

Action Summary

#1 Concept Mack Canyon (Peak Canyon)	Discussion
#2 MU (Mixed-Use) zoning definition	Discussion
#3 External ADU	Discussion

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 05/04/23. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM.

Commission Members Present: Commission Chair: Jaime Topham, Rick Barchers, Kevin Hall, Derek Dalton.

Excused: John Limburg

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: 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, Fire Marshal Jason Smith

On Zoom: City Attorney Brett Coombs, Mayor Critchlow

Citizens and Guests Present: Paul Linford, Stetson Blackmore

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

AGENDA:

1. Discussion of Concept Plan for Peak Canyon Estates

Paul Linford was present to present the concept for Mack Canyon (formerly Peak Canyon)

Paul Linford – Thank you. My name's Paul Linford. I was here with the previous one that's just south of this that we're going to see all together here as soon as it comes up.

What we have done here is we're trying to, as we discussed with you the last time we met, we are trying in these acreages to come up with all open space. We still are trying to keep around the density or anywhere between the three-and-a-half and four-and-a-half per acre, including the open space, units per acre. We've added in a RV parking. This is RV parking that's owned by the HOA. It's not going to be charging rent or anything other than the HOA. We'll probably do it, but if you go around to the other neighborhoods that are rural like Grantsville, and Tooele, and Payson, and Santaquin, and that, the RVs become sometimes a little bit of an issue. We've tried to do is try to handle those issues by actually creating the parking for them for the subdivision. I'll start going down the list of the stuff. We already went through the one to the south that we're coming up with here.

Now on this new section, which is up at the top of what you've seen there, we have 30%, 29.7% open space. We have RV parking. We have four pickleball courts, one large pavilion, three small pavilions, three pocket parks along with the big park. We've got two miles of trails going around these that can be added to dependent upon the future. You can add other things. What most people are thinking right now is on the highways. With some of this new legislation that they're talking

about, there'll be a bike road or a pathway going next to the highways going throughout most of Utah. This would be added. We could put that in there.

We've got two baseball diamonds, one large, one for little league like you have over in your park there across from the high school. We've got a trail head, and the trail head is up on the top left-hand corner, and instead of having people driving their ATVs and their thing all the way through the city, that would be a parking place for them to park, and then be able to go up Mack Canyon and to be able to take it from there.

Now, that's just a thought. Again, this is all for us to have you guys say yay, nay or Yeah. Yeah. It's just whatever. We have a lot of guest parking throughout this. We realigned Mack Road. If you go over to the highway on the top right of the drawing. We realigned it. It will go into the highway perpendicular, so you won't have an issue. We have taken a lot of work in trying to make the detention ponds big enough to be able to handle the stormwater.

If you look at the RV parking here and the ballpark, what we would probably do with the other subdivision to the south is we probably move the ball diamonds down to where the RV parking is We would combine the RV parking together. We would take the ball diamonds and move it down, so they're by the other park. Now you've noticed that I haven't put the roads in across the two subdivisions yet because I wanted to get your input first, but this in essence would marry.

This is going to come after the one that you're already looking at right now Of course, with both these projects, it's going to be a number of years before we'll be working on this. It's not going to be something that's of course going to be built out in a year, year and a half, but it's something that we're looking at for a period of time. Let's see. Is there any questions that you have? Any comments?

Now the new zone that you're going to be looking at, this fits within that zone of the medium density. It fits. That's right in the center. It's not the very extreme on one line. It's not the very extreme on this. It's right in the middle.

Rick Barchers – What is it zoned, currently?

Paul Linford – It's a half-acre lot.

Rick Barchers – Okay, but I'm seeing on the previous one to the south, there are several third-acre lots. I know that when this was put before us last time these areas, this green area on the very south that's still going to be city property?

Paul Linford – Yeah, all the this, all the green, all the spaces, except for the RV parking will all be city property.

Rick Barchers – What percentage of this upper portion is going to become city property?

Paul Linford – It is our goal on the upper one that all the open spaces will be city property, except for areas like these areas here would be HOA, but everything here would all be owned, and the Detention basins, we can either to keep those within the HOA, so we keep them clean, but it's up to you to decide what you want. We're open to it.

Dan England – How big are those detention basins?

Paul Linford – Paul Watson has gone in and determined how much he thinks you're going to need based upon the stormwater and stuff that he's been talking to you about.

Dan England – I'm just wondering if they're...

Brett Coombs – Madam Chair, I have a question as well when you're available.

Jaime Topham – Go ahead.

Brett Coombs – Mr. Linford, I was just looking. This appears to show Mack Canyon Road in the same location that it is now. Is that the anticipation that you're not going to need to move or make any changes to Mack Canyon Road to make this work?

Paul Linford – Only when it comes out to the highway. If you notice that on ours, if you look at the top right-hand corner, you'll notice that we curve it so that we can hit that without having to ask the North property owner because we don't know what the response is going to be. That we would just put that curve, if you will, in on this property.

Brett Coombs – Okay.

Paul Linford – Now he may come back and say, "Hey, you can do whatever you want," but I don't want to go through that until I talked to you first.

Brett Coombs – Yeah, and I bring it up, so the North Property owner Guy Haskell owns the other side of Mack Canyon Road from what I understand. He's voiced a desire to relocate Mack Canyon a little bit to make it straight or straighter. I don't know if you guys have had that conversation, but that's certainly something that as you look into this, you'll want to work with him to determine how much of the road you two will want to work together on.

Paul Linford – Well, the half plus 10 feet that we have to have will be on our property. Now, Mr. Haskell, we would love him to work with us. But at this point in time, I wanted to get the input of the city first. Right now, the goal is, which UDOT's going to require us to do is that road going in cannot be diagonal. It has to be going in perpendicular.

Dan England – As far as the engineer's concerned, where the existing Mack Canyon Road is, I'd like it to stay there in a straight line, which is all on Guy Haskell's property. That means there's going to be some negotiation with him.

Paul Linford – Sure.

Dan England – There's an even land on the south side of that road that I think might be his, too, to keep that in line with where it is going up now path, because they've already dedicated a right-of-way on both sides.

Paul Linford – Okay. The only reason why I'm doing it this way is because I've been in situations before where another developer has come in and said, "No, we want to put you between a rock and a hard place." What I'm trying to do here is make sure that if they won't give it to us, we can still make it work and keep the city happy.

Dan England – Okay.

Paul Linford – I'm sure Mr. Haskell will work with us. I don't even think that's a question.

Dan England – He would love to have it farther your direction.

Paul Linford – Okay.

Dan England – Just, I'd rather have it back in a straight line because what's going to happen with this is actually almost a full road over here. You're going to end up making a huge S-through up here like this that I'd rather not see.

Paul Linford – Hey, you know what we're really doing right now is this is really the concept and we want to know what we're up against with the council first, the commission first, and then the city council, and then see, "Okay." Then where do we go from here? If we don't involve you and get your input, we're stupid.

Rick Barchers – I can appreciate that, really can. One of the things that is really coming to mind on this is you're saying it's comparable, and that's okay. I mean, a big part of the reason we went with lower density on this other one being accepted was the amount of percentage wise of this property being donated to the city in the form of a continuous park.

Paul Linford – This is my design on both of these. In talking to the other developer, we want to combine as much of the parks and as much as everything else. What we really did on this was that I just wanted to come to you first and see, is it baseball diamonds you want or is it more soccer fields that you want?

Rick Barchers – That would kind of be up to the city and some other folks. I mean apparently pickleball's a big thing.

Paul Linford – That's one thing I didn't put in then we do have four pickleball courts on this one and then another four on the other one, and we probably put more in. I was up by Brighton High School the other day and watching a niece's soccer game and they had eight pickleball courts on Saturday afternoon, and there were people waiting in line. It was just amazing to me.

Jaime Topham – So on May 10th, we're meeting with city council through a working meeting. We'll be talking about those kinds of, "What do we want to see in the ADU, what kind of amenities?" We'll be able to give better information after that.

Rick Barchers – One of the things that I'm seeing right off the bat is this comparative number of town homes almost seems to be doubled. The things that we're going to get into on this are going to be the same as the other one, parking. Because you have a significantly greater number of town homes on this one, parking is going to quickly become an issue. I think we talked about that on the first one, and you guys did some amenities there, kind of moved things around, and got some extra parking.

Paul Linford – We've tried to do that here. If you look at the ends on some of these, and our goal right now is that we'll have at least four parking spots for every town home, plus guests will be over and above that of, I think it's one or two for every 10.

Rick Barchers – I mean, for me, and maybe different municipalities look at things differently, but parking's really a safety issue, honestly.

Paul Linford – It really is, and we concur.

Rick Barchers – I am seeing that some of these lot sizes are bigger in the orange area than they were in the first one, and smaller on the third acre lots. I'm just saying as long as it looks like the city gets the same donation in lands and parks comparatively, and the number of units that you increase is comparative per acre, then I don't have any big objections.

Kevin Hall – I spent three hours today reading and studying because I'm new to this body. Not necessarily new to city process because I spent some time here a few years ago on the term on city council, so I refreshed myself with the general plan. I read comments, public comments. I read the outlook for Grantsville. For me, when I look at these things, and this isn't the only one, everything that I've seen almost since I've been here is high density. I just personally, again, I know that we need a mix of things in Grantsville, but based on the general plan, public input, small town feel, all of those kinds of things, I just can't see where these lend themselves to that idea. I don't see how they match to the homes that are to the farther north

Personally, if we're going to do that kind of stuff way back when, I suggested because the big argument was whether to have horse property or not 20 years ago. Not everybody needs a horse. Not everybody needs one acre, and I recognize that. In my mind, if we're going to build a small-town feel, it needs to be rural. I think there needs to be a better combination, at least where we match to some things that are already here. My concern is that Grantsville is going to break open. Well it's already broke open, but soon it's going to burst. We all know that. I don't think that's a secret to anyone. My concern is that if this is all we're going to create, we are setting the tone for the future of our community because is it not a fact that the more units you can put, the more money a developer makes?

