

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
HELD 04/07/2022. 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 Member Erik Stromberg

**Commission Members that were present on Zoom:** Commission Member John Limburg

**Commission Members that were absent:**

**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:** Holly Jones, Conrad & Carlene Schultz, Eddie & Julia Martin, Logan & Daphne Hull, Jason Smith, Jeremy & Cheri Leavitt, Ernie & Vicki Matthews, Ryan Banister, Tiffany Hawke, Scott Catrell, Jody Erickson, Richard Anderson, Judd Lawrence, Deik Matthews, Rhett Butler, Barry Bunderson, Dustin Hall, Mike Quarnberg, Kevin Hall

**THE REGULAR MEETING WAS OFFICIALLY CALLED TO ORDER BY  
COMMISSION CHAIR, BRIAN PATTEE AT 7:00 P.M.**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- 1. Discussion to approve a Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for Logan and Daphne Hull to own and operate an Online Sporting Good Retail and FFL Transfer business out of her home located at 197 West Phelps Street in the R-1-21 zone.**

Logan and Daphne Hull were present for this discussion.

Gary Pinkham asked, it says you're doing everything online. How do order firearms online?

Logan Hull answered, customers can purchase firearms online and obviously you can't get a firearm mailed straight to your house, it needs to be transferred to someone with an FFL license to perform the background check.

Attorney Coombs asked, are you going to be storing ammo onsite?

Logan Hull answered, I wasn't planning on keeping ammunition since it's a hazardous material, and shipping and handling, that would be a huge hassle.

Dan England asked, I was just wondering how many people you think you might have coming

to your house and how often?

Logan Hull answered, so from the other home base FFLs that I know, they average typically four to six customers a month. I'm hoping this is mostly an online business selling sporting goods and accessories. Such as binoculars and range finders.

**2. Discussion to recommend approval of a Final Plat Amendment for LBP Building 1, LLC. located at 323 North Sheep Lane to divide lot 1 into two (2) building lots in the MG zone.**

Chandler Elliot was present on Zoom for this discussion and stated to the Commission. This is an amended Final Plat for Phase 1 of the Lakeview Business Park. We originally weren't sure how far the first building was going to extend to the east. Now that it is almost finished we realized that there's an additional 25 acres that could be available for another building. There's no current plan for anything, but in order to start planning for that we needed to amend the final plat.

**3. Discussion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Grantsville New Team, LLC. on the Matthews Meadows Subdivision located approximately at 401 West Durfee Street for the creation of eighty-eight (88) lots in the R-1-12 zone.**

Shawn Holste was present for this discussion and stated to the Commission: here's another project for you. 12,000 square foot lots. Nice area. Smaller lots to put affordable housing in for starting out or extending their family and just trying to make a great community for people to come into.

Jaime Topham asked, is Pear Street supposed to be developed through?

Shawn Holste answered, no. The school is in the way.

Erik Stromberg asked, where is Street G heading? It appears that it could connect to a future road to the East. What was your thoughts with this?

Shawn Holste answered, well, so that's the hard part. This has been through a handful of reviews. So just trying to figure out what exactly we want to do because switching it to the south is easy enough, but does it need to go east also? So just looking for some direction. What we want to do is Pear Street, but there is a school there. What are the parameters we're trying to fit when we bring these in?

Gary Pinkham stated, looking at the parcels to the east of here, there's a couple fairly large parcels that have homes out on Durfee, unless you drive through your yard, you can't get the back end. So we've asked Shawn to put potential street access to the back ends of those long skinny lots for future. And it may or may not ever get developed, but at least then the South end of those parcels could be accessed at some point.

Erik Stromberg stated, I'm not opposed to them doing this, I like that they are trying not to land lock parcels. I was just wondering what the thought process was.

Dan England stated, there was a comment about the lack of parks. While you're up there maybe you want to address that.

Shawn Holste stated, I think that's a great comment and same thing, we're looking for direction too there with parks. We intend to pay the fee in lieu for the open space. I would prefer on these to take that detention basin and turn that into a grass basin that you can have a little practice field. My boys are nine and we played football and a lot of the practices happen in these little detention basins. It's a great place. All the other parks and areas are full. It adds to the community. So that one's a little bit bigger. This one obviously is too small to put any kind of park in there. But that's what we typically do is do. And I hope that that goes towards something, like back to the football, along with everyone else here, we all travel to Salt Lake to go play on those 78-acre football fields on Saturdays. And so I hope those fees go towards building something like that.

**4. Discussion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Grantsville New Team, LLC. on the Cowboy Estates Subdivision located approximately at 416 South Willow Street for the creation of nineteen (19) ½ acre lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

Shawn Holste was present for this discussion and stated to the Commission: These are half acre lots. It'll be a little bit bigger home on there. You have more property to take care of and deal with. So just maybe a little older family opportunity to move in there. I like the idea of the different opportunities, because you bring mixed community together. That just adds, you got younger families, older families and it just adds together.

Erik Stromberg asked, how does Street A line up with Willow Elementary?

Shawn Holste answered, it lines up with the school.

Erik Stromberg asked, so you're going to have everyone trying to pull in and out of that entrance while everyone's parking on Willow to trying to pick their kids up?

Shawn Holste answered, yes. It's going to be a little bit busy.

Dan England asked, some of the lots at the end of the cul-de-sac look like they're a little bit narrow at the cul-de-sac. I think you guys went through and made sure that they were widened?

Gary Pinkham answered, I checked them Dan. Two of them were 60, I believe, and a couple are mid to upper fifties. They meet code at this point in time.

Chair Brian Pattee stated, I don't know if we are okay with this but the plans show a blow off at the end of the cul-de-sac instead of a fire hydrant. Can we make sure that Public Works and Fire are okay with that?

Dan England stated, I have been directed by fire and that they would prefer to have the fire hydrants at just before this goes wide into the cul-de-sac. And then the blow off at the end of the cul-de-sac for those purposes so that they can drop off the hose and they can go forward to where they need to, instead of dragging the hose up to the fire hydrant. And Public Works has been involved with this whole process.

**5. Discussion to recommend approval of the PUD Plan for Dustin Hall, D.A.B. & K, LLC. on the Willow Fields PUD Subdivision located at approximately at 834 N. Old Lincoln Hwy for the creation of twenty-eight (28) lots in the RR-1 zone.**

Dustin Hall and Barry Bunderson were present for this discussion and stated to the Commission: Well, this is a unique piece of property kind of long east to west, but the main goal that Dustin would like to do is, we've looked at some of the responses from people in the general plan, comment periods, and that they love the small-town feel, the rural charm of Grantsville. So, this is a one-acre zone. However, it's hard to create that small rural feel with this current city road section. So, we made an application to do a P-U-D. It's got a little bit of a unique road section on it, but we've had some comments about that with staff. All in all, we are mimicking what has been done in a lot of places in the county where they have one-acre zoning and, in parts of Erda, around Church Road, Cochrane Lane, lots of places that I've been involved with some of the projects there. We think that there's a market that people will enjoy this type of a product. So that's what we're going for. We're trying to create something that people want, and that's not being done in the city of Grantsville.

