

Coalville City Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
Held On  
May 16, 2022  
In Person And Virtual

1  
2 Chair Tonja Hanson called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.  
3  
4

5 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair: Tonja Hanson  
6 Commissioners:  
7 Tim Bristow, Jeff White,  
8 Brandon Brady  
9 Stefanie Bowen (excused)

10  
11  
12 **CITY STAFF PRESENT:**

13 Mark Marsh, Mayor  
14 Don Sargent, Development Director  
15 Sheldon Smith, City Attorney  
16 Zane DeWeese, Public Works Director  
17 Nachele Sargent, City Recorder  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:**

Dirk Rockhill, Alan Stanford, Nick Mingo,  
Skyler Tolbert, Paul Brown, Margarita  
Richins, Royes Richins, Albert Richins, Chris  
Boyer, Eric Langvardt  
Virtual Attendance: Jack Walkenhorst,  
Walter Yates, Kim Bowen, Rozella Richins,  
Nathan Rackliffe, Alexander Cramer

23 **Item 1 – Roll Call:**

24 A quorum was present.  
25  
26

27 **Item 2 – Pledge of Allegiance:**

28 Chair Tonja Hanson led the Commissioners, Staff, and Public in the Pledge of Allegiance.  
29  
30

31 **Item 3 – Review, Discussion, Public Hearing, And Possible Recommendation: Marvin Richins Two**

32 **Lot Minor Subdivision Final Plat:**

33  
34 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit A) and stated this was an application for the  
35 Marvin Richins Two Lot Minor Subdivision. He stated this application was for an estate ownership  
36 division with existing buildings and no proposed new development. He stated there was a  
37 preexisting legal non-conforming shed on Lot #2 and any new construction would be required to  
38 meet the setbacks. Albert Richins stated this was part of their inheritance and they needed to  
39 create two parcels. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated the access for Lot #2 was off of the NS  
40 School driveway and questioned if that was approved. Don Sargent stated that was the historic  
41 access for that property. Albert Richins stated it was considered a City street and had been used  
42 for access since the house was built. He stated when the NS School District built the buildings they  
43 had always been allowed access because it was a City street. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated  
44 that needed to be noted on the plat. Zane DeWeese stated the NS School did the snow removal,  
45 but it was a platted City street. He stated the utilities were all located in the roadway. Chair Tonja  
46 Hanson questioned what would be required for a sidewalk for this application. She stated the NS

1 School already had one on the west side of the road (100 East). Don Sargent stated they needed to  
2 decide if it would be a benefit to the City or other landowners. Commissioner Jeff White stated he  
3 thought if it was originally developed with one sidewalk, they could leave it as it was. Albert Richins  
4 stated the NS School used the portion in front of Lot #2 for parking and there wasn't any sense  
5 putting in a sidewalk along that portion. Rozella Richins stated she felt the sidewalk on the West  
6 side was sufficient. If they tried to put in a sidewalk on the East side (100 East), there wasn't  
7 enough room and it would create a hazard. She stated the sidewalk would come to an abrupt end  
8 at the end of their property and it would be really dangerous for someone that wasn't aware of  
9 that. She requested for that requirement to be waived. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated he  
10 thought it would be needed if it was finished to the bottom. Sheldon Smith stated they just needed  
11 to make sure they were consistent with what had been required for past developers.

12

13 Chair Tonja Hanson opened the public hearing at 6:22 P.M.

14

15 Margarita Richins – 1500 North Echo Dam Road

16

17 Margarita Richins stated I can't pass up the opportunity to answer Sheldon's question. There's one  
18 major difference. One's a main major subdivision. The other one's a minor subdivision. However, on  
19 the major subdivision, sidewalks were not required where there was an existing house, which is  
20 exactly the same as what this subdivision is. And so, I thought I heard someone say, Don explained  
21 to someone and I can't remember who asked the question, what about the sidewalk in front of the  
22 house, and they said, we haven't been requiring it on existing construction. And so, in my opinion,  
23 none of this should be required to have sidewalks. Also, this is the same situation as Candace  
24 Horne's subdivision. And their sidewalks were not required because there wasn't room and it's a  
25 minor subdivision. So, it's, and it's directly across from a school activity area. So those are my  
26 answers to your question. That's what I would say. Sheldon Smith stated that was a good response  
27 and stated that was what he meant when he stated they needed to be consistent.

