Mike Colson stated: We just want to table it at this time and then come back.

Jaime Topham said: Okay. So I make a motion that we table items number seven and eight.

Mike Colson asked: Before you make the motion, was there anything else that you guys have any issues with?

Attorney Coombs asked: Did you guys look at putting a church lot up there at all?

Mike Colson said: We have too many churches already.

Jaime Topham said: I guess I have a question. The mixed use. You wanted to, that's looking like a neighborhood commercial, right? So do they need to do a zoning change? Or because they are a PUD, that's already a variance we can grant? Yes? Okay. I think that's a good idea. We need something.

Mike Colson said: We listed the uses that we want there, you saw that? What's compatible with neighborhood commercial, that we want it to blend in very similar to what Park City is.

Jaime Topham asked: So will the PUD, or the homeowners' association or whatever own that? Or would you sell that lot off separately?

Mike Colson answered: Yeah. That'd be separate.

Jaime Topham said: Anything else? I'll table them both at the same time. I like efficiency.

Mike Colson added: One question. On your open space requirements on the PUD. Did that get changed to 10%?

Shay Stark responded: The PUD is that there has to be a minimum of 50% open space with 30% of that dedicated ...

Mike Colson said: That got changed in the last three months or something. Couple months.

Shay Stark asked: The PUD got changed to 10%? The standard open space got changed to 10%. But I don't think they touched the PUD. I know the code is still reading because I pulled that up earlier.

Jaime Topham said: It brings up a good point because I don't think our website has our current future land use map.

Kristy Clark stated: It doesn't, and I asked our IT person to put it on there.

Jaime made the motion to table the P.U.D. for Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg on the Presidents Park P.U.D. Subdivision located at Worthington and Nygreen for the creation of two hundred and ninety-six (296) lots in the R-1-21 zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

8. Consideration to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg on the Presidents Park P.U.D. Subdivision located at Worthington and Nygreen for the creation of two hundred and ninety-six (296) lots in the R-1-21 zone.

Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg were present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:

Jaime made the motion to table the Preliminary Plan for Mike Colson and Wade Sandberg on the Presidents Park P.U.D. Subdivision located at Worthington and Nygreen for the creation of two hundred and ninety-six (296) lots in the R-1-21 zone. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

9. Discussion to amend items in the Grantsville City General Plan.

Shay Stark was present for this agenda item.

Jaime Topham said: Shay, I guess we'll look to you for kind of direction here.

Shay Stark said: Okay. We had a discussion during the last couple of meetings prior to

the approval of the general plan about adding some language to the general plan. Somehow, I don't know where I made the change to send it on to Jewel Allen. And then this was, it happened to be in the same week her daughter got married, and somewhere in all that, it didn't end up in the final draft for the general plan.

And we've got North Star that we're looking at the planning area where they can use multiple sizes of lots. And Presidents Park is another example of where that's being utilized. And this is the language that allows us to justify those types of projects. And it was supposed to be put under the land use section under the goals and policies of land use.

It was going to be part of goal number three, and it was supposed to be item seven on this goal number three. And goal number three is support a mix of land uses. And this statement was: "Allow the sizes of lots/units within a subdivision to vary while maintaining the overall zoning density of the parcel to provide improved open space through the land unit development process."

And like I say, it got left out when this whole North Star issue with Travis first came in and we started looking at it and putting together documents. He was putting together documents for that. That's when I went, "Oh, wait a second."

So we need to amend the general plan and add that in. Then the second item, that actually has to do with some streets and-

Jaime Topham said: How unfortunate that that whole conversation wasn't here, too.

Shay Stark said: So on the transportation map, I guess it gives some background. So we have 900 acres that have been annexed into the City to the east of Sheep Lane. This is all going to be commercial, industrial use over there. And we have the Midvalley Highway that's going to be dropped that ends this first phase and ends at Sheep Lane.

So all this traffic is going to be dumped off on Sheep Lane down on the highway and we have this high intensity use that's going to occur in this area. So the one recommendation was to designate Sheep Lane as an arterial so that we have the ability to develop that out, to handle those higher capacities.

In the initial memo, or email that I had sent with the map I had sent Kristy, I was recommending that Durfee Street from 112 through Sheep Lane be designated as a collector. Todd Castagno saw that, then came in and talked with the mayor and a few other people. And then I received some comments from him that he had made. And he's very concerned about the intersection at 112 with Durfee, and that going through as a collector, just because it's a bad angle on the intersection in the first place. And if we increase or encourage increasing traffic on it, he's concerned about that.