Paul Linford – Well, it is when you are not giving 30% of the land away to the city. In other words, if we were to do what the city requires right now, of course, we'd be half-acre lots. One of the biggest issues right now, in my opinion of course, the city has right now is irrigation. What are you going to do with half-acre lots when, especially on the west side of town? You have to use culinary water.

Kevin Hall – No. I'm not saying that we have to have half-acre lots.

Paul Linford – The reason why we came up with this was because it is a very central area that's got a lot of open space. It's got a lot of amenities to it. If you look at the rest of the West Bank. You'll notice that they're mostly all the half-acre lots. It's just the stuff right here, and then in a couple other places in the city. There's probably not a house around here that your children can afford now on the half-acre lots with the bigger homes. This would allow some kids to be able to get a chance to get in. Also, it will be xeriscape, and we've talked about this before.

The front yards will have to be xeriscape, so we don't use the water that we've been using in the past. Also, a problem that I brought up before is in the west side, I hope I'm not offending anybody, but

most of the neighbors there, there's only 30% of all those homes have any green at all in the backyard, according to Google Earth, and no more than 50% in the front yard. The reason for that is, in my opinion, it's really expensive when you have a half-acre lot and you're trying to irrigate that with culinary water. It's really a problem. Now that's just my pet peeve I just was able to get that in.

Kevin Hall – My point is I would like to see a mix of to reflect that we're not going to build everything high density just because it has a park there. Right? Because I think it should mix with the rural feel of Grantsville.

Paul Linford – Well, luckily, I agree with you. Tell me if I'm wrong. On plans right now, most everything around this is larger lots, in fact. Is it not? I mean, most of it is half acre lots. That is what's being proposed.

Kevin Hall – My point is, that these aren't. Then Guy Haskell, if we do this, is going to connect onto that, and then the next guy's going to connect onto it all because our kids can't afford it?

Paul Linford – What we've done here is a concept. We went and talked to the mayor. We went and talked to people about they wanted. As long as we were going to give enough open space, as long as we were going to put the parks in, and we were going to do the ball diamonds, and the soccer fields, and all the other things they're good with it.

Derek Dalton – Everybody asks, "What do you want?" Green space, green space, ball fields. We get people come here all the time. It's a great concept. It's a lot better than some of the ones I've seen come through here. My concern is we're going to have 10,000 pickleball courts, million acres of green space that Grantsville City's not going to be able to take care of soon. I have to echo what Kevin said. I'd rather have bigger lots where people take care of that open space than having used our resources for all of this.

Kevin Hall – Jesse, can I just ask you a question? I'm not sure you can answer this, but I was curious about this today when I studied. Can you tell me what the projected income is from the new tax that was just voted in, the one that we're going to use for parks and rec.

Jesse Wilson – So just the projections we have right now is about \$100,000 to 150,000.

Kevin Hall – In my opinion, I would like to see us work with the developer and spend that \$150,000 and create more of a mix of things in Grantsville. Not give up all the codes and the things with the roads and all those things. Spend that money and combine with that so that the developer can make his money. The city comes out a winner. The citizens come out a winner. That's what I think as I made the general plan. We're looking for is to keep a small-town feel. I know we need some of it. I'm not opposed to some of it.

Paul Linford – I think that when you look at the overall West Bank plan, you'll see that there's not densities like there is here. The reason why we put the densities here, and again, talking to some of the political people that maybe aren't in this room right now, is that if we gave enough, and if we made it open enough it would work. I am now to the point where if I had a half-acre lot in Grantsville, it would probably look pretty ugly. I got a bad hip and it would probably not be very good-looking. All I'm suggesting is a lot of people don't want to have to take care of that yard. We are trying very hard, especially with the new laws that are being passed with water. Half-acre lots are going to be a lot more difficult just to even have them because of water.

Now, we've handled that here, and with the other south one, because we're going to restrict, or the HOA is, the amount of lawn, for instance, that you can put in your front yard and your backyard. Now, that's big brother, but I tell you right now, we're not planning any more water in Grantsville. It's tough right now.

Rick Barchers – I will give you my opinion on that and you may not like it. I have water for my house. We've got developments going in with half-acre lots right now, and they're happy. They don't have any problem. Bear with me, my friend. I know you got a rebuttal coming. That's fine. When a person goes to develop a property, water is an issue, and they should know that. I mean, it's not our job to make up for a lack of water. Our job to be accommodating, and we've addressed that with the xeriscape concept, and some of our city staff work very hard on that. At the same time, I'm hearing exactly what you're saying here, uneven development is not something that we want to start seeing because pretty much everything that's coming in now is stuff like this. That's fine, but right now, this is zoned for a half acre. Weighing all those things in mind, we did pass the one just to the south of it. There were conditions and reasons, et cetera, et cetera.

Paul Linford – That's why we're here on this. Okay? I mean that sincerely.

Rick Barchers – I hear you. I think you do, too, and one other concern that I'm seeing here, what are the width of these roads?

Paul Linford – They're the new state standard.

Rick Barchers – Okay. Does our code address safety issues as far as the new state standard? Because if the new state standard is 55, part of our parking rules, which are public safety issues, part of those parking accommodation rules are aimed at having a wider street, so if we go to an even narrower street, we're going to have to adjust our parking to address that if you ask me.

Brett Coombs – Madam Chair, can I respond? The new state standard is 32 feet asphalt, and that's for any residential cross section of street. It can't be any wider than that. There's no exceptions, and so if it's a collector street or an arterial, then we can have exceptions, if it's a boulevard, but for any just residential cross section, the max that you can do is 32 feet of asphalt.

Dan England – That 32 feet would be about 12 feet for each travel lane, plus four feet for parking, and then you can have concrete curbing that are outside that, so you might get six foot if you have a two-foot gutter pan on each side.

Rick Barchers – So it'll change our parking requirements, essentially.

Dan England – Yeah. One of the things that it says in the code, because I was pulling it up just today, is that also, if parking is an issue, then that's something you can require wider streets for.

Derek Dalton – What's Worthington at the newer part? Not the old Worthington, but where you keep going up the street to the newer subdivision, like Rancho and that, what are those roads?

Gary Pinkham – It's collector.

Derek Dalton – What's the width? Do you know?

Dan England – Yeah. The width coming up there near the school?

Kevin Hall – Well, at the top of Worthington there, where you go past that subdivision right before Durfee Street

Dan England – That one's a collector that's going to be 90-foot wide is the area that it's supposed to end up.

Derek Dalton – I'm talking about on the north side. Where we put that new four-way stop right there. That and then that other subdivision, all those roads, what are they?

Gary Pinkham – All those are 42-foot curb face to curb face. What the state is proposing is roughly 10 feet less than that, or one side of the street parking only.

Rick Barchers – What are you planning on setbacks on these?

Paul Linford – We were just trying to get the concept in, but it would fall in line with other PUDs in this area, and in others. We have to have at least a 20-foot driveway that's a minimum. That's not counting the sidewalk and the curb and gutter, so you got to have at least 20 feet just for that alone.

Rick Barchers – Do you see where I'm going with parking? It quickly becomes an issue.

Paul Linford – I don't want to ruffle any feathers, but if you go out and you look at what you have now, you've got some pretty big streets. Even if you park on both sides of those streets, you still have plenty for cars to go by each other and things like, that's all I'm suggesting. Now, you tell me what you want and I'll try to give it to you, how's that?

Rick Barchers – That's fine. For me, parking's a huge safety issue. It's kind of a big deal, and I don't know why that didn't just jump right out at me, right off bat. I don't know why, but now I'm really looking at this going, "Gosh, these streets down here look like they're twice as wide," and we were having parking issues with some of the lots' widths there, et cetera.

Paul Linford – Well, again, we went to the new code. Okay? If it meant the difference between you saying yes and no, and you told us that because of parking, we had to be the old thing. We'll do the old thing. That's not an issue. We just did it. This is so conceptual that it's really a blank sheet.

Rick Barchers – The only reason I'm bringing this stuff up is this. I don't want you to have to come in here a hundred times.

Paul Linford – Well, neither do I, this is not hostile at all and this is great, and so I'm just happy to be here.

Jaime Topham – If I'm looking at the West Bank plan, which is not approved yet and still has a long way to go. If I'm looking at it in your area, there's some light blue and some dark blue, and I think I recall those being churches, and schools businesses, public facilities. I don't see any of that kind of thought out in this plan, either of these two plans. Is there room for adding that? I mean, if we've got this whole West Bank study that's saying, "We really need to have that in the area."

Paul Linford – Well, both the church and the school district have property to the further west, just right by this, further west on Main Street. We actually approached the church to see if they wanted us to give property. They said, “We’re okay.” Schools? Yeah, we’d love to sell some property to schools. That’s not an issue.

Jaime Topham – Well, I guess that’s where my issue comes from. You keep kind referencing what’s going to happen with this West Bank study. Which it’s not passed and you are not quite following that either.

Paul Linford – Well, I think that if you look at the West Bank Study and what they were going to bring to you, that this is in that bed now.

Jaime Topham – See, there’s those little blue spots in that upper top corner. Mack Canyon’s the one that makes a little jog, right?

Paul Linford – Yes, that’s the newest thing.

Jaime Topham – So then there’s the little blue spots. I know this proposed, but there’s no room in this for that proposal.

Paul Linford – There’s plenty of room honestly. It’s just you got to tell me where you want it and what you want to put there.