Jaime Topham asked, so what does that mean, because I'm looking at this, but I don't really know what you mean by that. Can you explain that better? You say you're keeping it rural. So, what are you doing with the roads that's different?

Barry Bunderson answered, the only city standard streets that we have are curb, gutter, sidewalk, 66 feet wide. So, ours is unique in that it doesn't have curb and gutter, it's more of the gravel shoulder. Dustin is a paving contractor, so he knows a lot about that, and knows how to build it.

Dustin Hall stated, we sent in some pictures that we wanted to show you guys as examples tonight, but we were told they weren't admissible because this was a public hearing. So, I guess we'll have to wait for the next meeting to show you those. But we did take some photos to show for example of what we're trying to achieve.

Erik Stromberg stated, I guess where I was struggling a little bit, is it looks like all the lots or acre lots. But you're asking for the P-U-D so you can change the streets.

Dustin Hall stated, we also have 2 half-acre lots that front Old Lincoln Hwy that match the properties across the street. Those are the two reasons that we are asking for the PUD.

Barry Bunderson asked, did you guys get a copy of the objectives? We touch on a lot of bullet points that the General Plan is trying to promote. We also have included a 5-acre park. Which is more than what is required by code. So that was something else that we tried to incorporate into this project along with the unique road to hopefully give people that rural, small-town charm that is Grantsville.

**6. Discussion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Dustin Hall, D.A.B. & K, LLC. on the Willow Fields PUD Subdivision located at approximately at 834 N. Old Lincoln Hwy for the creation of twenty-eight (28) lots in the RR-1 zone.**

There was no additional discussion for this agenda item.

**7. Discussion to recommend approval to amend Chapter 7, Conditional Uses, sections, #7.5.1 and #7.8, in the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code.**

Kristy Clark stated, we had a discussion on this last month and the Commission was good with the changes, but it needed to be on for Public Hearing. I didn't receive any comments, so I think we are good with this one.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**a. Proposed Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for Logan and Daphne Hull to own and operate an Online Sporting Good Retail and FFL Transfer business out of her home located at 197 West Phelps Street in the R-1-21 zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:22p.m. and called for comments.

No comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

**b. Proposed Final Plat Amendment for LBP Building 1, LLC. located at 323 North Sheep Lane to divide lot 1 into two (2) building lots in the MG zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:23 p.m. and called for comments.

No comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

**c. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Grantsville New Team, LLC. on the Matthews Meadows Subdivision located approximately at 401 West Durfee Street for the creation of eighty-eight (88) lots in the R-1-12 zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:23 p.m. and called for comments.

Chairman, Brian Pattee read an email from Judd Lawrence into the record that stated to the

Commission: Attached is a marked-up plat for Matthews Meadows that addresses the concerns. It is very important that a road be stubbed south to provide sewer and water connections to approximately 30 acres of raw land. The road will also provide traffic circulation when adjoining properties are developed. The road stubbed east may not be necessary, since the Leavitt parcel is already subdivided. However, it may be further subdivided at some point in the future. Also, the extension of Pear Street should be addressed in this development. It is my understanding that Pear was to be extended when the adjoining parcels are developed, providing traffic circulation and additional vehicular and pedestrian access to the school. Also, note that the Eleven Twenty-seven parcel is landlocked without either the stub from Matthews Meadow or Pear Extension, or both. Also, if the rear of lots is to abut farm ground, a six-foot fence to keep debris and access out of adjacent property is needed. Please address these concerns. Thanks.

Eddie Martin stated to the Commission: Eddie Martin. I live on Willow Street. Having lived there since early 1970s, I appreciate the openness, the farming, but I also have six kids who I appreciate the fact that property will be sold and subdivided. I have several concerns and several questions, but I'm only going to address three concerns. And three questions. One is I'm opposed to this, mainly because I just think there was such a lack of communication. I know that COVID caused some problems where we couldn't be here in person. I know that the opportunity to meet was tabled more than once, more than twice. And I just don't think the communications got out. I know I didn't receive any communications that indicated, hey, we're rescheduling the meeting. I don't know what the protocol is for that. And so that was my first concern is I just don't think there was the opportunity to share what we're sharing now that maybe could have been shared early on in this process. The second thing that I've concerned about is a congestion living on Willow Street and right next to elementary school, there's a certain time during this school year where vehicles are literally stopped at the stop sign and backed all the way to the elementary school. Knowing that 88 houses are going to go in here with an average of two and a half vehicles per home, we've got just under 200 additional vehicles that have an exit to Durfee and to Willow and I think that's going to be an issue. I'd be curious to see how that's going to be addressed with the congestion. The last thing is with the zoning and in my mind there seems to be some confusion with the zoning, and we zone rezoned our family property from five acre lots to one acre lots, it was fairly easy to do because that was the master plan for the city. I do not recall getting confirmation or notification that the five acre lots in this property were being dropped all the way down to quarter acre lots. If I missed it, I apologize, but I've dug everywhere to try to find that notification. And I know that in the current plan, there's a 2015 master plan that's colored that has medium density defined as three units per acre. I vote for three units per acre versus four units per acre if that's an option. And this was dropped from five acre lots clear down to quarter acre lots with what I perceive as just kind of a lack of transparency and communication so that folks like me could have a chance to comment. The questions that I have is knowing this is going to go through to a degree and eventually, what are the plans to mitigate dust and debris? I assume we're going to do this in two phases, and that's a lot of digging. There's a lot of homes that surround this. There's a lot of Grantsville wind that blows north and south. And I'm just wondering what the plan is to keep it watered down and cleared up so that we don't have to clean excessive debris and dust out of our own properties. Also, I appreciate the fact that parks or trails were addressed a little bit. I'd like to see where that goes. If they're going to put some kind of a park in there, makes

no sense that they choose or have the option to pay it forward or in lieu of so that Grantsville City has to buy a park somewhere else. I don't know how that process works, but I think it would be very important to include some green in this area. The last thing is I'd like to see how they're going to address the fences and separation between properties. If that comes into the plan somewhere, is it going to be all vinyl fences? Do people do their own, not only for the aesthetic purpose, but also for the safety with the number of vehicles are going to be going down these roads and the kids going down the sidewalk, I think this is an accident waiting to happen. I appreciate the time to present these.

