

## **MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 01/20/2022. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM.**

**Commission Members Present:** Commission Chair Brian Pattee, Commission Member Gary Pinkham, and Commission Member Jaime Topham

**Commission Members that were present on Zoom:**

**Commission Members that were absent:** Commission Member Erik Stromberg, Commission Member John Limburg

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:** Zoning Administrator, Kristy Clark; Grantsville City Attorney, Brett Coombs; City Engineer Dan England

**Appointed Officers and Employees that were present on Zoom or Absent:**

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Lana and Claude McKean, Doug (Darrell) Peterson, Darryl Kelley, Holly Jones, Breck Russell, Barry Bunderson, Scott Stapley, Michelle and Mike Warner, Monte and Crystal Sides, Vicky and Ernie Matthews, Sandra and Adam Sadler, and Travis Daniels.

**THE REGULAR MEETING WAS OFFICIALLY CALLED TO ORDER BY  
COMMISSION CHAIR, BRIAN PATTEE AT 7:06 P.M.**

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Holly Jones on the Cadence Worthington Subdivision located approximately at 405 South Worthington Street for the creation of four (4) lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

Chairman Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. and called for comments.

Cindy Burt emailed comments and concerns to the Commission that stated: Mayor Critchlow, City Council, and Planning Commissioners, we received the preliminary plan notice for the Cadence Worthington subdivision. Our home is on a one-acre lot and the majority of our property sits behind the North side of the proposed development. We share approximately 440 feet of property line between the East and North side. We have livestock and have fenced the perimeter of our property to contain our animals. We are concerned that replacing the existing fenced farmland with new homes will allow access and bring temptation to feed our animals through the fence or climb up or possibly over the fence. In an effort to avoid issues and possible accidents we respectfully ask that the new development be required to install a solid fence along the shared

property lines. Joe and Cindy Burt, 695 E Clover Gate Lane

No additional comments were offered, Chairman Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

**b. Proposed Multiple Housing Conditional Use/Site Plan and PUD Applications for Holly Jones located at 225 S Willow Street for the creation of 10 units in the RM-7 zone.**

Chairman Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. and called for comments.

Monte Sites stated to the Commission: I live right next to this property we're discussing. I'm pretty unhappy about it. It seems like every couple years, I'm in here trying to keep somebody from trying to shoe horn, some houses in an area that I don't think there should be. There's been just under two acre lots all through there for the last 18 years, as I've been here. I don't think they got enough access or anything. I'd like to see some serious thought on how we're going with these kinds of decisions in Grantsville. Thank you.

Michelle Warner stated to the Commission: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm a neighbor. I live at 341 Legacy Lane. My concern is with this repeat presentation of PUDS to existing land use. Looking at the land use ordinances. When I look at proposed changes for a PUD. I see some real issues with this one it looks to me like if I start in purposes on item 12, one under planned unit developments, a planned development is a distinct category of conditional use as such as intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources and goes on. And then it goes down to number a that says creation of a more desirable environment than would be possible through strict application of other city land use regulations. So I've got a look at what it's proposed and say, gosh, is that really creating a more desirable environment? Number two, the use of design landscape or architectural features to create a pleasing environment while preserving desirable site characteristics going to happen here? I wonder. Under C, preservation of buildings such as architecturally or historically significant to contribute to the character of the city and the number D establishment of interconnecting paths and trails for alternative trail transportation routes, um, which lead to common and popular destinations. And then when I, I turn over to section 12, three, and it says minimum areas, and then it says under multiple residential district, RM-7, you shouldn't be even considering this, if it's not a five-acre piece of ground. So, I guess my question is why is this even under consideration? If you're considering the feelings of the current residents and people who live there now, I mean, it doesn't look to me like this fits within the planned unit development structure that you follow as a planning and zoning commission. So, my question is why is it even under consideration, I guess, thank you for your time. Thank you.

Vicki Matthews stated to the Commission: I live down the street from the 225 Willow property. On three sides of the property, there are animals, and that's what it's zoned right now for animals plus a dwelling. And that's how it's zoned. I don't think 10 dwellings in that little spot is going to be conducive to animals and to the neighbors. Also, my brother-in-law several years ago, put in a subdivision on some of our property. And there were four homes that went in. He

was required to put in a 90-foot cul-de-sac so that the fire truck could get in there and do whatever they needed to do in case of fire, my concern on this, how would a fire truck ever get in and out of that little piece of ground? Also, it showed on the map or the drawing of the apartments, that there would be a little garage for each apartment, but most families have two cars. I don't see how another car besides the one they already have would fit in that little area. Also, Willow street is very narrow and I don't think that, adding another 10 homes to come out onto Willow Street from one little area would be a very smart thing to do either. Thank you.