Jaime Topham – If you then put something there, are you going to then want more density?

Paul Linford – No. No, I think we’re maxed out what we want to be on this as far as the units per acre.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Paul Linford – On a normal church, we have to go three to four acres. We’re not going to be able to put any home there. We’ll have less lots, but we’ll also get compensated by the church when they buy the property or we give it to them. You can only do so much. Okay?

Jaime Topham – Jesse, you said earlier we don’t want to take care of it, but I think I wasn’t quite paying attention. What did you mean? Was that the little green spots?

Jesse Wilson – Yeah, the smaller ones.

Jaime Topham – Those little tiny green blobs?

Jesse Wilson – The detention basins.

Jaime Topham – The detention basins? But the area in between the detention basins where it’s running along that natural ravine, are we taking care of them? So, all of that would be HOA? All the green would be HOA.

Paul Linford – We would be willing to work with however you want to do it. How’s that?

Jaime Topham – Well, that's what I'm asking.

Paul Linford – Well yeah, I'm just saying if they come to us and say, "We'd like the HOA to take care of that," we would surely look at that.

Jaime Topham – So Jesse, do you recall on the other one what we said that we were willing to do? I don't think the other one ... Has it been approved? It hasn't come through yet.

Jesse Wilson – It's just been concept as well.

Jaime Topham – Okay, but were we willing to take all that green in the other plan? I don't recall.

Jesse Wilson – I believe we were, just because of the vastness of the space that was there.

Jaime Topham – So what's the difference between this and then the other section? Why wouldn't we want to ...

Jesse Wilson – Well, the larger green on the other section we would want to take care of, but not the smaller areas and not the detention basins.

Jaime Topham – Okay, but there's that huge pathway, I'm just trying to understand that, that whole thing considered the detention basin? Is it just at the bottom where it says detention basin?

Jesse Wilson – It'd just be that north side.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Rick Barchers – Isn't that part of the natural wash though, down through there? The city going to want to take care of that, Jesse?

Jesse Wilson – We clean out the washes so that they stay clean so the water will flow. We do that already.

Rick Barchers – Okay.

Jaime Topham – I like there's variety. I'm not sure if I like all the density, but the trail head that you have, that's really nice. Who owns that? Who's responsible for it? The trail head parking.

Paul Linford – My answer is yes. In other words, it's going to be done by somebody and you're saying we don't want to do it. I think what's going to end up having to happen is the HOA going to have to take care of it. Now the question is, is you want the HOA to take care of it or do you want control over it?

Jaime Topham – If the HOA takes care of it, are they going to allow public access so that it really is a trail head parking?

Paul Linford – Well, I guess that's all what you require us to put in our development agreement.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Kevin Hall – Hey, I have a question, Jamie, about HOAs.

Jaime Topham – Absolutely.

Kevin Hall – Can you refresh my memory about how well those are working today? Because in Grantsville, I know of several that are absolutely dysfunctional. The reason I say that is the only one that I'm really aware of that functions well is South Willow Estates. The reason that it services well is because there's water attached to it and everybody's affected by that. Palomino Ranch that home owner's association's defunct. My concern about HOAs, has that changed in my day where anybody can enlighten me saying they're working well? My experience, if there isn't some legal thing, I know in Palomino Ranch they all fought amongst each other and didn't agree with who was going to be the president and all those crazy things. Well, who now maintains all that? Who's taken care of those things that the HOA committed to take care of?

Paul Linford – Well I have done probably 15 to 20 HOAs. I'll be honest with you, I haven't had a problem with them. I'm not saying I won't.

Kevin Hall – Can you explain to me, because I'm curious, how the governing body works.

Paul Linford – It is elected. Up until the 50% of the property is sold, the developer has a lot of control on that to make sure everything functions correctly. Of course, they're not going to want to be selling a new part of the subdivision and the old thing's got weeds and everything else in it. That's one of the reasons why that's there. When you have a very large lot, and I don't know what Palomino, I don't know you're talking about.

Kevin Hall – They're larger lots, all of them, for sure.

Paul Linford – You got kind of an issue. You don't have to worry about where your child is going to go play the playground on your half acre lot. Here, if you've got a family of five, you got to have a place for your kids to go play because these lots are smaller and everything else. Well that makes a big difference on how they vote and how they feel about it. On the south side of this where the splash pad is, the city could come in and demand, I know it's legal and we can talk to your attorney here. It's all a matter of discussion of whether you can force that to be done. It has been done in Sandy, it has been done in Draper, it's been done in Western South Jordan where they've come in and said, "You have to do what you contracted in the development for you to do." It has not been bad.

Kevin Hall – So can I ask you that ... I'm looking for another thing I guess and that, is there a legal document Attorney Coombs or Paul, that ensures that the HOA stays intact once you're gone? That's question I'm trying to ask. Do you enforce that or to see that, that carries on?

Paul Linford – Hey Brett, are you there? Brett? Hello?

Brett Coombs – I'm here. Sorry, took me a second to get the button.

Paul Linford – Is there anything in the HOA that we have to put in so that the city can come in and say, "You're not doing it and so we need to make you do it?"

Brett Coombs – Yeah, so the city, we can require that the HOA maintain whatever it is we want them to maintain, and we can also have a requirement in there that they can't disband without the city's approval.

Kevin Hall – And can that be part of the development agreement?

Brett Coombs – Yep. Yeah, so that's where we would put it in and then I would work with Mr. Linford and his team on their CCNRs to make sure that it's included in there as well.

Kevin Hall – And Jesse, are we prepared as a city to enforce that, I guess?

Jesse Wilson – So, mayor's been texting me and he said the one HOA that did fold is they didn't have a development agreement in place.

Kevin Hall – And is that Palomino?

Jesse Wilson – I think so. So I think that's one thing that we need to make sure that we do. And that way we can put that in those documents of what needs to be done.

Kevin Hall – So the rest of them are functional, then?

Jesse Wilson – No.

Rick Barchers – Kind of like your family, you know how all family's kind of dysfunctional.

Kevin Hall – That's my concern because when you look at the magnitude of these things, right?

Paul Linford – I have three of my children that are in HOAs.

Kevin Hall – Right, and if they by some chance, Palomino Ranch is one thing, but this is a huge development and if it goes defunct, the city takes on a whole lot of responsibility there, would they not?

Paul Linford – In the bylaws and in what you're requiring us to do in our development agreement, there should be. The ones I've done before, there are teeth there that allows a city to come in and to do it differently. There's a big difference in communities like Daybreak, It's a lot different in Daybreak, and in West Jordan, and in Draper and in Riverton for an HOA. Very few of those ever go under. The reason being, the people actually need the help of the HOA to keep everything nice, to keep everything going. It sounds to me like what happened out west there in Palomino was probably that people just didn't want to be told what to do. Well one thing about this is, is when they come in and they buy the house, they sign agreements saying that they understand what they're going to have to do and they legally have to agree to do it.

I know for a fact that my daughter just was told by Daybreak to remove the new shrub they put in the front yard because it wasn't approved. They removed it because if they didn't, there was a per day fine. Now I thought that was overboard. That got me a little bit riled up, but it's the way their legal documents are worded.

Kevin Hall – I listen to Dave sometimes in the morning on Dave and Deb. I've heard all of his situation with home owners associations.

Paul Linford – I'll be honest with you now being 70 and having a half acre, actually six tenths of an acre lot. In fact, before I came here, I was out fixing sprinklers. I'm really looking right now pretty forward to going someday to go to a HOA so that they take care of my sprinkler system.

Kevin Hall – I'm with you. I'm 68 and I live on 12 acres at my place.

Paul Linford – My heart goes out to you sincerely.

Jaime Topham – But you get to do whatever you want on your 12 acres.

Rick Barchers – You said your peace, Kevin? You're good?

Kevin Hall – Yeah, I'm good. I think I voiced my concerned I think.

Paul Linford – We're not asking for any answer tonight, we just wanted input. I appreciate it and I'm loud but I really sincerely appreciate what you guys do. I hope you know that with what I'm doing here, we're looking at this as a two-way street. Not only that, but I really like the people in Grantsville. There is an economic situation, of course, but we believe very strongly that this could work. Not only work, but it would increase the ability for people to be able to have a home and be able to not use a lot of water in the yards and to be able to not have to have campers sitting in front of their garages because they don't have a place to park them on the side. There's a lot of this stuff that we were trying to work out. I hope we've done a pretty good job of it. If we haven't, that's what you guys are here for. So, tell us what we did wrong.

Jaime Topham – Well, and I appreciate the thought of moving the diamonds down to by the park and the RV and making that all congruent.

Paul Linford – When I say this is open, it is completely open. The only thing I can't do anything about is the drainage where it comes down through right now. Other than that, there's a lot of commercial, just for your information on the Haskell property to the north of us, northwest. Would we be willing to put commercial up on our there off a highway? I don't know why we wouldn't. It's worth more.

Jaime Topham – Well this is zoned MU, right?

Paul Linford – No.

Shay Stark – I don't think anything on here is right now.

Paul Linford – I have taken way too much time and I'm sorry.

Shay Stark – Your future land use, I believe says it's commercial. You have some out there by the highway that can be re-zoned to an MU or a commercial.

Rick Barchers – Yeah, there's like a little skinny strip around the plots that could go from you. But was that tape brown area? I know what you're talking about.

Jaime Topham – Yeah, that was MU on our half. That was all MU. The new one you just put together for us was said that, that was in MU Brown. Now I can't find it, of course. Got too many windows open.

Shay Stark – That zoning map that we approved at the last planning commission meeting-

Jaime Topham – That one. See look, it's brown.

Rick Barchers – Where's Mack Canyon?

Shay Stark – His property is right here.