28

29 Royes Richins – Family Trustee, 949 East 740 South, Spanish Fork, UT

30

31 Royes Richins stated the reason I'm here is, I'm a trustee to Beth Richins' property, which is in a  
32 trust and I'm the trustee. I live in Spanish Fork, but I grew up in Coalville. I grew up and our family  
33 maintained this hill along here, it's down here maintained that hill for about 68 years. So now my  
34 comment is, if this sidewalk is put in, it will end about right here in the middle of this road (100  
35 East). And for someone using that sidewalk to get to the other sidewalk, even if you paint strips in  
36 here, you're going to have to cross the street. So, all of you've probably driven down this street and  
37 know that if you come over the top of that hill and somebody's crossing the street right here, it can  
38 be a safety hazard. And I think that's something that should be considered. So, whether they're on  
39 bikes or whether they're on foot, you're still going to have to cross in the middle of the hill. And I  
40 don't know the distance from here to here, but sometimes some of the cars come over the hill  
41 quite, quite fast. So just another thought.

42

Rozella Richins – Family Trustee

43

44 Rozella Richins stated the basic reason that we're doing this is Albert and I inherited the property  
45 that our parents owned. It is owned by the Beth Bingham Richins Trust. And my brother, Royes,

1 and I are the Trustees of that Trust. And so, the purpose is mainly we just want to get what we  
2 inherited into our names. If there's anything further that we ever planned to do with the property,  
3 we know at that time, we'd also have to come before the Commission and have everything  
4 approved. And so, this was mainly just for our inheritance to make sure we could get everything  
5 into our names. And, you know, I appreciate what everyone's going through, but I'm also  
6 concerned about the hazard and with the fact that the County owns just below our property. I  
7 mean, how do you, how do you go about telling the County they've got to complete the sidewalk?  
8 Chair Tonja Hanson stated if the County came in and wanted to do a development or put a building  
9 there, we would request that they put the sidewalk in as well. Rozella Richins stated I understand,  
10 but in the meantime, if there isn't, they're not making a request for that, and I don't know, because  
11 I live in Las Vegas. I've lived in Las Vegas for almost 33 years. So, I don't know what's going on with  
12 the County, but once again, it just ends right there. That seems kind of crazy. Like Margarita said  
13 it's a sidewalk to nowhere. Chair Hanson stated she thought a possible recommendation could be  
14 that a sidewalk would need to go in there when and if there was a building put on that other lot.  
15 She questioned if they could do that. She questioned if they could be required to put in a sidewalk  
16 in conjunction with the owner of the other lot. Don Sargent stated it would be tough to require  
17 that in the future. He stated a landowner could end up with that responsibility and not realize it.  
18 He recommended requiring just an easement for the sidewalk. He stated the Code did have a  
19 provision for minor subdivisions that only an easement for sidewalks and associated trails could be  
20 considered unless the City Council determined one was necessary for safety. Sheldon Smith stated  
21 that was consistent with what they had done in the past. He stated you could require the  
22 easement in case at some point down the road a sidewalk was necessary. He stated they had done  
23 that in the past for other developments. He stated in my opinion, this may not be an area that you  
24 would want the sidewalk. He stated his main purpose really in asking the question was they  
25 needed to be very careful to make sure that they distinguish when they were requiring somebody  
26 to do it and not somebody else. He stated there had to be a really good reason. Sheldon stated it  
27 could be very dangerous, as they've pointed out, to have that crosswalk in the middle of the hill.  
28 He stated it was hard to see cars that came up over the hill so it could be dangerous.