Michelle Warner spoke again and added: The other concern that I have that just is bothering the back of my mind is that I'm told that we have elected officials who are serving the city who are finding ways to encourage developers and people to come in and circumvent our existing ordinances, ways to get around our existing ordinances using the PUD and other conflicting things. As far as a resident of Grantsville City. I mean, if I'm a resident of Grantsville city, I expect that as a planning and zoning commission, as a city council, as a mayor, people that are here to represent me truly are representing me. Why would we have public officials working with developers to circumvent our own rules and our own regulations? I mean, just a question in my mind, but as a planning and zoning commission, I think you should be aware that there's some real concern in the citizenship out there. Thank you.

Katherine Smith emailed comments and concerns to the Commission that stated: I would like to write concerning the building of the Holly Willow Townhomes. My first concern is the traffic it will bring to Willow Street. Willow Street, as you know, is already an extremely narrow street and it is extremely busy. With the added units to this neighborhood this would create more traffic added to the already small and busy street. Second, because these townhomes are to be placed on only 1.48 acres and due to the direction they are facing, neighbors in the surrounding homes will no longer have the privacy that they have been used to for so long. Regardless of trees and fences being built, adjacent neighbors will feel like people are looking into their yard and homes. Finally, these townhomes are not owned by individuals but are instead planned to be rentals. This can cause surrounding property prices to stagnate or even drop. For these reasons I strongly feel that the Holly Willow Townhomes should be allowed to be built. Katherine Smith

Sandra Killian emailed comments and concerns to the Commission that stated: Thank you for providing us the opportunity to participate and provide comments specific to the townhome proposal. We look forward to learning more at the Zoom meeting scheduled on January 20, 2022. Our comments, questions, and concerns are as follows: Mainly, as the direct neighbor to the north of the 225 Willow St. property, it will affect me in a variety of ways involving aesthetics, nuisances, safety, and financially. The residents of 235 Willow St. strongly oppose the potential townhomes at 225 Willow. It will decrease our property value. I don't see how this proposal will benefit us or any other neighbors. Grantsville is a livestock community. In order to be happy neighbors, smells, noise, trash and other nuisances must be kept at a minimum and if they are building townhomes close to our livestock, bringing their own barking pets along with an added dog park.

General questions:

At what stage is this application? Has it been approved or will neighbor comments have the potential to cancel or delay the project?

What are the benefits of building this townhome to all parties involved including occupants and neighbors?

What is the nature of this development? Has the property or project been sold to a private developer? Is it a smaller personal development? We fear that ten multi-housing unit creation isn't a reasonable consideration specifically since the neighborhood is currently an agricultural and animal habitat.

Will there be HOA regulations?

How will such a small area of land not become a nuisance to us as neighbors? Parking rules will not be followed. In general, these rules aren't enforced and we will be the ones suffering from this.

Have livestock and wildlife been considered? The area surrounding this property is all utilized for livestock purposes and we fear this will affect rancher and farmer livelihoods. There are deer, owls, hawks, foxes, and other wildlife that frequent the properties and rely on the current open spaces for habitat.

Some regulatory concerns:

Is it legal to build within 100 ft. of a corral or livestock? Horses and cattle surround this property.

Is it legal to build within 30 ft. of a house?

How will this affect irrigation rights? Water rights? Water shares?

How and where will the water drain from these units? Where will it drain? Will there be impacts to the water table? What other environmental impacts will be made? Potential water pollution? Will there be pipes or other structures installed on neighboring properties as a result of these townhomes? Willow St. is narrow and does not even have lines painted. Yet, a large 10 multi-housing unit development is being considered? Currently, apartments and a mobile home park exist on the street and have proven to increase traffic, drug use, and pollution.

The current zoning of the property is for livestock. Single home dwelling dynamics will be severely impacted by such a large community conversion. Why should a change in zoning be considered? This is a livestock community.

Will there be impacts to plumbing or electricity?

Will this development and occupants be in compliance and respect local noise ordinances?

If the project is approved, how long will construction take?

At what hours of the day will construction take place?

Safety concerns:

Neighbors not familiar with livestock tend to throw grass over fences to "feed" the horses. This is not a safe practice and has killed many horses. This is a great fear for us and neighbors. There doesn't seem to be room to allow a fire engine to turn around in the case of emergency. According to the 2018 fire code of Utah, different driveway classifications require different regulations for emergency vehicle access such as "dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus". Similarly, is the width of the road large enough?

Will there be groundwater contamination from the water run off?

Some concerns about nuisances:

An increase in noise and trash pollution is already being observed with current Willow St. mobile home park and apartment complex. We do not want to find more trash on our property and would like to retain the relative quietness of Grantsville compared to larger cities.

Another nuisance observed in relation to current apartments and mobile home park that would increase with the addition of these homes is lost or incorrectly delivered mail/address mix ups. There will be an increase in noise from construction and further concentrated living quarters. Has the height of the proposed townhomes been considered as this takes away from the existing majestic views we enjoy daily. If this townhome complex is approved, it will provide opportunities for worse air quality and higher crime rates due to increased vehicle traffic, overcrowding of people, drug use, and a general decrease in the safety of the neighborhood. There may be houses near livestock and resulting occupants may complain about the smell. This is a livestock community and we would like to retain our rights to practice ranching and farming.