Jeremy Leavitt stated to the Commission: Jeremy Levitt. I own the parcel to the east of this. I share a quarter mile fence line with this property. I'd like to start out by saying I do appreciate the fact that something is done there for future growth, right? With the stubbing of a drive into the back of my property, which is the field. And I agree with Judd in the fact that something needs to be stubbed south also. That's the good part about this. The bad part is like Eddie just said, there is a complete lack of transparency going on with this program here. The only reason I am here is because Eddie told me that this meeting was taking place. I did not receive a letter. I know Kristy supposedly mailed out two letters. One that was incorrect. One that's correct. I received neither of those. In addition, I didn't receive anything on the rezone of this. I was publicly opposed to a rezone that took place on the parcel north of Durfee. It was obvious that I was the one that was heading up and spearheading it. I know that the rezone, there was nobody here in attendance. This body should have realized that the fact that nobody was here in the opposition that was put forth on that partial to the north of Durfee right across the street, something should've clued in that we are lacking transparency and we are lacking public input, which is what this is supposed to be about. And it may be from COVID. It may be disorganization. I don't know what's going on there, but we do have a serious issue that should be addressed, separate of this subdivision. That being said, this is not harmonious with the surrounding area. The lots, while it does meet whatever was done in the dark of night there on that rezone, it is severely compacted and the density with the traffic needs to be addressed better. I'm also curious as to what the fencing or how they're going to work with the surrounding properties will take place. It is the responsibility of this planning and zoning to take into account the public responses and to take that as part of what we want to do. We all know growth is inevitable. It just needs to be put forth in a way that's harmonious with what we have here in that small town feel that we currently have. And I hope that this planning and zoning committee takes that into consideration.

Tiffany Hawk stated to the Commission: I live right next to the Levitt's and border this piece of property. I'm really here to speak about why I moved to Grantsville. I moved to Grantsville to have a bigger piece of land. I moved to Grantsville for the small-town feel. I moved from a quarter acre lot in Tooele to Grantsville so I could have the small-town feel. And to have that right next to me, I'm not really excited about it, especially with all the traffic. It's just going to be a mess. Let Stansbury and Tooele have their quarter acre lots and let Grantsville remain the town that we all know and love.

Ryan Banister stated to the Commission: My name's Ryan Banister. I live east of the property on the east side of Jeremy Levitt. I have some serious concerns about the process has taken place

with this. I also did not receive any notification about the rezoning. The only reason why that I had questions about it is because I saw the holes for compaction test and so the questions started. This is not acceptable to me. When I developed my minor subdivision, I had some heat because somebody was afraid that I would develop in the future my back five acres. I'm not understanding why we go from one acre, which was difficult to get seven years ago to go into quarter acre. I don't get that. It makes no sense. I have called the city several times and when I get led to the number to press, the pound, it led from many months to no voicemail. That is also unacceptable. The follow-ups also have been poor, which are unacceptable. As far as GTM Building, I applaud them for building good homes. I have faith in it that they're going to be a good, well-built home. I disagree with the quarter acre lots; which I feel I have been blindsided. Thank you.

Vicki Matthews stated to the Commission: I live just North of the property that is being developed and I agree with everything that's already been said. I am concerned about when we get this high density, water issues for around here. We are so dry. I just don't think we can have these new subdivisions coming in. I'm very much opposed to the quarter acre lots. And I too did not receive any input on having it changed to quarter acre lots. Didn't get anything on that. And if we could, with as many people that are upset about this, that we could kind of start over and let's go to preliminary number one and then see if we can get this into least half acre lots rather than quarter acre lots because the traffic is terrible. Sometimes at night at the four-way stop, they're lined up blocks down the road in every direction. I just really think it's going to be a hazard for everyone. And then also, we own a farm just north of this property and having that much residential population is going to be very detrimental to our farming and ranching that we've been there for a hundred years. Well, not we, but our posterity. Thank you.

Conrad Schultz stated to the Commission: I'm Conrad Schultz and live on Durfee. 453 east Durfee Street, right straight across from this proposed development. I too, my wife and I, Carly and I, did not receive communication of any rezoning. This is the first time I've seen in the plot. Maybe it's our fault for not reaching out, but the communication level has been very poor. As Vicky stated, where's water coming from for all this? The umpteen hundred houses being built and we were told when we moved to Grantsville, oh, 30 years ago, when we drilled the well, they said, "Well, this may be one of the last ones because the aquifers are dropping and there's not going to be water available." It's just a comment. Where's the water coming from? What happens? My major concern, assuming that at some point there will be development is that myself, my wife, our neighbor Jim Palmer, and down the line on Durfee are smack dab in the target zone for the south winds that we know will happen. And I don't think there's enough water in Tooele County to keep that property, to keep the construction watered down so that our home doesn't receive damage and/or we end up with health problems because of it. I would ask that the council consider that some kind of fund or guarantee or whatever the right legal word is, be put aside to take care of issues because the people that are my neighbors are up senior citizens in age and could be permanently damaged health wise by three or four days of getting wind blasts of nothing but dirt and dust and sand. And all the other comments regarding the being against the quarter acre lots, we agree with in that, it just changes the tone of the way we live and why we moved to Grantsville. It appears to me that it's inevitable that more dense housing is going to occur at some point. It's going to have to be. And I would suggest maybe look at putting it in the outer zones so



that it doesn't change the flavor of the existing surrounding properties and homes. Thank you very much.

Diek Matthews stated to the Commission: I live north of this property. I understand Grantsville's growing. I understand we're going to have developments. I would just like to see the quarter acres increase to at least half acre lots. Understand things in are going to change. Grantsville is evolving. People got to have a place to live. People should be able to sell their land, but I would like a nice subdivision. Trees, a yard, nice big yards, some green space, maybe some walking trails. That's what I see needs to happen and to change on this development. That's all I have to say.

Rhett Butler stated to the Commission: My name's Rhett Butler. I live on the corner of Willow and Durfee, the northwest corner. So directly kitty corner from this fine project by GTM. I just want to tell you I'm in support of everything that's been said thus far. I just want to reiterate a few things. The quarter acre lots, how that happened or how this is flying, we never got notified of any sort of change in those regards. I've lived in my home since 2002 and never, never received any notification that that area was changed to quarter acre lots, so very frustrated with that. The other thing is this talk about green space. There's none here and I heard the gentleman from GTM mention, "Hey, you know what? The fees and everything that city saves up enough, and we can go do that." They've been here. They've been working on projects, multiple projects. They've got another one that's coming up next. I'm sure we'll have plenty to say about that as well, but I don't see a whole lot of effort going into green space, going into parks, going into anything that's helping give back to the community. They've received a lot from the community, and they'll continue to receive a lot. This is their little gold mine. However, I don't see any green space here. How about let's put a quad baseball park and some football fields and then put in some quarter acre lots and a few houses then. Just something to maybe give back to the community, give back to us. I also have some big problems with some of their other projects, with some of the dead-end roads, with some of the cul-de-sacs, with some of the houses that are behind houses that have dirt roads going to them, with some of the fire hydrants that are in people's driveways. And I don't know how these things are flying and getting passed through, but super frustrated as a lifelong resident of this town. I'm okay with the growth and I understand. Don't get me wrong, but really frustrated with the way this has been presented. And I would just like to encourage this builder, instead of building a subdivision that, to me... I mean, I look at this and I think of Daybreak. I had an opportunity to work on the first phase of Daybreak 20 years ago. And I remember how close those lots were, but at least they had green space. It's a different area, but this is Grantsville. This is not West Jordan. This is not South Jordan. And those of us who have lived here all these years, we'd like to keep it Grantsville. I'm sure a lot of you would as well. So anyways, that's my two cents worth, for what it's worth and appreciate your time chairman and committee members.