And his suggestion was to make the west section of Durfee from 112 to Lamb Lane as a local street, and then from Lamb Lane to Sheep Lane as a collector. I have a concern about that because if we run it straight through, it will act like a collector whether we designate it as local or not.

So my suggestion after thinking about that is, because I do agree with him, and 112 is a scary intersection, it really bothers me, so my thought is that Lamb Lane be designated as a collector and that Nygreen, which is supposed to carry across to 112, but if we turn Nygreen and bring it down to the intersection at 112 and Lamb Lane, so that that becomes a convenient way for traffic to get on to 112 and it gives them a reason.

And then instead of having Durfee go the full way through, actually allow the local section of Durfee from the 112 intersection over at Lamb Lane. It's coming straight across as a local road. And instead of continuing Durfee on from there, create another street further down, away from it so it's on a totally different intersection. So it runs from Lamb Lane across to Sheep Lane.

Jaime Topham said: Oh yeah.

Shay Stark said: I think you were provided in the packet, with a revised drawing for that concept.

Jaime Topham asked: If they're going down Durfee anyway, and that local road is there and it connects to Lamb Lane but then goes ... it can either go north or south ... won't they just do that anyway? Does Durfee need to continue on? I'm trying to picture what else is in that area. Does it need to continue all the way to Lamb Lane?

Erik Stromberg asked: That is where Todd's in the middle of what we just approved, right?

Shay Stark stated: That corner extends out and then we have the other part of the Castagno family that's got 40 acres in there. We were just talking about 10 acres of that tonight. And then right on the right up against that, Todd has another piece of ground that he has turned in an application, and you'll see it in the next month or two for Davenport Subdivision as the name of it.

And that one, in that design, he has shown Durfee going through and connecting into Lamb Lane as part of that. And he's developing Lamb Lane on that property. So we'll have it as a portion of that Lamb Lane from 112 down essentially to the current city boundary, north of the city, that will be constructed as part of that Davenport subdivision.

And so that's where that comes from. And as I think about that, it makes sense for me to

approve that corner there; it's turning into a residential area through there. It doesn't make sense to push it through, and the key is to make sure that we've got convenient points to get traffic onto 112.

Jaime Topham:

Okay. So this is a discussion, right? So we need to read back as if we were wanting to make an amendment to this general plan that we need to bring it back so that we can have the conversation so we can have public input, right?

Erik Stromberg stated: Correct. Right now, we just talked about Worthington and also South Street. It seems like it would be good to put those altogether and have that conversation altogether. So perhaps what we can do is have someone provide the question to City Council for their next meeting. Can it go on their next meeting from there?

Attorney Coombs said: Sounds good.

Jaime Topham said: On their very next meeting about what they want us to do about Worthington. I think we could make the decision without South Street. Obviously they're going to make a recommendation that you all will eventually approve, but I don't think we need your direction to know about South Street, but I do think we need the direction about Worthington.

Gary Pinkham stated: Well, I think South needs to be discussed because where it dead-ends on the east end there, at Anderson Ranch, it's not going to go through, so why not resolve the right of way issues on the previous concept. I think if we look at South Street, Worthington, Nygreen, and the area east of 112, what we're going to do is this piece, this stuff develops out there, because right now we don't have any plans.

And of course, since 2001, we've had a few changes, more than a few, that may change our rationale on some of this stuff.

Shay Stark added: Well, and I will point out too, that in 2001, what we saw as we were looking at this plan was that the City was not following the future land use plan at all. People were coming in, they were asking for a rezone, and they were receiving whatever rezone they wanted at the time.

And so, as we were looking at this, our concern was that we were going to end up with a lot of small lot subdivisions in here. And that's why you see these collectors, that this density that you see them here, that if that's changed, our future land use plan has this area generally as half-acre lots out in here.

So that density, the number of trips that we're going to see has probably changed a little

bit with that. And I also agree that I think Midvalley Highway, and especially this development, that's going to hurt, going to happen over around Sheep Lane with commercial and industrial.

And honestly, the same group of people dealing with the 120 acres along 112, they're looking at commercial in there. And if that becomes the center that people are gravitating to, especially with Midvalley Highway being there, if you're living on the back side here, you take a good collector, if you're working in Salt Lake, that's the fast way to get there. So there hasn't been a lot of change per se, that hasn't occurred since then.

