

Action Summary

#1 Subdivision Preliminary Checklists	Pulled
#2 Subdivision Final Checklists	Pulled
#3 Waterwise landscape definition	Recommend Approval
#4 Chapter 2 Definition of Front Yard	More discussion needed
#5 West Bank Study cont. – Chris Hupp from Psomas	Discussion
#6 Prelim for Townhomes on Willow	Pulled
#7 Vince Anderson – Guzzled CUP	Approved
#8 Minutes for 11/17, 12/1, and 12/15/2023	Tabled
April 13 will be only meeting in April	Approved

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present: Jaime Topham, John Limburg, Derek Dalton, Kevin Hall

Excused: Rick Barchers

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Mayor Critchlow, City Manager Jesse Wilson, City Attorney Brett Coombs, Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth, City Engineer Dan England, City Planning and Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Lanise Thompson. DRC specialist Gary Pinkham

Zoom: Consultant Shay Stark

Citizens and Guests Present: Chris Hupp, Dustin Barnhurst, Chris Frandsen

Commission Chair Jaime Topham called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

PUBLIC HEARING:

- ~~a. Proposal to Amend the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code by adopting the Application—Subdivision Preliminary Plan Checklist and the Preliminary Plans Checklist~~
- ~~b. Proposal to Amend the Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code by adopting the Application—Subdivision Final Plan Checklist and the Final Plans Checklist~~

Jaime Topham – Items A and B have been stricken from our agenda so we are on to C,

- c. Proposed amendment of Chapter 2 definition of Waterwise to Grantsville City Land Use Management and Development Code**

No Comments

AGENDA:

- ~~1. Consideration to recommend approval of the adoption of the Application—Subdivision Preliminary Plan Checklist and the Preliminary Plans Checklist~~
- ~~2. Consideration to recommend approval of the adoption of the Application—Subdivision Final Plan Checklist and the Final Plans Checklist~~

3. Consideration to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 2 Definitions of Waterwise Landscaping

Cavett Eaton presented the definition of Waterwise Landscape

Cavett Eaton – This is the same thing we've had and you've looked at it before. It wasn't noticed properly, so we're just doing it again and noticing properly so we can get it put into our definitions. This is the requirements for the water reduction fee, to do these things.

Jaime Topham – Does anyone have any comments or questions about this?

John Limburg – I don't remember what, we just agreed to all this.

Jaime Topham – Yes.

Cavett Eaton – Just got to do the-

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Mayor Critchlow – Did you define front and the side yards, as part of that letter.

Cavett Eaton – We're finding the front yard in a few minutes. I'll show you the information for that and answer that question.

Mayor Critchlow – Okay.

Cavett Eaton – Kind of.

Jaime Topham – So does this apply to all parts of the yards because it's not specifically defined where?

Cavett Eaton – No, this is just front yard.

Jaime Topham – And is that defined somewhere or stated somewhere else?

Cavett Eaton – Yeah. In the wording it says front yard.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Cavett Eaton – This is just what the landscape would have to be.

Derek Dalton – Is this only for residences or businesses as well?

Cavett Eaton – It would apply to both but there's a few more things with commercial that would work into it.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Cavett Eaton – And we're also in the process of getting a new language for a rebate for grass removal. It requires that we have to do some certain things with commercial so that'll change a little bit with commercial too. I'm just getting the final wording for that. So probably the next time we meet, we'll talk about that one.

Jaime Topham made a motion to approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 2 Definitions of Waterwise Landscaping. John Limburg seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motioned past.

4. Discussion of Proposed Amendment of Chapter 2 Definition of Front Yard

Cavett Eaton was present to answer questions about this item

Cavett Eaton – So this is the definition we're going to propose tonight. It's just a discussion, we need to do a 10-day notice with this one as well. The definition on the left on the right is a description that we'll add with it, a graphic image to help them understand. The side yards would not be part of this except on a corner lot, and then you consider the whole thing as the front yard. Again, discussion and ideas, concepts, whatever you have to say about that.

Mayor Critchlow – Have you got the letter cabinet that the state sent us?

Cavett Eaton – Not with me.

Mayor Critchlow – Could you give everybody a copy of that?

Cavett Eaton – Okay.

Jaime Topham – Do you want to give us a heads-up on what we're talking about?

Mayor Critchlow – The state sent us a letter as far as the requirements the city had to put together to qualify. If people wanted to take grass out, they could do it and they would pay them a dollar and a half per square foot of the grass that they got. But we have to have our ducks in a row first.

Cavett Eaton – So they're requiring us to change our ordinances to enforce a little bit more water wise kind of stuff. One of them is commercial things and there's a few things involved with it. I talked to the gal at the state who's in charge of this today and she said if we get it passed right away, we'll be the first

city in Utah to do it. She's pretty excited that we get this rolling and it would allow some reduction of lawn. As I remember that the one that caught my eye was nothing under eight feet would be allowed to have... Any strip under eight feet would be allowed to have grass on. So it's kind of strict.

Jaime Topham – Attorney Coombs, how does this language sound to you? Is this enforceable, defensible, understandable?

Brett Coombs – So anything we can do to make it easier, to shorten it up and make it easier to understand is always favorable to the public. It's hard for me to opine necessarily on what language to use, that's kind of the realm that you guys live in, but anything you can do to either make it like a list. Lists are easy for the public to understand or I think it probably could be shortened.

Dan England – In regards to the water wise areas, it's the front yard in front of the fence, whatever can be seen. And that's the part that needs to be installed with when the home is built so that they can qualify for it. I would also, since I've been doing the calculations for reducing the water shares, if they do water wise I'd also like to propose that we make it some percentage of the lot. Instead of trying to go through each lot, figure out where the house is sitting and what area that is in the front yard so that we can have just a certain percentage of that yard being a front yard. It's similar to what we do with percentage of a home covering a lot. We use 65% of that lot is considered open and it would be irrigated. I'd propose that a certain percentage of that would be considered water wise if they choose to do that.

Kevin Hall – And that only pertains to new construction, correct?

Dan England – That is correct.

Cavett Eaton – This language is taken from several cities in Utah that already have that. Shay Stark and Robert Russo both vetted this and this is the one they felt like was the best. The image on the right came from Robert Russo as part of our definition, he's the one that suggested to include that.

Jaime Topham – So the front yard stops at the front corner of the house? So not to be picky, but your yellow lines go beyond that.

Cavett Eaton – On the corner lot.