No additional comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

**d. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Grantsville New Team, LLC. on the Cowboy Estates**

**Subdivision located approximately at 416 South Willow Street for the creation of nineteen (19) ½ acre lots in the R-1-21 zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:46 p.m. and called for comments.

Jody Erickson stated to the Commission: Jody Erickson, live on 248 South Willow. Very opposed to the quarter acre lots. I think we're headed for disaster with the traffic. Question, where are we with the outlet road for South Willow Estates that was promised to go out the backside of South Willow and catch the Tooele highway to alleviate the traffic when they put in South Willow Estates? Now we're going to put 88 more houses on the corner there, which is fine. I mean, the growth's coming, but I'm not sure what we're doing with Judd's field yet. I've heard rumors of 450 town homes, apartment complexes. There's 900 going cars, trucks. How does Willow Street handle that? That's my question.

Rhett Butler stated to the Commission: Rhet Butler. Live on corner of Willow and Durfee. Don't live too far from this project either. I just want to maybe talk a little bit more what Jody said about just the traffic. Living on the corner there, I'm afraid that the next stoplight in Grantsville is going to be on the corner of Willow and Durfee. It is and what's going to end up happening. I'm extremely opposed to this now because I can see it happening in my mind. What's going to happen is the city is going to be forced to encroach the roads with turn lanes into my property, into my in-law's property live across the street from me. And we both live on the corner, so that's going to be an inevitability with an additional, what is it, 18 houses with this particular one and then the previous discussion about the umpteenth number of houses with the quarter lots. So, the other question I have is just the sewer that is in front of my house. Years ago, we had a big snafu with the South Willow Estates subdivision. I think it was the third phase while I was building my home in 2003. There was some debris and garbage that went down the sewer lines as they were trying to, I guess, clean those out or blow those out. And they plugged up a neck right in front of my home. I was told by the public works department. And I'd like someone to look into this for me. I don't know if someone could look into this. I'm leaning to you. I think it was a 12-inch line to an eight-inch line right in front of my house where that vault is and a piece of plastic hit that. And as they were filling up their lines and it was rushing down with water, guess whose house got flooded with 10 inches of sewer water. This guy right here. So, if that line going down to the end of Willow and going to the sewer treatment plant is not larger than the line that is feeding it, then we have a big problem. And then we have a big public works project that we've got to do. I don't know if there's enough impact fees or what have you on this subdivision or the Cowboy subdivision or the Matthew subdivision to pay for that in addition to a new sewer treatment plant and everything else that goes along with that. I think the city needs to take a step back. There's a lot of growth here and I'm okay with growth, but measured growth. And we need to look at the fees that we're charging for these companies to come in and build around our community. I'll just tell you this, it's sheer greed from my perspective. Once again, there's my two cents worth. Thank you.

Eddie Martin stated to the Commission: All right. I'm since I got the letter for this one. Eddie Martin. I still live on Willow. I think since water, I'm surprised more people, there's only been

five people that have commented on water, but we know we live in a desert. We know there's issues. When our home at 357 was built, we were just on the outskirts of city limits in early '70s. We had our own power pole brought up there. We were on a septic tank and a well. When we bought the property from my parents 20 something years ago, the first thing I did is hooked up to the sewer line to get rid of the septic tank. And worked with Grantsville city to get hooked up to city water, because when the power goes out, unless I hook on my generator, we have no water. So, the issue I have is about the issues with the water, is the city was going to charge me such a large fee, including an impact fee to hook up to city water and it just wasn't affordable to me at that time. Since that time, we've had to lower our well twice, \$5,000 a pop and I'm real nervous, not only about what Mr. Butler commented on about the sewage line possibly backing up and using our basement for storage, but I'm also concerned about the water, the demand for water, and what's going to happen to our well. I don't think I can drop it another 35 feet. I'm wondering if there's something with folks like me that have a well, what the impact of construction is having on my well and if I can charge an impact fee. So, with that aside, I do understand that water is absolutely critical. Even if they're one acre or half acre, lots next to us. I personally don't want them to look like driving down through Phoenix, Arizona where people are out watering their rocks or have nothing but rocks in the front yard because there's no water. I think that is a very legitimate concern. There's no use having these developments if people can't live in them because there's no water. Thank you.

No additional comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 7:53 p.m.

**e. Proposed PUD Plan for Dustin Hall, D.A.B. & K, LLC. on the Willow Fields PUD Subdivision located at approximately at 834 N. Old Lincoln Hwy for the creation of twenty-eight (28) lots in the RR-1 zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 7:54 p.m. and called for comments.

Chairman, Brian Pattee read an email from Ben Brubaker that stated the Commission: Thank you for sending the plan. I thought it was funny that you ended your email to me with "state your concerns". I guess you mostly deal with people that are upset by development. I will be out of town, or I would plan on attending the meeting. If permitted, please share the following message on my behalf at the planning meeting. My name is Ben Brubaker. I recently built a house at 838 old Lincoln Highway. I am one of only a few properties that bump up to the presented development plan. I reviewed the map and application. I believe developments like this are inevitable as well as healthy for the community. I am happy to see mostly 1 acre lots. I only wish I could have bought the property before the developer did so that I could do the same thing he is planning on doing. Joking aside I have no objection to this plan and the future development of the property. I wish Mr. Hall the best in his development. Thank you.

Kevin Hall stated to the Commission: Kevin Hall. I live at 861 North 600 West, adjacent the proposal that Dustin's proposing. He is my son, so I certainly am in favor of what's

happening there. My comments tonight are more of a concern for rural Grantsville. I live on 12 acres and have lived there for 27 years. My concern is I attended some meetings with some of the city staff in regards to this project. And there were some comments made there about rural Grantsville. And I recognize that development like these are going to come, but I don't think we have to turn Grantsville all into asphalt and concrete just because there are big developments that are happening on this end of town. I think hope that the city would consider that there are those of us that live in a rural atmosphere. I think the one-acre thing is conducive with my lifestyle and not only with mine, but with my neighbors. And the idea that we have to have curb gutter and sidewalk in a rural area how do we have rural in Grantsville? How do we ever have anything that's rural and have the opportunity for me to take my 12 acres and divide that someday and allow my grandkids to have a lot to build on? Because obviously, the growth is going this way and eventually it'll come to us. But I think natural progression will allow for the upgrades that come. I just pray that you'll be concerned about the rural lifestyle of Grantsville, because that's why a lot of us live here is because of that. And I just pray that you consider that. That you recognize that not everything has to be half acre lots and not everything has to be curbed gutter and sidewalk and not everything has to be hooked to a sewer or to a water line because natural progression will provide someday for me to have to hook onto the sewer and to have to hook onto the water. But I don't think we have to force that today and allow somebody that has property not to be able to develop that or give their grandkids a lot because I have to do curbed gutter and sidewalk to allow that to happen. I know the growth's here, and we can't stop, but I just hope that you'll consider the rural lifestyle in Grantsville in some of these development programs. Thank you.