Jaime Topham – Our master plan future line use that's currently in place since the West Bank is.

Shay Stark – This property is this piece here. Down along the frontage there, is it like 400 feet back I believe is MU. Then there's this high-density buffer before we go back into the low density residential on the future land use map.

Jaime Topham – And what you're proposing falls within medium density?

Paul Linford – Yes.

Jaime Topham – Well the new medium density.

Paul Linford – Now I just guess is the medium density yellow. I'm colorblind.

Shay Stark – No, the medium density is brown. Yours is yellow, yours right now on the future land use map, is shown as low density. But again, the West Bank master plan different. If that gets adopted, that whole side changes.

Paul Linford – May I tell you thank you. I'm sorry to have taken 50 minutes. I thought it'd be 10 minutes, but I talk way too much. My wife won't even discuss things with me after 8:00 at night.

2. Discussion of MU (Mixed Use) zoning definition

Shay Stark from Aqua Engineering was present for this item.

Shay Stark – I made the changes that we discussed in the work session. Those were the green and red. Then I have a few comments in blue on discussion of some of these issues. It looks like I've kind of moved things around here since then. In the middle of the night things come to my mind are that, and I make additional notes, but anyway this is fine. The key is we made the changes that were requested. Can we flip back just for a minute to that future land use plan?

Our goal here with this mixed use, you'll see in the language that residential is subordinate to commercial. Our goal here is to try to create a commercial core. I just want to bring this up. I'm not saying that this is a problem with the code or what's being proposed here in the code. But what I'm going to talk about right now is something I think that if this code passes the way it is, we need to take another step. The really neat thing is, I think some of the research on the West Side Master Plan

actually gives us some of the answers that we need to take this next step. If you look at this map, and I'm just going to point at it because I can't see that green pointer on here at all.

We have this whole very long area that's mixed use, and then of course further down on SR112, we have Desert Commons. We have mixed down in there. Our goal, if I understand correctly, the real hope is that we can create a downtown corridor. We don't want businesses spread from the Flux exit, and have little patches of businesses all the way to the east boundary of SR138 and SR112. We'd like to have an actual commercial core that we're working from. We can have some other pockets of businesses, but that's really the key.

What we're asking for in this code is, we're saying, "Okay, we would like 50% of your land that is zoned MU to be commercial. In my comment all I'm saying right now, if you look at the zoning here, we have very little that's MU that's in there. I might work out just fine.

Jaime Topham – You mean it's actually been re-zoned.

Shay Stark – That's actually been re-zoned as MU.

Rick Barchers – So what's your concern?

Shay Stark – That's what I want to get to here. As we start to look at this, if we adopt this concept, if we want 50% of the property to be commercial, which again, I don't have a problem with that. But we may want to look at this again based on the information we get from the West Side Master Plan. The timing of this is perfect because right now the city is going through a downtown Main Street master plan. We may want to look at it and say, "Do we want to modify the future land use map and maybe cut back and focus more in this core area with MU for right now?" Then maybe cut some of this other out of there and see if we can cause that commercial development and the MU development to stay right in that downtown core.

Kevin Hall – Makes sense to me.

Rick Barchers – So your concern's not necessarily the Main Street area, it's this portion going up towards Flux, is that what you're saying?

Shay Stark – Yes, and just as it expands out. We approved MU over here. I don't know where they're at because I see for sale signs on all this property as you go along further to the northwest out along SR138. If you have people there that were looking at that Desert Edge going, "If this goes in, this is the same model I want to use all the way out through here." Of course, Desert Edge is more residential, which is with just the one noted commercial at the end of it. I'm just pointing this out.

Jaime Topham – That was one of the concerns though is that when that originally came in front of us, they were talking about a truck stop, and hotels and heavier on commercial and lighter on residential. That's not what we ended up with. I think that's what we're looking to fix. I get what you're saying about do we want to pull it in. But along that Flux area right past Main Street as you're heading out of town, you've got a lot of commercial and industrial uses there.

Shay Stark – I guess all I'm saying is, we may have the tools here to be able to look at it and say, "Okay, Grantsville at certain sizes of population will be able to support X amount of commercial." And maybe reign that into think about it, and look at our overall plan and maybe we reign that in and

focus on the downtown area. Then in the future, at some future point, then you allow that to expand out.

Kevin Hall – Can't we do that by case by case, because it seems to me like if you encapsulate that, if something came there that was applicable, say an install plant or whatever it is, then maybe it's appropriate to look at that, right? But maybe there's some businesses if we're going to create a core downtown, that we'd look at those on an individual basis so that we could create that core downtown.

Jaime Topham – Yeah, the problem is though, especially with what we have in MU now, because everything that's MU, they're putting lots of residential and a token commercial, and that wasn't the purpose of the MU.

Kevin Hall – I know, but that's what I'm saying too is that if you do away with that.

Jaime Topham – With MU, then what do you do it instead?

Kevin Hall – Well, whatever it's zoned to start with.

Jaime Topham – Well but then it's not zone commercial.

Rick Barchers – Are we conflating two different issues? Because you're just really talking about this area going out towards Flux. If someone came in with something that was just absolutely dynamite, almost blowing our socks off, I don't think we're going to turn it down to being as a PUD or something that

Kevin Hall – But again, isn't it currently proposed to be MU?

Jaime Topham – That's the master plan, yeah.

Kevin Hall – And again, doesn't that give or allow the opportunity for people to say, "Well I'm going to do all this commercial and then turn around and do no commercial and residential." If it wasn't that, doesn't it slow that process or stop that if it isn't designated?

Jaime Topham – Yes, but what would we call it instead? What would we designate it instead of MU?

Kevin Hall – What is it now?

Jaime Topham – So that area is, let's see, the green along there, half acre lots. What's MD? Can't remember. Medium density. It'll be like RM7.

Kevin Hall – But we got to get out further on that map, right? Because we're not out where you're talking about where Flux is.

Rick Barchers – It's a same area basically.

Kevin Hall – It is?

Shay Stark – Well generally going out that direction. All I'm saying is I like what's being proposed in this code. I'm just saying that I see this time and time again every community would love to have just a massive amount of commercial. But the reality is not everybody can have a massive amount of commercial. You run the risk of, if you've opened yourself up for miles and miles that you could potentially have commercial. You're not going to get the core that you're really looking for.

Rick Barchers – So you're talking about basically changing the master plan?

Shay Stark – All I'm saying is, if we adopt this, maybe the next step is just to look into the Master Plan. I don't know, maybe there will be enough. When you look at a build out of 95,000 people, maybe there will be enough. I just think we have some of the tools in front of us with that West Bank master plan. They seem to be modeling and studying that on that side to determine how much commercial fits that future population. It might be useful just to take those numbers, apply it generally across the city and just say, "Okay, are we setting ourselves up for this situation where we may not get the core that we're really looking for, that we're just going to have sprawled commercial along here and lots of pockets of residential in between?"

Jaime Topham – So that MU doesn't on our future land use map, as it currently exists, that MU stops at the boundary of Walmart.

Rick Barchers – They can build it like it is now. They don't have to go MU.

Jaime Topham – No, that's true.

Shay Stark – Like I said, there's really not a lot of land right now that's actually physically zoned MU.

Jaime Topham – Right. The point is, and the reason we're looking at this, like you've brought up several times, is that all of the stuff that's planned for MU, what the intention originally was, was to create commercial with some residential, but that's not what we're seeing. We're seeing residential with an afterthought of commercial. We want to stop that. If we change the definition to put in 50%, they can choose not to rezone to the MU, they can choose whatever their zoning district already is.

Rick Barchers – Yeah, and that leads to step stone to what he's talking about, which I agree with 100%.

Jaime Topham – Right, but I don't know that because that MU doesn't go that far out of town, I don't know that we really need to redo the Future Land Use map. Especially since the West Bank covers a whole lot of that. Then going the other direction, the MU just stops at that one development and there isn't anything beyond it because all of that's the Planning District, master planning district or something, right? I don't know that we necessarily need to change what our future land use looks like with the MU, but we absolutely need to change our definitions of what you can do in the MU. I really like your word subordinate confidential.

Rick Barchers – Right. No, I like it. I think we're all talking about the same thing just in like I'm speaking Chinese. Chinese and he's speaking Mandarin. I think we're all kind of on the same page really.

Jaime Topham – Realistically, all of the big parcels that are under MU are more in a downtown district anyway. The only thing that's not is Todd Castagno's place that he was trying to, Alington. That's the only one that, other than the Matthews area, that's the only real large parcel property that falls under that. Everything else is fairly small chunks.

Shay Stark – If we jump down to three. I had that question about; do we still want density noted in the language? We're totally removing that. So as staff, as we were looking at this and talking about the very last sentence in three, "Where surrounding uses are compatible, the mixed-use development may allow residential uses up to 10 units per acre." We're just striking that.

Rick Barchers – I got a Gary question on that. You think that's going to get us into trouble with them pushing density like on apartment buildings if it was to come into play? Okay, good. Because they still got to meet the parking requirements, so it's going to keep it even Steven. Okay, good. Thank you.

Shay Stark – Okay. Then the next, I'll jump down just a little bit further. The next item that I wanted to bring up with this is in that West Side Master Plan presentation, they provided this information. What this is, is Psomas has done work in a lot of different cities. They've done a lot of master planning. In each city, they've kind of taken the same step that they did here in Grantsville. They basically characterized all the land and looked at lot sizes, looked at the different types of uses. They have this huge database of information from all these communities. They try to keep that updated. From that, they came up with this, there was a sheet there that was showing a lot of different information. I just took this little piece off of it. These are, for instance, in the detached, these are the average square feet for these different types of lots. With the attached, the average square feet per unit that they're seeing in lots of different cities, and Grantsville is included in that model at this point now.