Jaime Topham – Not just on the corner lot, on that top left. It goes beyond the front of the building.

Dan England – I'm sorry, I did my best with the electronic pen.

Jaime Topham – So if we're going to put a diagram though we have to be specific if it's only the front part.

Cavett Eaton – Yeah.

John Limburg – Pull out your AutoCAD.

Jaime Topham – I'm wondering if it would be helpful to have a space. Okay. Means a space on the same lot with a building comma between the front of the building and the front of the lot line and extending across. Because you're talking about space on the same lot as a building, and then it's between the front of the building and the front of the lot line and extending across the full width of the lot. Right? So, two separate thoughts?

Cavett Eaton – If we can make this simpler, that's good.

Kevin Hall – Do we care at all about the size of the lots? So, for instance, if a person builds on one acre and puts his out house in the back and if he calls out his front yard, would it still be applicable to him?

Cavett Eaton – Well according to that definition, no more than 35% can be in lawn. So, whatever, we just can't have more than 35% of it in lawn.

Jaime Topham – Can you go back to what we're working on? So, on this corner lot, explain to me how we know where it stops on the corner. Why does it go so far back in the yellow on, I guess, on the right-hand side of the corners? Wouldn't it just be the same plane as the front of the house? When you say on corner lots, the front yard is the yard which is faced by the primary entrance to the building. So why does the yellow go around the corner?

Dan England – The reason I took it around the corner was because the side yards on smaller lots is what I had in mind as I was doing this. Smaller lots, they all use that basically you got two front setbacks on those lots and that's all typically exposed. Typically, they don't fence in that side yard on corner lots. With that being front yard, it wasn't going to be fenced in that's exposed to the street and so I used that as part of the area that wouldn't be water wise.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Christy Montierth – And what if you moved it to only be what had to be legal for the cross-section of fence?

Cavett Eaton – The site triangle is one of the things we're considering here too. They can't put their fence any closer than that 30-foot site triangle, which is probably a little more than that.

John Limburg – When you're saying site triangle, you're just saying when you stand in the middle of the lot, what you can see?

Cavett Eaton – Back from where a car comes up 30 feet across from the center.

Jaime Topham – So that should probably be in the definition as well for a corner lot because I mean this just says on the corner lots, the front yard is the yard which is faced by the primary entrance of the building. There's nothing that says that they can go around the corner, but we have a diagram that shows it going around the corner.

Dan England – You're right, the diagram is...

Cavett Eaton – Do you think the diagram is just confusing? Not use it at all?

Jaime Topham – Oh, I don't know. I would probably get rid of the... I don't know. It could be either way but if you have them conflicting, now we're back to the there's a loophole.

Cavett Eaton – Okay.

Jaime Topham – So if you want it really clear, like work on the language to get the language really clear then get rid of the diagram, or diagram be the specific thing that they follow. I don't know. Language is probably better than diagrams.

Kevin Hall – I think a picture for some people or maybe most people is helpful in my opinion.

Jaime Topham – But you're going to be bound by that picture. That's what they're going to come and say, "Look it shows right here I can go."

Kevin Hall – Well, can't we change the-

Jaime Topham – I can go five feet past the right. Well, and that's why, so back to my original question of the side yard, I don't have a problem with it going back that far but is it they can go X number of feet down the side of the yard? Or it's where we have to cut it off at the front of the house? We just have to want to define that.

Dan England – Agreed. And what I took it back to was this detail was one that showed where a privacy fence was so I took it back to the fence.

Jaime Topham – So what if they don't have a fence?

Dan England – Then they can't do it. No, I'm kidding.

Jaime Topham – See the problem? Just define it. Even on the corner lot you have to stay with the front plane of the house, the primary entrance or...

Cavett Eaton – From our standpoint, there's no disadvantage to them water wise more. They can do the whole yard if they want. They'll only get the break for the front.

Jaime Topham – But that's the problem is the break, right? The discount we have to have.

Cavett Eaton – So it has to be at least-

Jaime Topham – So it has to be defined. If we were just saying we want you to be water wise but you're not getting a discount or there's nothing else, then it wouldn't matter

Cavett Eaton – If we just cut it off and made it the same square footage as the lots without and said that's what you can do and not require anymore, that's fair. It's not exactly that fair for everybody.

Dan England – Is the city okay with the fence going, that privacy fence as it's shown there, if it goes all the way up to the front edge of the house, are we okay with that?

Christy Montierth – Only if you consider the site triangle. And it usually isn't.

Cavett Eaton – It probably won't fit that. Yeah.

John Limburg – Well, it'll kind of be lower along a three-foot fence. It can't be above the fence.

Dan England – Okay. Yeah, because in this picture it would be back far enough but there is potential that it could get in the site triangle.

Christy Montierth – I don't know why you would need to tie it to a fence, back to what Jaime was saying.

Jaime Topham – Yeah. I don't think you have to tie it to a fence, you could just say it can go 10 feet down the house. Whether they have a fence or they don't have a fence, that's not the defining line. It's here's the front of your house, you get to go an additional five feet to make this work or you get to go two feet or 10 feet or whatever. Then along those lines, because I almost lost this thought and then it finally came back to me, what was your suggestion about a percentage?

Dan England – The percentage I was thinking it was somewhere, I had seen something like 16, 18% of the lot would be water wise.

Cavett Eaton – What we're doing is we're just restricting the amount of water or grass. All of it would be a drip system except for a maximum of 35% of the lot.

Dan England – I'm talking a percentage of the entire lot.

Cavett Eaton – It all has to be water wise.

Dan England – You mean the backyard does too?

Cavett Eaton – Oh no, no just the front yard.

Dan England – The percentage of the entire lot that is water wise is about 16, 18% I think. But that would need to be calculated and figured out. Everybody has different house setback or every place has different house setbacks and things like that. I don't have a set number for that but I would like to propose that we come up with one that would be reasonable for.

Jaime Topham – Okay, so just so I understand. So 16% of the lot, I'm just picking a number, it's arbitrary. 16% of the total lot space is the maximum you can do for water wise? Or no you have to do at least 16% of the lot space as water wise in order to get the discount on the water, to get the reduced water share thing.

Dan England – That would be the percentage that I would be giving them for is a certain percentage of the entire lot, 16% or 18% or whatever. And that way I can reduce that percentage of the lot to the lower rate.

Jaime Topham – I feel like there's some other information that I'm missing to understand that.

Mayor Critchlow – Do you reference that letter I was telling you about? They're very specific about front and side yards and how much can be up there.