29 Chair Tonja Hanson closed the public hearing at 6:30 P.M.  
30

31 Commissioner Jeff White stated he was okay with them dividing the property and not having  
32 sidewalks since they weren't proposing any building. Commissioner Tim Bristow stated he would  
33 like to have the easement in case they ever straightened out and fixed the road. He stated the  
34 owners could still request more development in the future. He stated they could request to put in  
35 Townhomes or something else and a sidewalk may be needed along 50 South and the road may  
36 need to be improved. Chair Tonja Hanson stated he had brought up a could point of maybe  
37 needing something along 50 South. Don Sargent stated there would be constraints on the property  
38 off of 50 South as the existing shed was built on property line and the easement would run into the  
39 shed. Sheldon Smith stated in his opinion a sidewalk on 50 South really would be a sidewalk to  
40 nowhere. There wasn't any place for it to go. He stated if things changed on 100 East there may  
41 be room and a need for a sidewalk and he thought an easement should be required. Commissioner  
42 Brandon Brady stated he thought they needed to start somewhere and the Developer should install  
43 their portion of the sidewalk on 100 East and maybe it would put pressure on the County or the  
44 City to finish it the rest of the way or they could do the "fee in lieu" so the money was available  
45 when it was time to put it in. Chair Tonja Hanson stated she thought an easement should be  
46 required because she didn't see the County or the City finishing the sidewalk. She stated it was a

1 safety concern to have part of it installed and then for it to just stop. She stated she didn't think a  
2 sidewalk was necessary for 50 South. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated the other issue was the  
3 access for Lot #2 off of 50 South. He stated it needed to be determined if that was a City street to  
4 provide legal access to the property. He stated otherwise they would have to show access through  
5 Lot #1. The Commissioners, Staff, and Applicants continued to discuss the access off of 50 South  
6 and determined the City needed to review and verify if it was a City street. Don Sargent stated the  
7 Commissioners could recommend the application to the Council with the condition that legal access  
8 off of 50 South was determined prior to the Council taking action or they could table it and have it  
9 come back to Planning with the verified information.

10

11 **Commissioner Brandon Brady made a motion to table the recommendation for the Marvin**  
12 **Richins Minor Subdivision until the 50 South public access for Lot #2 was verified. Commissioner**  
13 **Tim Bristow seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

14

15 **Item 4 – Work Session: Continued Review Development Code Text Clarifications:**

16

17 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit B) and stated this was a continued review of the  
18 Code Text Clarifications. The Commissioners reviewed the information:

19

- 20 • Added the fee for the Temporary Use Permit - \$50
- 21 • Public Hearing for Minor Subdivision only required for the Planning Commission.
- 22 • Amended the Driveway regulations for anything up to 3 units the minimum width - 12 feet  
23 drivable surface and minimum right-of-way 24 feet. Anything for 4 units and up the  
minimum width – 20 feet drivable surface and minimum right-of-way 32 feet.
- 24 • Nightly Rentals – Don Sargent stated they would be looking at language for Short Term  
25 Nightly Rentals as a specific section in the Code. The definition would be expanded with  
26 the clarifications.
- 27 • Accessory Dwellings in front setback – The Commissioners discussed whether to allow them  
28 in the front setback or only a certain amount of feet in front of the main dwelling. The  
29 Commissioners decided to leave it as it had been corrected to “no accessory structures are  
30 allowed in the front setback”.

31

32 **Item 5 – Review, Discussion, Public Hearing, And Possible Recommendation: Development Code**  
33 **Text Clarifications Ordinance No. 2022-6:**

34

35 Chair Tonja Hanson moved back to the regular meeting and opened the public hearing at 6:52 P.M.

36

37 There were no public comments.

38

39 Chair Tonja Hanson closed the public hearing at 6:53 P.M.

40

41 **Commissioner Jeff White made a motion to approve and recommend the Development Code Text**  
42 **Clarifications Ordinance No. 2022-6 as presented. Commissioner Brandon Brady seconded the**  
43 **motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

44

45 **Item 6 - Continued Review, Discussion, And Possible Recommendation: Red Hills Ranch MPD And**  
46 **Phase 1, 31 Lot Subdivision Preliminary Plat, 800 S Hoytsville Road, (CT-482-F, CT-476):**