Rhett Butler stated to the Commission: Hello again, Rhett Butler. I do live on the corner of Willow and Durfee, but you're not going to believe this, before I lived there, I lived on the property just adjacent to this land right here. And my mother and father owned five acres there. And my grandmother owns 10 acres. And we did own 165 acres, but we had these greedy developers come in and snub my 65, 70-year-old grandmother out of 162 acres that's adjacent at my parents' place. I just thought I'd throw that. So, if it seems like I'm a little biter, we did lose to Morgan today and that's why. I want to say I like this development and I'm in support of it. I like what Mr. Hall has proposed and what his father just said. I just want to let you know, I'm in support of that. One acre lots are great. Green space is great. Keep that in mind, please. Thank you.

No additional comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 8:00 p.m.

**f. Proposed Preliminary Plan for Dustin Hall, D.A.B. & K, LLC. on the Willow Fields PUD Subdivision located at approximately at 834 N. Old Lincoln Hwy for the creation of twenty-eight (28) lots in the RR-1 zone.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 8:00 p.m. and called for comments.

No comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 8:01 p.m.

**g. Proposed Amendment to Chapter 7, Conditional Uses, sections, #7.5.1 and #7.8, in the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code.**

Chairman, Brian Pattee opened the public hearing at 8:01 p.m. and called for comments.

No comments were offered, Chairman, Brian Pattee closed the public hearing at 8:01 p.m.

**COMMISSION CHAIR BRIAN PATTEE OFFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 8:02 P.M.**

**8. Consideration to approve a Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for Logan and Daphne Hull to own and operate an Online Sporting Good Retail and FFL Transfer business out of her home located at 197 West Phelps Street in the R-1-21 zone.**

**Logan Hull was present for this agenda item:**

There weren't any additional comments from the Commission on this agenda item.

**Jaime made a motion to approve the Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for Logan and Daphne Hull to own and operate an Online Sporting Good Retail and FFL Transfer business out of her home located at 197 West Phelps Street in the R-1-21 zone. With the condition that they register with Grantsville City Police Department. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**9. Consideration to recommend approval to amend the Final Plat for LBP Building 1, LLC. located at 323 North Sheep Lane to divide lot 1 into two (2) building lots in the MG zone.**

**Chandler Elliot was present for this agenda item on Zoom:**

There weren't any additional comments from the Commission on this agenda item.

**Erik made a motion to recommend approval to amend the Final Plat for LBP Building 1, LLC. located at 323 North Sheep Lane to divide lot 1 into two (2) building lots in the MG zone. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**10. Consideration to recommend approval to amend Chapter 7, Conditional Uses, sections, #7.5.1 and #7.8, in the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code.**

Jaime Topham stated, All the changes are consistent with what we discussed last time. I don't have any concerns.

**Gary made a motion to recommend approval to amend Chapter 7, Conditional Uses, sections, #7.5.1 and #7.8, in the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**11. Consideration to recommend approval the PUD Application for Holly Jones located at 225 S. Willow Street for the creation of 10 units in the RM-7 zone.**

**Holly Jones was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:**

**Holly Jones was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:** The responses to the public comments is more educational, more fact data-based. The zoning, we had some questions on that, and the current zoning of the property is actually RM-7. It's not agricultural. The earliest map that I found was 1911 in the archives for the city, so I made sure of that prior to even applying. According to City Code, what I am proposing is allowed for this parcel. The minimum lot size for the RM-7 is 7,000 square feet, which allows for me to have 10 minutes. It goes over the setbacks. I'm within all code that way as well. Maximum building coverage, also within code. Street grading, street base, surface drainage facilities, curb and gutter, sidewalk, culinary water facilities, surface drainage facilities, wastewater disposal, street name signs, fire hydrants, street monuments, shade trees, streetlights. There's some question as to when Grantsville city's zoning ordinance changed, but the property has been zoned RM7, like I just discussed. We are not asking for a rezone of this property. The property was purchased with the current zoning already in place. According to the current zoning map, the adjacent properties to the north and south are also RM-7. The raising of rabbits, ducks, chickens, hens only, the turkeys, any cages, pens, coops, houses, etc, animals kept outdoors is permitted in the RM-7 zone, and any other agricultural animal uses are only by conditional use permit. Our project does not change the surrounding properties as well. Traffic. We hired Hale's Engineering out of Lehi to complete a full traffic study for the project. Hale's Engineering is well known in the Intermountain west for its specialization in traffic engineering and work closely with UDOT and many projects throughout Utah. The conclusions of the findings of this study, the proposed development includes 10 residential town home units. It is anticipated that the project will have one access on Willow Street. It is anticipated that the proposed project will generate approximately 72 average trips on a weekday, including five trips during the morning peak hour, six trips during the evening peak hour. These are trips that will use the projected access point. Property values were also a question within the public comments. This estimated total cost of the project is approximately \$4 million. An investment of this size will certainly increase values of surrounding properties as the city has chosen to limit the availability of more dense zoning. The areas that already have higher dense zoning will only increase with value in time. Nuisances. There were some discriminatory statements that apartments, trailer parks and other high density projects bring crime and drug use, and that's very unfortunate. Grantsville City is an entity that chooses to

enforce or not enforce current ordinances with laws within the city. To cite lack of enforcement throughout the city or on other projects regarding noise and trash pollution and other nuisances should not preclude us from developing a project. Our intent is to comply with current ordinances and codes within Grantsville City. Private property rights. Fortunately, we still live in America, and with that strong foundation and institution, one of our greatest institutions is that of private property rights. When we purchase property, we gain the access to the rights associated with that property, and we should be able to exercise those rights. Those rights do not include views. We may enjoy them for a time, but they're not guaranteed. We are enjoying the views of the mountains, lakes, and other views, nor are we guaranteed that the neighboring property may not view our property. Water. We had some questions about water. We have acquired the required amounts for both culinary and irrigation water required for this project. The PUD application. Our sole purpose in applying for the PUD application is to make the project better by attempting to mitigate effects on neighboring properties. Because of the zoning of this parcel, I didn't have to do a PUD, but we wanted to go that way so that we could have the input and make the project better. The variances that we're asking for is an attempt to center the units on the property versus having them seven and a half feet from the property line as permitted by code. Doing everything to code does not always result in the best outcome for the neighbors. We have spent months of time and thousands of dollars trying to make this situation better for all. Just the last time I was in front of planning and zoning, to some developers, \$10,000 on more engineering is just a little bit, but for a local small developer, every time trying to make it better, that's a lot of money for me.

Gary Pinkham stated, with the applications there are two or three different layouts. Are those still up in the air with what you're going to do?