Cavett Eaton – That's all for new construction.

Mayor Critchlow – For new construction. Which is what you're talking about here.

Jaime Topham – If they've already invented the wheel, should we perhaps look at their wheel? If they've already invented the wheel, should we perhaps look at their wheel? Attorney Coombs, do you have any thoughts on that with what the state has said?

Brett Coombs – I was trying to. I was hard for me to hear

Jaime Topham – Oh. Mayor Critchlow referenced a letter from the state that's kind of regarding all of this that has specifics about what a side yard is in the front yard and the dimensions. Should we be looking at that?

Cavett Eaton – Have you seen that letter, Brett?

Brett Coombs – I don't think I've seen that.

Cavett Eaton – I just got it this afternoon. What they've sent me is the actual wording that they're looking for. Let me see if I can pull it up. This is the letter that was sent to me today from the state and this is the wording from what we've seen, this is their examples.

Lanise Thompson – It's on your screen too if it's easier to read it on your screen.

Mayor Critchlow – 20% of the total land use area.

Jaime Topham – So it doesn't really give us anything.

Dan England – Yeah, that's just that. I'm not seeing the defining of the front yard or limits. It's just kind of where the lawn and percentage of that.

Jaime Topham – So it's just talking about lawns, it's not talking about...

Cavett Eaton – It's just to be able to, in order for us to give the rebate, we have to have this in our code.

Brett Coombs – So I see it looks like this would apply commercial, industrial, institutional, and multifamily but not...

Mayor Critchlow – Up at the top, Attorney Coombs, where it talks about the right of way between the curb cutter lawn areas, not be less than eight feet.

Jaime Topham – It's new residential.

Brett Coombs – Lawn area shall not be less than eight feet wide. All right.

Dan England – Yeah. That's talking about lawn but not the size of the water wise. I think that's something that we can

Cavett Eaton – We're already more restrictive on our proposal in lawn areas.

Jaime Topham – Yeah. This doesn't actually tell us about how you define a front or side yard.

Kevin Hall – And this is including front and side, right?

Brett Coombs – There are jurisdictions that have already defined side yard and so I don't know how ours matches up with that.

Jaime Topham – Okay. This doesn't really answer our question

Brett Coombs – But that's something we could look at.

Jaime Topham – So I'm going to ask this of Cavett, so does that mean that particular letter and what they're wanting us to do, does that mean that anyone who builds a new home cannot have more than 50% of the landscape area as lawn?

Cavett Eaton – In their front and side yard.

Jaime Topham – Or it just means if you want a rebate, then you can?

Cavett Eaton – No. It means our code would change and that would be our restriction for every home that's built in Grantsville after that ordinance is passed.

Kevin Hall – And that's what the state's saying we should do?

Cavett Eaton – Uh-huh. If we wanted to get the rebate, we need to offer the rebate.

Mayor Critchlow – So if John wants to take it half of his lawn, we have to have this in our ordinance so he can get a rebate from the state.

Jaime Topham – But do we have to adopt that?

Mayor Critchlow – I don't know. But if you don't then we don't get that part. Okay, you can do whatever you need to.

Jaime Topham – Maybe that should be something that the...

Chris Hupp – The State is starting to push more of this waterwise. So if you don't do it now, you'll probably be forced to within a few years.

Dan England – Unless we go to wet years.

Jaime Topham – Maybe that's something that we should ask the community if they want us to adopt.

Kevin Hall – Well, and just a thought, I sort of think because I'm old country I guess that when you look around and I guess it won't be any different, people who take care of stuff are going to take care of it, right? And people who don't, I just worry in some situations that if they can only have 35% or whatever it is, that they let the rest of it just go to the weed patch. And again, that's determined by individuals but it's certainly a thought. What does it look like really in the end?

John Limburg – I'm thinking about my front yard, and I don't know how wide it is, but I'm sure that only 35% of its grass because you've got driveway was always straight and then I have the land fines on the side of that. And then I put my swells, like there's no way that I have more than 35%. It's not that hard to meet that really.

Jaime Topham – My entire front yard is of course, it's native grass but...

John Limburg – But you could get a rebate. [inaudible 00:23:26].

Calvin:
I don't think that counts.

John Limburg – I have 30,000 square feet at my house, if I rip half of it up I'll probably get like \$20,000. Better get started on that job.

Mayor Critchlow – It'll be a long day, chump.

Cavett Eaton – Sell that grass to somebody else and you can make money on that.

Jaime Topham – It's probably way beyond the discussion but have they done studies about all of these adding rocks and things, like that actually increases the heat. Whereas if you have grass and more native vegetation, then it decreases the heat?

Kevin Hall – It's a lot more expensive to do, too.

Jaime Topham – Yeah.

Kevin Hall – It's a lot more expensive to desert landscape than it is to... A lot more.

Jaime Topham – I don't know, maybe we should ask the community if they want us to adopt this instead of rush ahead.

Mayor Critchlow – We can do that.

Kevin Hall – I think it would be a good idea myself.

Cavett Eaton – Just a side note, we started our water waste landscape classes last week, the Localscapes class, and we had 37 people show up to do that first class. We're expecting 45 or 50 for the second class and that'll go all summer long, every two weeks through the months. A lot of people are interested in knowing how to do this right and make it look right. And the idea of too much heat from mulching, that is addressed there that they talk about quite a bit. So there's some good ways, education helping. Even the mayor came and he knows everything. He could have taught the class.

Jaime Topham – So back to this particular definition, probably I think it needs a little bit of work. We have to decide if we're going to keep the graphic or not.

John Limburg – So I thought when we were first talking about this, it was to get a rebate when we brought this up originally.

Cavett Eaton – Just to get a fee reduction on developers and builders for building new homes.

John Limburg – Well, yeah. And I didn't think it was everybody was going to have to do it if we accepted this.

Cavett Eaton – But the rebate came just two weeks ago from the state saying, "We will now provide this if you'll adopt these other conditions"

John Limburg – So I think that was probably not communicated well because originally, I thought we were talking about that. Now it sounds like it's something else.

Cavett Eaton – No, that's something the mayor brought up. It's another thing that kind goes with-

John Limburg – That should go out to the community. They should decide that.

Jaime Topham – Yeah, because that would apply to all new buildings. You don't get to opt out. By what I read through there if we adopt it, you don't get to opt out of that.

Kevin Hall – I hear that's what you do.