Gary Pinkham asked: So, it was held up because of COVID, or what?

Attorney Coombs responded: So my understanding is, the funding's there. And we were, as far as my understanding, was that we were raring to go.

Shay Stark stated: It would have been under way at the beginning of the fiscal year. And I think there was a council member here who would probably know a lot better than me because I have to sit in on budget discussions.

But from what I was told, a lot of those projects that were planned were basically put on hold until this COVID thing stabilizes or things change, so the City can see how much money they're really going to be, they're really going to have available next year. Because again, even with this grant, it's not for 100% of it. There was a portion that the City was going to have to put in also. And so the City is trying to get past the current situation where I don't know what it's going to look like.

I'm going to say don't do it unless there's an end game, unless you're really jumping into the street master plan. Because the worst thing that you can have happen, is going to be more in line for six months. And then, a month before the six months is over, just like what happened with the general plan or a couple months before, all of a sudden it's a rush to try to do something because that time has been spent.

Erik Stromberg asked: I don't know if we need a full study to say, can South Street be a different type of road? Can Worthington go all the way? Do we need anything to the south?

Jaime Topham said: So Councilwoman Jewel is joining us on Zoom, and she had raised her hand for a comment. And I know that she had made some comments about that transportation plan and she's been pretty involved in it. So maybe if you could get her input too. Jewel, wait just a second and we will put you on the line. She said if all goes well, we'll tackle it in June 2021.

Councilwoman Allen said: Hi. Sorry, can you hear me? Yeah. Okay. Correct. I just texted that. I know the mayor is negotiating in terms, but we are hoping that if everything settles down, as we're all looking forward to that, it will be processed so we can be under way in the next year. But the scope has been presented to them. So, it's one step closer.

Jaime Topham asked: What is the scope, Jewel?

Councilwoman Allen responded: It's the scope that I forwarded to everybody a couple of months ago and it would include the transportation plan and also the Main Street master plan.

Jaime Topham asked: Okay, so would that include all the other streets? Is that part of the transportation plan?

Councilwoman Allen said: Correct. All the rows that are within the Grantsville boundary. And I would imagine if there are any future impacted roads because of Midvalley or whatever else they would probably go up as well.

Jaime Topham said: Okay. Thanks for that input, Jewel.

Councilwoman Allen replied: You're welcome. Anytime.

Jaime Topham said: Okay. So I think we have our marching directions. If you can take that to the City Council to consider if what they would like to see done with Worthington, if they believe that it should be changed from a collector or if they want to maintain it as a collector so that we can, on our next meeting, we can have on the public hearing part of it to consider Worthington Street, South Street, Nygreen, and then this Durfee Street.

Erik Stromberg said: I think the thing with Worthington Street is if it's going to continue south or stop. Because it can be a collector. It just needs to stop at Nygreen for that.

Jaime Topham said: Well, that's true.

Erik Stromberg said: So it can stay a collector. It just needs to stop at Nygreen and then that takes care of that, what we were just talking about.

Attorney Coombs stated: And there is the possibility of the City Council saying that they want this transportation study to be done before they can make those decisions.

Jaime Topham said: Yep. And we'll leave that in the directive. They didn't give us that directive. Any further discussion needed on this part? Okay.

10. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held May 14, 2020.

Erik made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held May 14, 2020. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

11. Report from City Council Liaison Darrin Rowberry.

Council Liaison Darrin Rowberry stated to the Commission: I don't have anything specific, but obviously there are some things that need to get worked out that are major concerns. And I think they need to get taken care of sooner than later. So that's my recommendation, that we tackle it now and make a decision so we can move on.

Jaime Topham stated: We have at least two developments sitting here that really could use some answers. And then there's also that issue with the City Council approving those secondary accesses onto Worthington Street. And I know some of the comments were that Worthington shouldn't be a collector. And then City Council makes that decision or gives us that direction so that they can go through the proper process.

Darrin Rowberry stated: We are having a work meeting Monday night concerning that stuff. Maybe during that work meeting, we can have some debate about Worthington.

Jaime Topham said: Do we have anything else to take back, other than what everyone said? I make a motion that we adjourn.

12. Jaime made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.

Kristy Clark
Zoning Administrator