1  
2 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit C) for the Red Hills Ranch MPD and Phase 1  
3 Preliminary Subdivision Plat and stated this was a continued review for this project. He stated all of  
4 the information had been provided for the public hearing in April with the direction for the  
5 Applicant to address traffic impacts, water requirements, and engineering comments. Don stated  
6 there were also some additional items needed for Staff to complete their review and reviewed  
7 those 7 items with the Commissioners. Skylar Tolbert referred to Josh Gibbons from Hales  
8 Engineering and Logan Riley to discuss the traffic comments and the water requirements. Josh  
9 Gibbons stated Hales Engineering had completed the traffic study for this project. He stated  
10 regarding the left turn lane, they didn't see a need with the number of vehicles traveling on  
11 Hoytsville Road from the information revealed through the impact study. He stated they could add  
12 the middle left turn lane if the City wanted to address any safety concerns. He stated as far as  
13 phasing, they didn't know at the time what the proposed timing was for phasing, but with the new  
14 information provided with the latest plans, there wasn't a huge difference. He stated they analyzed  
15 existing conditions and then five years out using the County model. He stated the model predicted  
16 a 1% growth per year which wouldn't change the information. Chair Tonja Hanson stated she  
17 disagreed with the traffic model. She stated there were future developments planned in Hoytsville  
18 and felt there would be a lot more traffic than projected on Hoytsville Road. She questioned if the  
19 Commissioners could request for a left-hand turning lane to be put in with the development. Don  
20 Sargent stated they could add that to the requirements. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated he  
21 noticed the road width was narrow and wouldn't provide enough room for turning and the County  
22 model didn't include the additional projected growth. Skylar Tolbert stated the development being  
23 referred to in Hoytsville, Cedar Crest Overlay, was in the very preliminary stages. He stated they  
24 would have their own interchange and so the traffic wouldn't be coming through Coalville. Chair  
25 Tonja Hanson stated they would still have school traffic. Skylar Tolbert stated he would have to do  
26 a traffic study for the Cedar Crest Overlay and if the project was going to affect another area, they  
27 would be responsible to correct or fix the issue, but he would be happy to add the left lane turns  
28 from a safety standpoint. Logan Riley stated he and his Dad, Jim Riley, worked with water issues  
29 to help applicants understand the laws which were always changing. He stated a city would accept  
30 water through an approved change application and the time period could take four and six months.  
31 He stated the change application would give the exact amount of acre feet of water that was  
32 approved and then it would be deeded over to the city. He stated they had reviewed the water  
33 available for this project and a change application would determine if there were any "haircuts" or  
34 limitations and how much could be approved which was how cities were protected. He stated the  
35 change application dealt with the paper water. He stated signing the change application didn't  
36 mean they were accepting the water. He stated the water wouldn't be accepted until it was  
37 deeded to the city. Mr. Tyler stated the paper water would then be changed or moved to a wet  
38 water source. He stated the State didn't look at or determine the current water source supply. He  
39 stated the City would need to determine if there was enough physical or wet water to meet the  
40 demand of the additional paper water. He stated they needed to wait for the State approval before  
41 they gave credit for the culinary water. Skylar Tolbert stated they were very aware they needed to  
42 bring wet water for their project. He stated the paper water was in this area and was local. He  
43 stated in the State, most of the water was agricultural and when they transferred that to paper  
44 water, they anticipated having left over shares because a residential use reduced the amount of  
45 water being pulled from the sources compared to an agricultural use. Nick Mingo stated they had  
46 met with the City a couple of different times regarding the options for wet water and he stated  
47 they wanted to do whatever was best for the City. He stated he reviewed the Water Master Plan