Derek Dalton – Might have heard you wrong, did you say that the developers get a rebate if we adopt this or is it?

John Limburg – So originally the developers, they got a rebate if they hit the water wise requirements.

Cavett Eaton – It's not a rebate, it's a water reduction on their acquisitions.

Dan England – So it saves them money to just if they do that, but in return we required them to install the landscaping with the house so when they buy the house it's pre-landscaped to the front yard water wise. That way we know that it's there and most likely they won't change it once it's already in, that way we don't have to go and police it because 90, I just made up that number.

Cavett Eaton – 70% of the people with waterwise landscaping will keep it. There's a good chance that it's going to stay. Doesn't mean that they'll pull all their weeds but at least they won't be using a lot of water.

Derek Dalton – I just wanted to make sure. I thought they were getting a rebate and then the homeowners was going to have to put in their yards afterwards. Okay.

Cavett Eaton – No. The rebate is something it just came back if we reduce grass in your yard.

Jaime Topham – This definition is necessary so they know what the front yard is.

Cavett Eaton – Because we're using the front yard as part of our explanation for the water wise reduction.

John Limburg – Right. So, we need to get this cleaned up. Do we need more discussion on this? Would you like more discussion on this?

Cavett Eaton – We'll do an edited version and send it out and see if they can give us some feedback on it.

5. Follow-up Discussion of West Bank Study – Chris Hupp, PSOMAS

Chris Hupp from PSOMAS was present to lead the discussion

Chris Hupp – I'm going to do a quick version of this and then we can come back to any specific slides that you have questions on.

That said, just a quick synopsis of our process. We did the kickoff back in August. We went over all alternatives for this West Bank, about 11,600 acres public visioning process. Right now, we're on the preferred scenario and capital facilities plan. Once that's completed, the city will be able to review that, give us comments, we'll put it back out and then it'll go into the public hearings.

Some of the existing information that we looked at, we looked at the general plan and future land use, map zoning, transportation maps plan on a proposed and improved developments. Then interacted a future annexation expansion map just to ensure that we are in line with a lot of the things that have already been worked through the city. These are the land use designations. I know there was a question about how these land uses equate to the existing zones within the city. You'll see how those zones reflect each of the land uses there. That will be in the final document. It's in our draft document currently, you'll be able to see how those work together.

Here are the concepts that we had originally developed. You'll see there's those black circles are specific nodes to where intensity would be more targeted. Keeping a lot of that intensity away from existing residents and Main Street and others, as part of the goal, push some of the development away from Main Street and the traffic away from Main Street.

Some of the land use models, inputs that we put into this to right size land uses and development are these. Again, I can go over these in specific. They will be in that master development plan, but there's a lot of data that goes into this land use model to make sure that the amount of commercial, residential, and other uses are appropriate for this area.

We then went through the public engagement. We had 967 website visits, people looking through the information, 131 comments and responses both on the interactive map and through the surveys, and then there's 15 stakeholder interviews. You'll see the breakdown of how those responses came in specific to the interactive website part.

We came up with this preferred scenario. This is what is currently in draft form but this is the current draft today, with those nodes being pushed a little bit more to the north for that loop road that comes through the city, again to try and pull that traffic away from Main Street and give extra avenues to and through the city. Part of the reason for some of the intensity is the moderate-income bills that keep going through the house. It's required once you hit 5,000 residents, you have to do these things as part of the state requirements. We also touch on the open space in this. We left it out in the previous concept to help residents focus more on the transportation networks, and the general mandates is how those get distributed. Within a quarter mile of each resident there should be either a pocket park, and we define that trails or regional parks, or an open space facility of that nature. Again, we also delineate where cemeteries, fire, library, schools, churches, water tanks, all things that a city would need would go on this plan.

The capital facilities plan is what we're working on in tandem with the finalized part of this master development plan. We're going through the water system analysis, wastewater facility planning, stormwater, all these different pieces including the park's recreation, public safety, timing and response times, and then schools, churches, and coordination with utility companies. One big piece with this that we've noticed with a lot of residents and when we're doing the initial vision process is agricultural ground is incredibly important for residents in the city in general. We did some calculations on the amount of acreage that currently exist within Grantsville city, just shy of 8,000 acres of agricultural ground. Of those 8,000 acres, or 7,800, 1679 is currently within the study area with 394 of those in Grantsville city boundaries today. Of that, 420 of those acres will be, that fall over current agricultural ground, will be preserved in open space agriculture, sensitive lands, and things of that nature with an additional 1359 of planned open space. And again this, it's actually 10,600 acres.

Some of these specific things that can be done to preserve agricultural ground land use regulations. It's a temporary fix. It typically doesn't hold out for very long but temporarily you can say, "Hey this is what this ground is designated" and it'll stay until someone buys and really pushes to get rezoned. It can be a little patch, but more of the better opportunities to preserve some of the agricultural ground is the conservation subdivisions and farmland preservation easements agriculture. The ACEP is funding that so you can get to buy some of this ground to maintain it as agriculture. There's also the green belts,

green ways, and green wedges, which essentially is a growth boundary. Stansbury Park currently has a growth boundary. That's why it's everything outside of what's compact there is open or agriculture land.

In addition to that, we can potentially touch on the transfer of development rights programs. A TDR bank is specific to that transfer of development right program where the city can actually go in, buy those rights, and hold them and sell them whenever they want. That money, some of those easement monies can be utilized towards the TDR bank to purchase those grounds specific to preserve them as agricultural grounds. There's also private land trust and easements. For example, Utah open lands program and then BLM and the United States Forest Service. You guys have a massive amount of forest service ground just west of here. There's BLM throughout the valley and the Utah Open Lands does have some properties in the valley as well.

This is information about the transfer of development rights program if you're interested. So that's a quick synopsis of everything. If you do have questions, feel free to ask now.

John Limburg – Why does the West Bank go all the way over to Burmester?

Dan England – We had a property owner who owned quite a bit of property to the north, who requested to be part of the study and said that he would pay his portion.

John Limburg – And then there's that secondary reservoir for the irrigation system that's in there somewhere. Is that going to have any effect on that?

Chris Hupp – To the south.

John Limburg – Yes. The main reservoir is further south but there's a smaller reservoir, and I don't know what it is called but...

Mayor Critchlow – It's called Little Dam.

John Limburg – Yeah.

John Limburg – That sits inside of that area.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. Actually, you'll see it southwest of the larger green piece, just along Mormon Trail. That piece is green and it's connected to the drainage corridor.