I'm just bringing this up because we, in our MU zone, we talked about the single-family lots and a minimum of 4000 square feet on those, and then beyond that, we don't break it out very much beyond that. We jump to Chapter 4.34, where we put some additional requirements because we thought MU was weak in that. But even there, we're just talking about multi-unit housing, and quite honestly, we're stating in there that a townhouse needs to have a minimum of 4000 square foot lot. A unit in an apartment or condo, based on that, would need to have a minimum of 4000 square feet associated with it, which is isn't reasonable and it's not realistic. At the time we were doing that, I think we failed to look at the different types of multiuse. I feel like we need to spell this out just a little bit in here. It doesn't have to be the numbers that these guys have come up with. In fact, I was looking at it and I was thinking on townhomes, twin-homes, that type, they're showing 1800 square feet, 1500 square feet. Maybe 2000 square feet fits better for Grantsville.

We have in our discussion, with detached ADU, it's a minimum of 900 square feet for a detached ADU, is 900 square feet a good size for an apartment or a condo as a minimum requirement? Because one of the things we're doing here, again, moving away from density, is we're saying, "You need to meet our minimum square footage requirements, our lot size requirements in that, and however you arrange those to be able to meet that, and if you meet that, if you can get 15 units in there, we don't care because it met the code. If you can only get six units in there because of the way you laid it out, so be it. That's up to you." I think we need to spell it out a little more clearly so that at least they can see at least three different uses there. Again, we have the single-family, something for townhouses, twin-homes, that type of use, and then condos and apartments.

Rick Barchers – Are you going to tie this to that study that they're doing on the West Bank, Right?

Shay Stark – Yes. That's what this is right here.

Rick Barchers – This is one of my concerns, because that study that they're doing, some of their definitions are like apples and oranges to our stuff. It's really confusing for anyone to look at, to be honest. I like what you're saying there, I really do. Define it by lot size instead of density, I think that's golden, because into that it's figured parking and street width and all that stuff goes right along with it.

Shay Stark – Yeah, exactly. That affects what they can put on there.

Rick Barchers – Okay.

Jaime Topham – All right. I like your proposals and the sizes. I don't have any idea what any of that translates into reality. You guys are the experts. I would follow those recommendations. I agree with either 800 or 900 square feet for the apartment sizes. Originally, we were talking about with external use, between 800 and 400, so 800, that's our minimum. What did we say on in the internal? I don't remember.

Shay Stark – I'll have to look at that and see. I can't remember off the top of my head. It may have been 900.

Jaime Topham – Okay. I think that sounds reasonable. So, a minimum square foot for an apartment unit would be 900 rather than the 600 there.

Rick Barchers – What did the mayor say, the minimum square footage for an apartment is 900, or am I crazy? I am crazy.

Jaime Topham – I don't know that he said that.

Gary Pinkham – You have to have parking. Two cars, 20 X 25 is 500 square feet. That only leaves you 200 square feet for the apartment unit. You have to have a little room around the building. As Shay and I were talking the other day it's 600 square feet per unit, that's 73 units per acre. It's 150 cars.

Shay Stark – I think that's a great point, and maybe what we have is the area for an apartment is 2000 square feet, but then the minimum apartment size is 900 square feet or something like that. Or maybe it's 1000 square feet and the minimum apartment size is 900 square feet.

Jaime Topham – On the mixed use, are we ready to make that an action item? Is there still some work to be done?

Shay Stark – Well, I think we need to put together some language for this part. Everything else that was in here was based on our previous discussion, but then, as we had that discussion, Gary brought up that we need to go into these other zones, RM-7 and RM-15, and take out that maximum density out of there, because, again, we're going to be using the lot sizes as the driving force there, RM-15. The other one is in 4.34, because we talked about that. Which we would pull that.

Jaime Topham – It's like 2, the subject to maximum of number of units permitted in the other section, maximum would be 15.

Shay Stark – Yeah, and we would just get rid of 2.

Jaime Topham – Yeah. But that led into a conversation of 2.1, somewhat interestingly, about the minimum lot size being 7000 square feet for the first unit and then additional 4000. You're saying that that's not reasonable, that's a lot?

Shay Stark – Well, for single-family homes, the issue is, and I wish I would have brought it tonight, I utilized this information from the RM-7 zone back in January. We had a discussion with staff. I put together just a theoretical 800-foot long street, and went in with twin-homes on that 800-foot-long street, and I used this requirement. Then I also looked at it, which I didn't have that drawn up, but it was easy mathematically just to look at it because I knew what the overall area was and how much was removed by the street, and just looked at the number of single-family lots that would be allowed. Well, the code is the same for both, essentially. You would have just slightly fewer single-family lots than you had twin-homes. I have forgotten that number. The townhomes was 5.34 units per acre in the RM-7 zone, and the number of lots was 3.0 something units per acre. The difference is you don't get the 6000 square foot lot after the first 7000 square foot lot, and both of them require the two 10,000 square foot lots on the corners. In the single-family homes, you've got two 10,000 square foot lots and then all 7000 square lots interior. Townhomes, 10,000 square foot lots, one 7000 square foot lot and all the rest of them are 6000 square feet. That's the challenge with it, that's the issue.

Jaime Topham – So what would the suggestion be?

Shay Stark – I suggested on townhomes, 2000 square feet.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Shay Stark – But at the same time, one of the issues that we're dealing with is we have, on the ends, we need to be able to keep that 30-foot side triangle. To maintain that 30-foot triangle, I had suggested that we add an extra 1000 square feet on the ends, but Gary simplified that when we had the discussion. This isn't in your notes, but he basically said, "Let's just require a 25-foot side yard on those," and so that forces it and then they can work it out however they need to.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Rick Barchers – How do these new skinny streets play into that? Because part of the equation that you're talking about is relative to parking, right? Is that going to be a factor at all?

Shay Stark – Correct, and we need to discuss parking.

Rick Barchers – All right.

Shay Stark – We're in 4.34, we've given them a certain number of parking stalls per unit. I think the reason we did that was because we assumed, from what we were seeing coming in, none of the townhomes, because their driveways are so close together, they can't park on the street anyway. With the townhomes and even smaller single-family lots, I think what the change is going to be, is we're going to need to apply that across the board and not just to the townhomes or the apartments.

Jaime Topham – So what do we need to do to get these all congruent so that we can get this in front of us the next time we meet so we can get this onto City Council.

Shay Stark – If you're okay with the sizes that I have in there, proposed, tell me what you want to see there and I'll make the changes.

Jaime Topham – You tell us what should be there, because I've not expertise in that.

Dan England – I think a detail might help. If we use those, I liked the areas that you're using, but I'd like to have a sample detailed what that lays out so we can see how the parking and how the lot sizes and things help.

Jaime Topham – My concern is they want the MUs fixed soon, because I think I heard that there's lots of MU things coming down the pipeline and they want it fixed.

Rick Barchers – Yeah, on that point, what could we do now and then fix that later?

Jaime Topham – Well, so I think what you said is we've got to fix... Because one tells them what they can actually do, and the 19 says, "This is what your density," well, not density, but this is what you can do, this is your minimum square lots," but then we're looking at multifamily homes, they come to 4.34 and it's not quite correct, so we need to get that fixed too. Shay, can you update all of that and have that for our next meeting and we can put it on for public comment?

Rick Barchers – Gary, do you have any feelings about those minimum lot sizes that would be expressed different?

Gary Pinkham – Oh, I've got lots of feeling on it.

Jaime Topham – In a very short answer, because we need to take a break.

Gary Pinkham – Shane and I were talking the other day, like you say, if you look at an apartment, condo or townhome, basically they're all the same thing. The only difference is who owns it. The concern I have in the front is if it's a two-car driveway, you're going to use up at least 20 or 22 feet, not counting flares if they've got them. If we don't bury the water meter under the code, they need to be, probably, a minimum of 25 to 28 feet width on the lot. The 25-foot setback so you get the vehicle off the sidewalk, you're looking at somewhere around 600 square feet just for the driveway and front yard. I think the code says that we have to have a minimum of 900 square feet per residence. If they put that on two levels, that's 450 feet per level. We're now up to over 1000 square feet.

Now, if you have room in the back, there are several things you would need to consider, number one, under multiunit code requires a minimum of 30 feet of separation between building units. That would be, if you split it, that's another 15 feet in the back. Again, 15 X 30 is 450. We're pushing that 1500 or 1600 square feet per unit as a bare minimum for something like the condo in order to physically get it there.

Rick Barchers – How does that fit into your numbers?

Shay Stark – I think it pushes us more towards that 2000 square feet minimum.

Gary Pinkham – The 2000, again, when Shane said when he penciled it out, if he puts 10 lots on there, that's 20,000 square feet if they still need a little extra room on the ends. If we say 2000 and they want to maybe skinny them up and make it a little longer, they can still make it work, but I think 2000 takes care of most of it.

Jaime Topham – So we want to have the 2000 plus the additional 1000 where you said, "Just make it a 25-foot side?"

Shay Stark – Yeah, and we just said plus 25 feet on each end, a 25-foot setback on each end.

Gary Pinkham – That needs to be addressed in the setback. You've got the front setback at 25 feet. Actually, it's roadside setback, whether it be front or at the end up of the building units.

Shay Stark – That's a good idea, if we just call it that. If it's against the side, whether it's side or front, it's got to be 25-feet.

Gary Pinkham – It gets the building and driveway basically out of our 30-foot side triangle.

Shay Stark – We'll just make a point in there, that this is not calculated in that 2000 square foot unit, so that it's additional.

Jaime Topham – We'll task you with doing that for our next meeting and put it on for just public comment too, so then we can actually send it on to City Council and it's ready to okay.