Holly Jones answered, No. We came with the first layout, which was a PUD application. That was the two separate five-plexes with a centered turnaround in the middle of the property. Then through planning and zoning and meeting with the city council, they advised us to give them two other options. So, with those other options, I provided per code option, which is the one that has units going to the east and west and also to the north and south, which cuts off the property and doesn't allow as much of a flow. It's also the cheapest option for a developer. The cheapest option is to go with code. It sets the unit seven feet off the fence, seven and a half from the neighboring properties, and it cuts down on asphalts. It cuts down on utility lines. The last one that you see is the most expensive version, which is the PUD application that I've submitted. It has taken into effect all of the comments from the public and also the council members and planning and zoning, and it has pushed the units off of the fence 25 feet instead of seven and a half feet. It has lengthened the road all the way to the back of the property, which is where the fire turnaround would be, so that we can give more access to green space and less public around the animals that are currently there.

Gary Pinkham asked, the one that is attached to the next discussion is what you are going with?

Holly Jones answered, yes.

Gary Pinkham asked, where did we end up with the regards to the street and the code on the street? As you know, our code is a little mushy mouthed on streets for projects of this nature, it says we need to have a minimum 66-foot-wide driveway. It doesn't make a difference whether private or public. Either way, our code requires 66-foot driveway or 66-foot street.

Holly Jones stated, so as for the per code plan, you'll see that I allocated for that on the per code plan. I applied for the PUD so that I could bring them off the fence line. We shortened the road going in because it's being treated as a private lane, that's why the PUD was applied for. That made it to where we could keep the units off the fence line and allow for more backyard space and keeping it more central within the property.

Gary Pinkham stated, I don't have a problem with the design. Legally, our code doesn't allow it.

Attorney Coombs stated, it does because of the PUD. Since she is applying for the PUD, the code can vary.

Gary Pinkham asked, does the PUD waive the driveway ordinance?

Attorney Coombs answered, it doesn't waive it, but it allows for a variance to the code.

Gary Pinkham stated, the driveway ordinance requires a 66-foot-wide driveway to city standards.

Attorney Coombs stated, it does, but the PUD allows amendments to the code, allows the city council to make amendments to the code as a give and take between developers. That's what all planned unit developments are.

Gary Pinkham stated, I thought the PUD required them to meet the city design standards?

Attorney Coombs answered, No. Absent an approval by the city council allowing them to vary from it, they do, but this is a request by the developer to vary from it, so ultimately it'd be up to you guys whether you want to recommend that and then the city council to approve it. It's not required. City council can say no. You guys can say no.

Gary Pinkham asked, do we need to recommend at some point in time a waiver of that ordinance on driveways, along with the approval of PUD? That would be prerequisite to get the PUD?

Holly Jones stated, yes. So that's why I applied for the PUD.

Attorney Coombs answered, No. The driveway ordinance can stand on its own and remain



with the PUD. It's just a matter of, if a developer wants to seek a variance from that driveway ordinance as part of their PUD, they can request that, but you're not required to grant it.

Jaime Topham asked, so that's what she's doing? She's asking for variance from the driveway and from the road.

Attorney Coombs answered, that's correct.

Holly Jones stated, to keep those units off of the fence line. Yes.

Mayor Critchlow stated, my understanding you're putting in 42 foot of asphalt.

Gary Pinkham stated, the detail in the drawings is 35 feet curb face to curb face. We're not getting 42 feet.

Chairman, Brian Pattee asked, so the PUD application, do we need to consider that first, and then this agenda item number 12 is that where we would put the conditions?

Attorney Coombs answered, the conditions would be part of the PUD approval, and then you would approve the conditional use permit and site plan application as the second part.

Shay Stark stated, I just wanted to comment on this street width for just one second. The width as shown on the drawing, on this drawing that has the narrower version of the street, this was discussed a little bit with staff, and the idea here is recognizing that this is a driveway, and first thing that we wanted to make sure happened with it was that it would meet fire code. So, the international fire code requires a minimum width for the travel lanes. And then also looking at this, we looked at it, and realistically, the only place to park on that driveway is on the south side. Because of the driveways into the garages on the north side, it's quite short in between. It just doesn't make any sense for people to park there. So with that, according to international fire code, it requires a 32-foot-wide paved section there for the travel area, plus the parking on the south side. So the north side would be, I believe it is noted on there that curb would be painted red, and no parking on the north side of it. And so, just to point out again with this, with the PUD, one of the questions that's asked in that code is, what are the exceptions that are being asked for? This doesn't give the developer carte blanche to go in and do whatever they want. There has to be a justification for it. The PUD allows the city to look at developments and consider the effects of what the code does on those developments. And if there are things that can be improved through exceptions, it allows the city to consider those things. But there definitely has to be a justification associated with that. And so what you see before you with this, at least in my opinion... And you saw my memo... there's really two options here to consider. I guess there's always the third option, but mainly I'm just talking about with the application, the PUD application is specifically for that concept of the narrower driveway with parking on the south side, which allows the larger setbacks along the sides of the property. And as they had shown in their drawings, they're planting trees and things there to try to buffer between the neighbors, and so allowing that

buffer. Or the other option is always, you can go back and certainly say, "Okay, we don't feel like there's the justification here for these exceptions that are being requested of the code." Then that other option comes into play with that 66-foot-wide driveway and the townhouses being seven and a half feet off the sides of the property. As I addressed in my memo, I think those are the two main options here with this, but certainly with those exceptions, we need to look at that and ask ourselves, what are the benefits of those exceptions, and what justifies it specifically with this project? Then that recommendation for city council to approve the PUD, that's basically saying yes, we accept those exceptions, unless we've stated something differently specifically in the motion that we would like to see.

Erik Stromberg stated, one of the questions I have when we look at these PUDs, and we have the drawing that shows the width, but if we look at the application, the exception, it says to develop with the 26 feet wide with no street parking. Are we going by the letter or what's in the drawing, which becomes part of that application? And then with the objectives, they don't really look like objectives. One objective talks about an eight-foot privacy fence around the perimeter and downward facing lights. Those aren't objectives, but are those requirements for the PUD? Just to understand when we approve this, what here is going into the PUD versus what do we need to stick this to?

Attorney Coombs answered, any part of the application that would vary from the ordinance, from what the city's ordinance would require, those would be listed as variances that you're going to grant under the PUD.

Erik Stromberg stated, Right. I get that. That's what I'm saying. As we look at this, and there's comments that an eight-foot privacy, outside playground amenities, to me, the developer is saying, "Hey, this is what I'm going to do." How do we make sure that those things actually happen? Is the fact that it's written here good enough in the application? That's my concern. I think we've seen in the past, we come into a PUD, there's things that are talked about. The developer stands here and says, "Well, I'll do this. I'll do that," we approve PUD and down the road someone's going by and where are those things? Because it didn't follow through. It got lost.

Attorney Coombs stated, all you have to do is in your recommendation, condition that on their completing those requirements, and failure to complete those requirements would then negate your recommendation.

Jaime Topham stated, I don't have any questions, but I have a comment. I don't know. I don't think that this is a great fit for the environment or for what's already there, the agricultural that's around this project. I don't think this is a great fit. However, as a planning and zoning member, my role is to say, does this fit our code? It looks like this particular developer is working hard to make sure that it's better than what the code would give us, because the code would give people this development right on their fence lines, and then a big open space that could be useful or not useful. So while I don't like this at all, I appreciate that the developer has gone the extra mile and is making it better. I appreciate that what they're asking for in

their PUD makes it for a better surrounding for the applicants. And the reality is that they are the property owner. The zoning is there. They would be entitled to build this whether we liked it or not, and whether we grant the variances or not. So I do appreciate that you've spent the extra money and the time, and you've taken in all the comments of the public and the city council and the planning and zoning commission to come up with something that at least is better than what the bare minimum is.