John Limburg – So they're going to keep that?

Chris Hupp – Yeah. Maintain that.

Dan England – I think it belongs to the irrigation district, doesn't it? So it does.

Chris Hupp – Yeah.

Kevin Hall – Well, it's actually where the distribution comes from. It goes from the reservoir to there and then it just distributes to the city from there.

Chris Hupp – I was told there's a lot more questions.

Dan England – Rick's not here tonight.

Chris Hupp – I'm ready.

John Limburg – Well, I got a question. He was talking about bike pass out there. I don't know if that has anything to do with this or not.

Dan England – You're welcome to throw any questions you want at him. He's good at answering.

John Limburg – I'm really concerned about bike paths in Grantsville. I would love to see that incorporated into this. I'm still going to push some of my other stuff on other stuff but what they're talking about. But you said they were projecting some sort of trail system that going to go through there. And somebody else was talking about that on the comments.

Chris Hupp – So you do see all those green trail systems? That's dedicated specifically to those trail networks. They are in tandem with the drainage because it's easiest to just say, "Hey there's drainage here, let's throw a multi-use 10 to 12-foot trail along that." Or you can even potentially do horse pass on the other side. We can delineate some of those cross sections if you'd like to see what that would look like.

Dan England – The other thing that we had talked about is that on the Nygreen road as it's coming through, instead of a parking lane on the side of that which doesn't make sense on the arterial, that would be open for a bike lane coming along the side of. So, you'd have one on going each direction.

Chris Hupp – On major roadways you can stick the bike lane there. In rural communities, it is safer to ride on a detached bike lane. So, if we could instead of having a five-foot sidewalk go to a 10-foot trail and pull the bikes off the road, it's significantly safer.

John Limburg – That won't work here because we have goat heads. You can't, like Quirk Street has a sidewalk and you ride your bike five feet down that sidewalk, you'll have a flat.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. But I'd rather have goat head flats than death.

John Limburg – I get that. Trust me, I know.

Dan England – He's had one of those near-death experiences.

John Limburg – So I guess what I'm saying though is on sidewalk, I'm going to go off on a tangent, but people are not going to ride if they're riding out recreationally. If they're just going out for a little ride, they're going to ride on sidewalks. But if they're going out to get real exercise, train, they're not going to ride on sidewalks.

Chris Hupp – Right. And that's why I'm saying multiuse path, it's different. So, a sidewalk has got cuts over 10 feet or five feet or whatever. A multiuse path would be a paved surface without those, and it was dedicated specifically to that use.

John Limburg – If they could have it so the goat heads weren't growing on it. But like Quirk Street has a farm field that's right on the side of it, there's just no way they're going to keep it off of it.

Chris Hupp – Yeah, yeah. I understand. So typically, the cities just don't go in and they put these right of ways in, it's built in as part of a neighborhood and a community or a developer comes in and they build up. With the water wise discussion that you guys just had, if you now put some of the water wise landscaping in between that and keep the plants that actually produce the goat heads are now further away from those locations.

Kevin Hall – Well, and that seems to me that we keep talking about our and we require all these open spaces, right? And my concern about that is the maintenance, who's taking care of them? And in my mind, if we're going to do those kinds of things, I'd like to see the developers instead of provide open space, create that trail system and put it in.

Chris Hupp – Well, that's part of it.

Kevin Hall – And I realize that that's going to have some sort of maintenance as well but at least it's established there. And instead of just we got all these open spaces full of weeds, do we have the resources to maintain them? I'm all about open space certainly, but you know what I mean? If we're not careful there then pretty soon we got all this stuff that's not taken care of, and then the goat heads are really going to be back.

Chris Hupp – Right. So larger open spaces are easier for cities to maintain. As soon as you start getting into the pocket parks in smaller acre and less, more often than not, the cities that we've worked with aren't willing to take them on. They want at least a two acre or larger. The ones that you're seeing here, at least a 10-acre piece or larger, which are easier to maintain, larger open spaces, you can have the crew go and work on it. But to break one 10 acres into several one acre, you're now having all the travel and extra time to distribute your workforce to maintain those. So larger facilities like this within X amount of distance from each resident are easier to maintain than loads of small.

Kevin Hall – And then can I just ask? Because I'm a farmer, I'm a hobby farmer and I'm just curious when you talk about the agricultural ground, the definition of that. Are we talking irrigated agriculture? Are we talking grazing agriculture? I mean what is the definition of that?

Chris Hupp – So in that number that I delineated there, I actually went through aerial photography of Grantsville and calculated it. Every single irrigated field that currently sits within the future growth boundary of Grantsville. It's not the grazing land, it's not where you've got horses and whatever.

John Limburg – I'm looking at the map right now. It's all between old Lincoln Highway and Burmester.

Chris Hupp – Right. And south, south of Main Street and north of Main Street there's ground and then there's some... You actually, so the Chris Robinson piece north, there's a significant piece up there which is irrigated ag land. And then there's some pieces further east of your growth boundary closer over to Deseret Peak.

Kevin Hall – So this West Bank, does it go to the mountains? How far does it go to the west? From that 138.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. You can see 138 is the one that goes all the way up and off the page. That's 138. We originally had a smaller boundary for this project. We have extended that boundary to try and incorporate where a growth boundary could be implemented. A growth boundary, as I sort of alluded to, means no growth to a certain date. You can establish that and what that does is it forces development to happen within a certain area, which to your point as far as maintenance, who's going to maintain these roads and everything else, it forces the residential and commercial and whatever happens into areas where it's easier to maintain. Currently, you have that development on the south side just north of the depot, which is fairly significantly separated from the rest of the city. And I know more development come down that way. But for fire, for police and other services to be able to access that, it's incredibly difficult to. When you add these growth boundaries in it, again, consolidates that to areas where it's congruent with existing development to try and maintain that service ability for police, fire, and other.

Jaime Topham – So is that the light gray?

Chris Hupp – Right.

Jaime Topham – All right. What is the brown that's kind of by the reddish pink?

