

## Action Summary

Worthington Ranch	Discussion
West Bank Study	Discussion
MU Mixed-Use	Discussion
External ADU	Discussion

## MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING HELD 04/25/23. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM

### ROLL CALL:

**Commission Members Present:** Commission Chair: Jaime Topham, Vice-Chair: John Limburg, Rick Barchers, Kevin Hall, Derek Dalton.

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:** Mayor Critchlow, City Manager Jesse Wilson, City Engineer Dan England, City Planning and Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Lanise Thompson. DRC specialist Gary Pinkham, Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Barry Gittleman, Stetson Blackmore

Commission Chair: Jaime Topham called meeting to order at 6:02 PM

### AGENDA:

#### 1. Discussion of Worthington Ranch Subdivision

Barry Gittleman and Stetson Blackmore from Hamlet Homes were present.

**Barry Gittleman** – Hello Thanks for meeting with us. I'm Barry Gittleman and this is Stetson Black-Moore. Hello. We're both with Hamlet Homes and we own the property in Worthington Ranch. Phase one has already been approved and phase one is on the screen in yellow. It is underway with development. They're on track to pave the roads in phase one, sometime in the next couple of months. And then our plan would be to start building homes and selling homes in phase one.

During the past, I would say six months now, we've met with city staff, we've met with the mayor, we've met with the adjacent property owners, planning commission, and city council to talk about phase two, which is the left west section on the screen and the current open space that is on the right section of the screen. What we have been discussing with all of those groups is the possibility of changing the currently approved plan, which has 62 homes in phase one and phase two and 94 acres of open space that's not being used for anything. We have a concept plan to get your feedback on tonight that would have us installing, paying for, and donating land and amenities to the city of Grantsville that would not be owned by the HOA. They would be open for all of the citizens of Grantsville, not just the residents of Worthington Ranch with a modification to the phase two land plan and the open-space land plan that would allow for some additional homes.

That's the general discussion that's on the table. I also wanted to share that we've had, in our conversations with plan commission and city council and staff, we've talked about what those amenities might look like and what the home sites might look like, the number of homes, the size of the home building lots. We believe we've incorporated all of the feedback that we proceed from all of

those groups. We've increased the minimum lot size from a quarter acre to a third acre. We've decreased the total number of lots in those conversations. I think our original proposed lot count was a little over 150 and then it came down to 130 something and 120 something and now it's 112 that's proposed in this concept plan. We got a lot of feedback from planning commission, city council, and staff about the type of trails for the amenities to go in.

There was some discussion about a lot of people in Grantsville own and like to walk their horses, but the general feedback was these trails, if we do them, should be walking trails for people and not horses because most of the people in the area who own horses are going to go to the foothills further to the west and not in this area. Pickleball courts was suggested by several people and so that area just northeast of phase one in yellow would be an amenity area with pickleball courts. A pavilion. Couple members of city council suggested that the open space land might be good for a future school site if there's school crowding in Grantsville, but it would really be up to the city what to do with any of the additional land in the open space. There's also the Willow Lane Parkway extension that is planned for long-term in the future for the city. Some of that open space land could be used for the Parkway extension as well. Am I missing anything? We'd love to hear anybody's feedback, comments or suggestions on the current concept plan.

**John Limburg** – When you guys came in here before, like you said, you're building some, you're building phase one, right now, right?

**Barry Gittleman** – Development is underway and phase one no homes are underway. Yeah.

**John Limburg** – You guys bought it that way with it already approved, right?

**Barry Gittleman** – Correct.

**John Limburg** – On phase one. And then you were coming in and asking to go a little denser on phase three than it is now. It's when you were saying they were, were quarter acre, half acre lots-

**Barry Gittleman** – Well, in the original plan there were 62 homes approved on a total of approximately 154 acres. The average lot size was a little bit less than an acre, but they ranged from maybe 0.6 to 1.4 acres in size. In the new land plan, phase one is unchanged, so it's still what was previously approved, and phase two in the proposed phase three has lot sizes that still range to some that are greater than an acre. Some of them are still up around 1.3, 1.4, but the smallest lot size is currently a third of an acre. In some previous versions of the plan, including our meetings with this group in January, the minimum lot size was a quarter of an acre and we got some feedback that several of you felt that was too small.

**John Limburg** – I remember you guys had some trails going up around but says Grantsville Elementary now that you proposed, and I think our general feeling was that would, that's kind of wasted land anyway that you were saying you were giving to the city. That's kind of no good. What's the possibility that you're actually going to put an elementary school there?

**Barry Gittleman** – That's totally up to city council and the mayor and staff and the planning commission. We have no preference whether that ends up being athletic fields or green space or schools in the future. It could be used for many different things by the city and that might be 5, 10, 20 years down the road. We were just putting on there that is a scale drawing of the current Grantsville

Elementary School. If another one of similar size were going to be done just to sort of give a representation of the size and the scale of the area.

**Jaime Topham** – But the land itself, I mean, can it even support something like that, Dan?

**Dan England** – I have not seen the geo tech report on this, but I have heard that this area was pretty much a bog and that they had animals who had got stuck in this area. It'd be very difficult to build any structures on this area without a lot of expense to make it work. It's kind of surprise that they've got a number of buildings going out that direction too.

**Barry Gittleman** – Are you talking about the wetlands in that southeast corner of the land or further north?

**Dan England** – In the 94 acres that were over there.

**Barry Gittleman** – Because we've got a wetlands study and that boundary of the wetlands from the wetland delineation is shown on the concept plan. We've spoken with engineers who say that it is a relatively low elevation in most of the 94 acres. If we are able to get approval for a phase three, many of those homes might need some pumps to get sewer out of the house and to connect to the sewer lines for phase one that are already in the ground. But homes would be buildable.

**Dan England** – Are you proposing to put basements in that area too?

**Barry Gittleman** – Yes.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Have you got a picture of what the original call zip was?

**Barry Gittleman** – We do.

**Kevin Hall** – And just a question, was there a phase three in the original approval or just phase one and two?

**Barry Gittleman** – Just one and two in the original approval.

**Mayor Critchlow** – 62 one acre lots. Right?

**Jaime Topham** – Cavett can you pull up the original? Find and pull up quickly?

**John Limburg** – Was it January, you said?

**Barry Gittleman** – December we came to this meeting. January, we presented at two meetings with the concept plan for this planning commission.

**Jaime Topham** – Major, were you meaning the original plan that this was originally approved for? Not their proposal, but the original PUD.

**Lanise Thompson** – Here's the final plan for phase one. Yeah, I can't get on the S Drive either, I don't know.

**Jaime Topham** – Well while they're working on that-

**Barry Gittleman** – Sure.

**Jaime Topham** – I remember of that land, and this came through originally, well maybe not originally. I don't think I was here originally when it was the first Bloomington, but when Adam brought it through, the whole reason that 94 acres was going to be whatever, I can't remember if he was giving it to the city or was part of the HOA, but it was because it's unusable land. Because it is a swamp land. It may not be a designated wet land, but it's swampy. I remember when the field north, no, south of it caught fire and just burned because it was some kind of moss underneath and it burned and it burned. And that's just south of you. It's not great land. It's very concerning.

**Kevin Hall** – It was peat moss burning under the ground.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah, peat moss. It's really concerning that you're planning on putting homes, especially with basements down there, particularly given the year that we have right now where it's quite possible that there's going to be a lot of flooding and that's a really low area.

**Barry Gittleman** – It is a relatively low area compared certainly to the foothills in the surrounding area. One of the other things that we've talked with staff about is the possibility that Grantsville city may need a regional storm pond in the future. Part of this land that we're proposing to donate to the city could be a location for that regional storm pond in the future. It would certainly be our obligation if we can get approval to do any homes in that 94 acres as part of a phase three to ensure that they comply with city code, state building code that we protect. We're going to be on the hook to warrant the homes that we build in any of these phases. We're going to make sure that we're not going to have basement flooding. If some of the homes are at an elevation that's too low that we can't do basements and we have to do slab foundations, we would do that. So that would certainly be our obligation.

**Jaime Topham** – Shay, do you remember how this property, the 94 acres, was it like part of an HOA or was it they're planning on dedicating it to the city? I don't recall.

**Shay Stark** – So originally this all came through in the, what was it called, the conservation subdivision. We had this big complex mess of things that you had to comply with and the huge spreadsheet calculation that determined how many lots there were there based on the wetlands study, based on the amount of open space that can be given. I mean there were a lot of things there. In that it was required to go into a conservation easement, but I remember when Derek Ellis purchased it and he came in and sat for years and nothing had happened and he came in and asked to amend it in 2000. We were just looking at that in December 5th, 2018 when it went to city council. It was amended from 51 to 62 lots.

The reason that that occurred was because this wetland study had occurred, which originally hadn't occurred. We were able to make a determination off of that, so bumped it up a little bit there on the total number lots they could have. All through that, and the code at the time required that it go to a conservation easement. Derek came in and you may remember, he said, well, he brought it in first of all, and he had a concept for a city park down there. He brought it through and City council at the time didn't want the park. The reason the city council didn't want to park was because of the issues that you've been bringing up about the land. They were afraid that it was going to end up being a pig in a poke and city would be stuck maintaining this piece of ground, wouldn't be able to keep grass

growing on it, wouldn't be able to develop the amenities on it because of the land, if I remember right. They just flat out told them no, it would have to remain as a conservation easement.

Then he came back and he said he wanted to develop it as he wanted to put a shooting range out there. He wanted to put in some stables and so people could keep horses down there, a riding arena for them, an area for them to store their RVs and some of their toys down in there. Then just an area that they could ride and do other things. That was the way I remember it being pushed through. In the minutes for the 12/05/2018, Councilman Allen asked him specifically, is this remaining a conservation easement? He said at that time that they were going to maintain that. They were going to keep the open space, but they were going to maintain and use the open space essentially as it was what he said at that time. Then that was approved.

Then it came in for preliminary and they decided, and then under our old process too, just for those who are newer to this, our old process used to be concept was actually the same as what our preliminary is now. Preliminary was construction drawings and then final plat was literally just the plat. There were three approval steps through this. They brought it in through preliminary, which is, I got a couple of those notes on here that I'm looking at that I still have on my computer. And when it came in on preliminary, the preliminary plat states on it, Utah Open Land Conservation Trust and states on it, that "open space will be owned and maintained by Utah Land Trust or Conservation Corporation." Unfortunately, I've just got bits and pieces here since I can't access my main server to pull stuff off of. I don't know what the final approved preliminary plat looked like, but this puts us into April or May of 2021. With that, it would be May of 2021 when planning commission saw it, probably in June or so, 2021 when city council saw it.

**Jaime Topham** – I don't really hear any reasons for a change that all of a sudden that land would be good for building on and having other major things constructed on.

**Barry Gittleman** – So we have no data that says that open space cannot be built on other than the wetlands in the southeast corner. The concerns that he just raised about the city doesn't want to get dedicated to it, a bunch of amenities or get dedicated to it land that they're going to then build amenities on that they might not be able to maintain. I think that's relevant for the wetlands area. I would agree with that.

We're not proposing to do anything in that area, but we're also not proposing to dedicate land to the city and then burden the city with an obligation of building or installing any amenities. What we're proposing is that we would spend our funds to do those amenities and then gift them to the city. It would cost the city nothing other than to maintain them going forward, just like the city does with any other public parks or buildings or real estate that they already own

**Rick Barchers** – Here's my problem. Not that any of these other issues are not an issue. Originally, this was approved as a PUD.

**Cavett Eaton** – No, it has never been proposed as a PUD.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay. Well it's my understanding that at the time the zoning, if the zoning was followed, there'd only be 51 lots.

**Barry Gittleman** – Yep. There was, right? I don't think that's correct. The original zoning was two and a half acre lots. The size of the total property is 154 acres. I think your point about the wetlands is

valid and relevant, but I think if you do the math and take 154 acres divided by two and a half, it comes out to exactly 62 lots. I think that's how the original number was determined. And then the previous owner before we were involved, proposed to concentrate those 62 home sites in the west and leave.

**Rick Barchers** – Thank you for making my point.

**Shay Stark** – Can I jump in here, because I did all the calculations on this thing. I know this quite well. You're right. Ultimately the idea of the conservation subdivision was that you looked at the original zoning, you said, okay, we have X number of lots that can be built on here and if it were just going in under that zone. The idea was that you would take that number of lots and then you'd go through these calculations determining what portion of it was open space. So really the benefit to the developer was that they could build smaller lots, but they would never exceed the total number of lots that they would've been able to do if they would've just walked in with the standard subdivision. But, they could build smaller lots so they have less infrastructure to be able to have with it. Then this other, for instance with wetlands, basically if you found it a certain amount of this was wetlands, you weren't allowed to count that as in that overall property, the buildable acreage.

**Rick Barchers** – Perfect.

**Shay Stark** – And even with the open space, it wasn't counted in the open space as open space that could be applied to this set of calculations. I wish I could pull it up because I could show you the spreadsheet on it. It's there. There's several other factors in there. But you're correct. I mean it's essentially the number of lots. That's how we ended up back up at roughly about 62 was because like I say, the wetland study, wasn't it originally done. I guess nobody had required them to, even though it was in the code there. They came in and they did that wetland study afterwards and determined that the acreage, that it was actually a relatively small section of the acreage right there that was wetlands.

**Rick Barchers** – That kind of goes to my point. The concession has already been made by the city for that area. Okay. That'll include phase three. Now you're asking to double the density when it was put over into one area, which made it more efficient to be developed and more profitable for the developer, which is fine. I got no problem with that, really. I don't. But now you want to double the amount of density on that total property. That for me just isn't, doesn't work because I'm not seeing the benefit of it. I'm seeing a huge area of this being water retention, which is fine. Then you've got the wetlands area, that's fine. The potential school going in on that northern part of it is a possibility of maybe we can do whatever we want to with it and we're not sure we can do anything with it all so that you can double the density. I don't see the benefit in it, that's just my opinion.

**Barry Gittleman** – That's fair. So, let me address those points, please. First, we're not doubling the density. We're at 62 now, and so we're proposing an additional 50, so it's less than double. We have previous versions that were double and we got a lot of pushback on that. We've taken that into account. The first planning commission meeting that we came to with this body, there was a developer who went up right before us who was requesting some variances in exchange for putting in amenities that were going to be owned by his HOA and accessible only to his homeowners in his project. We heard loud and clear that wasn't really a benefit for the city of Grantsville and all of the citizens of Grantsville. We took that into account and we're proposing that we'll pay to put in one and a half to two miles of trails at our expense and gift them to the city and all the citizens of Grantsville for their use, not just our homeowners.

We're proposing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on trails, on pickleball courts, on additional parking, on pavilions that would again be gifted and donated to the city and all of the citizens, not just for our homeowners. That land could also be used for a potential future stormwater retention pond, a regional pond that the city may need in the future, a parkway extension that the city expects to need in the future, but it's not a certainty. The other land, whether it's school or anything else, could be used for whatever the city might need in the future. If the concern is whether or not that is buildable, we're happy to pay to go get additional soil studies and engineer reports to certify that it is buildable. To certify whether or not any homes that went into that area, even if it's just a few or a handful would or wouldn't be stable, engineered correctly, whether they could have basements or whether they need to be on slabs. I think we've heard loud and clear that for any additional density, there needs to be something that is of benefit to the city and all the citizens of Grantsville, not just the homeowners here. I think we're proposing quite a bit that would cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars that would benefit them. We're not just asking something for nothing or for something that's only going to benefit our homeowners.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay. How many people in this room have ever played pickleball? Four or five. So, benefit about 40%. That's okay. So that would be a potential benefit, a pickleball court. The rest of it's kind of just out there, dude. You see what I'm saying?