1 study provided by JUB Engineers LLC in 2016 for Coalville City and one entire section regarding wet  
2 water had been analyzed in great detail. He referred to a table from the report (Exhibit D) and  
3 reviewed it with the Commissioners. He stated from the options listed they had chosen to study  
4 three items and had decided to start with focusing on treating the Brown Well water. He stated the  
5 costs of treating and dealing with the water based on this report were similar to the costs  
6 associated with expanding the Water Treatment Plant. He stated the difficult part of treating the  
7 Brown Well water would be figuring out what to do with the concentrated waste. He stated this  
8 was land intensive and it would take 10-15 acres if you did a settling pump which could be provided  
9 as part of the subdivision. He stated the next option would be to get the water piped from the  
10 Weber River and upgrade the Water Treatment Plant. He stated both of these options were  
11 feasible and would provide more than enough water for the project. He stated one other option  
12 that he had spoken with Zane DeWeese about was for them to explore rehabbing the expanding  
13 the Hoytsville Well. He stated this well used to produce more water than it currently did and the  
14 City only used it when they needed it because it produced a lot of air bubbles and people  
15 complained about that. He stated the report had written off that option, but if the City felt that  
16 was worth revisiting, they would be happy to do that. Nick Mingo stated all three of these were  
17 really good options, but they needed some guidance from the City for what they would like them to  
18 pursue. He stated one other benefit of treating the Brown Well was it would provide a source of  
19 water on the East side of the Interstate for the City. Chair Tonja Hanson questioned if they had to  
20 have the water determined before they gave a recommendation. Don Sargent stated no, they just  
21 needed to have a direction showing their intention. He stated it would be decided by the City  
22 Council with the Final plat. Skylar Tolbert stated they had looked at the contract with the City and  
23 it stated the petitioner agreed to investigate and research filtering or treatment for the existing  
24 Brown Well. He stated they felt this was the best option to move forward with for their project.  
25 Skylar reviewed some of the comments from the Staff report and stated they had committed to  
26 connecting a trail to the Rail Trail with Phase 1. He stated they had discussed the concern of a bus  
27 lane for the bus stop and had decided the best way to address that was to have the bus pull into  
28 the subdivision so they wouldn't be picking up students from the road and would continue their  
29 talks with the NS School District regarding bus routes and options. He reviewed the rest of the  
30 items with the Commissioners. Chair Tonja Hanson questioned if they had pursued paving the Rail  
31 Trail with the State Park. Skylar Tolbert stated they hadn't yet. Chair Hanson suggested for them to  
32 continue to work toward that possibility. Skylar Tolbert stated they were very interested in the  
33 affordable housing aspect of this project. Chair Tonja Hanson questioned when they would see  
34 some type of structure for the affordable housing proposal. She stated it was tricky because they  
35 had requested reduced setbacks and lot sizes to accommodate affordable housing, but they didn't  
36 know what the program would be. Skylar Tolbert stated there would definitely be a program  
37 because it was part of their agreement. Chair Hanson questioned if they could put a cap on the  
38 amount of affordable housing for the project like only 8% could be affordable housing. Don Sargent  
39 stated yes, they could do that. Skylar Tolbert questioned where the 8% came from. Chair Tonja  
40 Hanson stated that was what they had presented as the number of smaller lots. She stated she  
41 kept going back to the General Plan and the rural feel for development and the smallest lots didn't  
42 feel rural to her. She stated she was concerned about setting a precedent for future developments.  
43 If a project was only 20 units it wouldn't be a problem, but if it was larger than that, then she was  
44 uncomfortable with setting that precedent. Skylar Tolbert stated not all of the smallest lots would  
45 be part of the affordable housing program. He stated they would be fine if the City wanted to put a  
46 cap on it. He stated they could sprawl the entire development across all of the property, but they  
47 wanted to preserve the hillside and keep the open feel and open space and the smaller lots help