Gary Pinkham stated, I know through our discussions with regards to the street, one of the concerns with fire, was that they would still be able to have good access. The 35 feet curb face to curb face, if we've got one car on the south side, we're still going to have 26 or 27 feet open asphalt, so we're still taking care of the fire marshal's concerns. As you say, by going to this configuration, it pulls the units further from the neighbor's property line, creates more privacy, more openness to the neighbors. So approving it with the proposal to waive the street requirement to this design as shown in the following package, I would be okay with. Again, it does address the majority of the neighbors' concerns and meets code pretty much everywhere else and does allow the landowner to utilize their property.

Erik Stromberg asked, who is maintaining the property?

Holly Jones answered, it will be one owner.

John Limburg stated, In the exceptions, it says 26 feet with no street parking, which I understand if you're going to the 35 feet in the plans. I just think we need to address that in the recommendation, need to make that clear that it's 35 feet on the plans, and that's what they need to do. Unless I'm reading that wrong. And then I guess in the recommendation, we'd have to recommend all of the objectives, or are we just accepting this application this way without putting into the recommendation to accept it?

Holly Jones added, I believe the original PUD that I applied for, if you look at the prior plat map, it says that road was the 26 feet, and we have widened that. So you have the three different designs. The first one was the PUD prior application, the second one was the per code, which had the larger access, and the third was the new with the 35-foot access. So even though I applied with a 26-foot access, I still went larger because that's what the comments needed.

Erik Stromberg stated, I think we get that. I think it's just past experience says we need to make sure it's clear, because one page says something, another plan says something different. What's goes forward needs to be what gets developed.

Dan England stated, my experience is that the plans that end up getting approved and signed is what's going to get built. And no matter what's on the original application, those plans, whatever gets signed, is what's going to get built. They shouldn't make any changes between the time that you guys and city council approve it, and then it comes to the city to sign off on those plans.

**Jaime made a motion to recommend approval of the PUD Application for Holly Jones located at 225 S Willow Street for the creation of 10 units in the RM-7 zone. Based on the map that was provided dated March 23, 2022, C-300 with the 35-foot right-of-way face to curb, face to curb. The following objectives must be done and completed by the developer. one, landscaping including placement of trees around the perimeter to shield views and reduce noise. Two, an eight-foot-high privacy fencing around the perimeter. Three, downward facing exterior lighting to keep light on the property. Four, 50-foot setback from Willow Street. Five, effective use of the RM-7 zoning, and then, six, onsite playground amenities. Gary seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**12. Consideration to recommend approval the Multiple Housing Conditional Use/Site Plan Applications for Holly Jones located at 225 S Willow Street for the creation of 10 units in the RM-7 zone.**

**Holly Jones was present for this agenda item:**

Jaime Topham asked, so this is the site plan and the actual plans that they'll be building on. So, there should be no changes between the time it leaves here and the time that you guys review it, stamp it. my expectation is the city will make sure that whatever is on these plans that are submitted here get built.

**Jaime made a motion to recommend approval of the Multiple Housing Conditional Use/Site Plan Applications for Holly Jones located at 225 S Willow Street for the creation of 10 units in the RM-7 zone. With the construction plans that were provided that are dated March 23, 2022. Erik seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**13. Discussion to adopt a Retaining Wall Ordinance in the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code.**

**Andy Jensen was present for this agenda item and stated to the Commission:** Good evening. It was a good day. Not sure if you've read the proposed ordinance in regards retaining walls and how to address them and their construction within the boundaries of the city. I put this ordinance together because of pending development that's coming on hillsides where we will end up with differential settlement or grades between parcels and just how to address the construction of those retaining walls. Because currently in the ordinance, there's no guiding direction in regards to how to approach the construction of retaining walls. So, this is a proposal to have that become part of the city code to use for that enforcement.

Chairman, Brian Pattee asked, so we don't have anything at all in our current land use?

Andy Jensen answered, No governance whatsoever at this time for retaining walls.

Gary Pinkham asked, the stuff in black is that coming out of our current code?

Attorney Coombs answered, No. Nothing in here is in our current code. This would all be new.

Andy Jensen stated, this is all 100% new information for the city code.

Gary Pinkham asked, the stuff in red? What is that?

Attorney Coombs answered, those are questions for you. This looks different than the one that we had went over. Andy did you make some changes to it?

Andy Jensen stated, I had already given it to Kristy.

Kristy Clark stated, this is what he gave me.

Jaime Topham asked, so Attorney Coombs did you anticipate a different version for us to review?

Attorney Coombs answered, No. I think this has the information. Andy and I, we had met and talked over some things. I think that there's some pages missing. Are you able to verify that Andy?

Andy Jensen stated, there's three pages.

Jaime Topham stated, There's only two in ours. So since we don't seem to have all three pages and it's a late hour, can we move on from this discussion?

Kristy Clark stated, Yeah. But I can add it back onto the next meeting. The scanner could have eaten it. Not even kidding. This packet was so big.

Jaime Topham stated, so maybe it seems like it would be appropriate to have definitions. So maybe if you could create definitions that you would like us to review before the next meeting as well.

John Limburg asked, Hasn't Grantsville City adopted APWA spec's, and doesn't that have specs for retaining walls in it? I guess I'm wondering why we would need this. I mean, maybe I'm wrong, but if we've adopted that, why do we need this addition?

Chairman, Brian Pattee stated, I don't think there's anything in this much detail in that APWA specs to be honest.

Dan England stated, I'll look it up and report back. that's a great question. I didn't go back to look what was in the APWA first.

Andy Jensen state, this has some guidelines into when an engineer's required, when specifically, a permit's required. Because this does give options to allow somebody to build a retaining wall and not need a permit. But depending on the height, depending on offsets between multiple walls, this just clarify when we need engineering, when we don't need engineering or a permit.

Shay Stark mentioned, I've dealt with this in a few other communities and what's been interesting to me over the years in dealing with this and modifying their code time and time again to try to address the issues, what I really appreciate here is that it's coming from the building code inspectors. Because what I've found is the international building code, international residential code, their requirements, there's not a lot in there. But the requirements that are there better address these issues than a lot of the other model codes that have been put together previously. And as we go through these amendments in some of these communities, it turns out that what we end up doing is copying and mimicking out of those building codes. I don't remember APWA addressing retaining walls with any real specificity. And part of the reason is you can have rockeries, you can have various types of block and interlocking block, you can have just standard concrete retaining walls. There's so many different options out there and that's where the building codes, the international building codes, have dealt with this enough that they really get to the meat of the issue. And the real meat of the issue is in certain circumstances, these need to be engineered and the city needs to be able to see an engineer stamp, a set of drawings and calculations based on the type of materials that they're proposing to use in these walls. So I appreciate the approach that's being taken here from that perspective.