Chris Hupp – So that's high intensity residential. And to respond to exactly what that is referencing, let's go to this page right here. So high intensity residential supports commercial office and mixed-use areas. The zones that are equivalent to it are the RM-7 and the RM-15. Those stars that you see there, that density, we are leaving all densities off. That is why we're showing land uses and not zoning, because currently each and every one of these zones has the density associated or allocated to it. If we come in and say high intensity residential an RM-15, then everyone thinks immediately day one they can go and get that. We wanted to distinguish this to say for this, you can get these zones but it's based on density allocated by city council, planning commission at the time of the project submittal and its context. So, that context portion's incredibly important. The reason we write it this way is because if you're 10 years down the road and you're looking to develop an area, and you haven't rezoned or done any of that, and all the residents and all the things develop next to yours are half acre lots, your density should be context specific. That means you shouldn't and won't be able to put in a town home next to a half-acre lot. It's got to be context specific. If you have town homes next door, that makes sense. Or if you have 10,000 square foot lots and you want to do eights, that makes sense. But it's got to be context specific. We actually have as part of this development document, sort of those steps. If you're a town home you can't do, or if you're wanting to put in town homes and next door to you are 10,000 square foot lots, then you have to go to a smaller detached lot before you can do town homes further in your project. To help with the buffer zones.

Jaime Topham – So can you go back to the map. So, the agricultural is the green?

Chris Hupp – Yeah.

Jaime Topham – Well, the dark green.

Chris Hupp – So the dark green is open space parks.

Jaime Topham – So the light green is the agriculture?

Chris Hupp – Light green is agriculture.

Jaime Topham – So that's not a whole lot.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. We had more agriculture and the difficulty, and this is why TDRs and other things like this that may be a curse word to mayors and things, come into play. When you go and you say, "Hey, our future growth, and this is like 30, 40 years out", this will not be developed in 30 years the way that they're seeing it. It's just not going to happen. We have some statistics to that. But the landowner's like, "I'm not doing ag. Why are you telling me I have to do ag on my ground? What I want to do is this." And then you get the residents that come and say, "Well I want what our density is and continuing our community character, which currently is about 2.8 units to the acre." Finding the medium ground there is difficult. This is why some of these programs are incredibly important to help find the difference between those two things. For example, in Spanish Fork we ran this transfer of development rights program for something called the River Bottoms. Currently, all ag ground, and there's a few homesteads there, but the city all wanted that ground to maintain as agriculture ground. Those people that own the land are like, "I'm done farming, I don't want to do it anymore." I want to sell it. -

John Limburg – You can't control that.

Chris Hupp – So there's this issue where the landowner doesn't want that and the whole city wants it. What do you do with that? You can't force that landowner not to sell their ground. You create something like this TDR program which allows somebody to sell their ground or the development rights off of their ground so it's maintained as agriculture ground, and you take that area around... Just as an example, let's go back to this concept.

You take that area around Walmart distribution and say, "You know what? You have five units to the acre there. You can do two more units to the acre, but you have to buy the right from that ag person's ground." You take a hundred-acre piece that's agriculture ground, let's say that's one unit to the acre. You now have a hundred units that you can put in that other project up to that density increase that you can get. Does that make sense? That's why you're not seeing ag ground here because you talk to the property owners and they don't want it shown that way, but you talk to the residents and they want it show them that way.

John Limburg – Yeah. I hear that all of this. I hate to see these farms going, "Well, they own the land and they can sell".

Chris Hupp – Buy the ground. Buy the ground, then it won't happen. It's expensive. But that's why some of these other programs are also important, because let's say the person wants to continue to do it and they want to be able to retire and pass the farm off to their kids. Well, there's these programs where you can actually get funding to buy that ground, to buy them out, and then it goes into an agriculture or easement preservation program. There's several programs that can be utilized to do the same thing. That said, for TDR program to work, you need to establish a land use and a zone because if there's no zone to send that density away, let's say it's one unit to the acre, if there's no density to that, it can't be sold. You can't do anything with it. You have to have a density allocated to it so that those units can be sold to someone else.

John Limburg – I got it.

Jaime Topham – Thanks for that explanation.

Chris Hupp – There's actually several slides in here, but if you want I can share these. If not, that's fine too.

John Limburg – You've said something about anytime you get over 5,000 residents in a community, then the regulations change. That's with like Moderate-Income housing or high density housing you have to have a certain amount. Where are we at right now? How many units?

Dan England – We have 13,000.

John Limburg – 13,000 residents?

Chris Hupp – 13,500 ish residents currently in Grantsville.

John Limburg – It's not homes, it's residents.

Chris Hupp – Residents. Right. And currently Grantsville has 3.7, a little bit over 3.7 residents per unit, per home. So, you can do a little bit of math and figure that out and say, "Okay, we've got this many homes, that many residents."

John Limburg – And what happens if you don't meet the requirements?

Chris Hupp – You get fines. And that comes from the state. State legislature just came out with some updated, they had 575 bills passed this last legislative session. Several of those touch on this moderate-income housing piece. Again, some of those stipulations for general plans, once you hit 5,000 residents, you're now required to do X. And it's different. You're not going to be required to do what Salt Lake's doing. It does step up from designated city sizes.

Jaime Topham – Thanks for the information. Can you send us or is this online already?

Chris Hupp – If you want, you can just pull that off the flash drive and you can distribute that.

Cavett Eaton – I'll send you all a copy of the PowerPoint.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. I purposefully stacked it with loads and loads of data so that you'd be able to go through.

Jaime Topham – All right. Any more discussions then on this? Thank you for your time.

~~6. Discussion of Preliminary Plat for Townhomes on Willow PULLED~~

7. Discussion of Conditional Use Permit application for Vince Anderson/Guzzle

Dustin Barnhurst was present for this item.

Dustin Barnhurst – I'm not Vince. You guys probably know that.

John Limburg – I figured that out earlier.

Dustin Barnhurst – Vince is in Kansas City right now so he's on his way back tomorrow. So I'm Dustin Barnhurst.

Jaime Topham – You're representing him today?

Dustin Barnhurst – Yes. We're partners and co-owner.

John Limburg – So this has nothing to do with it but we grew up together. Which means he's good people.

Jaime Topham – Do we have questions specific to this item? I mean this is on for discussion tonight, not necessarily consideration.

John Limburg – So all we're doing is we're amending it so that you can put that storage unit on there and you're going to increase the waiting line by almost double, right?

Dustin Barnhurst – That's the plan. Yes.

Jaime Topham – That's awesome.

John Limburg – How many cars will take that?

Dustin Barnhurst – So I think currently we have seven, so it should a little more than double that. We should get about 15 in that, with the goal being that we move a lot of that line off of Main Street. Also, out of the residential neighbors next to us so that access to their property easier. We'd get rid of those Conexos so that it beautifies the spot in the city a little more.