All the other changes, did you review our changes, the green? I liked it. Makes sense to me.

Shay Stark – I think that work session was really helpful last time. I feel like this, even with just the changes we have in here, it's a lot better ordinance than what it currently is.

Jaime Topham – Good. All right. So that's going to end discussion number two. I just want to take just a five-minute break and then we'll admit discussion number three if that's okay with you guys?

3. Discussion of External ADU

Jaime Topham – Accessory dwelling unit of exterior, we created a list of pros and cons. The last time we started addressing this, Shay had put together this proposed Chapter 25. Did you guys have a chance to look at it? It's in the pack... No, it's not in the packet.

Rick Barchers – I don't remember seeing it. I think your assignment was for us to come up with some ideas.

Jaime Topham – That's true, too.

Shay Stark – Okay. Maybe this didn't get in the packet either, I did type up the notes from the last meeting. I can give you that, too.

Rick Barchers – It's in our packet?

Shay Stark – I typed this up the other day so it came out after the packet, but I just thought, at least that way, you'd be able to remember what we talked about in the last meeting.

Jaime Topham – We have a whole lot of that, but I don't really remember how I got this. I know somebody sent it to me because I printed it out but now I can't find it. You probably sent it to my personal email.

Shay Stark – I sent it to Lanise sent it, and I think she probably forwarded it on to you. That was the day after the work session is when I sent that out.

Jaime Topham – One of the things that we were talking about, and obviously, I think I'm the only one that was still on the Site and Zoning Commission from when you talked about it, but one of the things we started to kick around was the size of the detached ADUs. We were working on no smaller than 800 square feet, but no longer than 1200 square feet, but then we were like, "Should it be tied to the certain size of property? Tied to the size of the house there?" So those were some considerations. Do you guys have any thoughts about that?

Rick Barchers – Isn't it in the code somewhere that you can only have 50% of the property covered by a build?

Shay Stark – Some of the zones, the small is what, 35% or maybe 20% in some. Those are large lots that your house can only cover 20%. Let's see, RM-7 and RM-15, Maximum building coverage of the lot, 50% in RM-15, 35% in RM-7.

Rick Barchers – Right. My question on that, following that logic and following some of the logic that I've seen come in here to podium, shouldn't we have a reference back to that in the detached ADU code? Does that make sense? Instead of saying, "Oh, well, your ADU code says I can do this end thing, but we've got this little bitty part over here," does that make sense?

Jaime Topham – Yeah, I hear what you're saying. I actually understand what you're saying.

Rick Barchers – Just an idea.

Dan England - Are you referring to reference back to the code, or is it better to have it separate? We said it would be a change, which works better?

Rick Barchers – Can't you just refer back to it?

Shay Stark – I would refer back to that section in the code, but your point, I totally agree with your point.

Jaime Topham – So you would refer back to the code. If it's zone R-1-21, it would refer back to the zoning ordinance maximum coverage? Because our 121 says 20%.

Rick Barchers – I just don't want to contradict what it already says for a zone.

Jaime Topham – Right, good catch. RR-5 is 10%? I don't know what that would change.

Shay Stark – Well, 10% of RR-5, that's still pretty huge. That's a massive house, that's like a hotel in there.

Jaime Topham – I agree and then if you said, "No larger than 1200 square feet," that's going to limit that anyway. I guess the question is, do we have a different size maximum for the size of the lots? So if you have an R-1-21 or less, then you can only build so big of an external ADU and if you have larger than that, it can go up to 1200 square feet or 1500 square feet.

Kevin Hall – I think it should be lot related, because for instance, I'm in a situation where I live on a big lot, right? And maybe it's more applicable for me to be able to build something larger because I've got plenty of property to do it, right?

Rick Barchers – Larger than a 1200 square foot? I'm just asking.

Kevin Hall – No, I'm just saying. If it's going to be for grandma or your kid or whoever it is, a rental, right? Again, I think there's a limit there, but I don't know that a larger lot should be the same thing as a half-acre lot.

Jaime Topham – Or a RM-7.

Kevin Hall – Or an RM-7, or whatever, right?

Rick Barchers – That zoning is going to limit it anyway, right? The maximum amount of footprint on the lot.

Jaime Topham – So suggestions from the professionals in the room?

Dan England – I thought you were going to go to the peanut gallery. I like the idea of going with a percentage of the lot size, then with the maximum building size. If that's what you'd like to do. If you get 1% of the lot size, that makes it real easy if you have a 10,000 square foot lot, you can have a 1000 square foot house and it seems to fit. Think of that lot size, that's about as big as you're really going to get for a second dwelling unit on the lot.

Jaime Topham – So what if I have a 10-acre lot?

Dan England – Then you have up to that maximum house size that you want to.

Jaime Topham – That's what I'm looking for. Because this is an external ADU, and we don't want to get into a situation where we have two full houses on one lot, no matter what the size is, do we need to say, "No matter what, you can't go bigger than this,"?

Shay Stark – Or no greater than 25% of the primary dwelling. Because I agree, you don't ever want to have 2 equal size houses on one lot.

Jaime Topham – That does that seem to make sense, 25% of the primary residence, primary building? And no smaller than 800 square feet? Does that work for... So we're talking about detached ADUs.

Dan England – I'm concerned about if somebody already has a house, and sometimes you have a 10-acre property and their existing house is only 1200 square feet, and now all of a sudden, you're going to say 25% of that? So that's why I like better going with the lot size and then turn around and say, "Up to but not greater than a certain house size," if you want to say a 1200, and then you can end up having two 1200 square foot dwelling on 10 acres, and I don't think anybody cares.

Jaime Topham – Give me a concrete example of that, what do you mean?

Kevin Hall – I guess my thought in that is, for instance, if I lived in a 1200 square foot house on a 10-acre parcel, and I wanted to build a new home and let my mother-in-law, or rent my smaller home, it would limit me to be able to build something larger than what I already have, right? It seems to me like a person should be able to do that if it meets the other criteria, it would be necessarily strapped into that.

Dan England – You're saying that if I'm living in this tiny 1200 square foot home, I'm on a 10-acre property, I want mom to come live with me. She's going to take my house and I'm going to build me my nice big house now and let her have my house. I like that option.

Kevin Hall – We keep talking about our kids can't afford to live here, and I get that, right? But I think it would allow some of that because some people buy older places that have a smaller home on them with the intent to do something different there. I think it would allow an opportunity for a mother or mother-in-law, whatever it is, or a child, to have a piece of the American dream there and be able to afford it, right? That's my point, I guess.

Jaime Topham – That brought us back to have a conversation we had last time of now rebuilding your house behind a smaller house and do we want to have bigger houses behind smaller houses?

Dan England – As long as we get access to them, I don't see a problem with that. Our fire back here needs to be able to get to that, and that is a different conversation that was brought up about access widths and distances from fire hydrants and things like that.

Kevin Hall – But wouldn't the current code cover all that though, Dan? Do we need to change something to say there has to be access? Or is already in place?

Dan England – It becomes very difficult when we're dealing with people who want a second dwelling unit because a lot of times, they don't have access on the side of their property, but they want to have this home back there. Maybe they want it way in the back because they have this long skinny lot. All of the sudden, that becomes very difficult because we may not have more than 20 feet on the side of the house. We don't want it way in the back because we can't get a fire hose back there.

Kevin Hall – Right. So could we relate it then to say you have to have a RR-5 to build bigger, do you know what I'm saying, to separate it from the smaller lots for that situation, to say it's only applicable in the RR-5 or the A-10 or whatever it is, whatever two and a half or whatever that is, can we relate that, again, to the lot size, and you have to have that size lot to build a bigger square footage home there?

Dan England – You're saying if you have a half acre lot or bigger, or an acre lot or bigger?

Kevin Hall – Yeah, I would guess if you were going to build a bigger home, if you were going to have two homes on a lot, you'd need at least two and a half potentially, right? Because of that, being able to access and do all those kinds of things, right?

It would allow somebody, again, in a two and a half or a five or 10, to be able to do something more there because obviously they're going to have plenty of room for all of the concerns as far as fire safety and those kinds of things, right, and still allow them to do that, but below that we probably shouldn't do it on anything smaller than that.

Cavett Eaton – To answer that, Kevin, the code specifies that and we don't have to change anything. We get that all the time. They want to put something back there and they can't do it. It just can't be done on that size of lot and there's all there is to it. You don't have to write anything into it. Right, Dan, Shay? For those smaller lots, they're constantly wanting to know.

Shay Stark – We've had several come in, but then at the same time, we had that strange situation where we had a commercial on Main Street here. They had a commercial property on the front and they wanted to try to split that up and get an extra lot and it was kind of the same story. That was long and narrow and we had to make some concessions there, some exceptions and variances to the code because of the access issue on the side.

Cavett Eaton – That's pretty unusual and irregular that we even would grant that.

Shay Stark – Well, yes. I know. Like I said, it was very unique.

Jaime Topham – So the challenge is writing the language to capture our intention with the least number of loopholes.

Shay Stark – So let me just ask this question. Do we have a problem with them building a house the same size as the existing house if there's room on the lot for it? Regardless of the size of the lot. I mean, say you've got a quarter acre lot, something down in the downtown area or right close to Main Street there, you've got some smaller lots there. They have an old 600 square foot home on the front or 800 square foot home or something. Same problem with them building the same thing behind it if they meet the setbacks.

Rick Barchers – If they meet the setbacks and the percentage. I'd actually I'd have to look at that.

Shay Stark – Or does it really matter I guess? If they decide they want to build a bigger home, if they can meet the other requirements, why does it matter?