**Barry Gittleman** – How many of us in this room have used walking trails before? Or how many of the citizens of Grantsville have, I would guess that's higher than the number of people who've played pickleball. I agree with you that it's not going to be a hundred percent for probably any amenities that a city offers their citizens.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, I'm still going to go back to the, you want to go 62 to 112 and that's, I'm not seeing the benefit there for it. So go ahead Kevin, please.

**Kevin Hall** – I just want to comment about a little bit that's in the news. Can I?

**Barry Gittleman** – Sure.

**Kevin Hall** – I'm a life-longer here and I know the history of Grantsville and I struggled this morning when they had a hydrologist on the news this morning talking about the situation in Draper. And I'm certain we're all aware of that, right? His statement was that they knew that the soils there were conditioned to problems. They knew that. As such, it was engineered. The hydrologist did the tests. The other part of the story is there was a story in the news today that paper said, right, that they had to follow what the engineers and the hydrologists and all those people said. It was built that way. But the hydrologists said from the beginning that the soils were suspect. So personally, that part of the world down there is definitely in the low land of Grantsville. And there is a history, right? I've seen that property burn all summer long and I struggle with saying it's a benefit to Grantsville in any fashion to set us up for failure in that area.

**Barry Gittleman** – So the neighborhood that you're referring to in Draper, I live in that neighborhood. Hamlet built 72 homes in that neighborhood, Edge built on the Utah County side of the county line. I don't want to get into the issues that they had. We'll let that play out as it does. When Hamlet built our 72 homes in the neighborhood of Suncrest and Draper, we spent a small fortune ensuring that our homes would not have the issues that led to those two homes slid down the hill.

**Kevin Hall** – According to the city and according to the engineers and according to the hydrologists, so did Edge Holmes. My point is, by law or by proof, it never should have happened, but because it was suspect to begin with, and we think that these hundred year events are never going to happen. I've seen two of them happen in Grantsville in my lifetime, and there's one going on right now. I just struggle with the idea that we're going to go into that and that we're getting really anything that benefits Grantsville, especially the city when we have to answer, if those problems arise down the road somewhere, I just struggle with it. For me it's just not a good idea.

**Barry Gittleman** – But if you take that logic to the extreme, we would never build any homes for anybody to live in because there's always a possibility something may go wrong. And obviously people, we all need a home to live in. Building nothing is not the right answer. And so reasonable precautions are what you take when you approve a subdivision where the last subdivision that you approved, it's unlikely, but maybe all those homes fall down or catch on fire or sink into the mud. You have city staff and engineers that work with developers and builders to minimize the chance that something extreme like that goes wrong. We have engineers, we have developers, general contractors and subcontractors that also do everything in our power to minimize the chance that some extreme, unlikely event is going to happen. I share your concern that terrible things can happen sometimes and we do everything we can to prevent them, but you can never prevent them perfectly, a hundred percent in extreme circumstances or with a record winter like we have this year.

**Kevin Hall** – And again, I understand that. I appreciate what you're saying and I don't want to argue about it, but there's, it's not apples to apples I don't think, because I get that we could approve a subdivision that could sink in the ground tomorrow, but I don't think I would know or be suspect of that home sinking in the ground as I would when I knew from the onset that there's a pretty big issue there, a potential pretty big issue. Again, if there weren't hundreds of lots improved in Grantsville and hundreds of acres that could be built on, maybe so. But just again, personally I just struggle with it.

**Barry Gittleman** – And your concern is primarily with the open space area close to the wetlands?

**Kevin Hall** – Well, I just don't think we should, again, I just struggle with the comment that well, we'll put pumps in and pump and we'll do all that stuff, right? Because I think, again, we know there's a problem there, right? Because you've stated that we're going to put pumps in there potentially and we're going to do this to do that. Right? So again, for me, why would we do that? I just don't see the benefit to anyone in doing that.

**Barry Gittleman** – One thing that I do want to clarify when I say we may put some pumps in the basement if we're required to, that has nothing to do with the elevation of the land or the wetlands. We're not going to build anything in the wetlands and we know we can't. The only reason that we put some pumps in basements if we're required to is because of the elevation of the sewer system. We're already putting the sewer system, actually, I can point it out here. Our sewer system in phase one is already in the ground and there is an easement from phase one that goes southeast through Bud's property adjacent to us to the south that we worked out with Bud and Nicole. Because that sewer pipe is in the ground, if we build a home, let's say right there behind lot 119 or 120, it may have sewer in the house draining into the basement that needs a pump to get it up to connect to the existing sewer line in phase one. So that has nothing to do with the soil quality in the 94 acres. It's all about the elevation of the house and the sewer pump and the sewer lines.

**Kevin Hall** – Again, I understand all that as well.

**Barry Gittleman** – Okay.

**Kevin Hall** – It isn't the only reason we put some pumps in the basement, right? When there's groundwater issues, we put some pumps in the basement for that too. Correct?

**Barry Gittleman** – If we have groundwater issues, we're not going to build basements.

**Kevin Hall** – Okay. Well anyway.

**Barry Gittleman** – Okay.

**Jaime Topham** – Derek, do you have any comments?

**Barry Gittleman** – I did want to ask Mr. Hall, you, your concerns sounded like they were all related to these 94 acres to the east. Do you have any concerns if we were to pay for, build, and install amenities and then dedicate them to the city with doing an exchange for that, some additional home sites in phase two which has already been certified as buildable and doesn't have the elevation issues that exist in the 94 acres?

**Kevin Hall** – Well, I guess I'd have to see that. I don't know that I could answer that. But without seeing your idea of that, to be honest with you, right? But I'm much more favorable of that than I am going any further to the east or to the North.

**Barry Gittleman** – That's fair. This plan right here that we're looking at, if we ignore the 94 acres to the east, this has phase two in sort of this pink color and this phase two is shown with 43 home sites.

The current plan that is already approved has 32 in phase two. This would be an additional 11 in phase two without even touching, without doing a phase three and without touching the 94 acres to the east.

**Jaime Topham** – So let me be clear, what you're saying is you would be open to not doing phase three and still giving us amenities in that 94 acres if you were allowed to do phase two, as you have shown.

**Barry Gittleman** – We could do some but not all of those amenities and dedicate them to the city with phase two as shown and nothing in phase three. If you're asking us to give up 39 lots that are currently proposed in phase three, we couldn't do all of the amenities that we're proposing to pay for and dedicate to the city.

**Rick Barchers** – I would like to make a point on what you just said. Phase three was never approved. Building in that area was never approved. So, you're not giving up anything.

**Barry Gittleman** – From what we're proposing.

**Rick Barchers** – You're asking from us. So you're not giving really anything up, in my opinion. Just so you know.

**Barry Gittleman** – That's fair. Okay.

**Jaime Topham** – Jesse, well actually let me ask you really quick. But you would still give the whole green section to Grantsville City? All of the green, including phase three.

**Barry Gittleman** – We believe that dedicating the open space to the city provides benefits to the city, to the citizens and the residents. And it also provides a benefit to our homeowners, in that most homeowners in Grantsville don't want to have an HOA or they don't want to have high HOA dues or for the HOA to not have to have insurance to cover that property. Several city council members who we met with did say that eliminating the HOA completely would not be their preference, but making the HOA architectural controls only would be their preference because they've seen neighborhoods with no HOA where the homes and the lots go into disrepair. Keeping an HOA that has low annual dues and the sole responsibility to make sure that the homeowners maintain their homes and their yards would benefit the city and that would be their preference.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, thank you. Jesse, our parks and rec people, would they want all of this green land?

**Jesse Wilson** – Probably not. As for things that were expressed by prior city councils about having that much green space grass in that area, I don't think they would want something that large. I know we won't have the staff to try and maintain it.

**Jaime Topham** – Mayor Critchlow, I know you have input. What's your input on, would that be a benefit to the city in some way? I mean you're out talking to the people all the time. You have a feel?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Well I'm going to say a couple of things. First of all, this was zoned two and a half acres. They allowed this to change to keep that open space so that they can have everything built up here off of that lower thing. I'm going to tell you, there's a lot of people that would just love to run their cattle out there. The homeowner association could actually charge them a fee for letting them run those cows out there and would actually make up some of the cost of the homeowner association. But, if you didn't want to do that with the Homeowner Association, they could always turn around and deed it off and sell it.

**Jaime Topham** – So that kind of brings me back to something that you had said, and actually Rick, about you're asking for more density and you're saying that the benefit will be all of this stuff. But Rick made a really good point that this land has already received concessions. The land received the concession of one acre lots to stack everything on the north end. So, when you're asking for additional, it's not the same as the person who was before you that you heard him say about those different amenities in the homeowner's association because that land had never asked for concessions nor received concessions. You're talking apples and oranges. I think you were talking about probably the land that was up on the hills that was going to do a whole bunch of different things. You had mentioned that that person was right in front of you.

You guys thought, "Okay, we hear that they want it within the HOA or they don't want it within the HOA." But that's not the same kind of land because that land did not already receive concessions. This land has already received concessions. Any additional ask from you has to have a real benefit to the city. What I'm hearing from our city managers, our parks and recs wouldn't necessarily want that 94 acres, dedicate it to the city. I'm kind of hearing the same thing for the mayor and I have the same kind of feeling. Now, you ask about the Phase 2. I don't know that I'd necessarily have a problem with that if we got something we really wanted on the end. But then it comes back to the, "should it be dedicated to the city?" That's a lot of area to take care of.

**Barry Gittleman** – I agree with your statement that there have been some concessions on this property with the previous property owners before we bought it. Your point is valid about the developer who wanted to do a park for his HOA for his residence only in exchange for some concessions that he was asking for. My point there was that planning commission and city council has been clear that concessions by planning commission or city council that only benefit the homeowners of the developer and they don't benefit the city and the citizens are not really a benefit to the city. That was my takeaway from your feedback to the other developer. We understand that and we're trying to do something that would be a benefit for the city and all of the citizens.

To Jesse's comment and the mayor's comment, I agree that if that 94 acres stays in its current state, where it's a lot of tumbleweeds and just open space without any amenities, if I were in charge of the parks and rec department, I would not want to have to maintain that either because it provides no benefit to the city. But if it has, whether the city decides that you want pickleball courts or you want a regional storm pond or you want an extension of Willow Lane or you want a future school or you want walking trails, any of those things would be a benefit to the city and might be something that parks and Rec would be willing to take on if they're not just getting 94 acres of tumbleweeds.

**Jaime Topham** – So let's say that we would be open to this idea of phase two but not phase three. What amenities would you be able to do?

**Barry Gittleman** – Without figuring out the cost of those amenities in detail, I think we could do either the trails or the pickleball courts in a pavilion, but probably not both. If I had to guess right here on the spot. The land, that could be a future extension of the parkway could be a future regional storm pond, could be a potential future school. We could do that as well.

**Jaime Topham** – So, Jesse, on that, if they dedicated all of that land to the city, not looking at parks and rec but looking more at storm drains, storm retention ponds, is that viable? Maybe I'm asking the wrong person. Maybe that's a Dan question.

**Dan England** – We are currently going through the Westbank study and in that Westbank Study we can ask the question to Chris, who's online right now. Well his engineers are still working on, we don't have the answers to that at this phase, is needed. I did talk to public works just today and they said they'd like more storm water coming up around this side of the city than everything going around the south side of the city to the east. If that basin's needed, I don't know. At some point we will need to have a road that's going to go through this area that they show just underneath the elementary school area. We'll need a road that goes through that area. What was your question again?

**Jaime Topham** – Would that land be useful for the city for storm water purposes or some other purpose than parks and rec?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Can I just, there's two things. Can I mention one thing here? Okay. The water that's coming off of the mountains up there in the west are going run down through, they're going to go through Desert Edge. They're going to go through these folks' detention because we're not going to let them fill the washes in and they have to make arrangements to capture what's coming through. It's going to go out there, it's going to go there and it's going to go over to Chris Robinson's and it's going to go there because that's where naturally it goes. Okay? We're not going to mess with the natural flow of the water. First of all, it won't be detained out there because there's no way where it's going to seep in. This doesn't percolate through this area.

**Kevin Hall** – Got a little clay out there on Burmester don't we?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Okay. So as far as the elementary school goes, the people up on the west side of the mountain up there have already dedicated or want to dedicate a school area. So that won't be necessary down there. 62 is what we agreed to because that's what the zoning allowed them to do. It's my feelings, personal feelings, this should just stay that way.

**Barry Gittleman** – That zoning that this property was approved for before we purchased it doesn't exist anymore in the city, as I understand it.

**Mayor Critchlow** – That's why it got changed. They allowed them, it was two and a half acres when they agreed to this.

**Barry Gittleman** – And am I correct that the current city code, your lowest density zoning is two homes per acre? Is that correct?

**Dan England** – Cavett, do you want to answer that?

**Cavett Eaton** – I don't know.

**Derek Dalton** – We have one acre lots.

**Chris Hupp** – There is the RR-2.5 and the RR-5 still and the RR-1 and the RR-1-21, which is half acre lots.

**Shay Stark** – So I said one home for five acres is the RR-5

**Barry Gittleman** – Got it.

**Shay Stark** – But the A-10 is ag land with one home on a 10-acre lot.

**Dan England** – I don't know 2.5. Chris, is 2.5 still there?

**Chris Hupp** – Yeah, it's still in the code and it's still on the zoning map.

Speaker 6:

**Jaime Topham** – I know we're here just on discussion but, I mean to me, it sounds like you're stuck with what you have. My opinion: you're stuck with what you have.

**Barry Gittleman** – I think that's definitely the general sense that we've gotten from meeting with the mayor and planning commission a few times. I think our frustration is that what we currently have is acceptable. Obviously, we knew what we were getting when we bought the land and so we can proceed with that plan rather than banging our heads against the wall every time we come to planning commission and city council and meet with the mayor. We feel that there is a better opportunity for the future residents of Worthington Ranch, for the city of Grantsville and for us. If sticking with the current plan leaves the homeowners responsible for 94 acres of green space that's not really green and

they get no benefit of it and the citizens of Grantsville get no benefit of it because there are no amenities in it, then that's not optimal for the homeowners.

If the city has an opportunity to get some amenities that are available, whether it's pickleball courts, walking trails, future parkway, future regional storm pond, at zero cost to the city, then why would that not be a benefit to the city if they can get things that their citizens want and the city may need in the future at no cost. It seems like there's some opportunity that would be better for the city, better for the citizens, better for the homeowners and for us, which is why we're going through this process trying to not just settle for what was previously approved that's suboptimal for all of those groups, in our opinion.

**Rick Barchers** – Well going back to that 2.5 acres, this was a benefit to the homeowner because they made concessions to go to smaller lots to start with because this area is not developable. These, as proposed, are already benefiting those homeowners because they're smaller size and makes them more affordable. That's my opinion.

**Jaime Topham** – What I hear from the citizens all the time on Facebook, I never comment, what I see them post all the time is: we moved out here for this rural feel and it's getting eaten up. Well that's going to feel pretty dang rural. It's exactly how it's been since the dawn of time, that land, if you leave it the way that it is. I don't know that they could get much better than that. They have the smaller lot living but they have the rural area and that's what you signed up for. I feel like I've heard from everyone. I think we've definitely given you a fair shake and listened to everything you have had to say.