John Limburg – There's a drain back there, is that going to go around the drain

Dustin Barnhurst – So what's back there right now is just actually the... It's a pond. So it doesn't have a drain in the bottom, it's just a pond.

Mayor Critchlow – It's a retention basin.

Dustin Barnhurst – Yeah. We'd basically moved that back.

Cavett Eaton – That diagram shows it there.

Dustin Barnhurst – Barry Bunderson helped us put some of this stuff together. I don't know exactly the answer to that question, it looks like he's got it going around that pond so maybe that pond would stay.

Dan England – It's a bigger pond because he's got it paved.

Dustin Barnhurst – Yeah. The idea would be to pave it.

Dan England – In phases.

Dustin Barnhurst – More retention, because it's got more surface.

Kevin Hall – And is that where their storm water goes, into that?

Dustin Barnhurst – So part of it goes there and then we do have a big drain box in the front.

Dan England – It's an underground like manhole, perforated manhole for the water to go into the cap.

John Limburg – Surely that's probably on the note. Why is the pavement being redone?

Dustin Barnhurst – I don't know the answer to that.

Kevin Hall – Maybe he did a crappy job to start with. It's bad too.

John Limburg – You see it? You know what I'm talking about?

Dustin Barnhurst – So part of it is because of that crane's been there twice to put that on and put it off. I mean when you get a big heavy piece of equipment like that, we were anticipating just passenger vehicles not cranes like that. So that's a big part of the reason why that's currently the way that it is.

John Limburg – You're good with everything?

Dan England – I did work with him on the layout of this. Some of the things that I'm working with him on that I can't tell if it's in the wording or not, is that back part. When he first comes in around it for the short term, immediately he's supposed to put the handicapped parking right next to it and use the existing pavement and make the loop a little bit longer. The back part is all gravel and he's going to be parking back there on that. The dumpster is not going to be way back in the corner because you'll never

get a dump truck in the wet season back there to be able to use it. So that'll be back up right off the edge of the pavement back on just next to the basin.

On the other one what he ends up coming back around the backside, he's asked for a year to pave that area. He's going to come around on gravel for a period of time until... and he said within a year he would do that. And based off of what his promise was last time he did one of these, he did come back and pave like he said he would. Based off his past experience, I was okay with the delay in paving for the parking area back there.

John Limburg – I think they're doing a little bit more over there to just take the cars off Main Street.

Dan England – Yes.

John Limburg – Can we just put a stipulation on the conditional use that he has that in by a certain date?

Dan England – Cavett, do you remember when he said he was going to put it in?

Cavett Eaton – What we recommend on here is that reasonable timeline for the immediate site plan and when it's future timeline. So, you can stipulate those timelines. He was hoping to get to get the first phase done, which is the one on the left. He was hoping to get that done as soon as the spring/summer comes, and he can actually work on that. He wanted to be summer of next year to be able to pave clear back here and do the big strips.

Dustin Barnhurst – That one will be the end of next summer.

Lanise Thompson – That one's '23, this ones '24.

Cavett Eaton – And it says that on it.

Jaime Topham – Have any issues with any of that? Dan, do we have enough information to move this to an action item?

John Limburg – I think we do. I feel comfortable with that.

Jaime Topham made a motion to move item number seven, discussion of conditional use permit application for Vince Anderson and the Guzzle to an action item, Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

John Limburg made a motion to approve the conditional use permit for Vince Anderson/Guzzle, Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of minutes from Nov. 17, 2022, Dec 1, 2022 and Dec. 15, 2022 Planning Commission Meetings. TABLED

Jaime Topham – We do not have a quorum for those of parties who were actually present, so we will have to table that. Do I need to make a motion to table it?

Jaime Topham made a motion that we table number eight. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carries unanimously.

9. Report from City Council liaison Mayor Critchlow

Mayor Critchlow – I think it's a great idea to take this and put it out for a survey just about whether or not we do these things. Okay. My feeling is the state's going to require us to do it whether or not the survey says yes or no.

Jaime Topham – Someday

Mayor Critchlow – Sooner than you think. They were really pushing.

John Limburg – Well, with this whole great Salt Lake report and everything else and everybody's, they're be pushing.

Mayor Critchlow – Yes, they are. And that's gone up two feet, but it's going to have to go up a lot more to make up for things. So, anything you want me to take back to the council?

Kevin Hall – Mayor, can I just ask a question? I'm just curious. With this water deal, are we doing anything currently to control what people are watering outside of their water meter? You know what I'm saying? I guess obviously the irrigation company provides irrigation water, and because the good lord hasn't sent much, people are watering with city water.

Mayor Critchlow – Yes.

Kevin Hall – And it seems to me like if that's the case with the situation with the water, shouldn't we be saying, "Hey, wait a minute here. I know we're getting a revenue from it." Nonetheless, it seems that there should be an avenue to sort of curtail a little bit of that.

Mayor Critchlow – We have a tiered system, Kevin. If you're down on the normal thing, if you're watering a lot more, then that gets... the price goes up. The more you water, the higher the price is.

Kevin Hall – But that's the only control then so if I've got lots of money, I don't give a crap about that. I just keep flooding, right? That's my point is that.

Mayor Critchlow – And they would pay any fine or do whatever if that's their attitude.

Chris Hupp – Mayor, can I address that a little?

Mayor Critchlow – Sure.

Chris Hupp – So when we put the tiered system in about three years ago, I guess four years ago, we did have a lot of usage. Because I mean you basically you had an unlimited use prior to that. So, we put the tiered system in. That first year there were several water users that were like, "Why is my bill \$300?" And they were like that consistently. When they finally came to us, we educated them that they'd been notified several times. Anyway, those water users have come down significantly.

Kevin Hall – I'm just curious about that because I know that.

Chris Hupp – Yeah. We haven't imposed water restrictions and those types of things yet. That would be something we might look forward in the future, but right now that's kind of the way that we're regulating that is with people's pocket books.

Kevin Hall – Anyway, I was just curious about that I guess. I wondered about that.

Jaime Topham – So how do we balance this? Jesse, maybe this for you as well, but how do we balance this? We don't have enough water so we want to restrict everything. We restrict the plants, we restrict all of this other stuff with you have to do higher density building in your house because of the moderate income. How does that balance out? We're bringing more and more people in, at the same time saying we don't have enough water for more people.