Cavett Eaton – Let me give you a real-world example. When I moved to Grantsville three years ago, the Fermin property on West Street between Cherry and Durfee, I was going to buy that. I put an offer on it and I came in to Kristy Clark and I said, "Okay. I want to build a 3,000 square foot home in front," and there was a 500 square foot cottage in the back attached to the garages and my mom was going to live in that. I was going to live in the front. It would have been perfect. Right now, she's in assisted living because I can't have an accessory dwelling. I couldn't buy that property. Couldn't build the house there. It would have been a great situation for me and I was going to build a house a lot bigger than that little 500 square foot cottage that was there.

Rick Barchers – Right. Oh, it's an excellent example.

Cavett Eaton – So it would have been super and I'm biased. But I really thought that it was a great plan.

Kevin Hall – Because it is.

Jaime Topham – That's what I was looking for was like a real-world example. That's a perfect example.

Cavett Eaton – It was just because we can't have two family dwellings. My option was to tear the house apart and build a shop out of it or else build onto it, which I was going to build in the back corner. I didn't want a house over there. I'm happy where I'm at. I'm in the same neighborhood and we're doing fine, but it would have been nice to be able to do that.

Rick Barchers – So the exemption wouldn't be just for you is what you're saying.

Jaime Topham – No, but it's a really good example.

Rick Barchers – No, that's a great example.

Dan England – See, I have another example though, and it's another person who said that they have an existing home and it's an old home. They can't add onto it or build onto it. But it's not big enough for their family. They're outgrowing it. They have mom and dad next door, another family member next door. They want another house. They got a lot of property back behind the house and they want to switch and build a nice big house back here and have mom and dad move into this one instead of something else that was back there. In doing that, they want their nice big house in the back. They have a big lot that they can do that.

One thing they're going to have to figure out is how to get fire back there to make sure it all works. But that's the problem that they'll have to work out and figure out. But I was hoping that they wouldn't be restricted. If you guys were going to restrict, I figured they were going to come in for a variance if they couldn't that.

Rick Barchers – Are we going to talk about three houses on that property?

Dan England – No. This is neighboring lots. There's three. They're on different lots. But there's one big flag lot and then there's two lots on the side type. It's one of those type subdivisions. But on the back, they want to build another house for family. A big one this time.

Rick Barchers – Well, let me ask you this. Can we grandfather certain types of lots? I'm talking about going forward, new construction. Do you want to allow that sort of thing going forward new construction? I mean, I don't know.

Dan England – I think we can always go to variances if we have to go to variances. I don't know if we can hit every single situation that's going to be there. We should come up with what you want to see.

Rick Barchers – So a variance for existing? Design the law for a new construction, build in some variances for existing? Does that make sense?

Dan England – I don't know that you're going to want to try and build in variances. Variances are always going to happen. We want the code to be what the code needs to be. Make it clear and easy to follow as you can. You're never going to hit all the variances, but we'll-

Cavett Eaton – One of the challenges of the board of adjustments is their mandate is to not decide just because of the economic hardship on the person building it. Sometimes that's what they're leaning on and we need to be careful of that. If it's difficult for them financially, that's not a good reason to change our code.

Rick Barchers – I agree.

Jaime Topham – So that kind of brings us to the discussion of new building. If we pass an external ADU. Obviously, builders are going to take advantage of that, which brings us back to the conversation. When we thought through the kind of things we don't want to see happening in the new developments. It brings the conversation back to two houses that are the same size.

Paul Linford – I think we have that an individual property owner can request, but developers can't.

Jaime Topham – Oh, yeah. We do have that.

Shay Stark – We talked about that anyway. I don't know-

Lanise Thompson – It was something that was brought up at the work meeting.

Jaime Topham – Right.

Kevin Hall – Then you could build over that or a person can build a home there, right?

Cavett Eaton – But we're having individual home owners right now having developers build an ADU inside and they're requesting it. It could very easily be twisted that way just because they're asking for the home and they're having it built and they're having two built at the same time. If we allow it then we allow it.

Jaime Topham – So that brings us back to that conversation.

Dan England – I'm also looking at a lot of these new developers want to come in with the smaller lots. I thought, Okay. Let's look at just a 5,000 square foot lot. 50 by 100. You don't have room in the back for another. I mean, even if you have 50 foot in the back of the house, you're still not going to be able to fit a house back there. They're going to have to come in with larger size lots and then you're going to end up limiting by the percentage of it of how big that's going to end up being. I think it's going to restrict very quickly if we just put those two requirements on it. I don't know that we have to worry about the builder, unless you have a builder who comes in and says, "I want to go ahead and do your two and a half acre lots and I'm going to give an option to have a second home." Would that be a problem, because we're still looking at two homes on two and a half acres.

Gary Pinkham – You need to be careful. If you're doubling your density, you could really impact your utility section in the street. Do you have sewer capacity? Do you have water main size? If we're going to let a 100-lot subdivision come in here and put duplexes on every lot under this code, or second homes on every lot under this code.

Shay Stark – That was the whole discussion that was the hang-up last time when we wrote this other version and why we decided to just scratch it and just go to the internal ADUs initially was this very issue.

Gary Pinkham – Dan has already been approached by a developer on that.

Rick Barchers – Can you put it in the modeling's required or something? It has to meet the model of the sewer and the water?

Shay Stark – If the developer comes in up front and says, "We would like to be able to build two homes on each lot," there's no problem. But the city say then that, "That's what we're going to size the utilities for."

Gary Pinkham – I think that probably would push a PUD.

Shay Stark – Well, if we could do it through a PUD.

Rick Barchers – It's complicated.

Jaime Topham – That's why we're having these conversations.

Gary Pinkham – Parking is the other issue that I don't see on the list here.

Derek Dalton – That's what I was going to ask. Is the 900 square feet the structure or does that include parking? Is that what that measurement is?

Gary Pinkham – No, it's just the building itself?

Derek Dalton – So for example, I know a gentleman that has... I think he's been trying to get it through the city, but he just went and bought basically a tuff shed. I know it's not 900 square feet, put it on a foundation and he basically used that like a studio apartment for a worker on his property to just live at and stay in. And I know it's not 900 square feet.

Jaime Topham – That's why we're having these conversations is trying to think of all of the loopholes, extras and the this and the that because that's I think where we get in trouble with our code a lot of times is we don't do enough talking and thinking through before we decide to make a change. I mean, you can't plan for everything. The more conversations we have, the better we do.

Rick Barchers – To get to that point, I mean, we should require it's on a foundation, an inspected foundation.

Shay Stark – I think we did at the very bottom? External detached ADU must be on a permanent structure on a foundation. We also were talking about those tiny homes. You look at some of those, they're 12 feet wide and like 15 feet long. It's essentially a tuff shed. I guess as we have this discussion, we totally get rid of the loopholes if we don't dictate the size of the ADU at all and we just allow the setbacks and the access issues to control. If they want to build, because they're told they can only have one unit, which also we didn't talk about that specifically, but I would like to change that, that it's one ADU whether that's internal or external detached. It's one on the property.

Rick Barchers – Minimum. Or I mean maximum.

Shay Stark – If you have somebody who's got 10 acres and all they want to do is move in a tiny home and put it on there. We wouldn't care. If you've got somebody that's got a half acre and wants to build two houses and they want to build their house in the back a little bit bigger than the other because they want to move into it. As long as they have the access and it fits within the existing setbacks that you want, I guess I'm just wondering is there any reason that that would matter?

Jaime Topham – And then you making sure all the utilities match.

Rick Barchers – Can we require them to have additional impact fees and they're going to have to have additional water for that too, right?

Cavett Eaton – All individual separate utilities.

Shay Stark – Yeah. No, that's a good point, the impact fees too would be...

Cavett Eaton – So a lot of this is pricing a lot of those guys out of the market because it's not going to be cheap. It's like a single development in terms of having everything.

Rick Barchers – Right. I mean, that's not the intention though. I mean, if we got twice as many cars going down this road out here, I don't want to pay for it. Somebody's got to pay for it.

Cavett Eaton – Now, I'm not saying it's a bad thing. It's just it naturally limits some things.

Kevin Hall – It's still cheaper to do that than it is just to start from scratch somewhere and have to buy a property for a situation of... In your situation, the mother or mother-in-law or whatever, it's still cheaper for you to pay the impact fees and do whatever you do there because you already have the property.

Jaime Topham – Or your adult kid that never moves out.

Dan England – I was just trying to do the math and it'd be really hard to do anything less than a 10,000 square foot lot with the second unit on there. And it'd have to be shaped correctly to make it all work. But we do want to make sure that they have room for additional parking. Because now with the skinny streets, they don't have room to park either, except for maybe on one side. So that becomes an issue too, especially if it's around local, which it very well could be.

Jaime Topham – So does it make sense to limit external ADUs to a certain lot size and up?

Shay Stark – I believe Park City; their limit is 7,000 square feet and up.

Rick Barchers – Yeah. But if we limit it that way, it's going to be just back to that maximum density argument, right? If we're saying it has to fit within that percentage of the total, then that's automatically limiting. They still got to make setbacks to them.

Jaime Topham – I was going to say; can it be three stories tall?

Dan England – Per code, 35 feet.

Jaime Topham – Wasn't there maybe years back, wasn't somebody in arms because they were building their garage bigger than the house up in the front of the street? Not that I condemn that. We don't make laws based on one space, one issue, but...

Dan England – I've seen that happen when they ended up making this huge garage in their backyard and they had very minimal setback and all of the sudden this person, all they saw, they had their six-foot fence and then they had this 15-foot wall of barn. It was in a small lot residential area. So that could be a problem. Yeah. It could be 35 feet high, right?

Rick Barchers – So maybe we should limit the height?