Chairman, Brian Pattee asked, was this taken from another municipality or was it taken out one of your building codes? This verbiage that's in here.

Andy Jensen answered, this is a modification from a previous jurisdiction that I worked at. I got their approval to for lack of better term, pirate it. But there was a lot of things that they had that I've removed, with things that felt were over burdensome for information that needed to be provided in regards to geotech information. There is still some geological hazard information that needs to be done but a modified version from another jurisdiction, yes.

#### **14. Presentation by the Grantsville City Engineer, Dan England about amending the Street Master Plan.**

**Dan England, City Engineer presented this agenda item and stated to the Commission:** I'm excited to go ahead and give this presentation. We are in the middle of a master plan transportation for the whole city. As you can see on this first exhibit there's the green boundary of what our existing Grantsville City looks like. And this is a boundary that shows you, you can see in black what's the existing. And there is an existing future annexation boundary in green for what the city would be willing to go to. And then this map here shows in red an additional future annexation boundary line for the city, which gives you a kind of limits of where we can have influence of that growth that's coming in. So everything I've

heard since I've been here. In fact, when I interviewed to work here at the city of Grantsville, it was always keep the small town feel. I'm 100% behind that, traffic levels, utilities, schools, city activities, landscaping. All those things need to be coordinated to try and help keep that small feel. Tonight I'm only going to be talking about the traffic side of things, no increase in traffic levels to the city would be nice, but we do have a lot of growth and, therefore, we're going to try and keep as much of that new traffic off the existing roads and put the new traffic on new roads. And that way, we won't get into some issues that we'll go into it a little bit later. This is the first thing that was given to me from our consultant that's doing the transportation. And what he did was he took our existing streets and he puts a hose out there on the roads, cars run over it, tell you the number of counts. These are the counts. You can see the red street right there along Main Street, which the city of Grantsville already knows good and well that we have a lot of traffic there. This shows that that portion where we only have one lane each direction is already too much traffic for that street that's there. It needs to be widened. We are trying to work with UDOT to try and move forward with their plans to go forward with that, but it's not there yet. This is future residential projects over the next 30 years. You can see a number of projects that are shown throughout the area and those are the projects that we know of. Right now, it was brought to my attention. Right now, we have almost 40 or 4,000 water connections, one water connection per home or per business. And we're sitting about 4,000. The number of proposed residential homes is over 12,000. So there is a lot of potential growth. I took the numbers for our existing population to the existing connections and gave an estimate and said, okay, if we have over 12,000, what population does it put it? It's about 65,000 is the population in 30 years. Now, if we don't do something to help, we're in a lot of trouble here at the city. And we've learned through said experience that we can't stop development. We can only try to direct it and help it. So if we don't do any additional roads, you can ... These are the numbers that are predicted with the new things. And so what he explained to me going down Main Street those numbers of cars is about what you're getting on I-80. And so having that kind of traffic slowed down to come down through, it would be a nightmare, which is why it's all in red. And we don't want to have that traffic going through there. And so we need some way of getting that traffic out and around the road. This is our current transportation master plan. The red lines there are the arterial, the larger roads. The blue lines are the collectors, which would be a little bit smaller roads. This is a draft of where we're looking right now for our proposed master plan. You can see over on the West Bank over there in the purple area. That's where a lot of that development will be and it comes through. And we're looking at trying to route that. We're assuming a lot of the people who are coming to Grantsville are going to be a bedroom community to go to Salt Lake. This model assumes that people live there would go to any of the businesses between here and Salt Lake. And a lot of them want to go to Tooele according to the model. And so you see a dashed, a yellow-orange line, something, up there across the top going to Burmester. A lot of traffic can go up that direction and avoid Main Street to get to work. Nygreen also has a loop coming down around the bottom side. And if Nygreen was to be extended all the way through and go up Lamb's Lane, that would be one way that they could go out without impacting all the existing streets and roads. There is a school being proposed right there at the corner of Nygreen and Worthington, just to the south side of Nygreen. It's in construction. You're right. I can't say it's there yet, because there's nobody going to school,

but it is there. And there's a concern for what would be there in regards to amount of traffic things. So I'll talk about that in just a second. If Nygreen does not go through, these are the numbers that it would look like and you can see there's a large number using that green collector that goes down around, out toward 112. But if we extend that out, I think it'd be more that like that purple line instead of where they put the green line in for their models. The locations of these roads are not specific. They're not actually where they're going to be. They will flux depending on where development comes in. And that's something I wanted to say just really quick is that these roads will be built with development. These are not necessarily money that's coming from taxes. They're coming from the development as they come either through impact tax or as part of their development when they come in. They will be paying for these roads and trying to get their increase in population to these roads and out. This is what the school is supposed to look like. You can see the bus drop off on the side, over here near Washington. That Washington Avenue is not going to be that loop road that goes out and around the outside. It's going to be farther away. So that route for the buses to come in and turn around and drop kids off on the side, and then they could go back out and head back out. The top part up there next to Nygreen will be more where the teachers park, where the parents come drop off their kids for dropping them off themselves. And they come in one side and out the other and that's proposed. Something that you want to notice is that the distance between Nygreen and where the playground is quite a distance. And so that's a positive thing, especially when it comes to pollution and things like that that might happen up there near the road. We'll have the playground and everything farther away. The green line I put on there is just ... I'm assuming is the most possible route that people are going to end up using to get to that school. There's also some development that's coming in off to the east side of those roads. And they may also to be coming to that school, but they can only get there if Nygreen's coming through or they have to come all the way up around Durfee and then back up in. So at this point, that's as far as I want to go.

**15. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held February 3, 2022.**

**Gary made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held February 3, 2022. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**16. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held February 17, 2022.**

**Gary made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held February 17, 2022. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**17. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held March 3, 2022.**



**Gary made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held March 3, 2022. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**18. Consideration to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held March 17, 2022.**

**Gary made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the previous P&Z Meeting that was held March 17, 2022. Jaime seconded the motion. All voted in favor with John on Zoom and the motion carried unanimously.**

**19. Report from City Council Liaison, Mayor Neil Critchlow.** In our meeting last night, there was several items that got tabled because the developer wasn't there. We talked about the intersection of 112 and 138 and whatever is going to be there. There are a lot of safety concerns. And the council wanted more information from UDOT about what they felt was safe or not. It's not like we can tell them or we're going to tell them they can't have a gas station there, if that's what that is intended to be. But we need to have some safety things taken care of. They've had eight accidents there in the last six months, I think, is what she said. One just Sunday. Okay. So we need to take care of a few things that way. A lot of things tonight. And just for those who question the ball fields, they're in the plan. Okay? We're working on them. We're getting a plan together to work on it. So I appreciate you guys for doing this. And it's a thankless job. It really is. And we pay you so much for this.

**20. Adjourn. Jaime made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Erik seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 pm.**

Kristy Clark  
Zoning Administrator