**John Limburg** – I've got a couple things. If I were you guys, I would've come in with a geotechnical report for phase three to go, "There is water problems or there isn't water problems. Percolate or does it not percolate?"

**Barry Gittleman** – I believe we already have that but I will confirm that for you.

**John Limburg** – We don't have that and I think we got to be making decisions based off facts, not feelings. It feels like that's not a good thing to do. But I don't know if that's really right. I haven't even been out there so it's hard for me to even make a decision on that. And then I kind of agree that it is kind of wasted land and he talked about, Mayor, talked about deeding it off and selling it. I don't know how they could deed it off and sell it without coming back into us

**Mayor Critchlow** – It would have to remain open space because that's how it was agreed to be done.

**John Limburg** – That's how it was agreed when they did the original.

**Mayor Critchlow** – But people would love to just have this is a grazing land and it would actually be an income producer for the homeowner association that's out there.

**John Limburg** – So are we sure that they can't deed that off of sell it to somebody else?

**Barry Gittleman** – We can't. With the current plan that has been approved by Grantsville City, that land is required to be owned and maintained by the HOA so they can't sell it.

**John Limburg** – Okay, good. Are we being shortsighted though, you guys, in that going, I mean we don't even know what those guys that are going to live out there, if they do want this stuff or don't want it and I'm not fighting for them, but I'm just going, "Would it be good to have this stuff versus just an open field that has nothing?" And the only reason that field's open is because they got that much land and they probably went out and bought some more to make it work for the zoning so they could put the homes in it they wanted.

**Kevin Hall** – No, it was all one. Yeah, this was all one property.

**Mayor Critchlow** – This belonged to the Worthingtons and that's how they ended up, it's all one big farm.

**John Limburg** – It just doesn't make any sense why you wouldn't just keep it at two and a half and just say you build on half of it originally.

**Dan England** – Well it is cheaper to put all your utilities in one part.

**John Limburg** – It's less infrastructure.

**Dan England** – Exactly. So, if they're able to take that and combine it all down to that area, it would be a benefit to them and go with the one acre lots for one part. And the other side was, from what I've heard, is that that whole side over there is difficult to build on.

**John Limburg** – Kevin, I would say is when they were building up on Suncrest and I managed a geotechnical firm for 17 years. I thought it was insane to build up on that ridge and where the old widow maker used to be. All of that just, this seems insane. I wondered that whole time that they were doing that. We were testing on the roads and we did some other things, but I thought that just seems insane and it's coming. It's coming true. Right? But we still don't like here. I just think this isn't Draper, it's not up on a ridge. Yeah. I mean don't think that it's apples and apples.

**Rick Barchers** – I do.

**John Limburg** – So how do you know?

**Rick Barchers** – Because the original agreement went from two and a half.

**John Limburg** – I'm just saying facts. You got to do it for the right reason.

**Rick Barchers** – I understand. But there was concerns. They reduced it from two and a half acre lots to one acre lots because there was a concern. They've basically moved the density so that concession's already been made. If they want to go back to putting all two and a half acre lots in because they feel this ground is developable, I mean that's a whole other discussion.

**John Limburg** – No, I totally understand what you're saying. But if they came in and said, "Hey we have 25 acres here, we want to put 39 lots on it and we're going to build all this out for you. Here's the Geotech report that said it's going to work." Why would we tell him no?

**Rick Barchers** – We wouldn't. Sorry. We wouldn't. I wouldn't have a problem with it. But the agreement's already been made.

**John Limburg** – I know. So all this, it's an agreement. All these coming back. All they're coming back saying we approve PDDs all the time. He's saying, "Here we know that this is the original agreement. We're asking for a variance on that." Are we being shortsighted and saying, "Hey you guys made an agreement. That's it. We're walking, we're not changing it."

**Rick Barchers** – Correct. For what? Where's the gain?

**John Limburg** – Pickleball courts and if they do it, this the lowest area in town and we do need some storm water. I'm just saying I don't-

**Dan England** – It's a definite maybe.

**John Limburg** – That sounds like a great place to put a storm water drain if it's the lowest part in the...

**Rick Barchers** – Well look, being a plumber myself who has done percolation tests.

**John Limburg** – I did percolation tests for years. I understand.

**Rick Barchers** – Perfect. So, you know what's going to happen if you try to percolate water in that area. You already know.

**John Limburg** – You'd put a system in, you'd put some front drain down, you'd figure it out. If it's the lowest part, it's going to go there anyway. Where else would it go? It's a storm drain.

**Jaime Topham** – So John, what would be okay with you in this proposal?

**John Limburg** – I don't know because I don't even know if you have enough information to even say no. I don't. Because they may come back with, because I agree. They said, "Hey let's not build on this part because we feel like it's not good area." But then they did go do a wetland study and it wasn't as much as they thought it was and came back in that lower portion. I'm just, I think we ought to either say, "No we're not going to do it because we don't want to approve a PUD" or "No, that it actually is a wetland problem and then there is water problems," and say no because of that.

**Barry Gittleman** – We have a Geotech, you've got a meeting next week, we have a Geotech, we can bring it back to you.

**Rick Barchers** – I'll say yes if you want to go to 62 units on that entire area. Fair?

**Jaime Topham** – No, this isn't coming as a PUD, right? This is an amendment to the-

**Cavett Eaton** – That's part of the thing we need look at is if Worthington wants to come back in with the amendments and changes, then apply for the PUD and then all of this information will come out. The reason that you haven't is because it's still a concept.

**Jaime Topham** – It's still a concept.

**Cavett Eaton** – So if they come back PUD, if that's their choice, present it, and change it.

**Barry Gittleman** – If we did come back as a PUD with what's proposed up there and we came back with a Geotech certifying that wetlands down here in the southeast corner we need to stay away from. But the rest of the 94 acres to the north is buildable and could be used for our stormwater retention for Worthington Ranch and the regional storm pond, if the city wants it in the future. We've heard objections about going into the 94 acres because it may not be buildable. We can get a Geotech to certify whether it is or isn't or portions of it are or aren't to address that concern. The density comment has come up a few times, whether or not we're proposing benefits to the city and citizens that compensate for the additional density that we're requesting. Is there a specific number that any of you have in mind? Like 112 is too many, but going from 62, we'll give you five more lots if you spend half a million dollars on amenities and donate them to the city.

**Jaime Topham** – I said that I would not be totally opposed to phase two, but I would not agree with phase three. So that would put you at what, like 70, I can't remember, 70 something acre. 73 lots.

**Barry Gittleman** – 73. That's right.

**Jaime Topham** – 11 additional lots, if the city gets the big chunk and you do some improvements to that said chunk.

**Barry Gittleman** – Some amenities that we would dedicate to the city.

**Jaime Topham** – Right. Because then look, mayor, I know your opinions, I see it, but Dan has a point. We might need that property and if we can get it for free and it sits there until we have this storm drain and all of that figured out and then we need it, then there it is.

**Rick Barchers** – We still have to maintain it though.

**Jaime Topham** – And maybe we don't but you're maintaining, for the moment, is you fence it off and leave it set. The city could lease it out for cows just the same as the HOA.

**John Limburg** – It's no different than what's happening right now. It's just sitting there.

**Jaime Topham** – Yep. The big difference is that they would be asking for is that Grantsville would be responsible for it, not their HOA. Because right now their HOA would be responsible for all that.

**Barry Gittleman** – And there would be amenities that are not currently there.

**Jaime Topham** – Right. But if it was in the HOA, we wouldn't really care anyway. But that's your subdivision's stuff.

**Kevin Hall** – Well, and here, here's my last comment I guess. And then it has to do with density and that is: it's in an area and it's A10 and the people who live in that area, for the most part, other than Silver Fox across the street and the new one-acre thing that's by me. I guess, personally, I struggle with going on the outskirts of town and doing away with all the density, right? Because we only go smaller from there. Right? Once we get down to a certain point, then the next thing that comes next to there saying, "Well it's conducive with what's there." Right? We're in an open area of our community on the outskirts and we're going to now take it down to something else and then the next thing that comes, it opens the door to go to 7,000 square foot lot. Do you agree?

**Barry Gittleman** – Not exactly. I understand your concern that whenever any of us make concessions there's a risk that they're going to snowball from there. I think the city's already approved a 700-lot project right across old Lincoln Highway from us. We're not talking about anything anywhere near that. We're talking about 150 acres for only 60, 70, 80 lots. One other thing I forgot to mention is that when we met with a few of the city council members, they expressed an opinion that home buyers like to have choice and variety. Having a subdivision where all of the lots are exactly a quarter acre or all of the lots are exactly one acre is not ideal for the consumer because some people might want a smaller half acre lot and some people might want a bigger one-and-a-half-acre lot. As much as we can, if we're going to get approval to make any changes, their feedback was to have some variety of lot sizes, not have them all be the same plus or minus 10%. If we were to go with the new proposed phase two, that does give some variety in the neighborhood for home buyers to choose whether they want a one-and-a-half-acre lot or a half-acre lot.

**Cavett Eaton** – You have provided some graphics to show.

**Barry Gittleman** – Oh, that's right, if you could. Thank you.

**Jaime Topham** – Since you're there, this is another proposal.

**John Limburg** – Shay, is this in a flood plain?

**Shay Stark** – I don't think the top portion is. It's the bottom portion.

**John Limburg** – Just where it says wetland.

**Shay Stark** – We have to look, I know the city took a tour with FEMA the other day so the maps, I don't know if they're completed yet or we're getting close, I'm assuming, is why they were touring.

**Dan England** – By close you mean within the next five years?

**Shay Stark** – Well, whatever it is. But I know it's-

**Dan England** – Going to be a couple years.

**Shay Stark** – I know there's some draft maps out there, so you guys may have a better fill for what.

**Dan England** – But they only showed the hillside as being flood possibility because where the creeks could change past.

**Shay Stark** – In the drainages only or did they actually go outside of that?

**Dan England** – Well, the hillside is on sandy banks and those sandy banks can move. So, the whole hillside basically is possible flood area and once it gets down to the city they left it open.

**John Limburg** – I think if you look at the USGS site. I don't know which one it is, but it shows almost all of Grantsville is a flood plain if the dam breaks. So I don't know.

**Jaime Topham** – So I'm giving you two more minutes to kind of wrap this conversation.

**Barry Gittleman** – We had Stetson actually put together this rendering to give an example of what we were proposing for phase two where we would increase the density and do some smaller lots, but none of them were less than a third of an acre. These are the largest one story and two-story homes that we build. This shows that we're not talking about high density jam packed together houses, but they're going to have a lot of space in between them if we are able to go smaller than the roughly one acre lots. On the next slide, we've got examples of the homes that we have built in some other neighborhoods with smaller lots. This was in right near Sugar House Cottage Court. Then the next one shows another one of the homes, I believe this is in our Brookside neighborhood up in Heber. Just some examples of the large size homes that we have in mind. There's one more or two more.

This shows some of the architecture of the homes that we've built. We take a lot of pride in our architecture team and our design team and we're not proposing to build cheap, ugly houses in Grantsville just based on what we've paid for the land and development alone. We expect that these homes mostly are going to sell in the 800s or above. We know they're going to be relatively large lots and large homes, but if we're able to build a few more than the 62 that's already proposed, then we could make them a little bit more affordable for home buyers. That's what we wanted to show. Is there anymore. Is that it? Okay. So, I know we've already taken up over an hour of your time. Thank you for the feedback and if we're able to get on the agenda for next week, we'll make sure that we've got the Geotech report so we can share the highlights from that too. Anything, any other questions for us?

**Jaime Topham** – I don't think so.

## 2. Discussion of West Bank Study – Dan England, City Engineer Chris Hupp from Psomas on Zoom

**Dan England** – We have Chris Upton online. I'll just introduce you real quick and then turn it over to him. The whole purpose of this is for pretty much everybody in the room here to understand what's coming down with this Westbank Study and to try and wrap our heads around what it is, how it's going to help us, and how to be able to understand it, be able to use it.

We sent out for bids to do a West Bank study. We had a concern on the West Bank that people were developing without considering the other property around them. It was just their project and it wasn't working with the other ones. One at the bottom and say all I need is an eight-inch line for my sewer. By the time everybody else develops, that now needs to be a 12-inch line. None of it was working, and the roads weren't working. The water was needed but nobody was building it there, figuring out ways of getting around doing development. We went sent out for bids for a firm to design that West Bank force.

**Kevin Hall** – Is this the infrastructure?

**Dan England** – No, it was to figure out what was going to be built. That's the first part. Then once they figured out what was going to be built, how it was going to be interconnected and how the utilities could serve that. Chris is a planner and he's the head of the team that won that bid. He came in and he's put together a plan. I'm sure he'll show that to you in just a minute here. He's also tried to take a lot of the concerns that we've had, that we've been going through with development, and tried to come up with a written way of us being able to protect the city as we go forward. He's also in the process right now, he has engineers that teamed with him that are going through figuring out the

water, sewer, storm drain and how that's going to end up working for what he's proposed as far as where the homes are going to be, where the commercial, where industrial and everything else on the hillside. He'll be able to go over that. He'll go ahead and he'll be able to tell you how he got to where he is. Because we did end up going through and we had a team that looked at it to give us some insight and direction of where we thought the best places are, put it out to the public to have them vote on it and make comments on it. Then we took those through and consolidated into one. That's one that we're working off of right now to plan the utilities and everything for that area. It was a surprise to me how much we need to make that all work.

The other thing is Chris Robinson is on the North side of the city, and he and Judd Lawrence, they also wanted to be part of this. We included them, plus some other properties on the North side that's in the county but is in our sphere of influence that we would end up acquiring someday in the future. They're part of that plan and coming forward with that.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay. So that's something that I wanted to ask. There was an influence by the property owners and what potential development they want to do, put above our master plan, in this scenario. Who represents those interests in those areas? It sounds like to me those were represented by the developers and property owners.

**Dan England** – We put together a committee that included three or four of the developers along the side. Typically, they were the larger developers that were going to be the major impact of these things and the ones who are going to be building most of the infrastructure with their projects. They're included. We also included a number of people, well someone from Planning and Zoning, someone from City Council. We had the mayor a couple times. We took their input and Chris interviewed each one of them and got information from them to find out what they thought about those things and took those and incorporated it into the three plans we ended up putting on the website out there. We took the ones who owned the property as well as the city and the direction that we were going from there, as well as our committee and council to get their thoughts and ideas all incorporated into it.

We've tried to do it without going out to the public with big public meetings where we tried to get input from everybody. We tried to keep it reasonable and manageable to try and go through as quick as we can. One of the things that has... This infrastructure that is coming in is needed for additional things that the city is trying to go through and do right now, too. It's important that we can try and get this wrapped up and so I'm sort of putting pressure on Chris to help on that. We have property owners and things that are still trying to change and morph things and every time you change and morph things, utilities change too. They come back and they recalculate and go forward. That's where we're at right now and we're going.

The important thing that I want, because this will be coming three weeks, four weeks out for your review and approval. I haven't really wrapped my head around this, either. We need to be able to know that this is understandable that we can figure out what's being presented to us so we can actually protect our city as it comes to develop. Because some of the things he's doing may stretch out into other parts of our city, too. If it works well here, we could use it other places, too. With that I turn it over to you, Chris. Unless anybody else want to.

**Chris Hupp** – This presentation was previously sent to Dan and Cavett, so if you want a copy of it, they can distribute that to you as well.