1 them achieve that. Chair Tonja Hanson asked Don Sargent to give some insight on the standard  
2 setbacks. Don Sargent stated they had been in place since the Development Code had been  
3 updated in 1994. Skylar Tolbert stated the agreement stated the number of units plus any density  
4 bonuses allowed and they had come in under the number of units they could have. Chair Tonja  
5 Hanson stated she loved the open space, but she had a concern about the minimum setbacks and  
6 thought they were too small. Skylar Tolbert stated they needed to have the reduced setbacks for  
7 some of the lots so they could still build a decent size home and be able to afford it. Don Sargent  
8 stated the Beacon Hill Subdivision had been approved for 8-foot side setbacks. Skylar Tolbert  
9 stated the agreement that was created back in 2001 allowed for cluster density and design features  
10 that encouraged open space and to follow that agreement, they needed to have reduced setbacks.  
11 Eric Langvardt stated he understood the concern with setting a precedent for other developers by  
12 allowing a 5-foot side setback, but they would also have to match the other items they were doing  
13 and offering. He stated he didn't think they would see another project come in with the amount of  
14 open space they were offering, the connection to the Rail Trail, the trail and park system, etc. He  
15 stated he didn't think they would notice the setbacks when it was all built out. He stated there was  
16 a precedent as well on the good side of the project that justified the reduced setback.  
17 Commissioner Brandon Brady stated he would like to see the next steps if they decided to proceed  
18 with the Brown Well information. He stated he would also like to see a warrant study for the left  
19 turns for safety reasons. Skylar Tolbert stated they would just agree to put in a left-hand turn and  
20 would let the traffic engineer to decide if it needed to be on the North side or South side. He  
21 stated the water discussion would be an ongoing conversation and wouldn't be determined until  
22 the Final plat. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated he would like to see where they would place  
23 the settling pond. Nick Mingo stated they would continue to review the direction for the water and  
24 any detailed questions could be answered through the report issued by JUB Engineers LLC back in  
25 2016. Don Sargent stated he would email that report to the Commissioners for their information.  
26 Chair Tonja Hanson stated she thought they needed to have another public hearing for this project  
27 for the citizens to hear this new information and have the opportunity to give comment, especially  
28 on the water. Commissioner Brandon Brady stated he would like more discussion on the 5-foot  
29 setbacks. He stated he had seen issues with these in the past and was still leery in allowing them.  
30 Chair Hanson stated she would also like to see the document for approval to use the Rail Trail for  
31 the sewer line. Skylar Tolbert stated they could provide the document from them that showed they  
32 were open to pursuing an agreement with them. He stated he would need direction on specifics of  
33 what information Commissioner Brady wanted concerning the 5-foot setbacks. He stated it had  
34 been discussed and explained before and needed to know what else they would like to see from  
35 them. Chair Tonja Hanson questioned if they agreed to 8-foot setbacks, what would that look like  
36 for them. Skylar Tolbert questioned if he provided a scale of the 5-foot setbacks on some of the  
37 smaller lots and a little bigger on others, if they would be interested in looking at that or were they  
38 set on only allowing 8-foot side setbacks. Chair Tonja Hanson stated she would be opened to  
39 looking at allowing 5-foot setbacks on the 8% work force housing portion and then scale it from  
40 there. She stated she had a hard time approving an entire project for 5-foot setbacks.  
41 Commissioner Brandon Brady questioned if that would be for the Town Homes. Skylar Tolbert  
42 stated they wanted to provide single family lots as well as Town Homes for the work force housing.  
43 He stated they didn't necessarily need to be the smallest lots. He stated the 8% represented the  
44 smallest lots and he thought it was better to provide some flexibility for the work force housing  
45 portion. Sheldon Smith informed Skylar Tolbert the Brown Well was now part of the secondary  
46 water system for the City and wanted them to be aware of that as they proceeded with their water  
47 analysis. Don Sargent recommended for the Applicant to respond in writing to the seven items

1 listed in the Staff report so he could forward that to the Planning Commission for review. He stated  
2 he would start working on a list of proposed findings and conclusions of law for approval. Chair  
3 Tonja Hanson stated they would move forward with scheduling a public hearing for the meeting  
4 next month for this project.

5

6 **Item 7 – Chalk Creek Estates Phase 4 MPD and Subdivision Concept Plan:**

7

8 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit E) for the Chalk Creek Estates Phase 4 Subdivision  
9 and stated Dirk Rockhill would be representing the Applicants, Alan Stanford and Chris Boyer. He  
10 stated they had received approval for Phase 1 and Phase 2 and was jumping to Phase 4 for their  
11 next project. He stated this project would extend 50 North for a second access. He stated there  
12 was a possibility of a bridge over Chalk Creek that continued to Border Station Road that would give  
13 the property three accesses if completed. Don stated this was a concept plan for Phase 4. Dirk  
14 Rockhill stated as a Planning Commission they had a significant role for the City and he had been on  
15 that side of it before. He stated they could provide information for their project regarding the  
16 sidewalks, setbacks, frontage, and lot sizes. He stated the Commissioners could drive through  
17 Phase 1 and see the benefit to the community from an existing completed phase. Dirk Rockhill  
18 stated access was important and the main purpose of Phase 4 was to get another access for the  
19 project. He stated Summit County was on board to extend 50 North through their property to  
20 continue through this project. He stated this project was black and white and there wasn't a lot of  
21 guess work. He stated they were providing a need for the citizens of Coalville. Dirk Rockhill stated  
22 they would like to move forward as fast as possible and he would petition the Commission to  
23 continue this project forward. Chair Tonja Hanson questioned what the timeline was for Summit  
24 County to extend the road through their property. Dirk Rockhill stated they were ready to go and  
25 was just waiting for them and would do it in conjunction with their project. . Chair Tonja Hanson  
26 stated she drove through the Phase 1 of this project and agreed it was a very nice development.  
27 She stated everything was landscaped which made a big difference. She questioned when the  
28 detention pond would be put in. Alan Stanford stated the detention pond was in for Phase 1 and  
29 Phase 2 and they would extend the pond for Phase 4. Dirk Rockhill everything from their project  
30 would be retained within itself. Commissioner Brandon Brady questioned if there was a reason for  
31 the double cul-de-sac. Chris Boyer stated it was just to give another turn around option. Don  
32 Sargent stated the Code did require a certain amount of park space or recreational space which  
33 would be Parcel A. He stated the Final Plat for Phase 2 had been approved, but it hadn't been  
34 recorded yet and he was reviewing where Phase 3 was in the process. The Commissioners  
35 recommended moving forward with the Preliminary plan and public hearing at the next meeting.

36

37 **Item 8 – Work Session: Continued Review MPD Code Provisions Refinements:**

38

39 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit F) and reviewed the changes with the Planning  
40 Commission and made the following adjustments.

41

- 42 • Page 1 – Change the language to match the style and language to the current Code. Keep  
only the first line of the second portion.
- 43 • Page 3 – Remove “and subdivisions”.
- 44 • Page 6 – Change to remove the yellow highlighted reference to the specific water  
ordinance.

45

1       • Discussed the density bonus percentage of the base density. Don Sargent stated the old  
2 provision only allowed 25% and the change to 50% was to create an incentive for deed  
3 restricted open space. He stated the rural area was open land and cluster development  
4 allowed for that. The Commissioners decided to continue the discussion.  
5

6       Don Sargent recommended scheduling this for a public hearing at the next meeting.  
7

8       **Commissioner Jeff White made a motion to hold a public hearing at the next meeting on June 20,**  
9       **2022 for the MPD Code Provisions Refinements. Commissioner Brandon Brady seconded the**  
10       **motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

11       **Item 9 – Community Development Director Updates:**

12       Don Sargent informed the Planning Commission the City Council was continuing to review the Use  
13       List, Definitions, and Low Impact Permit and should be ready to complete it at their next meeting.  
14

15       **Item 10 – Planning Commission Updates:**

16       There were no Planning Commission updates tonight.  
17

18       **Item 11 – Review And Possible Approval Of Minutes:**

19       The Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the April 18, 2022 meeting.  
20

21       **Commissioner Jeff White made a motion to approve the minutes of April 18, 2022 as amended.**  
22       **Commissioner Brandon Brady seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**  
23

24       **Item 12 – Adjournment:**

25       **Commissioner Tim Bristow made a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting.**  
26       **Commissioner Jeff White seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion Carried.**  
27

28       The meeting adjourned at 8:55 P.M.  
29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Chair Tonja Hanson

Attest:

Nachele D. Sargent, City Recorder