Financial concerns:

With more people sharing the same availability of water, water and irrigation rates will increase. The completion of this multiple housing will decrease the value of our house and surrounding houses/property.

Aesthetic concerns:

How will the property be up kept? Better than current conditions in order to not drag property values down?

If a multiple housing site is built, our mountain view will be lost.

In conclusion, the concerns about this Holly Jones Willows Townhomes seem endless and we strongly oppose the changes that Holly Jones applied for. If this application is unfortunately in

the final stages and already in progress, some demands we would make going forward are a larger and higher quality privacy fence, better property upkeep and cleanup. Finish yard/landscaping, upkeep driveway, sidewalks, and other structures in the yard.

We appreciate you taking time to read our concerns and look forward to sorting out answers on Thursday, January 20, 2022 @ 7:00 p.m. Sincerely, 235 Willow St. residents: Adam and Sandra Sadler.

No additional comments were offered, Chairman Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

## **COMMISSION CHAIR BRIAN PATTEE OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:27 P.M.**

- 1. Consideration to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Holly Jones on the Cadence Worthington Subdivision located approximately at 405 South Worthington Street for the creation of four (4) lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

**Holly Jones and Barry Bunderson were present for this agenda item:**

Gary Pinkham stated, since our last staff review you've addressed everything. I feel that this is a good use for the parcel.

**Gary made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Holly Jones on the Cadence Worthington Subdivision located approximately at 405 South Worthington Street for the creation of four (4) lots in the R-1-21 zone. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.**

- 2. Consideration to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Holly Jones on the Cadence Worthington Subdivision located approximately at 405 South Worthington Street for the creation of four (4) lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

**Holly Jones and Barry Bunderson were present for this agenda item:**

Commission didn't have any additional comments.

**Gary made a motion to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Holly Jones on the Cadence Worthington Subdivision located approximately at 405 South Worthington Street for the creation of four (4) lots in the R-1-21 zone. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously.**



### **3. Discussion to Amend Chapter 14 and Chapter 15 of the Grantsville Land Use and Management Code.**

**Gary Pinkham stated to the Commission:** what brought this up is in some of our discussions on drawings, we've been having a lot of problem trying to figure out how to get utilities and driveways in some of these narrow frontages, particularly in cul-de-sacs and the way the code reads is the cul-de-sac dimension for driveway is figured at the edge of pavement, not the right way line. If we look at the edge of pavement and the necessary separation between driveways and making room for the utilities, its apparent that we're not able to really accommodate everything that needs to be there with narrow frontage that is currently in the code. There's also one spot in our code where it actually goes down to 30 feet for cul-de-sacs, for frontage, which is impossible, to get the driveway and the water and sewer water and sewer themselves take up 15 feet. That would be on one side of the driveway. The other side of the driveway would require a minimum of six to have the separation between this driveway and the neighbor's driveway. So in order to dimensionally, make it work on the cul-de-sacs. We need to revise the sections or subsections 14.3 paren three, 14.4 paren three, 14.5 paren three, 15.1 paren one, 15.2 paren one, 15.3 paren one, 15.4 paren one, and 15.5 paren one. I would propose that we go out to 70 feet, which gets us wide enough on the cul-de-sacs to accommodate the driveways and utilities. Even on our smallest lot, 70 feet of frontage is pretty much common on a 7,000 square foot block, um, that would allow a hundred-foot-deep block taking out the building setbacks. We still have a 55 by 55 building pad area, which is over 3000 square feet. So, we're not going to make these lots where they can't be built basically the way they're being built on now. It just simply gives us the frontage we need to accommodate driveways and utilities and so on and still meet the requirements of the code in the public utility work. We've had some cul-de-sac lots where you can't get 16-foot driveway to work. So that's part of our problem here.

Brian Pattee asked, Dan, do have anything to add?

Dan England answered, I absolutely agree with everything that Gary has brought up. It would end up making the cul-de-sac extend probably a little bit farther to make it work. So it might be a little bit more expensive on the developer, but it would leave enough room for 30-foot driveway plus the car to parallel park in front of their lot that way.

Brian Pattee asked, Kristy, this is set for just a discussion?

Kristy Clark answered, yes. I also sent you all Chapter 14 and Chapter 15 ordinances in case there is something else that needs to be looked at and amended at this time.

- 4. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held January 6, 2022.**

**Gary made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held January 6, 2022. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

- 5. Report from City Council Liaison, Mayor Neil Critchlow. Was absent.**

- 6. Adjourn. Gary made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Jaime seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.**

Kristy Clark  
Zoning Administrator