Mayor Critchlow – It really is, the state has done some things the last two years with the legislature that really has affected us. They're requiring so much affordable housing, that low income affordable housing, all of those things. Basically, their threat was if you don't do what we tell you, we're just going to over your zonings.

Jaime Topham – That doesn't address the fact that we don't have more water. You're saying more smaller houses, smaller plots, more people, higher density, and we don't have more water. If you have bigger houses, you'd use less water because you have less people on that lot.

Mayor Critchlow – It's still the same amount of people per unit. 3.7. Just a little over that. But if we make smaller lots, I like half acre lots. I like five acre lots. Isn't that what I tell everybody? They said, "What do you want?" Like I said, "Five acre lots, leave me alone." But the fact is that our zoning and the state has is going to or has put some things into place that we're having to do some things. By making them do water wise, cutting the amount of water that they have to bring to the city is really helping, is going to help us. The amount of use in a home with all the new appliances, the toilets, the bathtubs, everything, water heaters, the average se is going down because of that. Okay. It affects our sewer plant because of that because there's not as much water going into there. Does that make sense?

Jaime Topham – Yeah.

Mayor Critchlow – Okay. And what I'd like to do is just stop the building but...

Jaime Topham – That's the part I was going to say. Everything just sounds good-

Mayor Critchlow – That's what I would like to do.

Jaime Topham – Acre and bigger, nobody builds. You have less water use because you have less people.

Mayor Critchlow – Yep. The zoning that we have approved over the last... well everything on the west bench was changed and in 2000 whatever, and up here was changed in 2010 up on where the Romneys are doing. There's lots of things that have changed over the years. It really has. If somebody's got a zoning we can't tell them no, right? Or we're going to get sued.

Jaime Topham – Right.

Mayor Critchlow – Okay. So, their numbers on the population is a little off so we have 4112 connections. We average 3.7 per unit, and that's 15,000 something residents here.

Dan England – To go a little bit deeper on your question, Shay and I have had a number of conversations about that because I says, "How dense can you end up going before all of a sudden you end up getting... using more water than a farm?" And Shay, correct me if I'm wrong, but you said about six units per acre?

Shay Stark - Roughly. It's kind of interesting though. If we look at the city's requirement, we basically state that there's 0.45 acre feet per each home. That's what they're required to bring in. Then they're supposed to bring in another amount for their irrigation if they're not within the irrigation district. If all you were talking about was the houses, at 0.45 you're about 7.5 houses per... So let me take one step back. Alfalfa is 3.36 acre feet is required. You would get 7.5 houses out of that 3.36 acre feet. So, in one acre you could have up to 7.75 houses. That's just houses, that's not any outdoor irrigation. Realistically, when you're talking about single family lots, that number drops really quickly. And so roughly six, maybe five. A lot of it just depends on the size of the lots and how much area is being irrigated.

Jaime Topham – Thanks for that, Shay.

Kevin Hall – Can I just ask Dan a question? And I was hoped to ask it of whoever was going to talk about the town homes. In the traffic study that they did there, and the reason I ask this question is because of the kickbacks from the residents in that area about the traffic. That traffic study that they did, does that take in the development that's already improved there or what's happening at the time they built? Do you know that?

Dan England – In which area?

Kevin Hall – Town homes on Willow. They did a traffic study there. And I'm just wondering if it's-

Dan England – It's an old traffic study.

Kevin Hall – So, it doesn't consider that that Durfee street corner's been done and all of those developments are not in the-

Dan England – I don't remember the date on the study.

Lanise Thompson – It's February 11, 2022.

Dan England – I know I've asked him to give us an updated study on that and he said he was going back to the traffic people to provide that.

Kevin Hall – The other question is, should it or can it include that legally?

Jaime Topham – It's the standard.

Kevin Hall – That takes all that in? Even though there's nothing built there, it's approved and that traffic's going to affect what happens there.

Dan England – The way our code reads is that if, I think it's a hundred daily trips or something or less, he can do a small study which basically says, "Okay, where's your cars coming from?" If it gets above that, then they have to do a bigger, wider study to say, "Okay, How is everything? How is what are we doing impacting everybody else too?" So what he's provided at this point is just the smaller study. And we're looking at that saying okay. Part of the problem that we had, Shay brought this to our attention also, is that during the peak hour of the morning when most people are going to work in the morning, only half of the residents were leaving. And we said, "How do you make that work?"

Kevin Hall – Yeah.

Dan England – And so it didn't make sense. And so that's part of why we asked him, "Go back to your traffic people. Tell us why that's happening and give us some more information about what's actually going on here."

Jaime Topham – So for all other plans, if it's less than a hundred trips, they only have to take into consideration how they're impacting, their particular thing is impacting. But if it's more than a hundred trips daily, then they have to take into consideration everything around them. Not everything, but within a certain whatever.

Dan England – Basically, yes.

Jaime Topham – Okay. That helps.

Shay Stark – Can I point out one thing with this just really quickly? Even on those small plans, there is still a growth element that is included in there on that existing city street that they're going into. And so they still add a certain percentage for growth that is outside of the development on that street with each of it. They'll do, for instance, they may do it, look at it initially, look at it when their development is finished, and then look at it 10 years later which may be 20 years out or 25 years out, depending on how big their development is. But they usually do, as they look at each one of those different steps, there usually is a component of growth that's put on there that's just a percentage.

Kevin Hall – Okay. Thanks.

Jaime Topham – All right. Anything else?

Mayor Critchlow – Yeah. Holler if you need something, you guys can call me.

NEXT MEETING

Cavett Eaton – On 6th of April, which will be our next planning commission meeting, both Dan and I will be out of town. We would like to ask if you'd be willing to switch and have a meeting on the 13th instead of the 6th? If that would work for you guys or your schedules. Jaime said maybe.

Mayor Critchlow – So you'd only have one meeting in April.

Kevin Hall – I should know this, but is spring break the weekend of the 7th?

Mayor Critchlow – Yes.

Kevin Hall – So spring break is over by then, it's not the 13th weekend then, right?

John Limburg – The 13th works for me actually.

Jaime Topham – So we wouldn't have the 20th?

Mayor Critchlow – You can if you want, but I would just cancel that one and just one meeting.

Jaime Topham – I'm might be out of town so John wouldn't be here.

John Limburg – This is the only one of the whole month?

Jaime Topham made a motion to move the April 6 meeting to April 13. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motioned past. There will be no meeting on April 6. Meeting will be held on April 13

10. Adjourn

Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. John Limburg seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Meeting was adjourned at 8:16PM