Thanks for that introduction Dan. Just a little bit of information on boundary. I'll just pull this up really quick on screen. This is essentially the property boundary that we're looking at. It's approximately 10,600 acres. You can see the existing size of Grantsville off to the Southeast corner. It's a large development, basically its own city in terms of development potential. That said, when doing this we like to develop a land use model that right sizes everything that happens here. So, as we go through this, keep that in mind. This property is not going to be developed tomorrow, it's not going to be developed in 10 years. This is going to take a very long time to actually develop out. Just for scale of development that's sort of that timeframe that we're looking at. If we continue at the rate that we are, of the approximately 400 residential permits per year, and they were a hundred percent inside of this area, it would be more than 60 years to develop this whole thing. If a hundred percent of that came to just this area and nowhere else in the city. Just for a little bit of reference.

**Dan England** – I was just going to say that typically cities when they grow, they'll start to go exponentially in growth, so it most likely wouldn't take that long to fully build out if it really went through a growing spurt.

**Rick Barchers** – Do you know what Day Break was originally supposed to be? Its build out?

**Dan England** – No.

**Rick Barchers** – 30 years.

**Dan England** – And how long did it take?

**Rick Barchers** – Less than five.

**Chris Hupp** – It's actually incorrect. It's over 20 from the original date and they're still not done.

But that said, this process as Dan was sort of talking on, the area plan kickoff started in August. We went through, as he had mentioned, stakeholder interviews, meeting with City Council, Planning Commission, a few of you individuals we had gone back and forth with a little bit, and then several of the staff individuals. We also went with key employment individuals throughout this region that may be of interest to the future development. Then after we did all of that, we went into the alternatives analysis with that vision in mind. We did that first step to try and understand exactly what future Grantsville wants to be. Is it more of the same? How does that vision look? We developed that. Then we put forth three potential alternatives that looked specifically at how the development can fit together. These were void of civic uses, meaning schools, churches and those kinds of things, and void of a lot of open space. It was just the trail networks, just so we can understand what types of development patterns residents would like to see.

We put that out. We developed an interactive website, got a lot of feedback from that and we'll actually touch on that in this slide show. We got a lot of feedback, took all of that from the residents, integrated that with the concept, developed a preferred scenario. This is sort of the phase that we're in and have been in for a little while to try and dial in some of the comments and things that have come in. From this preferred scenario, we develop out the capital facilities plan, which specifically says this is the kind of infrastructure that would need to support this type of development. That's where we're at. Once this goes through, then we'll have to come back and do a presentation of the actual full document after review and everything for public approval, public hearing approval. So that's the general process of this development.

That said, existing plans and preliminary analysis is one of those initial things that we looked at, as well, to see what does the existing general plan say? What does the future land use map show? How was the transportation master plan developed to incorporate some of these areas? Obviously, the transportation master plan doesn't cover the entire boundary, but it does cover portions. Then we also looked at existing and proposed development plans, ones that have already been approved by the planning commission and city council, so they have vested rights, and ones that are proposed to see what may come down the pipeline. Obviously, we didn't take those at a hundred percent. We looked and put those plans through the vision of the city and what they're trying to accomplish. What you all are trying to accomplish, through that. We also looked at the future annexation map for areas where growth could occur and this actually expanded out from approximately - I don't remember the exact initial number - it was 9,000 something acres and jumped up to 10,600.

There's a little background there. Then in the preliminary concept we actually have established a few different land uses. The difference between a land use and a zone: a zone is a very prescriptive thing that says this is what's going to go in this area, a land use is the general use that can go in that area. So that's why you'll see several specific zones associated with some of these land uses. For example, commercial, it corresponds with the C-N, C-S, C-G, C-D and potentially the MU zone. Obviously not all of the mixed-use zone but portions of that. In concept one, we actually show a mixed-use zone as a continuation on Main Street. In the preferred scenario that mixed-use zone goes away. A lot of the feedback that we received was against using mixed use in the land use at all, and so that's what you'll see.

Office zones flex is distribution, light industrial, those types of potential users, warehouse, those things. High intensity residential, medium intensity residential and low intensity residential. You will notice because we do it the way that we do, there are no designated densities associated with any of these land uses on purpose. It gives you the flexibility to make decisions based on the context of when a project gets submitted to you. For example, let's say it's 20 years down the road. If it's 20 years down the road, development in Grantsville may look very different than what it is today, and so that low intensity residential zone could potentially shift from a R-1-8 to a R-1-21 based on what's around it or vice versa based on your context that you have at the time that that submittal comes in. We do this to try and add a little bit of flexibility with very specific guidelines for how those decisions can be made to help protect you and give you the ability to make a decision with real data.

So again, these are some of those zones. As we just mentioned with that previous developer there currently still is RR-5, RR-2.5, RR-1, and RR-1-21 and I'm not sure who mentioned it, but the A-10 zone, which again is one unit to 10 acres specific to agricultural uses.

In addition to this, we do delineate specific open space to establish that as its own zone so that if a developer or somebody comes in and says, "Hey, we want to..." Well, I hate to use the example that just came in, but let's say that came in, got approved as is, that green area in the east. If they say, well, we got let's say two units to the acre or whatever, just hypothetically speaking and it's a hundred acres, we get 200 units. Well, if it's 200 units and they cluster it all and then they try and sell that green portion off to somebody else so that they could develop it and potentially get more units, that wouldn't be allowed because it would be an open space zone with a conservation easement associated with it. So, if a land sale happened, they could see that the only use would be for agriculture or open space. A little depth into that one piece, but that's more for informational purposes.

The next piece, minimum lot sizes is a big thing currently with the State. This past year they passed, 575 bills. Several of them talk about intensity. Several of them talk about increasing that intensity

around major transportation corridors and things of that nature. Be aware that the State is starting to lean heavier on cities so long as they hit over 5,000 residents, they have to hit that certain threshold. Obviously, Grantsville's over that threshold, so pressure may be placed on you for increased intensity. That's more of a be aware that that is coming down the pipeline. As development comes in, you may hear that thrown at you. Again, just a side note. We show these intensities with the minimum lot sizes. Again, high intensity goes to the RM-7, the RM-15 as potential zones. Medium intensity is R-1-12 to RM-7, and then low intensity is R-1-21 to R-1-8, and then very low is the A-10 to R-1-21 just for those associated zones with the land uses.

In addition to that, we've established some residential property types, the minimum lot sizes for those. Going back to this previous conversation of the individual that just presented, if development on the outskirts of their project is, let's say it's half acre lots, they shouldn't, and I don't care who it is, they should not be allowed to develop town homes next door to that. If anything, it should either be half acre lots or stepping down to medium lots. If they're putting half acre on their edge, then they can step internal to their project but not on the edge of their project. What that does is that allows for blending of the intensity to go from let's say half acre lot down to potentially whatever's internal to their project. That said, there are specific sub-steps inside of this that should be followed to try and help you say, "Hey, the context of this development that we're looking at today is a hundred acres and right next door you have town homes. You can't put half acre lots next door. Sorry, you can't do it. And vice versa." If it's half acre lots, you can't put town homes next door. It has to step. So, if you're going from half acre lots, maybe you go to third acre lots or something of that nature so that there's a step in those intensities so you're not getting incongruent development patterns. Does that make sense?

**Dan England** – We see a lot of nods.

**Chris Hupp** – Okay, perfect. Because I'm sharing, I can't really see all the heads in the room. These are those preliminary concepts and how those could potentially play out. We ended up walking way back from what you're going to see on screen and we'll get to that. The black circles are development nodes and what that means is where intensity should happen and then fade out from there. They typically happen on major intersections where you have an arterial and another arterial intersecting. Those are major intensity nodes where development can get a little bit more intense and then it fades out from those locations. That's just to maximize on utilities, maximize on infrastructure and everything else. You put the most intense uses around where your best infrastructure is. Just simple costing on that. These were those initial concepts that we received feedback on. As you can see, again, we had a little bit of mixed use in this location and none on any of the other concepts, just as a potential. If we were to continue Main Street, this is what it could become.

From there, we get into a lot of numbers. I am a planner as Dan mentioned, but my previous life I ran a marketing company for a decade and a half and I love spreadsheets and numbers. So, as we do this, we develop what's called a land use model that has loads of inputs to better understand what is actually sustainable in this area. So, in order to establish that, we needed to understand what the existing population is, what a projected population may be, and what a full build out could be.

So, going back to those things that I said at the very beginning, the existing population today is approximately 13,500 residents according to Kem C. Gardner and a few other major sources throughout Utah. The current population per home is 3.7 residents, 3.7 residents per unit. So just doing math, you can walk that back to see how many current units, approximately how many current units are there without having to actually count every single one. In addition to that, you'll see the

projected population and this, Kem C. Gardner, the state population, the state put out projections, Kem C. Gardner's from the University of Utah. They put out population projections. We adjusted those slightly to be a little bit less based on some of those pulled permits over the last several years, to assume approximately 18,000 population growth by 2060.

Again, walking that math backwards, if it's 18,000, typically when cities grow their population or resident per unit shrinks. So today it could be 3.7. By that point we're assuming a 3.5. So, if you're getting 18,000 extra residents divided by the 3.5, that would be approximately 5,143 units just for math's sake. Going a step further, we looked at the entire project and then we looked at Grantsville and said, okay, what is the existing density in Grantsville for what's actually the core of Grantsville?

As we look through that, we actually went through and counted a lot of the residential units based in these acreages to get spot checks throughout the city and a very, very large swath of what the existing density actually is in the city, and the average density throughout the city hits about 2.5 units to the acre. Obviously, we're not counting the rural areas that are currently outside of city boundaries where there's maybe one or two units for hundreds of acres, but as far as the city core. Looking at that 2.5 units to the acre, that creates our baseline. So, if you just do simple math from that. 2.5 times 10,600, we can assume at full build out, and this may come across as a fairly shocking number, approximately 95,000 residents in this area in the next hundred years. That said, 95,000 residents if we now look at that and input that into our land use model, we start to get a sense for how much commercial development, how much employment, how much of these other things are actually going to be feasible at the full build out of this area.

We looked at Tooele County School District and looked at their existing populations for elementary schools, middle schools and high schools, and then we have a working relationship with their superintendent and several of the individuals there to try and understand what their long-term growth strategies are and how they model that. We also looked at several other school districts to try and understand what their population has become in their schools so that we can say currently high schools are approximately 1,400 students, but we're assuming that the population of those schools would go up to close to 1,900 per school, per high school. 637 from to 870 for middle schools, and then 483 to 575 for elementary schools.

We also looked at the proximity of those schools to each other over almost all of Utah. We track this data ongoing and the density as you build this out, they hit approximately a quarter to a half mile apart from each other for elementary schools. High schools are a little bit more nuanced based on location, and middle schools are half mile to a mile apart. So, we looked at a lot of this data. Then we looked at civic uses.

Currently, obviously there's the library on Main Street, there's a fire station and some of the other users, police and the cemetery south of Main Street, and a few other things. And again, we keep this database up to date on a fairly regular basis looking at different community types, and these are the informational numbers that come from that. There's approximately one acre per 10,000 residents in most rural and growing communities, one acre per 10,000 residents for library, one to 20,000 for police stations, one acre to 8,000 residents for fire stations, and then 10,000 acres. This is something that a lot of cities or communities don't plan for on a regular basis, 10 acres per every 1,500 residents for cemetery users.

Hospitals, approximately one acre to 3000 residents. So we're starting to approach some of those densities where hospitals may come into play. Typically, you don't get a major hospital, a secondary

major hospital in an area like this until you reach some critical densities. That said, hospitals range from anywhere from approximately 10 acres up to 30 acres for a one specific facility. Sometimes they'll do the smaller facilities to meet more rural communities. We also looked at religious populations for the major denominations within Tooele County to understand what their specific criteria were to establishing a church or a facility within the community. We put that into this. Floor area ratios are, basically if you have an acre, how much of that acre is going to be filled up with commercial office, flex, or industrial users? So that's what the floor area ratio means. And then how many jobs come out of every thousand square feet. This is just a start.

**Dan England** – Can you help me understand the hospital, you said one acre for 3,000 residents. So every 3,000 residents, you're supposed to have another hospital?

**Chris Hupp** – No, that's one acre of hospital land for every 3,000. Typically, the threshold is 10 to 15 acres before they'll establish an actual hospital. So, for example, Spanish Fork just reached one of those populations about eight years ago when they developed their first hospital. Now they've actually had decently explosive growth. Again, they have approximately 470 to 500 residential permits per year. Being as large as they are at this point, they still consider themselves a rural community where a lot of people don't. They have started to get their second hospital because they have Mapleton and these other communities that don't have a hospital, and it's a regional draw because they've got a Costco and some of the other things to pull those people in, and so they get a capture rate higher than what just their population shows. Does that make sense?

**Dan England** – Yeah. You answered the question for me at the first sentence.

**Rick Barchers** – Hey Chris, I hate to interrupt you. I really do, but is this list the complete things that you've based the model on? Is that the least list of inputs?

**Chris Hupp** – No.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay. You're saying... I've got a million questions and I would wear everybody out, trust me. I've just got one in regards to input here. You said the full model build out was 95,000 people in Grantsville?

**Chris Hupp** – That's the rough number. Yeah.

**Rick Barchers** – Is that based on the amount available water? Is available water calculated into that at all?

**Chris Hupp** – Available water is an extremely fickle thing. And the reason I say this is because if you look at your water users today and you have, let's say that we average half acre lots, your half acre lot user is going to be drastically different than your town home user. Internal to the house, it won't be, but external to the house is phenomenally different. Your water user per resident changes drastically based on the size of the unit. I can't just give you a straight answer and say it's based on existing users today.

**Rick Barchers** – All of these other things are based upon existing users, existing this, existing that, existing average, existing everything. Do we have an existing water usage calculation figured into this? If you can get to that, that was just my... And I'll leave it at that.

**Chris Hupp** – Yeah, it's a great question. That comes up in the capital facilities plan. It doesn't come up, and so this is all part of the master development plan. We had to create a plan so we can understand what the needs were. And so that's what this is establishing. As far as water users, it's also very difficult to establish a base water user in Tooele County because as you may or may not know, there are way too many service districts that don't really talk to each other. I get it. I'm not saying it's a good thing or a bad thing, I'm just saying, that's the reality. To understand the actual existing water shares in the valley is a very difficult number to come by. We can make some estimates and calculations on that and we do that in the capital facilities plan. But this master development plan, to take that as the input is very difficult to do until you actually have some sort of a base calc, so that you can run those water calcs and utility and carrying capacity in terms of infrastructure.

**Jaime Topham** – So Chris, can I ask you to kind of zoom forward? We've got two other things we've got to be talking about tonight and we're getting a little late in the hour.

**Chris Hupp** – I'm getting really deep into some of this stuff. I was trying to glaze over some of the other stuff that's not as important. To go over public engagement. We had 967 website visits, 131 comments and survey responses, 15 stakeholder interviews, the individuals that we previously mentioned and then the response types on the right. We then moved into this preferred concept based on all that public engagement. You'll see there's a fairly large employment center in that northeastern node with some commercial users. We now put in all these civic uses including schools, cemeteries, churches, libraries, fire, you name it, we place those into this. Using all those inputs and parameters that we had previously. In addition to that, the vision was to maintain approximately 2.8 units per acres. We are actually, with all of this, we're at 2.3 and in my meeting earlier with you Dan, I said 2.5, but that's what it was before putting all the civic and other uses in. We're actually at 2.3 units to the acre.

So less dense than typical Grantsville is today. So that's why I said that previous number was 95. This drops us down to approximately 89 at full build out. Again, full build out, if we're assuming, I believe we did the calculation on 450 residential permits per year, every single year until that date. Obviously, there'll be higher years and lower years, but we just ran that as a calculation based on other communities and their growth and Grantsville as well. Again, there's a lot of input data that I'm sort of glazing over, but that's what we ran this off of, and the full out is beyond 2080. Most likely a lot of people will be gone by that point.

**Rick Barchers** – I'll be mad if you're wrong.

**Chris Hupp** – We also talk to a lot of developers, specifically home builders, to try and understand where they're being pushed and where they're being pulled. Most residential home builders, not all of them, but most residential home builders, their sales have almost fallen off a cliff in Tooele Valley. For example, just taking D.R. Horton and I mention that because I know they've got a recent develop inside of the city. Someone will have to, it's that little town home piece. I can't remember off the top of my head what that piece is called, but it's along Main Street, Sun Sage Meadows. So there, their sales went to zero. They've got four other developments inside of Tule County, some fairly substantial. They have sold, I believe the number that one of their individuals, one of their VPs told me was they've sold 25 in the valley in the last two months. 25, which is from their typical hundred plus. So it's dropped drastically. That said, again, we'll speed through.

We've looked at agricultural ground inside of the entire city and its future growth boundary, approximately how much there is. We did some math on that to say, okay, if this is what is the ideal

vision for the city, then we need to preserve a certain percent of this in perpetuity. You'll see in this plan, we have a lot more open space than those previous ones. A lot of the drainage corridors and then there's some very key areas. This only shows regional facilities, meaning larger parks, regional parks and things of that nature at full build out. It doesn't include all the sub parks and other things within the city. Another concern was to push traffic off of Main Street. You'll see these major arterials that we pulled from the master transportation master plan and brought into this development as well.

Going into the next thing, we're now at the capital facilities plan. As Dan previously mentioned, we keep making adjustments to the site plan based on comments that are made and issues or concerns that the city has in certain areas and that developers have about their property. We have maintained that 2.3 and we're not budging from it. We had a call earlier today where a specific developer was trying to get significantly higher than that.

Continuing on, these are some of those capital facilities, things that we're going to be looking on or that we are currently engaged in developing for the city. There will be a full document with master development plan, a lot of this stuff backgrounded in it and then the capital facilities will all be there as well. So that's basically that. I can go in a little bit more to agricultural preservation, but I know we're short on time. But please, any questions?

**Rick Barchers** – I got too many, but it's-

**Chris Hupp** – Well let's set up a meeting where you and I can sit down and go over those questions then.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay.

**Chris Hupp** – I'll let you work through Dan and Cabot because I'm sure they know your schedule better than I do.

**Cavett Eaton** – Chris, you feel good about providing this and then we can share it with them and they can do a preview?

**Rick Barchers** – Yeah, I really haven't got... That's part of it. I've never seen some of this stuff, so.

**Jaime Topham** – Gary, you had a question.

**Gary Pinkham** – Sounds like your projections are based on historical growth here?

**Chris Hupp** – Historical and future potential growth based on other communities of similar development pattern and development style.

**Gary Pinkham** – Have you factored in the effect that things like the Romney Group bring, the complex in here with several thousand jobs and the recent discussions of the inland port just towards the town? That might affect or accelerate this pattern, your plan?

**Chris Hupp** – Yeah, we also work a lot with Inland port authority and we know probability of things happening.

**Gary Pinkham** – Okay.

**Jaime Topham** – Any other questions? Thanks for your time, Chris.

**Chris Hupp** – Yeah, again, please set up a meeting through Dan and Cabot and I'll answer any other questions that you have.

### 3. Discussion on MU (Mixed Use) zoning

**Jaime Topham** – Take it away, Rick.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay. My biggest concern is that mixed use density is not really defined as a zone. We've got a lot of words in here, et cetera. The intent of the mixed-use zone was to encourage commercial growth along Main Street. That was the intention of it, initially. Right now, what's coming into the city, because we don't have a good definition of what we expect, is less than 10% on some of these is going for commercial and it's a third of that's being used for water percolation. I'm open to all kinds of input on this. One of them was that we had discussed once upon a time, what should be an acceptable ratio for commercial to encourage developers from just coming in here and saying, "Yeah, less than 10% and they never plan on developing it anyway." In other words, we're trying to say, "okay, if you're going to use this zoning, you have to be serious about putting in commercial development. That has to be a serious part of your plan. "The gentleman who came in with the one last time around who's, I mean he's got a very serious plan to put Soelberg's over here, but that's the first time I've seen anything like that. So, minimum of what?"

**Jaime Topham** – You've talked about 50.

**Rick Barchers** – I have. I'm going with 50% on it. What are your thoughts, John?

**John Limburg** – So I think the problem with that particular piece is when they came in, I don't know if you were here yet, I know Jaime was. When they came in and wanted to rezone it, it's like makes sense, fits with the future land use map. We want that to be mixed use because we want commercial to be part of that. But they didn't tell us that they were want to put Soelberg's on the other side. If I could go back and take back that zoning right now, I would. And just say you'd have to break it up somehow and just make commercial on the front and residential on the back, because it kind of felt like it was almost like bait and switch there, where they came in and said that, knowing that they were probably going to put commercial on the other side, when the reason we had that there is we wanted commercial up towards Main Street. So if all we did is say 20% they come in and go, "Oh yeah, well we're going to hit 20% because we're going to put Soelberg's down.

**Jaime Topham** – Well and that's the thing though, is there's no specific amount listed in this. In fact, it looks like this and Shay you probably know this history more than anyone, it looks like this mixed-use district was originally created in 2011 by what says, "enacted by ordinance 2011-04". Then it looks like we may have updated it, amended it in 2018 when we did the plan. But I remember when we did the plan, that it was kind of a rush to get the mixed use done and we never spent the time to actually define it out because our whole intention and the whole reason Main Street and all of our major corridors, travel corridors as mixed use is so we would have the commercial, but also be able to do commercial on the bottom, apartments on top.

Which we previously couldn't do in our zone because everything was either commercial or residential and not a combination of both. Somehow, we ended up with the purpose and intent of mix used district to allow for the establishment of medium density residential neighborhoods mixed with commercial properties. I don't think that that was the intention of the mixed use when we talked about this plan.

**John Limburg** – We were going to come back and visit it and it just never did come back.

**Jaime Topham** – That's why we're here tonight. We're revisiting this.

**Shay Stark** – That's what I want to talk about. I want to say that first language that was part of the original ordinance, when we made those revisions to try it, because we looked at it and said, "This is totally hollow, there's nothing here we can even, that gives us any real guidance." It was all very generic terminology and so we just threw it, like you say, we threw a few things in quickly because we already had pressure from some people who were claiming they were going to be coming in developing and so we needed to have something in place that would start to help us in the right path.

**Rick Barchers** – Some of the things that, you know, 50% commercial, I'm real good with that is... What are your thoughts?

**John Limburg** – Well one thing I would say about that is that still wouldn't keep us from having what happened there with Matthew's property.

**Jaime Topham** – No, that's true. And we maybe can't control that entirely. That definitely was not our intention because the future land use map before the master plan was that was all commercial.

**Rick Barchers** – What if it was tied to Main Street?

**John Limburg** – It would be nice if we said "Hey, before you rezone something, you have to bring it in and show us what you're going to do with it." Even though we don't do it in that way. It's not the right way to do it, but-

**Kevin Hall** – Well as a citizen, that was my argument when it was changed. I voiced some of that, is that when we rezone it and exactly what I said would happen is happening, right? Because they can now, and we've lost that opportunity. Not necessarily totally lost, but to some degree we lost the opportunity to negotiate when we should've maybe seen a-

**John Limburg** – They're still going to come in and ask for a PUD

**Jaime Topham** – They have to because it's mixed use.

**Shay Stark** – What if we require just along the Main Street area, or if you want to define it on some other streets too, require the commercial pass front Main Street and the justification for it is that we are trying to create a feasible, workable downtown area that people can come to and can find a variety of commercial uses so they don't have to travel all over the place.

**Jaime Topham** – Cavett, can you pull up our land use map or actually our future land use map while we're talking about this?

**Rick Barchers** – While he's pulling that up, one of the other thought processes here that was brought up by Gary was under a certain number of acres, if you're in an MU zone, it would exempt you from having to develop a certain percentage this way or that way. Gary, do you remember how you worded that? You said something to Pete when we were talking about this, under a certain, like under an acre would exclude you from having to have a certain percentage residential or a certain percentage commercially. Yes. Didn't you say something like that, or am I crazy? I know I'm crazy.

**Gary Pinkham** – I thought that was regards to across from the butcher shop down here. He wanted to put those two small pieces up front for commercial. We talked about what's a feasible size for a commercial parcel, a half-acre, short of getting another squirt joint, we got over here on Main Street, you're not going to get a commercial facility on that. You need to have enough room for several thousand square feet of retail or truck space plus the parking. There's physical and economic size constraints on what will or won't be commercial. When it comes to what's coming in, if you're going to do a strip mall with 20 storefronts in it, or you're going to do a big box, it could both be done on the same piece of land. I don't know how you're going to define that.

The one thing I was just talking to Shay is, you guys don't have to approve the zoning request for mixed use. If somebody comes in on South Willow or down on the south end of Quirk where there's open ground and wants to go to mixed use, you can say no. They don't have to be approved here. To put it into the code that you could only do it on Main Street is imposing the constraint that you people already have jurisdiction.

**Jaime Topham** – Well and that's why I had them bring up this land use map because look at where our mixed-use zones are. They're along the travel corridors. They're not along in inside of any neighborhoods. This statement doesn't even make sense. Even in the next sentence, it says "Plan unit developments are required in this zone such that open space, neighborhood parks, natural areas, trails and other amenities are required as part of these developments." No, we don't want that. We want it commercial. Right? Natural, I mean natural areas, even neighborhood parks or probably maybe neighborhood parks but natural areas, trails and things of those sorts is probably not what we're looking for in our commercial districts. Our commercial areas are main thoroughfares.

**Shay Stark** – Do you want the apartments and really high-density housing such as that in those areas?

**Jaime Topham** – I think more so than other areas. The whole idea, I think what we were thinking was that we want commercial along Main Street because we wanted to develop a commercial Main Street, but we also wanted the ability to have housing on top of that commercial or mixed into that commercial. Which of course kind of excludes those neighborhoods, or single-family homes and parks and such and then more looks towards apartments and things in that nature. I think we just need to revamp this thing.

**Rick Barchers** – Gary, I think now that I'm kind of, all this stuff is rolling around in my head again. I think your comment was more geared towards these small lots on Main Street, the small narrow lots. Because right now they're in the future plan to be as mixed use.

**Gary Pinkham** – We also talked about that for instance like the little parson next to the fire hall down here.

**Rick Barchers** – Exactly.

**Gary Pinkham** – It was trying to do something commercial and our code didn't really address what could be done with that little piece and still have viable business and parking and so on. Again, I'm not sure how you would address that because we have all these little pieces that somebody could go buy two parcels, knock down some buildings and put up a store.

**Rick Barchers** – I think if I remember right, you said something like, if it was less than an acre in the mixed-use zone, we'd be okay with it being a hundred percent commercial.

**Gary Pinkham** – Well it would almost have to be. If you've got 43,000 square feet, you put in a 10,000 square foot shop and you look at what our code would require for parking, depending on the type of business, it's almost going to eat up an acre. You can't have five apartments on the side of here. These little pieces, you can't say 25% of an acre is going to be commercial and some parts residential. So, putting a numerical constraint on it might work for one parcel, but not one another.

**Jaime Topham** – Could you say, “if it's less than an acre, then it can be solely commercial, but it cannot be solely residential.”

**Gary Pinkham** – It could be residential under our code-

**Jaime Topham** – But if we're trying to-

**Gary Pinkham** – They could put several apartments there and still have parking.

**John Limburg** – This isn't what it's zoned right now. They've already got what it's zoned. So if they go in and knock something down that's zoned that way already, can we stop them from building something on it that's already zoned that way? This is just what we want it to be.

**Gary Pinkham** – And there's other zones too. You got CS, the neighborhood, CM zones, there's like three or four different commercial zones. They don't have to be mixed used.

**Shay Stark** – Is there a problem with that, with anything under one acre being either, or? We did try to have this discussion. They can still come in with something that was mixed if they want to, but we're not going to require commercial. They can choose either/or.

**Rick Barchers** – The problem with either, or is then it all ends up being little strip apartments.

**Jaime Topham** – That's kind of what I was thinking, is if we're limiting mixed use to our main corridors where we travel, then we're trying to encourage commercial there. If we say if it's a small lot, we want commercial, not housing because we have an abundance of housing and not commercial.

**Shay Stark** – So essentially, going back to what John said, right now, not very much of this ground is zoned along the downtown Park, Main Street. Not very much of this ground is actually zoned mixed use right now. There's just some small. And I guess that makes sense if we tell them that under the mixed-use zone, if you're under one acre, it has to be commercial. Right now, they have a lot of that is zoned residential. There's no issue with them continuing to, if they want to tear down a couple of houses and build an apartment there instead, if it fits the zoning, there's no problem with that. Because they'd be rezoning to MU anyways in order to get commercial, so that makes sense.

**Rick Barchers** – The problem that I'm seeing in my limited time here, is the one across from the butcher shop and the trailer park. I don't think he ever intends on developing the commercial part of that property. That's just my opinion.

**Jaime Topham** – But at least it's at the front.

**Rick Barchers** – Yeah, at least it's at the front. But the problem is it was just like bare knuckles trying to decide just exactly what he could put in there. And then we go into this whole, "Well it says that I can have this amount of density"

**John Limburg** – But we kept him from going with trailer parks all the way to Main Street and I don't know why he would want to sell that land, but if somebody came in and wanted to buy it built their own. Why would you?

**Mayor Critchlow** – I just want him to clean up the stinking trailer or something. That's all I care about.

**John Limburg** – But we were able to keep it from going all the way to Main Street.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, I wanted this meeting so we can address this because it keeps coming up and it's going to keep coming up and if we don't do it now, we may never, because that's kind of how everything just gets away from us. And I also said we're going to stay until we get this done and figure it out, or the best we can. Which is why we had dinner before we came, right? I don't know. Because you're in my line of vision. I usually look at Dan.

So, back to this discussion. How do you guys feel about, if it's an acre or less then you can do commercial or mixed but you can't do solely residential?

**John Limburg** – I'm good with that. And even like he said, it could be a hundred percent residential but you could still put... I mean commercial, you could still put residential up on top.

**Jaime Topham** – Right. Yeah, it could be the mixed, or the commercial.

**Gary Pinkham** – We were looking at two storefronts at the ground level and three or four apartments above it.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Okay, so right next to that property, that two-story building that's there, the guy wants to sell that. Now if he only wants to sell that two-story building... I'm not even sure if he wants to sell that, the old beat up house behind it.

**Kevin Hall** – Well at one point there was a realtor sign by both. I haven't looked for a while, but at one point there was a realtor sign.

**Jaime Topham** – So what would you do in that particular case?

**Mayor Critchlow** – I would rather just have a commercial because that's what it was-

**Jaime Topham** – Well what is it zoned currently?

**Lanise Thompson** – RM-7 is what it looks like.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Just leave it commercial and make it function that way. It would be nice to have some parking.

**Kevin Hall** – Because I think somewhere, I think we need to build a Main Street. Right? And we really don't have one. And so I'm with the mayor there. Let's begin to create that the best we can. Anything we do to I think promote business on Main Street is a way to clean up our city and it's a way to develop a Main Street in Grantsville.

**Rick Barchers** – So are you good with the 50%? What are your thoughts?

**Kevin Hall** – Yeah, I'm okay with that, personally.

**Mayor Critchlow** – What you guys were saying earlier, a certain lot, do you either do it commercial-

**Jaime Topham** – If it's less than an acre then it would be commercial, or you could do the mixed commercial and residential. You can't do strictly residential.

**Rick Barchers** – And then anything above that, 50% of it has to be commercial.

**Jaime Topham** – Even in under an acre.

**Rick Barchers** – Well just, what did you just say?

**Jaime Topham** – Under an acre, you can do commercial, or commercial and residential.

**Rick Barchers** – But you can't do just residential. So, it's at least 50% commercial, unless they want to build with the existing zone, right?

**Jaime Topham** – So, Shay, we talk in all these abstracts and it sounds good on paper, but if it's less than an acre and we say, "If you're going to choose to do it residential and commercial, then it has to be at least 50% commercial." Can somebody actually build something like that?

**Shay Stark** – I think it's a challenge. That's what... As I'm sitting here thinking about this, I'm asking myself, so the auto parts store. How many acres is that property that's on? Because parking constrained what they were able to do on their commercial square footage and that becomes a real challenge.

**Lanise Thompson** – O'Reilly's is 0.72 acres

**Shay Stark** – Okay. They're not quite an acre. We had that physical therapy place came in.

**Lanise Thompson** – Next to Guzzle, is .60

**Shay Stark** – Okay. I remember on O'Reilly, they were actually, their building site was constrained by what they had to provide for parking. It was really tight. I think telling them that they have to provide at least 50% commercial in that case is a challenge because as soon as you start putting residential in there, you've got to provide parking for that residential on top of the commercial. It's going to reduce the square footage that you'll be allowed to develop in commercial.

**Rick Barchers** – Right, but that's a minimum of 50%. They don't have to do 50% housing. It doesn't even have to be there.

**Shay Stark** – Yeah, I guess but the question was, does that work or not? I'm just saying it's a real challenge on the small-

**Rick Barchers** – Sure. I don't want to eliminate it because of the gal that wanted to build the insurance company with the apartments up above. Right? I don't want to eliminate that.

**Shay Stark** – Well I guess why in that case... That's okay to tell them that if they come in with something mixed use with commercial on it, on one of those small lots, any amount of commercial they put on there is a, seems to me that that's a benefit, right? On the small lots.

**Cavett Eaton** – So that map is current commercial and the purple is CS.

**Jaime Topham** – Where is that piece that we were just talking about?

**Cavett Eaton** – This is Center Street.

**Lanise Thompson** – The little brown is the one right next to the firehouse.

**Jaime Topham** – What's brown?

**Cavett Eaton** – Mixed use.

**Jaime Topham** – But that's old mixed use. That's not 2018 mixed use.

**Rick Barchers** – I mean, I just don't want to eliminate the possibility that someone wants to do something like that, personally. But everybody can also feel a different way. I'm okay.

**Jaime Topham** – No, I agree. We need a main street. That was one of our things in our master plan as well was creating more of a main street, downtown main street that we don't have.

**Dan England** – We're in the process of doing a plan right now too, for Main Street.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. So, what I have now is that MU would be 50% commercial and then you'd mentioned on Main Street. But if we say that that commercial has to front the major roadway, not necessarily main.

**Kevin Hall** – Yeah, or in most cases, if they're changing it, we have that flexibility to say that's where it's going to be, right?

**Jaime Topham** – Well, we do anyway because it's a PUD, right?

**Kevin Hall** – I mean, if they come for the change to the MU, can we dictate that that 50% is on Main Street as a part of the approval or not?

**Cavett Eaton** – Brett, are you on?

**Brett Coombs** – Yeah, I'm here.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, Attorney Coombs, the question is, well actually, you ask it because it was...

**Kevin Hall** – The question is, and when they come to rezone to an MU zone, if we require a 50% commercial, at the time of the approval, as part of the approval, we can dictate that that 50% be on Main Street or on whatever street it fronts so that we, again, help to create a Main Street or a business district or whatever.

**Brett Coombs** – Yes, you can. Yeah, you can control how the zone gets laid out. There could be some potential restrictions on if there is already a property that's zoned MU and there's a grandfathering and some other things that would come into play there. But yes, for in the future, absolutely.

**Kevin Hall** – But the majority now is not MU?

**Brett Coombs** – That's correct.

**Kevin Hall** – Right, so again, there are a couple of little ones that may not be applicable, but we could dictate that as they come.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, as long as when they understand that if they're going for that MU zoning, we're going to expect that 50%. It's still a conditional...

**Kevin Hall** – Well, I think we write all of that, right?

**Rick Barchers** – Right. But it isn't in there now.

**Jaime Topham** – Right. Right.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah. I think you guys hit it on the head there. What have we got to do?

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. So as far as the actual language in our document, we need to fix the proposed, the purpose and the intent. I mean we need to take out the language that talks about the open space, neighborhood parks, natural areas, trails and other amenities. Although with MU with a PUD, are we still requiring open space? We are, right?

**Rick Barchers** – We should.

**Shay Stark** – Well, so in the situation of a PUD, the language in the PUD requires that they provide 10% open space.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay.

**Shay Stark** – See, the way I interpret that, they can't do a fee in lieu and the other thing, when we had the PUD discussion, we can discuss this more, but the idea being if you think about it, if you have single family homes, a half-acre lot, those homes have a place for people to go outside to be able to spend time outdoors privately, for their kids to play in their yards, that type of thing.

If you're building townhouses or you're building, say, apartments or condominiums in an MU zone or high-density development, where would they do that? It's not provided in the development of the building, and so that 10% open space, and I think that should be amenity-rich open space if it's in a PUD, that they should be providing amenities with it. Because of that very issue, that becomes the place that those people can go to get outside.

**Gary Pinkham** – Due to the existing code, 19A.8, that would require a minimum of 25% set aside for landscaping.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Okay. Just so you know, in those papers I gave you, the state has restricted what we can ask commercial developments for landscaping. I'd have to read through it, Jaime.

**Rick Barchers** – When does that take it affect?

**Mayor Critchlow** – May 1st.

**Rick Barchers** – May 1st? Wow. Well, it needs to be in our code if it's...

**Shay Stark** – Oh, yeah. But we can just change this requirement of the landscaping to apply only to residential.

**Jaime Topham** – So it says in commercial, industrial, institutional, and multi-family development common area landscapes. Oh, it says lawn areas shall not exceed 20%.

**Mayor Critchlow** – That was more with the multi-family dwellings. When they were talking about commercial, they said they just really want to restrict that.

**Jaime Topham** – Which kind of makes sense. You're not really going there for the land, to landscaping and that.

**Mayor Critchlow** – It's like the guy down at American Burger. We made him put in a park strip and according to the state, we can't even make them do that anymore.

**Jaime Topham** – So Shay can we charge you with kind of revamping this mixed-use district with kind of what we wanted to say, taking out things that would conflict or adding in things that would be appropriate? Like the minimum lot sizes. I don't know if those are, how those tie in, Gary?

**Gary Pinkham** – With minimum lot size, I didn't have a problem with that but that will define our density. So if you look at 19a.1, paragraph three, delete the last sentence. Because that sentence is the one that we constantly argued about in building.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah. Well, in 19a.9, exceptions also. That's where the conversation went with well, we could have up to 15.

**Gary Pinkham** – Right. If that wording and 15 units per acre needs to be totally rewritten.

**Cavett Eaton** – I can't believe how many times we hear that from developers. "Well, we can get 15 units per acre, right?" Every time we turn around, I'm going, that's exactly where they're getting it.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, here's my argument for that. You can drive 35 miles an hour down the street out front here, right? That's the speed limit. That's the maximum you can go. But you can't do that through the street lights. You can't do that without lights on your car at night. I mean, you still have to follow all the other rules. You just do.

**Mayor Critchlow** – We only have one street light, folks.

**Gary Pinkham** – One other item that you might want to look at, it's on 19a.4. Paragraph 1, paragraph a. The front setback of 25 feet. The rest of that should probably be deleted because that actually lets them go down to 20. And when I was talking with a guy over there at Coops, there at the funeral home the other day, he works for the city of Magna and they're being sued over that very item because people are hitting cars parked on sidewalks on those short driveways, and because the driveway is public right of way, the city of Magna is being sued over that 20 foot driveway.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, yeah. Some of this stuff isn't to pick on the developers. It's a safety issue. When it comes to cutting corners for PUD, I 100% agree.

**Gary Pinkham** – The deal should just be a 25-foot setback. It's that wording about letting them go 12 feet in front of the garage and letting the garage go up to 20, we have our houses within eight feet of their sidewalk which means you can't back out of your driveway without running over a pedestrian. I would just simply say draw up 25 feet period.

**Kevin Hall** – I'm good with that.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah. The number three, we said just take out the "and 15 units per acre." They could still go, I mean, are we still okay with them doing heights of three stories or above? I mean, so some of our mixed use is out along, 138. Are we okay with them going up to three stories above grade?

**Gary Pinkham** – Yes, someone can in with an office building and they want to put in some extra floors. I mean, if we're looking at commercial, I wouldn't say in Grantsville we want to go above three stories?

**Cavett Eaton** – Mayor, are we good with the fire reach on three stories?

**Mayor Critchlow** – That's why that 35-feet's in there. There's ways to mitigate that in that you put in the sprinkling system that will be able to extinguish a fire or a certain thing, and there's lots of ways you can make that happen. By keeping them at 35 feet, we can still get people out of the building if it's on fire on another floor.

**John Limburg** – That's a good idea then.

**Dan England** – According to the building code, that 35 feet is not to the very peak of the roof, it's halfway up the roof. It's not defined in there, therefore you go to the building code and that's all.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, I'm just trying to, I mean, do you remember when the three-story apartment buildings were proposed down here in front of Maverick? What kind of pushback there was on that from the public? Do we really want to allow three-story apartment buildings? That's the question.

**Jaime Topham** – We're kind of not going to have a choice because we also are getting mandated to do affordable housing.

**Mayor Critchlow** – You know, the whole thing with the fire is being able to get people out of the building, okay, safely. I don't want them jumping 35 feet. Old people like me would just turn to dust when we hit the ground. If we have to get on the roof, we can get on the roof and go up from there. That's why we have these really cool toys and all sorts of fun little things to do that with. So, I mean, three stories is okay with me.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. So, we have 19a.9 that says exceptions, and it says heights of three stories above graded street. We're going to strike out the 15 units per acre. Do we need to add in there the three stories not greater than 35 feet? I mean, it does say it in 19a.6 but then this is an exception. Do we even need the exceptions? Do we strike that out?

**Shay Stark** – Yeah, I thought we said we were going to get rid of the exception.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. I like that. I don't like exceptions.

**Shay Stark** – So yeah, I agree with you, the 19a.6, let's just say a maximum of three stories high, up to 35 feet above the grade of the street. But I guess we need to define what that 35 feet is first.

**Jaime Topham** – So is there a code somewhere that says what that means?

**Shay Stark** – Well, see, I think in our definitions, we do have a definition on that. Currently, I believe it's to the peak of the roof. But if the building code is saying that on a sloped roof it can be mid-height and on a flat roof, on a commercial building, it just needs to be to literally the roof and not the parapet, then maybe we ought to...

**John Limburg** – But wouldn't it need to be above the parapet if they're going to get somebody on the roof?

**Shay Stark** – I guess that's what we need to know is what does the building code allow?

**Kevin Hall** – What are we measuring from to begin with? The sidewalk?

**Shay Stark** – From the grade at street.

**Cavett Eaton** – Here's what our code says right now, in the building code, what does it say, Dan? To the middle point of the parapet?

**Jaime Topham** – So you need to modify that as well? Add that to the list of definitions we need to fix.

**Rick Barchers** – What's wrong with this one?

**Jaime Topham** – It doesn't comply with the building code.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, I'm okay with the definitions. You don't want to change the building code? Or change the definitions?

**Jaime Topham** – Well, we can't change the building code so the building code trumps.

**Dan England** – The building code trumps. Well, we've barely worked on this.

**Jaime Topham** – We want to make our definition in line with the building code, right?

**Dan England** – It would make it probably less confusing but I don't know that you have to make it match as long as it's defined and it's clear for our code, this is what it means.

**John Limburg** – But we can only be more restricted, we can't be less restricted with it?

**Dan England** – Well, there's no restriction on measuring. It's just where you're measuring the height to, so that's all that, is a definition.

**Jaime Topham** – Would it cause a problem to just grab that language and make that our new definition?

**Dan England** – It's not doing what the Mayor was thinking. The Mayor was thinking that third floor, getting it to where the wall came to there, coming to that height right here, that right above the wall. That would be your 35 feet, so it didn't include the eave. If you include this then it's going to be halfway up that between there and the peak, somewhere in here. That becomes the height. So it changes things to the 35 feet. You may not get your third story.

**Rick Barchers** – Under that definition, would they be able to build apartments like they're building up in Tooele currently?

**Dan England** – I don't know. I don't know what they're building.

**Jaime Topham** – But what I'm saying, so the building code has a definition of how you measure it, right? And you're saying that's what we should be using as our definition.

**Dan England** – I didn't say that, you said that.

**Jaime Topham** – That's what I'm asking. Should we be using that? Is that what we need to be doing so that they could get their 35 feet but you can also get the rig that we have?

**Mayor Critchlow** – You know, I've been told on those new apartments, the ones that are not finished because they can't get the materials, they said. The top of that is what I'm saying is that their ceiling of that third story is 35 feet up.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. Cavett is saying that we have a lot of builders that want to push us to the building code definition, is that the right way to go? Should we just adopt the building code definition of what that roof, how you measure it? This is not my language so you guys have to help me.

**Shay Stark** – I think they want two things because the building code description, I don't think says 35 feet, I think it's just talking about how you measure the height. Is that right?

**Jaime Topham** – I know but we're going to say 35 feet no matter what.

**Shay Stark** – The other thing that we're seeing on every one of these PUDs, I believe, I have to go back and look again but I think every one of them asked for a minimum of three stories and 40 feet. These PUDs that you're going to see coming through.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, but we've already said we're not going to do more than 35 feet. So what definition do we need so that they know here's where 35 feet is? This is how we define 35 feet.

**Dan England** – I think it would be better not to go with the building code because the building code, they've learned how to cheat on that one where all of a sudden you have an A-frame. Now, with the height of your building it's halfway up that roof. So you have floors above that height of the roof and everything else. I think, if you say, outside wall where the roof crosses, that's the definition our mayor was saying they can make the safety work at that point.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. What our definition says, can you pull that back up, Cavett? Is that what it says in our definitions?

**Mayor Critchlow** – They can do four stories if they spend the 1.5 million bucks allowed on a truck.

**Rick Barchers** – Mr. Mayor, in your opinion, would the apartment buildings and building in Tooele meet the definition of a rural feeling in our community that we're trying to produce?

**Mayor Critchlow** – No. No, it doesn't.

**Rick Barchers** – Okay, so is that, do we want the ability for a developer to do that?

**Mayor Critchlow** – So I'm going to tell you the conversation we had down in St. George. Jesse was in that class, weren't you, with the lady from Mapleton?

**Jesse Wilson** – No, I was alone.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Oh, she had bad words to say because the state came in and said you have to allow these people to build multi-family dwellings up in the same, and she says, "Our city doesn't do that. If you want to do that, you go to the city next to us, either side, to the East, the West, but we're not going to do it right here." And the state says, "You're going to because we told you to."

**Jaime Topham** – That's what I was saying.

**Rick Barchers** – Was that in the State law that they can come in and tell us what our codes are?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah, it's coming.

**Jaime Topham** – So we'll get on the definition, it can stay.

**Kevin Hall** – Okay. The two-story thing, if they can do three stories, it's not going to be the residential, the rural feeling we have in our community. I know that. But in the right place, we can live with that. I can live with that.

**Rick Barchers** – Well yeah, but what I'm getting at is then that's what everybody wants to do. On our PUD, they come in and they propose something that's appropriate in a place for whatever, et cetera. I'm not opposed to voting for something like that but right across the street from here, do we want apartment buildings like are in Tooele?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Where this guy bought Jane Hill's place and he wants to do the front commercial and do the back townhomes? It wouldn't matter to me right there if it was three stories because it would be off the Main Street. Personally. That's my personal opinion. I'm just sharing.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, I know you talk to a lot of people, that's why I'm asking.

**Jaime Topham** – So do you have enough direction to get that cleaned up? I think we've gone in a little bit of a circle here. I know, well I wrote all over of it so I'll scan it and send you it.

So, Gary?

**Gary Pinkham** – We looked at 19a, all the same lines on this unit density thing, we might want to look at 4.34 2. b. ii.

**Jaime Topham** – Can you find that Cavett?

**Gary Pinkham** – Yes, where it says about the density per acre. Again, delete that, and let the dimensional characteristics of the lot determine the density, or calculate the density. That's the one that keeps biting us in the tail.

Similarly, on 15.4 paragraph one, we have that minimum lot count per acre, then maximum density. That line should probably go away. Then in 15.5, the same correction there.

I think that gets rid of all the little code that are perpetually haunting us and let the physical dimensions override the term of how many we're going to get, unless you guys can show variants.

**Rick Barchers** – So Shay in particular apartment buildings, do you think they're going to reach a density higher than that? Is it possible?

**Dan England** – Not higher than that but the problem we're having, sorry to jump in but people come in and they say, "Oh, I have 10 acres therefore I get 150 lots onto here." They can't get that many lots on there, but they have it set in their mind that they're going to get that many lots because it says right there in our code that you can have that many.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, I don't think they actually believe that. I think that's what they're saying.

**Jaime Topham** – Oh, so many people believe that.

**Dan England** – Oh, yeah. They absolutely believe it.

**Cavett Eaton** – They forget to realize it's an open space and they're like...

**Jaime Topham** – Haven't you sat through some of those conversation?

**Rick Barchers** – I know but I can give you 1000 reasons why you can't always necessarily drive 35 miles an hour down Main Street.

**Jaime Topham** – Right, but they don't care. They're going to try and bully us as much as they can, if they can.

**Rick Barchers** – I know common sense is out the window in these discussions, so I understand. My question is maximum density on an apartment building, are they going to be able to exceed that?

**Dan England** – They might be able to.

**Shay Stark** – Well, again, it's all based on what we're requiring. For instance, don't we say to the MU Zone that the minimum dwelling site, every dwelling unit in this zone should contain a minimum of 900 square feet of living space. They come in with an apartment complex. The maximum number of stories they can have is three stories and then in every one of those units, the minimum size unit they can have is 900 square feet. That's going to control it and again, parking is going to control that too.

**Rick Barchers** – And minimum numbers of units from that place.

**Shay Stark** – Then we've got, I guess, the state law, I'm going to have to read that a little bit because the multi-unit housing. I mean, I knew there were limitations on everything but I thought multi-unit housing was a little more open than that. I know commercial, we really can't require much of anything.

**Dan England** – Do we have anything in the code that says if we have so many apartments that they need to have so much playground area to compensate.

**Shay Stark** – Well, that's what I'm saying. That's what we need to try to deal with and we can deal with it through the PUD. We can require all, which I think we do currently in code. Don't, we require MU to go to PUD?

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah.

**Gary Pinkham** – The MU is required to be at PUD for a multi-unit and the new revision of 4.35 and 4.34, it does stipulate that you have to have a minimum of open space and a minimum of square footage per residential unit. So again, we have dimensional requirements they have to meet. If they meet those, that will determine how many units they get on all of the property.

**Rick Barchers** – I'm just worried about it going the other direction, that's all. But it doesn't sound like it's really possible.

**Gary Pinkham** – If they want to double that, they can come to you folks and ask for it. And you guys can say, "Well, in this instance, yes. Or in this instance, no." Because again, it's coming in as a PUD where they're allowed to ask for waivers. You're not required to give them to them. But you could consider. If they come in with a two-story apartment and say, "We're going to put in 15 units per acre on a 50% of the ground. The rest of it's going to be open play space." You could say yeah.

**Rick Barchers** – Yeah, I'm good.

**Jaime Topham** – You're good? John?

**John Limburg** – I'm good.

**Jaime Topham** – Good. Shay, is there any way that you could have this cleaned up and ready for us to review next week?

**Shay Stark** – Yeah, I will.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, and then can we put it for public comment at our next meeting, what is that, the 18th? Not next week's meeting but the 18th.

**Shay Stark** – Yes.

**Lanise Thompson** – Did you get enough changes on the purpose and intent?

**Jaime Topham** – I scratched some things out. I think that it works. So, this is what I have now. The purpose of the mixed district is to allow for the establishment of commercial properties with shall we put high-density housing? Or does it matter? with residential.

**Dan England** – If you say residential, they will assume high-density.

**Jaime Topham** – Okay, so then just put residential? But well, that's kind of, should we put medium?

**Shay Stark** – Do we even want to bring up density again because we're going away from that and we're letting the lot sizes make that determination? Do we want to bring that argument out?

**Jaime Topham** – No, just leave it out? The purpose of the mixed-use district is to allow for the establishment of commercial properties and residential neighborhoods.

Planning new developments are required in this zone, period. Developments in the mixed-use zone shall be designed so as to integrate the residential and commercial components into one harmonious development and to be compatible with the existing or anticipated uses of the surrounding properties. Does that all work?

Then the next part, I didn't really have too much of an issue with. While achieving a mix of commercial and residential uses in mixed-use developments is the goal, the city will review proposals on an individual basis in determining an acceptable ratio for the residential and commercial components.

Project designs that fail to sufficiently integrate commercial and residential uses will not be considered for approval. Creativity in both site design and architecture is expected. Master planning in multiple contiguous properties is encouraged in order to integrate the proposed development harmoniously into the surrounding neighborhood.

Some of that seems like a little bit of fluff language. It's not enforceable and creates a whole lot of discretion. Do we want to keep that? Do we want to take that out? Somewhere, we need to put in the 50% requirement and maybe that's where it needs to be.

**Dan England** – That's where I was wondering if you wanted to say, "Individual basis determine the acceptable rates of approximately 50%."

**Jaime Topham** – Not approximate.

**John Limburg** – At least 50%.

**Jaime Topham** – At least 50%, okay.

**Rick Barchers** – Or we can always approve something less, right?

**Jaime Topham** – Right.

**Rick Barchers** – But the code-wise, they can expect 50%.

**Dan England** – Well, you better say 50% commercial then.

**Jaime Topham** – Yes. 50% commercial.

**Rick Barchers** – Right. You say that's fluff language, that last sentence there?

**Jaime Topham** – Well actually, it's not the last sentence actually. It's probably creativity in both site design and architecture is expected.

**Rick Barchers** – Ax that.

**Jaime Topham** – I don't know that we should really have the language of project designs that fail to sufficiently integrate commercial and residential uses will not be considered for approval because we're going to allow the one acre. What do you think? Should we strike that line too? Or does it matter?

**Dan England** – Say what you thought. Do you care about that one?

**Shay Stark** – I agree with you. I think let's just pull it out of there. It doesn't...

**Jaime Topham** – Okay. It doesn't add anything.

**Dan England** – There's nothing behind it. It doesn't really give us any authority here to do anything.

**Rick Barchers** – The authority's already there anyway.

**Jaime Topham** – And then, in that same paragraph, we're going to add in the one acre or less can be all commercial or mixed but not only residential. I guess I mean that's kind of true of all mixed-use but it's clear.

**Rick Barchers** – Well, it's still got to be a minimum of 50%, I don't know.

**Jaime Topham** – No, I don't think you want to say you have to have a minimum of 50% under an acre because that could...If you just say, "You can't be only commercial," then they could do their

building 20% commercial and the rest residential and still fix or get what we want, so long as all the other details are counted and that's not our problem.

Does that make sense?

**Rick Barchers** – It does but however, anyway. Maybe I just need to see it in black and white.

**Shay Stark** – We'll get it to you in black and white and then we can...

**Jaime Topham** – Talk more about it.

**Cavett Eaton** – So do you want to see that draft next week? Then in two weeks we'll notice it. By then, you can do a consideration if everything looks good.

#### **4. Discussion of External ADU is a permanent structure**

**Jaime Topham** – Moving on to a discussion of external day use. I gave you the PUDs from other jurisdictions that Brett had tracked down and provided for us. So, you can be looking at it, because our next meeting that we're having with the combined group is going to be talking about PUDs. I'd really like to have a plan or presentation.

And the reason that I asked Brett to provide the ones he did in particular is that they put in a table of, you get this much density bonus for these things. Now, read them. Very open-ended. They're other people's ideas, but we can put in the things that we want.

And I think that we need to do that so that when we're talking to developers, we can say, "This is what's required. This is what you get," and they can't say, "Well, but we want..." Oh. Well, they can say, "Well, we want this," and we could say, "That's not what's permitted on our PD. Okay? So there's that.

**Jesse Wilson** – So Jaime, Brett had a drop off. He's not on the meeting.

**Jaime Topham** – Oh, okay. All right.

**Rick Barchers** – You're just providing this as a framework to start with, basically.

**Jaime Topham** – Yes. To start with for our next meeting, so please read through them. If you find other jurisdictions that have great language, let's look at those too. But that's where we're starting.

External ADUs. I don't know who could direct this conversation, but what I do know is that we have community members who want to do External ADUs, who has to do it, who've even come in front of us and we said, "Hang on. We're going to be working on that," and then it kind of just got dropped. We got to rectify that situation as well. Now Shane, I think you were saying the state hasn't started on the ADU externals.

**Shay Stark** – Nothing's gotten out of committee yet. I don't know if it even went. I wasn't really following that closely this time, so I don't know if anything came in the committee like it did last time, but nothing's gotten out of committee yet.

**Jaime Topham** – At one point in time, we were working on some language with external ADU's and we kind of dropped that to deal with our internal. Can you send that same language over that you previously sent to us?

**Shay Stark** – Yeah, if we can find it. Because that was based off, I believe originally, it was based off of Tooele and then it had been highly modified. But yeah, I think what would be really helpful here is if everybody would kind of think about what, and maybe what you need to have is that code in front of you first. I realize you may not know what I'm going to ask you here is a little bit open-ended, and that may help close... So it's not such a so it's not such a wide, wide thing. But I almost feel like we need to brainstorm what it is we would like to see in the ADUs, and come up with a list of things that we would like, and also a list of concerns. So that then, when we look at code, we can see if we, how we can incorporate those issues or address those concerns.

**Jaime Topham** – I like that idea. I like the brainstorming instead of working kind of in the negative, I'd rather work in the positive. What do we want to see? What don't we want to see? I'm open to that conversation, but everyone please put input in.

**Rick Barchers** – Input? Setbacks, parking. My biggest concern, access to the property. Are we going to require, if you've got, I mean, if we just say anybody can have an external, then they're going to have some sort of minimum clearance on the side of the house and the front to get around to it, if that makes sense. They have to provide an access. I just think it's going to have to be defined, that's all. I mean, its common sense, I think maybe it's already kind of defined, but that language needs to be in there.

**Shay Stark** – I believe Park City kind of tried to do the same thing, not exactly the same, but I believe Park City, in their code, basically says that your lot has to be set 7,000 square feet or greater to, before they would even consider an ADU on there. And some of that may be tied to those access issues and physically being able to have room to, put that on there and still have room for emergency services to get around it. You can't get around it when you put your little tuff shed out there and turn it into an ADU and it catches on fire. And they got to climb up to the third story that you stacked on there to get back in there.

**Jaime Topham** – Accessory dwelling unit. I guess that would be good to define what we're talking about. So yeah, an accessory,

**Rick Barchers** – So that would address setbacks, allowing for setbacks too, so.

**Shay Stark** – Yeah that's an important part of it. I think everything we did is for key issues.

**John Limburg** – So it would be like a mother-in-law apartment downstairs if its internal, right? If it's external, it's still going to completely separate building.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah it could be in your garage, you could turn your garage into an external ADU.

**Rick Barchers** – One of the things that we had talked about when we were talking about this before was separate utilities.

**John Limburg** – What we're concerned about is, is it a detached ADU though, right? So it wouldn't be the garage, it would be an additional building.

**Jaime Topham** – Well okay, if it's a detached garage, then it could be. Yeah, you're right

**Rick Barchers** – And the detached garages will become ADU's.

**Jaime Topham** – Yep.

**John Limburg** – They already are.

**Jaime Topham** – They're already talking about it in the state, right? That garages can become one, yeah. So, we're not doing something out of the norm, we're just going ahead.

**John Limburg** – We just know that kids are going to be coming home, mother-in-law is going to be moving back in.

**Jaime Topham** – Well, and the particular people that keep coming in front of us, they wanted to move into the ADU behind and have their kids stay in the front, in the big house.

**Rick Barchers** – Existing structure requirements, in other words, if they want to turn their garage into an ADU, we're going to require to have them insulated, and do all that stuff.

**Mayor Critchlow** – What about building code inspections?

**Rick Barchers** – Exactly. It'll have to be brought up to code.

**John Limburg** – We've talked about having separate power meters. You know, like, because if your house is based off of this, can you just build it off the same water meter, sewer system, there's like, all of that's got to be figured out.

**Rick Barchers** – Yeah, it's got to be separate. It's got to be.

**Jaime Topham** – From the city engineer's perspective, do you have thoughts along those lines, of the external ADUs detached?

**Dan England** – I've worked with ADUs, I think they can work. My parents had ADUs in their backyard for their parents to live in. It was an awesome arrangement. It came with the developer who said, "Do you want an ADU as part of your house?", and they paid a little bit extra and got it. I can see that happening. That's something that we need to take into account as we go through. Is that something we want to allow the developers to do, or is that something we just want to have individual lots to do as part of those ADUs?

You already brought up the building code side. That becomes very important to make sure that all that happens, and there's a whole lot of things that need to happen to make that a livable structure. But I mean, you can also just have something built in the backyard that's built as an ADU, follows the codes, everything's great.

**Rick Barchers** – Limit at one?

**Dan England** – Do we care about sizes, compared to the original house, and things like that.

**Jaime Topham** – That's kind of where we got stuck last time, I think.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Right. They require 900 square feet on the, on the apartments. Is that a bare minimum?

**Jaime Topham** – So minimum is square feet 900, or max? Maximum, that's really small.

**Dan England** – That is really tiny.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Good.

**Rick Barchers** – Can't have granny having poker games in it.

**Dan England** – I know of one person that they have a really old house that they've been living in, their family's outgrowing it, and so they want to stay there and rent out that one, and build a bigger house in the back. Can that be an ADU for them to build back there? Then they're building a bigger house, and they have this small 1800s house that's a building in the front. Would that be something that would be allowed?

I like the idea of being able to keep the old house, otherwise they have to knock that down build a bigger house. I like the old, I like the antique.

**John Limburg** – How do you get around not subdividing a lot and just putting three homes on it?

**Dan England** – Well, you can restrict that.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah, you can restrict it, because we talked about that.

**Dan England** – Only one ADU per lot. If they want to do more, they have to subdivide.

**John Limburg** – I think I'd just be stopping them when it's two homes on one building lot. It's not a home. It's maybe a bedroom and a little kitchen.

**Jaime Topham** – Well, but, like we talked about, yeah, limiting the size, but if you have an 8,000 square foot home, are you limited to a 900 square foot ADU? Did we want it proportional, do we not want it proportional? Do we want it to be behind, or in front, or the side? Like you just said with that would be, their ADU would be in front of the home.

**Rick Barchers** – Well my, on that note, the original intent is somewhere for mom to live, and I got no issues with that, that's fine. But that goes away, and I'm not trying to be heartless, when it becomes a rental, so.

**Jaime Topham** – Well that's what the state's directing them to be.

**Rick Barchers** – No, I'm understanding of that, and that's fine. But they have to look at this as, from the perspective, in my opinion of, that's a rental. So, it's not just a place, you know eventually that's what it's going to be, that's all it's going to be eventually.

**Jaime Topham** – Well, I think you're right, and I think that's what the state's going to be directing us more of, but we also need to plan that way. That's why I asked it, are we, Gary...?

**Gary Pinkham** – Following up on what Dan said, in a comment or question that he had several months ago from a developer who wanted to put two homes on every lot, okay? We need to be careful on the ADU code that we don't open this up to two lot, or two resident per lot subdivision process.

Maybe the wording should be "An individual property owner may request", and exclude developers from doing it. The reason I'm bringing it up is my son did a job for Dale Webb, just before he came up here from Arizona. Virtually every lot in that 50,000 lot subdivision had an ADU on it. That's a hundred thousand residents per 50,000 lots.

**Jaime Topham** – That's just right around that density-

**Gary Pinkham** – Perhaps it should be individual homeowner may request, but somehow exclude the open door for the developer to double their density with an ADU.

**Rick Barchers** – On the upcoming law, in your opinion, are we going to be able to require more or less, like, water provided for the property?

**Gary Pinkham** – I have no idea what the law's doing out there. I'm just saying-

**Rick Barchers** – I mean, it would seem right to me that if they're going to-

**Gary Pinkham** –... if we don't be careful, we're going to open a door to two units on every single lot. In other words, the R-1-21, Instead of having two units per acre, will have four units per acre.

**John Limburg** – Couldn't you just say something like, "It's going to be, it's a minimum of 900 square feet."? It's got to be, after that it can only be a certain percentage of the original homeowner lot, like 25% of the size. Or something where you're not going to come in and build, so nobody's going to build another home on there. Does that make sense?

**Mayor Critchlow** – So going on with what Dan's talking, or his question, the problem is, as a fire department rolls up and the big house is in the back, and they can't get in the driveway, you got to pull off the hose to get back there. We have, on the attack hoses, 200 feet, and that's it. That's got to be able to reach, by fire code, it's got to be able to reach the back corner of the second dwelling.

**John Limburg** – So isn't that kind of the problem you have with that property that Cloward's bought?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Absolutely.

**John Limburg** – Where it's got the shop in the front and the home in the back, and you can't-

**Mayor Critchlow** – Other than we got a driveway that goes through now.

**John Limburg** – Yeah. But that was the original problem there, right?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah, that was the original problem. There's a house down here on Race Street, next to my old in-laws. They let them build a house set back in there. The driveway literally is like, 10 feet maybe. I can make it back there on the fire truck, but I might lose a little fence on the way back through.

**Rick Barchers** – You might take out the eave on the house.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Oh, the house is away. Fence is gone.

**Shay Stark** – But is that why the City outlawed flag lots?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah. Pretty much.

**Rick Barchers** – That's why I'm saying access, side access, it's a big deal.

**Mayor Critchlow** – There is a fire code that says it has to be able to go to the back corner of the house from the fire truck.

**Jaime Topham** – So if you can't get the firetruck down there, that tells them how far they can go back.

**Rick Barchers** – There's not a minimum distance from a fire plug too?

**Mayor Critchlow** – That's something that goes along with that. It's 250 feet.

**Rick Barchers** – So we're going to have to meet those fire codes.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah, of course.

**Dan England** – And you need to have access to the back building.

**Rick Barchers** – Right, because now you're talking about adding additional footage distance from the fire plug.

**Dan England** – Right. That really helps a lot, because that sets limits on if you don't have a drive access between lots, which a lot of properties, the small lots don't have, they won't be able to put anything very far, or very big back there behind it. So that really does help a lot.

Whereas if you do have a larger lot, you have room for a 30-foot driveway along the side, then they can put something bigger, as long as they have access back there.

**Jaime Topham** – What about tiny homes? Anyone have a tiny home?

**Mayor Critchlow** – I think they're cool, and I want to have one sitting on a beach in Oregon somewhere. But that's, what else do you want to know?

**John Limburg** – I was just in San Antonio last week and there was this whole village of them.

**Jaime Topham** – All right. They're everywhere.

**Shay Stark** – They're building them over in Salt Lake, too. I mean, they're putting them in a whole subdivision over there.

**Rick Barchers** – Don't those fit into basically the camper category, as far as the house?

**Cavett Eaton** – They're not mobile, so no.

**Rick Barchers** – They're not mobile? The ones I've seen were on wheels.

**Cavett Eaton** – There are some that way. But there's manufacturers now building pre-fab tiny homes and I've had developers ask me if they're accepted in our city. Everybody's looking that way.

**Jaime Topham** – Well I know of people that do tiny homes with the compostable toilets. Are those allowed, rather than a sewage hookup?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Sewage, water, power. Knowing that we have to have power buried underground. We can't have anything overhead.

**John Limburg** – So are we going to rely on the city to decide whether or not they need an extra water hookup? Or are we just going to say "They need an extra hookup."

**Mayor Critchlow** – I think they need to have an extra one.

**John Limburg** – Agreed.

**Dan England** – I think they should.

**Rick Barchers** – So separate utilities, because like I said, you're looking at basically it's going to be a rental, eventually at one point or another. Personally, I've been involved with decaying, decrepit utilities that were shared in that type of situation. It's a nightmare for everybody. Nobody likes it, so.

**Mayor Critchlow** – So up on the corner of Plum and Hale, they built a duplex. Now this duplex over here was going to be just this half, and the second one was going to be a bigger duplex and have a basement, okay? Well they turned around and so now they rent out the top and the basement, and they're all hooked to the same utilities. The guy downstairs is the guy who has to pay for all of the utility.

**Kevin Hall** – I bet he's a happy camper.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Oh, he's a happy... yeah, they're really happy campers when they realized that.

**Rick Barchers** – You're talking about a rental, right? So, imagine the guy upstairs. He doesn't care if the sewer's backing up in the one below. He doesn't care.

**Cavett Eaton** – So we've already got that problem right now with our internals. We have those right now that are building internals for rental purposes so they can qualify for their loan. That's happening in Grantsville right now.

**John Limburg** – Oh, so they can use that rent for... They can use the rent that they're going to get off of that towards the payment on a home.

**Cavett Eaton** – That's the only way they can qualify. Yep, a lot of people are converting their basements and Andy's having to deal with does it meet code, did it meet code originally. They've all got the same utility line. And they didn't specify to that, it'd be different, because it's internal.

**Dan England** – Internal is different from external.

**Cavett Eaton** – I'm just saying that situation is already happening. It's just going to exacerbate it.

**Dan England** – The external... I think we should try and keep them separate for the reasons you were saying.

**Mayor Critchlow** – As long as it's not too big and we have to meet those fire codes, but we can access them. These things are all part of the job.

**Jaime Topham** – Can RV trailers be considered external ADUs?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Oh, yeah. That's a good question.

**Cavett Eaton** – I was going to bring it up but I don't dare touch it.

**Jaime Topham** – We have to touch it.

**Cavett Eaton** – We've got hundreds of people living in their 5<sup>th</sup>-wheel in Grantsville right now.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah, one that's living out front of... Her parents are living right in front of her house. the cords across the sidewalk and they got the awning-

**Kevin Hall** – On Clark street?

**Cavett Eaton** – We have on that they are in the backyard and they're asking if they can come live in their trailer while they build their house for a year. We get tons of that. And that hasn't even been touched with the economy and what might come in the future.

**Dan England** – I thought we already had the code says no.

**Cavett Eaton** – There's some discrepancies.

**Jesse Wilson** – Brett and I had this discussion as well, and I think there is one that says RVs are not considered-

**Cavett Eaton** – The code says no coaches, which is the RV.

**Lanise Thompson** – Well, how did the people on the Durfee do it while they rebuilt their house after the fire?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Well, okay. Yeah. I have no idea. We let them do it.

**John Limburg** – I mean he'd lived there for two years before they even started.

**Lanise Thompson** – Yeah, it took him forever to even turn down the old burnt house.

**Kevin Hall** – What about the place out by Tooele Valley Meats. There's three or four trailers their people are living at. They're all set up, just like they are homes

**Cavett Eaton** – The ones that ask get a no, and the ones that don't ask just do.

**Mayor Critchlow** – The one by Tooele Valley Meats, that's the county. We don't worry about that.

**Kevin Hall** – I thought that was annexed here.

**Jaime Topham** – Not yet.

**Kevin Hall** – No? I thought they'd already annexed it.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I wish. But I'm not sure about the trailers. I'm not sure what situation it is. I know that there's been times when people have lived in the trailer while they built their house. And we've allowed them to do that as a City. I'm not sure why-

**Rick Barchers** – Well as long as it meets the code, whatever the code is, for a temporary dwelling inside an RV, like an RV park, they have to have those hookups to the sewer and the water and all that stuff.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah, I don't know with those folks.

**Kevin Hall** – That kind of defeats the purpose though, because a lot of places will tell you, "Get the infrastructure in, you don't have a wait time." And we have facilities to dump and do all those things. So, I don't think-

**Jaime Topham** – I guess that's why I asked. Could we allow them to have an RV that they run a connection to the sewer and an actual connection to power and allow them to have that as an ADU?

**Cavett Eaton** – I'm glad you're asking. I think we're going to be faced with this. If we get this approved as an external ADU, the next step is going to be can we use a trailer.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah, and the thing is like we aren't allowing any more RV parks, right?

**Rick Barchers** – Okay, ADU has to be a permanent structure, how's that?

**Lanise Thompson** – We had a guy come in to talk to James today to about he wanted to lift the manhole cover to run his sewer into it. He was... James told him, "No, you mess with that. That's a fine." Like he was going to be at his daughter's for two weeks.

**Kevin Hall** – Your question was, is it in the street or is it in the yard, right? That was the question.

**Cavett Eaton** – James just had them pull the meter cover and dunk in the meter hole and had to deal with that, two or three times. So, we need to talk about it if we don't pass anything-

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah, I mean I think we should meet to talk about it because there's a lot of people that can't afford to do anything but that. We either talk about can they do that, as long as they hook it up properly, or are we going to allow some trailer parks that allow people to live in their RV parks?

**Cavett Eaton** – The thing I look at, or the thing that means the most to me is the safety part of it, right? And then we have hundreds who are doing it, maybe not. But quite a few. And we have no regulation. We have no say, nothing. If we pass it, at least we can regulate some safety. Maybe somebody's RV might burn to the ground.

**John Limburg** – You've got to a trailer park, you can make them tie it down with hurricanes ties and stuff like that.

**Cavett Eaton** – Right now we have no control.

**John Limburg** – Well, maybe for an ADU, you just say it's on a foundation. Just an ADU's a permanent building.

**Rick Barchers** – How are you going to inspect it? How do you know it's safe? Here's one from the 1930s, and pull it in there. Who's liable for saying it's okay?

**Cavett Eaton** – Same thing as mobile homes. Manufactured homes have to be made after '95 or '96 or they don't pass code. So that there's actual regulations for that with manufactured homes and we could do the same kind of thing.

**John Limburg** – I know about all that kind of stuff. I have mobile offices on a lot of the jobs. You'd have to get the City and have a permit for the trailer. Have them go out and inspect the tiedowns

**Cavett Eaton** – They'd come with an inspection paper and whether they pass. We had developed the last day tell us she has access to 25 of those mobile units and she wants to bring them in.

**John Limburg** – It'd be easy to do. It'd be easy to regulate if that's what you're asking. I think with ADU we just say it's a permanent building and let's deal with this.

**Jaime Topham** – ADU needs to be on a foundation.

**Dan England** – Right and you deal with the RV separate. I agree with that. But it does need to be addressed.

**John Limburg** – There's got to be some precedent somewhere that I've got to have the right power to run the ADU outside the house. If they plug in, and they can hook up to the sewer if it's done right. But it's got to be done right.

**Shay Stark** – With some other communities too, where they've allowed... they've... you know if somebody comes in they're building a home and they come in and they say, "Hey, Look I want to have an RV pad off to the side of my house. And when I come home from using my RV, I'd like to be able to just dump my trailer right there and not have to go to a dump site. Can I run a line out to my sewer and then just cap it so I can dump trailer in?"

And a lot of the cities, at first are like, "Sure, why not?" You know, not big deal. "Just keep it clean and don't let it stink." And they allow that to happen. But you know exactly what happens. I got somebody up the street from where I live that I know that trailer's being lived in because they've had it all pulled out and it's been that way for a long time. I see lights in it. And they've got the same situation. They set themselves up ahead of time for it.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Does it smell? And you know we have situations like that in Grantsville, where people have installed the, after the building part of it, have installed the sewer dumps on their lots.

**Jaime Topham** – Anything else that we want to talk about tonight for this? Okay. We'll start to wrap up. When should we... I'd like to have this put together... Well, I actually asked Shay if he could get us the language that we had kind of started working on last time. Now, that we have some brainstorming ideas without having all the rest of that, maybe we can start tying that in. And then when do we want to have another meeting about this so that we can get this ball rolling and help our community members actually tackle this.

So, our next planning and zoning meeting jointly is on the 10th. So that's May 10th. That's only PUD. P-U-D, right?

:

Our next meeting that's joint with City Council is only to talk about ADUs. No, PDU. PUDs, there's too many acronyms. PUDs and only PUDs.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I just typed that in there. PUD only.

**Jaime Topham** – Yeah. And then, so we could do it as a work meeting before the 18th. We could-

**Lanise Thompson** – When do you leave?

**Jaime Topham** – I leave on the 21st and I'll be back on the 2nd.

**Cavett Eaton** – Do you have time to put it together by the 18th? That's two things.

**Jaime Topham** – So June 1st, I will not be here. I'll be flying back. Wait, that pushes us all the way to the 15th. Or you guys can have the discussion without me.

**Lanise Thompson** – Do you want a meeting on the 8th or something? Just a work meeting?

**Jaime Topham** – Are you guys open to that? Work meeting on the 8th?

**Lanise Thompson** – I mean it's a Thursday night, but it's the off week.

**Cavett Eaton** – We'll have planned zoning on the 1st and City Council will be on the 7th.

**Jaime Topham** – John, you're the one that's always traveling, so-What about the... I mean we could just do it the 15th before that meeting.

**John Limburg** – I'm here the 15th, so.

**Jaime Topham** – Should we do that? Six o'clock on the 15th?

**Lanise Thompson** – So a work meeting on the 15th?

**Jaime Topham** – Okay great meeting.

## **5. Adjourn**

Jaime Topham – Okay. Anything else we need to discuss tonight? Thanks everyone for all of your

**Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Meeting was adjourned at 9:29PM**