Dan England – Well, it depends on the neighborhood. If it's typically two stories in the neighborhood, and that's something I've seen in other jurisdictions is where it's different than the height of the homes in the area, they have to go through a planning review of that home to make sure one, their windows aren't looking into somebody else's backyard. Two, they're not towering over all the neighboring homes and just out of place. Now, is that getting over restrictive and government intrusive in somebody else's own business? Probably is.

Kevin Hall – Can we create to say that they have to all be approved by variance so that they could all be reviewed and be... You know what I mean? Because that's every situation could be different. There's no way I don't think to corral it all, right?

Dan England – Well, realize this though. If you want everything to be approved by variance, we have a different committee that is the variance committee and they're normally the only ones who have to look at it. It's just going to be the Cavett's going to call that committee together. They're going to look at it.

Cavett Eaton – Did you mean does it fit our code? It has to be vetted against the code and what we do.

Kevin Hall – Yeah. So, does the code address all the issues that we've kicked around the table here I guess?

Cavett Eaton – In some ways it does and in ways it doesn't, then that's what we're doing.

Shay Stark – So if we tell them that the height cannot be any taller than the existing dwelling unit on the lot, because again, if they have to meet the setbacks, to your point them looking down on the neighbors, what if their existing home was on the back setback? If it's 20-foot tall or if it's 35-foot tall, there's still the setbacks there. They could add onto their home and build to that rear setback and build at 35-feet. If we were just to say it can't be any taller than the existing primary dwelling on the lot, then we're really not allowing them to do anything different than what somebody could do if they wanted to add onto their house and go to the back setback.

Rick Barchers – Well, you got the whole argument that Cabot was bringing up though. The mom's living in the one room apartment and he wants to build a two-story home.

Shay Stark – Right. Or just go to 35-feet.

Rick Barchers – Well, we still got it in the code that it has to look the same as everything else in the neighborhood. Well, if this is going to be the only structure that's three stories in the neighborhood, that flags it and you can throw it out automatically. Am I wrong?

Jaime Topham – I don't think it's-

Cavett Eaton – There's not a code that says it has to be like everything else?

Dan England – No, that was a different jurisdiction.

Jaime Topham – Here's the thing is that we can't be arbitrary in how we approve things. That's where we get into trouble is when that there's too much decision.

Cavett Eaton – The idea of a variance for everything, that doesn't work.

Jaime Topham – No, we can't do that because then it's subjective. There needs to be objective criteria.

Cavett Eaton – Tooele County has a pretty good code, and one of them says that the building has to be similar materials as the one that's already on the property. They kind of write in some of that kind of stuff. So, the building look has to be similar to the existing house so that they look similar and they're not going to be weird. There's a lot. What is there, like five or six different examples within 100 miles of here of external ADUs that have their own code. I've got copies of all of them if you want to look at them.

Jaime Topham – Yes. Yes. Send it.

Cavett Eaton – Salt Lake City has got about a 40-page. It's pretty. They really did a good job.

Dan England – I think we need to figure out a minimum lot size, or a minimum lot size that can allow it, and then come up with a percentage of a lot up to a max height. That'll hit a lot of those things. And then I do like for someone to do as much as they can with their own property. We do need to make sure that they have parking out there for them, because people do not do that. We need to make sure that they have utility hookups. I do like separate put in, but that's up to you guys. I don't think it's a necessary required, but it does solve a lot of problems with utility payments in the future.

Jaime Topham – You are kind of right. I don't know that it's necessary, because one of the requirements is that the primary homeowner has to reside in one of the buildings.

Rick Barchers – I've been in my line of work, I've been involved in situations where's it's like, "Hey, not my problem, that's your problem." What do they call that, Gary, common sewer? Instead of your own sewer, a common sewer. They had five buildings. They just kept flushing. They didn't care it was backing up into the other one. They didn't care. They just kept going. I got called into repair that disaster and it was ridiculous. It really was. It led to a health problem, a potential... I mean, that's protecting the public if you read the opening page of the... What do you call it? it's the plumbing code book. Plumbing code book. The job of a plumber is to protect the public health.

Dan England – Speaking of public health, one thing that I would like to make sure is if they end up building a home on a lot that legally could be split, they definitely need to have separate utilities.

Jaime Topham – Thought we were going to say you can't split it. If you put in any external ADU, you don't get to split it.

Dan England – How long do we go back and look for an ADU on a property? I guess if you see two houses on one property, all of a sudden you say, "It can never be split"? Is that the direction you want to go?

Jaime Topham – I don't know. That was one of the statements was... Maybe not on this conversation, but it-

Dan England – Yeah. I remember that being said. I had forgotten about that though.

Jaime Topham – Because then you wouldn't be able to subdivide it and make it into its own lot.

Cavett Eaton – Most of them won't qualified because they wouldn't have a street frontage. They couldn't be split most of the time anyway.

Jaime Topham – But I guess if they come in and they apply for an external ADU, and then they have to add that to their plot or their restrictions or...

Dan England – I mean, going back to the large 10-acre piece, he wants to have a nice big home on the back half, all of a sudden mom and dad die and we don't get along anymore and we want to separate. At that point, they're stuck together or are we going to let them separate? If they're in a zone that's now two and a half acres, I'm making it up as I go, and now all of a sudden we could split it, make it work, and as long as they have separate utilities they can both do their separate thing and make it work. I'm not necessarily a fan of not allowing the split afterwards, as long as it meets the zoning codes and everything else for that area.

Shay Stark – Your setbacks and frontages would control that. Obviously, if you put two units on a half-acre lot, the 10-acre lot or something large like that, if you build them side by side, you're going to get all the setbacks the whole way around. No problem if they split them later on. What do we care? But on a half-acre lot, you put one behind the other, you don't have a front setback on that rear unit. You don't have the street frontage so you won't be able to split it. I don't know that we need to even bring it up.

Jaime Topham – Going along those lines, so we require it that the primary resident resides in one of the homes. And then they want to split it, how does that... And then it's no longer an external ADU?

Shay Stark – If you divide it, they're separate lots.

Rick Barchers – Based on the subdivision process and everything else, they'd have to pay all those fees and all that other stuff.

Dan England – It is very expensive to subdivide a lot. Normally they're not doing it to make a profit. They're probably doing it because they don't like each other and they want to get apart.

Rick Barchers – They shouldn't have shacked up.

Jaime Topham – I know all about that. But these are all questions that need to be asked because...

Dan England – Yeah. Is there any other questions out there that we think we should ask?

Jaime Topham – What about converting existing buildings?

Rick Barchers – Probably has to come up to code.

Cabot:

Yeah. They got to build it up to code [inaudible 02:04:50].

Shay Stark – Yeah. I'd say you have some people in town who have specifically built barns or garages with the thought in mind that this is going to get passed and they're going to turn them into a residential unit.

Jaime Topham – Yeah.

Rick Barchers – I got a question for you. It still is going to have to go through all that whole inspection process. If they got to tear the Sheetrock off to prove that they've got insulation in there, that's their problem, not mine.

Shay Stark – They may not even have Sheetrock under right now, because they're planning-

Rick Barchers – Right. But if they do, if they try and hide something, "Hey, you got to take that up to prove that that footing goes down the way it's supposed to be," because if they never have it inspected though...

Dan England – One of the things that will probably happen with ADU is just if you have a separated garage, that garage will be converted and it has to go through a whole... The building department will be very busy making sure it meets all the codes.

Jaime Topham – Well, and the state is already talking about allowing that, right? Any other discussions for tonight? Vote? How about the other jurisdictions, external ADU sections would be great?

Cavett Eaton – Okay. I'll package a few of them up and send them out.

Jaime Topham – Okay. I don't want to lose track of this, because I know there's community members that are really... They've waited a long time for us to get this done. You guys good?

Cavett Eaton – Kevin asked a question about what do we do with RVs and that sort of thing, and I'm not sure this is the place to talk about it. It'd take us forever. But we really need to get that one discussed and talked about.

Kevin Hall – For instance, that one in particular, we know about that one. We know their circumstances, what's going on there. And I guess my thought in some of that, I know we're limited by staff or whatever it is, but I was thinking in Grantsville we need to start doing something to stop

some of those things, because if I can see it down the street and I think I can sneak it in behind my place, we just do it. If we catch a few people and say, "Hey, you can't do that," then it'll start to discourage those kinds of things. You know what I'm saying? I just think that we need to do something.

Jaime Topham – But maybe we also reconsider allowing in RV parks for people to be able to... Because that's-

Kevin Hall – Yeah, or something. What I'm saying is I think our code or laws or whatever we have could make it so that we can... Whatever it is, if we allow an RV park or anything-

Rick Barchers – We have them, don't we?

Kevin Hall – Well, yeah. But what I'm saying is I think we want to stop the illegal things. That we know is going on all the time.

Jaime Topham – Another time for discussion. So, if somebody can keep that in mind.

Dan England – I don't think you guys can do anything about those legal things. I think that's city council.

Jaime Topham – Yeah.

Cavett Eaton – But thanks for your sentiment.

Kevin Hall – But I mean, again, I still say that Jesse, you're the city manager. I think it's something that we need to do, right? I suggest it, but I don't have any power to do that. But I think the city council or somebody needs to look at some of those things and the code enforcement needs to do something.

4. Report from City Council liaison Mayor Critchlow

Jaime Topham – I guess we don't have Mayor Critchlow tonight.

Jesse Wilson – So one thing that he had texted me about is the trust who's our insurance company, they are having a land use wrap up, legislative wrap up. It's on May 18th. It's from 10:00 to noon in North Salt Lake. If any of the commission would like to attend, you can just let Cavett know and we'll get you registered for it. It's a free event. Doesn't cost a single thing, but they will feed us and they have a bluegrass band and stuff.

5. Adjourn

Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn. Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM