

### Action Summary

#1 Development Agreement for Matthews Development	Tabled
#2 PUD for Matthews Development	Tabled
#3 Amending Chapter 19a	Tabled
#4 Northstar Ranch PUD phase 9 Prelim	Made an action item – Approved
#5 Worthington Ranch Concept	Discussion

### MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 05/18/23. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM.

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

**On Zoom:** Vice-Chair: John Limburg

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

**On Zoom:** City Attorney Brett Coombs

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Howard Schmidt, Brett Lovell, Connor O’Leary, Ernie Matthews, Dustin Hall, Russ Christiansen, Jamie Hall, Roger & Jana Hale, Rhett Butler Jeremy Levin, Tiffany Hawke, Barry Gittleman, Greg Wall, Tracy Christensen, Sandy Walton, Nick Mingo, Marlo Meno, Kelli Butler

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

### PUBLIC HEARING:

- a) Public Hearing on a proposed amendment of Chapter 19a Mixed Use (MU) Zoning District in the Grantsville City Land Use Code.

No Comment

- b) Public Hearing on a proposed Development Agreement and PUD for the Matthews Development Subdivision PUD

**Ernest Matthews** – My name is Ernie Matthews. I've been a resident in Grantsville for a long time. I think you got an email from me. I'm not against anybody selling their property because it's only a matter of time until agriculture is over in this town. Especially on my end of town. We about get run over every morning moving pipe. Sprinkler helpers just about got hit this morning. Because people are coming at 6:30. They're leaving for work. And I don't blame them at all. Whatever. I'm sick of getting the sign when I'm on my four-wheeler. Anyway, that's here or there. We're not against, I'm not against, my family's not against, anybody selling. It's only a matter of time until we'll have to move on ourselves.

The only thing that I would like to mention is I've got a good friend that just sold a big farm in South Jordan for three times what these guys are offering us for. And I just wanted to mention that. That's all I can say. Thank you.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you, Ernie. Is there anyone else that would like to be heard on this? Come on up. We can get you all in.

**Dustin Hall** – Dustin Hall and I live over on Matthews Lane. I'm sure you all know that. Across from this mess. I just wanted to take a minute to address a few items. We have these public hearings and I feel like we come up here and waste our breath anyway. We tried. We knew this was coming when they come in and ask for the zoning and get a blanket zoning so they can come out and change all the rules. My concern is the precedents we're setting by giving consideration to this for future development. We've got some public safety issues as we've all heard many times about Matthew's Lane. They know better than anybody. It was used for nothing more than a sheep lane. For agriculture to get back and forth. It was a cold mix road and it never has been built correctly. It is certainly not wide enough.

When we first heard about this during the zoning change, we heard about how there was going to be all of this commercial. Well, right now we've looked at a proposed grocery store with very little commercial. Obviously, we want to try to promote commercial in Grantsville. I understand that. I'm certainly not against growth. I've got a PUD of my own. But I certainly want... At all these I hear, and from all the residents I talk to, they talk about the small-town charm. Well, that's certainly what I want to see and what I want my kids to enjoy going forward. Most of the Matthews have moved out of Grantsville, so whatever they do is going to be left for the rest of us to deal with. Again, I just have a lot of concern about a lot of the safety with the traffic. As Ernie said, we already have a racetrack there. The roads got a lot of problems. My question would be who's going to pay for all of that? Improving all that infrastructure?

The other thing is I understand they've asked for 40 different variances. I understand the PUD process is so you can get some variances. But in my mind if we're considering 40 variances, we're basically letting them rewrite the ordinance. I would just ask you to consider those things. Thank you.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you. Anyone else?

**Russ Christiansen** – My name is Russ Christiansen. I've received this copy. This for the proposed PUD narrative. I don't know if anybody's seen it. If it's online or anything.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – It should be online.

**Russ Christiansen** – Should be online. I could stand up here and stomp my feet and get mad. There's a lot of emotion involved in a small town. But I'm just going to start out with a simple recorded, written down statement.

I'd like to start out with some statistics and comparable facts. What is being proposed here in this PUD development is 528 units or dwellings on a 70-acre rectangular piece of land with a cutout or a funky notch around the Main Street frontage. They're wanting commercial retail space, affordable housing, rental units and apartment complexes all within the 70 acres.

For comparison to this, if you take from Willow Street to Center Street, Main Street to Durfee Street. That's 422 acres. And within that block of 422 acres, you only have 537 residents. To support that 537 homes in the same 422 acres, you have an elementary school with playgrounds, you have high school with football field, you have open grass space, you have a very large city park, you have tennis courts, you have a skate park, five baseball diamonds, one LDS chapel, three gas stations and approximately nine other Main Street businesses, and plenty of open space for the kids and people that go about. If you were to say on average that each unit of their 528 units had 4.5 people living in that unit, that would be 2376 people. And divide that into the current population of Grantsville City is 14,417. That is one in six people that you meet on the street will live in that 70-acre square. I'm saying as the point, that we could all take this into consideration. Not just blow hard, get mad. But you need to understand the capacity of what's coming to this 70-acre square.

Under their PUD, they would be required to have two parking spaces for each unit. That would be 1056 cars just in that 70-acre block. Like Dustin was saying. Who are going to pay for the improvements? What kind of bottlenecks are we going to have on Durfee Street? What kind of bottlenecks are we going to have? Who's going to bring up traffic lights? Stop lights? You're not going to get 1056 cars in line just getting out of the project. It's just going to add to the problem. You're going to add to the infrastructure of your church community, your high school community. Just everything is going to be impacted quite a bit here.

We go back to my statement. In 2021, Grantsville City issued 493 building permits. In 2022, they issued 693. As of today, in 2023, they've issued 187 unit or building permits. If you averaged that across three years, that would put you 520 yearly permits. The Matthews Development would equal one full year of permits just for that.

Now I know they're applying for a PUD, but that's just a comparison. In their PUD narrative, they claim a wide demographic and variety of housing budgets. On a wide demographic of home buyers. A variety of housing options. From the view of this plan, it doesn't look like a wide variety at all. It looks like a mass concrete jungle. To be frank, it looks like they're trying to pack 50 pounds of crap and a 10-pound bag. I've seen many subdivision renderings over my life. This is definitely not the nicest one, but it sure is the greediest one. Just because you can doesn't mean you should.

To talk about the flagship grocery store that they want to bring in. They want to push it towards Durfee Street from my understanding and not have it on Main Street. One thing this town needs is some Main Street charm. Can you imagine the cars coming out of Soelbergs onto Durfee Street? The traffic patterns would be a nightmare. The land values for those people that live in that vicinity would decrease because no one would want to buy their home. No one would want to move there and build.

I'm not here to stop the Matthews from developing their property and getting their inheritance. But I please would like them to think about the impact this kind of a project would have on our community. People are leaving the projects in the Bronx to come out to this wide-open space. We don't need it to come here. We've all seen the movie Field of Dreams. If you build it, they will come. They say that.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to be heard?

**Jamie Hall** – Yes, I would like to be heard.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Who are you?

**Jamie Hall** – I'm Jaime Hall.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you.

**Jamie Hall** – I live on Matthews Lane. And I guess I'm just heartbroken because the Matthews grew up here. We were all raised here. We all grew up here. We all had the same dream. If they were still loving our town and loving us, why are they selling this and leaving? They don't want to live here. They don't want to have any part of this. They want money and they want to leave. Because they're not staying here. We need to look after the best interest of us and our community. They could care less about that.

Because if they did, they would not be putting in the surface across the street from my home that they're putting in. I have nothing against them building or selling their land. You know what, do it reasonably. Make our town better. Make it a beautiful development. Sell pieces of land where people can live and they're not closed in box to box to box to box. It's going to hurt our community as a whole. Like Russ and Dustin said, nobody is going to want to move anywhere near that because of the circus it's going to be. Enough said.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you. Anyone else?

**Roger Hale** – I'm Roger Hale. I live on Durfee Street, just a little bit east of the proposed development. You guys probably already know this, but Durfee Street is almost like a Main Street. We're going to put in some improvements next year just so we can get out of our driveway, especially in the mornings and the afternoons. Sometimes we'll sit there a long time and it's like you just got to go. And we're going to put in a circle driveway so that we have a chance to be able to get out there in a safe manner. I wanted you to look at maybe the consideration of having the store down where the business development is in the city on Main Street, and having the residential improvements up on Durfee Street.

I've heard concerns about snow removal in that area. Where are they going to put all the snow that they're going to have to remove from that parking lot from this grocery store? Thank you.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Anyone else?

**Jeremy Levin** – It's Jeremy Levin. I'm there on Durfee Street. This parcel was rezoned and it was rezoned against the public will. That was a time that this body should have fixed this issue. Instead, they went with a mixed-use zoning that is going to allow stuff like this to come to our community. They could have zoned it, there were several parcels. They could have zoned part of it commercial, part of it residential. They could zoned it in something that would be cohesive with our community.

The people moved out here because it is a small rural community, and that's what we expect it to be. This body and the city council has chosen to go a different direction against the will of the community. I don't understand exactly why. What they're getting or what they're gaining from pushing these developments through. But I hope, I have don't have a lot of faith, but I do have some hope that this body and the city council will do the right thing and make sure that the communities that come into this will be conducive to that small rural environment and not become just a slum of Salt Lake. It's not even going to be a suburb of Salt Lake. We're turning this into a slum of Salt Lake. Where we're headed with these communities, and the way that they're laid out, and the way that this

planning and zoning and the city council has pushed these subdivisions in. It is becoming strictly a slum of Salt Lake and I hope that we do the right thing before it's too late and save our community.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. Anyone else want to be heard? This is your chance.

**Rhett Butler** – My name's Rhett Butler and I live on the corner of Willow and Durfee, 296 Willow Street. I'm somewhat adjacent to this proposed development. A couple of concerns that I have in regards to this is to echo what both Russ and Dustin talked about is the amount of deviations and variances that they're requesting. You're talking setbacks, parking deviations, green space deviations. I would really encourage this board to not allow those deviations and variances to happen. I understand that they're trying to make a mixed-use community and that's really what it is, in and of itself. If you read the narrative, which I'm sure the three of you have, and just the discussion about the need for this type of development in Grantsville and the proposed charm that it might bring. And the different amenities that'll bring pickleball courts, pools. I think that's great. But note this. That is all for that community. No one in Grantsville outside of that mixed-use community will ever enter into that area to go utilize those amenities. You want to know why? Because you can't park. If you look closely, there is no parking, zero. Hardly any for the residents that are there. Think for a moment. You have 1, 2, 3 major arteries going into that mixed-use subdivision. You have 520 some odd houses with an average of two cars per home. That's over 1000 potential vehicles.

I'm glad that Russ went to the effort. I was going to draw a circle from that area and see how many miles I needed to go out to reach 528 houses. I was figuring it would be a good mile. But the comparison that he made from Willow Street, the street I live on, to Center Street, the street I grew up on, from Durfee Street, the street I went to school on, and to Main Street, the other street that I went to school on in elementary school. And all those houses. The core of Grantsville, 500 and some odd houses. The same amount of people traveling in and out of that space in 70 acres. Unbelievable. I'm fine with them selling their land, but to do something like this, is over the top.

The other things. Unintended consequences of the amount of infrastructure. I don't know if the mayor or any one of you have read the contract that's tied to this and the infrastructure requirements that they are washing their hands of. Anything outside of their 70 acres. Anything that it's affected. You think about the effect that's going to have not only on Durfee Street as has been discussed, but also on Main Street as well. It just doesn't sit right with a lot of us. I think you can see that. I'm probably the sixth one to get up here and voice my opinion.

The other thing that I've said in previous discussions to the planning and zoning and also the city council is, the effect this amount of houses on the infrastructure of the sewer district of this town is going to cost the residents of this town an immense amount of money in years to come. I deal in that arena as an electrical contractor. We get the opportunity to do these big mega projects in Salt Lake and South Jordan and Provo. It's great, but they are hundreds of millions of dollars a project in a project. I'm not saying that's going to happen here in Grantsville, but I'll tell you it's going to be a shock. Ask Preston City up in Idaho. When they got their final bid, they were absolutely shocked. It was three times the amount. Preston, I don't believe is much bigger than Grantsville. It was shocking to them when they got the price tag of \$75 million for an expansion of their plan and they were planning on \$30 million.

I'm fine. I'm part of the Matthews Plan. My father in law got up and spoke before. I'd actually like someone to read the email that was sent to this board or to this commission in regards to my mother in law and him.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I've never seen that.

**Lanise Thompson** – They're with your agenda

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So it wasn't sent to us until today?

**Lanise Thompson** – I received them this morning.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Is it from Vicki Matthews?

**Rhett Butler** – Vicki Matthews, Ernie alluded to that. I think it's probably important to read that. If you'd like me to read that, I'm more than welcome to, or I can have one of you. But just keep in mind the variances, the deviations, the unintended consequences, the effect of the infrastructure on our city that is not included in this. Do we have the money to be able to do that? Do we have the ability to be able to do that? What is that going to take to have a four lane plus a turn lane down Durfee Street all the way down? Which I'm sure is in the plan in the future, but that costs millions and millions and millions of dollars. I think I've said my 2 cents worth. Thank you. Appreciate it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – This is your time, so if you'd like to read that letter, you're welcome to do so.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Do you have a copy of it?

**Rhett Butler** – I do not have a copy, but I'll be glad to. I haven't even read it. I'm sure it's very well-written. This one is Tiffany Hawks. I'll turn it the other way, Tiffany, unless you want me to read yours.

This is titled Matthews Development from Vicki Matthews. So she says this is Vicki Matthews. I live at 295 Willow Street. I'm responding to the Matthews Development Application. We have farmed and ranched here for over 60 years with property close by this proposed site. Having this type of development would be devastating for our operation. Also, traffic on Durfee Street and Main Street would be severely impacted as they are busy roads and intersections now.

88 more homes are already slated to be around us soon at the intersection of Willow and Durfee Streets, which will also increase these issues. Add to that, the infrastructure impact on our community would be very costly and those costs are not covered by the developer.

I think the planning and zoning needs to re-plan all of this high-density zoning as it impacts the entire community and our quality of life. I'm very much opposed to this type of zoning and hope the planning commission will reconsider having this and any more of this type of developments in our town. Thank you. Vicki Matthews.

So that was hers. Tiffany, did you want to come up and read yours?

**Tiffany Hawks** – Sure

**Rhett Butler** – Okay. Well, that's all I have. So, thank you.

**Commission Vice Chair John Limburg** – Rhett, I just want to let you know that I'm listening too. You said the three of them.

**Rhett Butler** – Oh.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – It's John Limburg here on Zoom.

**Rhett Butler** – Okay. Thank you.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I'm listening. Just so you know.

**Rhett Butler** – Thank you, John. All right. Great. Appreciate it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Anyone else want to be heard?

**Tiffany Hawks** – I guess I do.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Tiffany.

**Tiffany Hawks** – I wrote a letter but seeing that you guys said you didn't read them.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Actually, we didn't say that.

**Tiffany Hawks** – So I'm going to just come up here and read it. All right. Because I don't like to speak in front of people. But obviously 88 houses that I fought, that we fought against, is against our will anyway as well. 528 is definitely against my will. So anyway.

Durfee Street is not a Main Street. It should not be ever a Main Street. It feels like a Main Street because I cannot get out of my driveway during the busy times of the day. Putting the two main entrances of that 528 lots and Soelbergs right there, it's not going to fly well. It's just not. There's not enough infrastructure to support this traffic. We have no idea the impact of the 88 houses that are going in right now that are being built. We don't know what's going to happen with the traffic pattern there.

Let's see. There is no neighborhood, like he was saying, no neighborhood anywhere in Grantsville like this. That is why we moved here. We moved here for the small-town feel, for the large lots, for the community feel. I think we're going to lose it when we start putting in huge apartment complexes and tiny town homes. I can't even read on the little map how big those lots are. I'm going to guess maybe quarter acre to less than that on those other lots.

When I was talking to the mayor about the other subdivision across the street from me, he told me that there was "Nowhere to put these people's poop." He was against the 88 lots as well. He says, "I have nowhere to put these people's poop." So, let's go build 528 units, and it'll solve its own problem I guess.

Grantsville needs to focus on its infrastructure first. That is a lot of problems that cities run into is they build and build and they sell land and they sell it to developers, but they don't fix the infrastructure before they decide to do this. We need to fix the infrastructure before we can allow developments to happen.

That's about all I have. This was another one. I don't want to sound judgey. There's a hard way to put it. That if you're going to put that many high-density apartment buildings and things like that, you are just inviting crime and drugs. It doesn't feel like a good situation to be inviting into our town. I don't want that across the street from me. That's exactly where all these entrances are coming and going is exactly across the street from my house. I don't want that. I just want you guys to consider these points and see it from our perspectives, of the citizens that live here. I know you live here as well. So please think with your hearts and not wallets. Thanks.

Commission Chair Jaime Topham close the public hearing

c) Public Hearing on a proposed Preliminary Plans for Northstar Ranch PUD Phase 9

No Comments

**AGENDA:**

1. Consideration to recommend approval of Development Agreement for Matthews Development Howard Schmidt, Brett Lovell, Connor O'Leary were present to present and answer questions.

**Howard Schmidt** – My name's Howard Schmidt and I am representing the Matthews Development with my partners Brett Lovell and Connor O'Leary. We appreciate the public comment. We appreciate the efforts of planning commission and staff and working with the city here. I know change in a city as a city grows is often very difficult. I've experienced it myself. I actually grew up in West Jordan at a time when there were about 3000 residents when I was about 12 years old. There's just a need in these areas for growth. It's difficult to do it all in half acre lots or whatever, because you have to provide a lot of different housing possibilities for different people.

The other thing that is important to point out is change is actually healthy for cities. If you don't have growth in a city, you really start to shrink. We're excited about the development because this is where Soelbergs wants to be and we want to support them and help them grow their store and grow their business here. They've been longtime residents. They love Grantsville too. They've studied out where their best place is to put their store. This is what they've concluded that this is the best option.

This property has a mixed-use zone and as you all know; a mixed used zone allows for 10 units to the acre. That would be 700 units on this parse. Honestly, I think your code even allows it to go up to 15, is that correct, under certain circumstances. I don't know how you get there. We're asking for 528, which is considerably less than 10 units to the acre. We do want to create something that has multiple uses from apartments to single family homes to town homes. These are all needed in your community. There are a lot of people that do want to live in Grantsville, your kids, some of these kids that can't, because they can't find a rental and they can't find an affordable home here. I personally have a subdivision here that I've developed that has half acre lots in it We're trying to sell those really hard right now and we're moving through them slowly, but it's crazy. Basically, the least expensive home you can put on a half acer lot is about 600,000 right now. The only way you can really meet the needs of people that need a three or a 100,000-dollar home, which sounds like a mansion from where I've come from, but is to get higher density and to increase that density.

We are here to hear you also and we've appreciated the comments that have been here. We know these are emotional and it's stressful and change is always shocking, but we're here to hear you out. We're going to try and figure out how we can accommodate the mixed-use zone that this property



has, that is vested in this property. How we can accomplish that and still provide some affordable housing that needs to be here in order to incentivize the CRDA financing and the government support for a tax incentive that helps Soelberg's. They have to have that in order to make this move. We're here to hear you as a council. What is it you would recommend that we do in order to still provide what's allowed in this zoning and that makes you happy?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – So, Cavett, my first question for you is in the development agreement that's in our packet, there are notes off to the right, whose notes are those? They're Dan's? Okay. That helps me understand.

Here's my issue here. This is what we're talking about right now is the development agreement, not necessarily the PUD. We're going to get there in a minute, but what's on our agenda, number one. Yeah, they're both together. We're running them separately. But couple of things. One, I don't see why we should be entering into a Development Agreement where we don't have the PUD all sorted out. So that would be my very first comment. That doesn't make any sense to tie the city into what you're asking for until we have the rest of the PUD stuff worked out.

**Howard Schmidt** – My understanding is we just really have to work on them together.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Yeah. So that's comment number one. If we're also looking at the PUD, you're asking for 40 plus variances to our code. That does not work in any way, shape or form. It's going to have to be re figured and you're going to have to come up with a way that you can make the development work with not nearly as many variances. A PUD is not for the purposes of completely trumping the code that we already have. It's for making use on a piece of property that with the zoning that it has, what zoning there is, things don't necessarily work, so we make some variances. Not to come in and ask us completely throw out the code that we already have. So that's one thing that's definitely going to have to be addressed.

The other thing is we have notes asking us not to necessarily take into consideration what Solberg's wants to do, but we have to, because you are basing your PUD on the CDRA funding which is required for having, you have to have Solberg's to get that in order to get this. It all ties together. We cannot ignore that Solberg's wants to buy the commercial.

Another thing for me is that when this came in as a mixed use, actually I'm going to go back even farther to address some comments. When we were doing our master plan, the general plan back in, I think it was 2018, I've been here a few minutes, but it all blends together for me. That property was originally on the future plan to be commercial, only commercial. I think that the plan had it being like the front half of it next use and then the back being something else. And we had a whole extra meeting with the public to determine what that should be. And the public provided their input that it should be mixed use with the understanding or the thought process that that's our one big block that isn't encumbered by anything else, that fronts Main Street. That could be a place where you have any kind of commercial, a lot of commercial like Solberg's, like other things that go around a grocery store and become a tie-in. But that's not what you're giving us and that certainly wasn't the intention of this property. I get that there's other landowners involved, so Main Street isn't necessarily an option at that time, but that doesn't make this plan appropriate for our community. I said it to you, I think you were here last time, and I could be wrong. Two meetings ago, I said about Durfee Street and Main Street, that is a lot of development. Whether Solberg's goes there or not, it's put for commercial. So that's going to be some type of commercial, which is what you're asking for. That means there's going to be traffic for commercial. Then you also have 500 and plus lots, a 1,000 plus

vehicles on Durfee Street that can't even handle what it has now without the 88 extra homes that are down the road, that have already approved. Matthew's Lane Camp is way beyond capacity. And I understand the person who said about almost being run over on his four-wheeler, I've driven hay down that road, but big truck and trailer and I got minivans wanting to play chicken with me on that road, because it's simply not big enough. I get all of that. Hold on, you'll have your chance. You wanted to hear what we had to say.

**Howard Schmidt** – True.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I'm telling you.

**Howard Schmidt** – I'm hearing it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I get that you guys are looking at and potentially would increase Matthew's Lane, but what I saw in the development agreement is it would be a maximum of 35 feet. We've already heard from our engineer in previous meetings that that's not wide enough. That is going to be a collector. The road would be 90 feet, so you'd have to do 45 feet. Already we've got problems in our development agreement. Who's going to improve all of the rest of Durfee Street that this one development is going to severely impact on? I drive down Durfee Street, there's one field left between Matthews Lane and SR112, that can be developed. Everything else has already been developed, which means the infrastructure is there, which is obviously not adequate, because people are telling us that it's not adequate. That has to be a consideration. Those are all of my thoughts just to start with. I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to my colleagues here.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Howard, I would echo what Jamie said. I think there's a number of issues. To me, we've got the cart way before the horse in this situation. I'm a little bit upside down that we've mixed Solberg's into it, to be honest with you, because I think Grantsville needs a new store. I think in our work meeting and then other meetings, we've pushed awful hard to try to move it to Main Street. It appears I guess by your statement, that's never going to happen. I think we need a store. I just have a question for you, because I'm not sure of this. I ask in the work meeting to someone that was here, if the store in this development are tied together? Are they?

**Howard Schmidt** – Technically they are not tied together, but we have a purchase contract with Solberg's.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So the contract with you, not with the Matthews?

**Howard Schmidt** – Well I'm representing the Matthews here tonight. The contract is with the Matthews and Solberg's. Yes, so, there is a contract.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – The point I'm trying to get around is, I want somebody to tell me that the store is a separate contract. If this doesn't go, does the store go away or does the store still have a chance to be somewhere? Can you answer that?

**Howard Schmidt** – I only have a contract for Matthews with Solberg's on this site. I don't have another site for Solberg's. They haven't indicated that they have their eye on another site. This is where their studies tell them this is where they should be.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So then again, Howard is, in your opinion, the store site off the table if this development doesn't happen? That's the question I'm trying to get to. Can you answer that for me?

**Howard Schmidt** – I'd have a hard time giving you a definitive answer on that because-

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Financial issues with this.

**Howard Schmidt** – Right.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** –...is right? But I'm just trying to get to the idea of whether it all goes away if something isn't worked out?

**Howard Schmidt** – I would say yes, but I feel like I'm trying to respond for somebody else and not me. That's an opinion.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – From your perspective, not the Solberg's.

**Howard Schmidt** – Right.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – But from your perspective of what's happening there.

**Howard Schmidt** – Yeah, I would say that from the meetings we've had, this is where they need to be in order to build their new store. They've looked at a lot of other sites and they can't seem to make them work. So that's as far as I can go.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So Howard, I just want add to comments that I made prior, because for the public record, I just want to know or just say that I'm concerned and I know and recognize that there has to be affordable housing, that there have to be things for our kids to be able to afford. I get all that. But I'm also concerned, and I've been here for a long time. I'm almost as old as the dirt here. And I like Ernie, I do a little hobby farming. It's getting to a point where you can't farm, because you're risking your life to do it. I know that's going away, but the one thing that we don't have to do away with is the hometown charm. The general plan calls for a rural atmosphere. So, me personally, I argued when I wasn't in this chair, but I argued about making that MU zone just a blanket for that. And I argued because I said this is exactly what's going to happen and here it is.

So again, we're tied to that by law to some degree. We don't have a choice in that it's already been done. But to do that, because we're tied by law, and then to take 40 exceptions to the code, why would we do that? What benefit is there to the community in doing that? And again, for me there's a density issue there. I echo what Jamie's commented and I just think that there's something more that needs to be worked out there. And I too would hope that there would be a contribution to the community other than pickleball courts in there, because I agree what happens inside there, because of limitations of parking and all of those things. The idea that the community's going to go in there and have any benefit from that is slim to none. There may be a little because kids are going to play with kids, but for the most part, the community is not going to benefit from those things. In my opinion, we need something different there. I think, we've got the cart the way before the horse. We're trying to do something that there's so many unanswered questions. How do we do anything but say, hey, we need to go back to the drawing board?

**Howard Schmidt** – Okay, thank you.

**Commission member Derek Dalton** – Yeah, so it's hard to follow these guys. They're hitting the nail on the head. Unfortunately, Grantsville is growing. We know that and we do need affordable housing, but I don't think we need 500 affordable houses on 70 acres, especially in that area with Matthew's Lane and Durfee. It's just going to be a headache. The density, I think it's just too high for that area. This contract, I don't see any benefit for the city from it or their proposal. Like Kevin was saying, until I see that and the variances, I couldn't in good conscience approve something that had all these variances and a lot of questions that we have not answered. You came couple meetings ago and the same questions that were on in our packet are the same ones that we have tonight. Nothing got answered or improved. I was kind of concerned about that. I've got to echo these guys. I think the carts way before the horse on voting for the development agreement.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – John?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Yeah. Can you guys hear me okay?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Yep.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – All right. I guess first of all, I just want to say Tiffany, Ernie, Russ, Roger, Jeremy, Rut, I heard all of you guys. I understand the frustration. Howard, I would say, well, I'll just start with Jamie hit the nail on the head with what we were thinking was going to be done with this property. When you came in and asked for the MU zone, it hit the future land use that we'd already decided. Because we knew that was one big piece of property that we could still put commercial on. But if I knew that you were going to do this, we would never, ever have approved it. I kind of feel hoodwinked in a way.

I would just tell you right now, I'm not going to vote for anything until I have all the information on the table on anything that you guys are doing here. I do feel like that this is kind of switched on us and it doesn't feel good. For you to come in and say, hey, now that it is a mixed use, you can put 10 properties per acre. Well we got hoodwinked into this, because you saw that it was what we wanted on the future land, we wanted commercial in here.

I'm not going to vote on anything that we don't have all the information on. I'll still say it, I know the city wants us to go ahead and do this and we're going to have a meeting on the 10th to talk to the Jeffries. When I drive past Tiffany's house, I wouldn't want a store there. If I bought a home there, I think I bought it in a residential neighborhood and there wasn't going to be a store built across the street. You can probably hear, I'm a little emotional about this, but I said in the last meeting, there's no way I'm voting to put Solberg's right where they want it.

And I've heard through a little bird told me that Solberg's said, or Jeffrey said that they have kind of drawn a line in the sand. If I was a city, I would say open it up then. Let Macey's come look at this. If Solberg's doesn't want to do what the city needs here, I think we need to make a decision that's best for Grantsville 50 years from now. Not what's best for two families in Grantsville. I've been waiting for this meeting, I wish I was in town and I feel bad that I'm on Zoom, but yeah, I don't feel good about this. So that's my opinion.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you. John. Do we need any further discussion on the development agreement part of this?

**Howard Schmidt** – I'd like to respond.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Oh absolutely. I apologize. Of course. I told you to wait and yes, please. Go ahead.

**Howard Schmidt** – Thank you. Concerning Matthews Lane, it's my understanding, I haven't been in Grantsville my whole life, but it's my understanding that that was originally kind of a sheep lane that they put in so they could get back and forth to their properties and so forth. It ended up being a 100% on Matthew's property. If I'm wrong on that, forgive me, because I've tried to research it on title, that's what I've been told by some of the locals that have been here. And you've actually only got 20 feet right now that is city owned and they've already contributed all of that.

They're willing to say, okay, we'll take the middle of the existing road and we'll add another 33 feet to that. Which means that they totally really have contributed 43 feet, which is a pretty generous contribution for one side of the road. We can talk about a few things there. We can maybe make some other adjustments and see where we're at. But I thought it was important to just bring that history in. It is incredibly narrow and it's straight and I'm sure people break the speed limit all the time.

As far as the 40 code deviations that we're talking about. Some of those are pretty minor, so it's probably a bit of a stretch. They kind of overlap a little bit, but we've looked through those. All of the things that we've asked for are pretty common in Mixed-Use subdivision. In other words, the size of the setbacks. You have a setback code here in Grantsville that is pretty difficult all the way around. At the same time, you have this other zoning that allows for 10 units to the acre. We're not going to 10 units to the acre. We want less. How much less? It still has to be able to be affordable. There is going to have to be some compromise with the city. We need that, but how do we get there? How do we get, oh, and by the way, to John and everybody, if your goal here was to have this entire thing commercial, what was your plan for traffic then?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Main Street. Big part of it. Main Street.

**Howard Schmidt** – But if it was commercial all the way to Durfee Street... Anyway.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – But the relevant road improvements wouldn't change Howard. If it was commercial, there'd be the same requirement, whether it's houses or whether it's commercial. There'd be a need to upgrade Matthew's Lane, either way. So that's a push.

**Howard Schmidt** – Absolutely. No question. No, I agree. But as far as Durfee Street grows, you're going to dump a lot of more traffic if it's all commercial now anyway.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Howard, can I ask you a question really quick?

**Howard Schmidt** – Please.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Why are they not willing to sell those three homes in front so you could put commercial frontage right onto Main Street? Why won't they do that? That would solve all the problems here.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Can I just answer that for a second? That property belongs to Kirk. He doesn't want to sell that while his parents are still alive. I personally don't believe that the city ought to force him to do that.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Okay. But should we go, okay, this isn't what we were planning, because we thought commercial was going to be right on Main Street, that was with this whole section, this whole piece of property here and allow them to push all this commercial stuff to Durfee.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Well, the zone change really messed the whole thing up you guys. And I know that there was a lot of people who didn't like the zone change, but the zone has changed. Okay, so I'm sorry.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – So this is where we have our control now is to say no to this, even though this is a PUD, we don't have to accept this.

**Mayor Critchlow** – You are correct. I do want to say one other thing. In the old days when Kevin and I were young, and Ernie, we didn't have the state coming out here telling us that we had to have a certain percentage of our housing as affordable housing. You guys, they have really kind of messed with us, with that. The road thing down Matthews Lane, they're given a 100% of that road at this point, but the rest of it will come when the people to the East will develop it. Now there is kind of a line in the sand for Solberg's. That's kind of the deal.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Mayor, I understand where you're coming from. I want my kids to be able to stay here and be able to afford a home. I understand that. We got to look at 40 variances and what the amount of properties they're trying to put in here. I guess I'm just really hung up on, hey, we're trying to revitalize Main Street and we're going to take the biggest part of Main Street, the epicenter of the business in Grantsville and take it off of Main Street. It's like exactly opposite of what we're trying to do.

**Mayor Critchlow** – John, if there was a different option right at this point. Kirk's not going to sell this. He doesn't want to. He doesn't want to do this with Al and Janet and I understand that and I just don't believe we should force him to do it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Nor can we.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Nor can we. That's it.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – No, we can't. But we...

**Mayor Critchlow** – This is your decision to make here. There's a lot of emotion, but I think you got to give Howard and Brett and those guys a chance to pull this back and rethink this whole thing personally.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I'm fine with that. But they came back with exactly what they had two weeks ago. It's not changed. We weren't happy with how it was and now they've come back. It looks like it's exactly the same. So, oh, I'll be quiet. Thank you, Mayor.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Mayor, can I just ask a question?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Hold on, who are you asking it of?

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I'm asking the mayor.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Mayor, do we have a calculation to tell us how many affordable housing units we have approved in Grantville right now? Are there any?

**Mayor Critchlow** – That one Cavett can answer better than I can. Cavett or Shay?

**Shay Stark** – This last year they didn't require us to do a calculation. This next year, that's the next step. This last year, the state required us to set goals. Then this next year we'll start calculating and tracking the results of those goals and tracking that affordable housing. I can say we have just down here across from the arena, we have the project with county housing that was affordable housing. I know all that's built, that's not available right now, that is one project that's been done somewhat recently here.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Shooting from the hip, Shay or Cavett, is that the only real affordable housing we know of in Grantsville currently? That is available?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I thought we approved some of it up on the west bench on that. I can't remember the name of the property, of the development, but that one up there on the west bench.

**Mayor Critchlow** – There was some that was coming in, but he hasn't set a plan yet either, you guys. I had my word with Governor Cox about this, because it came from the legislature that says, hey, if you guys don't start doing the things we want you to, we're just going to take this over. I told them, I said, don't threaten us to do this. It really bothered me. This last session, they almost doubled down on what they wanted out of us.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I appreciate all this conversation, but it's not on point for what we're on.

**Mayor Critchlow** – It isn't.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – So we're going to go back to our discussion and I'll let you continue as it relates to this.

**Howard Schmidt** – So I'm hearing from the planning, hey, we don't like this, but is there something you want to recommend to us? Because we're going to need to provide some small lots, we're going to need to have variances on setbacks. Your city code and some of this was just implemented, if I'm not mistaken. And Jamie, please tell me, about a year ago you changed some setback requirements. Do you recall that?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – But it might have been longer than a year ago. Was it a year ago? Okay.

**Howard Schmidt** – When you did that, what you did is you said, well, we're going to not let people build any high density. If we do this, we're going to stop it. This is how we're going to-

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Don't put words in our mouth.

**Howard Schmidt** – Okay.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – We most certainly did not say that. There were changes for specific reasons. If you want to state that, I'm fine with that. But don't put words in my mouth.

**Howard Schmidt** – I'll retract that.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Great.

**Howard Schmidt** – But in so doing, you made it so it's absolutely necessary to have PUD variances so that you can come anywhere near there. I mean, unless we built just walkup apartments, I don't know how we'd ever get there and I don't know that we could even at that.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I appreciate that input. As far as the development agreement, do you have any other input on that before we make a decision on that?

**Howard Schmidt** – I guess you have the possibility of tabling or just a straight denial. Maybe we need a little more time on it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I think that our preference would be time, for you to rethink it. Because there is definitely a feeling of us versus them, us versus you, I think, and that's not our intention. But it can't come the other way, you versus us. That's what happens. That's the impression that at least I get. I won't speak for the rest of the members. When you come and you ask for 40 different variances right out the gate, that's not okay. We have our setbacks for a reason. A lot of them have to do with safety, a lot of them have to do with parking. What your plan here won't even allow for on street parking as far as we can tell. So where are all of these people going to park? That's a concern.

When you go back to the drawing table, the other thing is that you're not guaranteed 10 lot to an acre. That's the maximum that's allowed. But you still have to fit within all of the other codes that are in our code. And if you're asking for variances, they should be minor variances, not the whole thing. So that's what I want to see happen.

Now as far as the development agreement, we definitely have the cart before the horse because we have way too much to work out. I would say we table it so we can have further conversations unless you want a denial and then that's where I'm standing today.

**Commission member Kevin Hall made a motion to table the Development Agreement for Matthews Development, Commission member Derek Dalton seconded the motion. All in favor? Motion carries unanimously, with John on Zoom.**

## **2. Consideration to recommend approval of PUD for Matthews Development**

Howard Schmidt, Brett Lovell, Connor O'Leary were present to present and answer questions.



**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – We still have Howard here. We've had the conversation in our first item. I'm going to go ahead and say the same thing. We need to put this on the table and re-look at it. I would make a motion that we table the consideration of the PUD for the Matthews development.

**Brett Lovell** – Can I add something to that?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Sure.

**Brett Lovell** – Just based on our city meeting two weeks ago, a few of you on the planning commission actually advocated for more apartments. Jamie, you being one of those? Can you give us some color of what you want to see in terms of product type here? Because it sounds like from what we've heard from you, Jamie, and I apologize, the gentleman that wears basketball, shorts traditionally.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Rick.

**Brett Lovell** – I think he was an advocate for more apartments. Is that what the community wants to see? We don't want to come back with a plan to appease you and then have outcry from everybody else. We want something, if we're going to take this back to the table, is it more apartments? What is it you want to see?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – What I would suggest is that maybe you go talk to the community about it. What I think that our community does need and is seriously lacking is apartment complexes, because we don't have places for people to rent. That's my opinion. It seems like that would tie into a commercial project better than a bunch of single-family homes and twin homes. But I also don't want to see the entire thing as apartment complexes either.

**Brett Lovell** – Sure. Yeah. Good, good feedback. Thank you. Yeah,

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Appreciate that. Other feedback before we...

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Howard, hang on really quick. Why not put Solberg's right behind those three properties on Main Street and then say hey we're eventually going to sell when she decides to get rid of that home and do something like they did up in Stansbury with Solberg's and then they were able to build up, they were able to bring in, I don't know if it was American Burger but some burger joint. They've got things built around it, right. Why couldn't they build it behind and just kind of have a access to it from the side? Why is it got to go all the way to Durfee?

**Brett Lovell** – I think that's a good question John. It was answered I think last week in the work meeting, by Steve Minor. From a commercial perspective and kind of a site plan that really doesn't work to be mid-block like that. I'm sure it's in the notes. It's really not a comparison to the Stansbury store at all. It might be worth going back and looking at his comments and feedback because that was addressed for a substantial amount of time in last week's work meeting.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – All right, thank you.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. I had made the motion I was waiting on the second.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham made a motion to table the PUD for Matthews Development, Commission member Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All in favor? Motion carries unanimously, with John on Zoom.**

**3. Consideration to recommend approval of MU (Mixed Use) Zoning District revisions.**

**Tabled**

**4. Discussion of Preliminary plans for Northstar Ranch PUD Phase 9**

Nike Mingo was present to represent Northstar Ranch

**Nick Mingo** – Thank you Madam Chair. My name's Nick Mingo. I'm here tonight representing Ivory Development. This is Phase nine of North Star, more of the same, consistent with the previous eight phases and the development agreement. I read through the staff report, the one item talking about the water infrastructure. We're well aware of that and we're working on it. This phase has 20 lots ranged from quarter acre to a little over one acre. With that, I would welcome any questions.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – It's my understanding that there's a water problem there now currently. Is that correct

**Dan England** – The simple answer is, yes there is. This one is going to be tying into a higher-pressure waterline and having a pressure reducing valve that ties into the lower zone, which will help increase the pressure on their zone also. This development will, although it's taking our upper water tank area that, they're supposed to replace their own tank in the near future. It is solving the problem for this development and some of the other water problems that are happening in the rest of the development there.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I'm just speaking from the hip a little bit cause I don't know, but wasn't that to have taken place already, the water tank and all that in that area?

**Nick Mingo** – So I can read, well it's this paragraph here, but we're allowed to build up to 700 units at the time of this and I don't know how many of those have been built based on those four requirements, or the four triggering events. None of those have happened yet, but we're still working on that tank. We know that tank and an additional well are needed and as soon as one of those triggers are hit or the 700 units, then it'll be built. Or I guess it also says if the city asks for it to be built.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Does that take a consideration then of all the other things that have happened including that 700 units? They were Approved for 700 units here. Right?

**Dan England** – They'll probably end up doing more than that up in that area eventually.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – These three triggers will trigger the need for the well and the tank and all that, right? There's no need for that today I guess is really what I'm really asking.

**Dan England** – Correct. Yes, the that I can answer that question.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Then so what's going to happen here today has no effect on any of the water situation in that area?

**Dan England** – No. They have been moving forward and you can say what you have been doing for the water.

**Nick Mingo** – We've identified a few locations for the tank site. We've hydro hired a hydrogeologist to locate a well site. We've been working with the city and the West Bank master plan waiting for those infrastructure plans to be complete. Then we'll be ready to move forward with the construction. We've got the water rights in place, It's knowing that all the infrastructure is ready on the city's end and we're ready to go with it.

**Commission member Derek Dalton** – Okay. Are you guys going to wait for one of those triggers to hit or when everything's ready, then are you going to work on the, well?

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Are you going to be proactive or wait till that happens before you do any improvement?

**Nick Mingo** – Can I borrow you crystal ball?

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Yeah, I know that's a tough one.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I don't have any particular questions. Dan's, everything. I don't have a memo on this one.

**Dan England** – Yeah, I'm sorry, I didn't put a lot in your staff report, but I did work very closely with their engineer. He worked with us and gave us all the things we were asking for to make this a good development to add on to it. I felt very good with moving this project along.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – John, do you have anything? John, can you hear us?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I can hear you. I thought you said Don. I don't.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Oh, John.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I called you Amy earlier, so we're even

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – All right. Okay. This is just on for discussion today. Do you feel like that all the checkboxes have been made that we could move this to an action item?

**Dan England** – Yeah, I do. I'm comfortable with this.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Oh, okay. I'm getting head nods from the rest of our staff.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham made a motion to move this item to an action item. Commission member Derek Dalton seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

City Attorney Brett Coombs – I just want to make sure that we have the public hearing on this tonight.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Yes. It was item C.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary plans for Northstar Ranch PUD Phase 9. Commission Member Derek Dalton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously, with John on Zoom.**

## **5. Discussion of Worthington Ranch Concept revised**

Barry Gittleman was present to represent Hamlet Homes

**Barry Gittleman** – Thank you. I'm Barry Gittleman with Hamlet Homes representing Worthington Ranch, LLC, I have Nicole and Greg Wall here with me. Nicole and her father Bud own the adjacent property and we've been working together with them.

Over the last six months, we've been in front of this planning commission multiple times. We've met separately with mayor, with staff, with city manager, with a few of the city council members one-on-one. Over the course of the last six months, we've gotten a lot of feedback, some specific, some general. We've tried to incorporate all of that feedback into the plan. We think what we have to present now, we're still at the concept plan stage, we haven't gone to preliminary plat yet.

We've got option one on the screen, which is what was previously approved by a previous property owner several years ago for 62 homes on a total site of 157 acres. This plan, we've heard from some people, "Why don't you just stick with the current plan and not change anything?" Our response to that is that we believe strongly that we have a better plan that's not just slightly better, but significantly better for the city, for the citizens, for the financials of the city and the citizens, for the amenities of the city, for the future homeowners of Worthington Ranch, and pretty much everybody all around. We've created two other options to take a quick look at today.

Option two on the next slide shows that the yellow center section of phase one remains unchanged. Phase one is already approved. Plat is almost recorded, but not fully recorded yet. Development is underway. Roads should pave within one or two months, and then a month or two after that, we'll start building a model home in phase one, which is the yellow. In phase two, which is sort of pink colored, what this option proposes is to increase the lot count from 32, to 48, so an additional 16 home sites. We've gotten feedback that you don't want to see small lots that are quarter acre or smaller, so we've increased the minimum lot size to a third of an acre, and that is what is currently shown in phase two. If we can go with this option, then we could afford to donate the 90-plus acres of open space to the east to the city, which would be a benefit to the city in terms of land that the city plans to use for the Meadow Lane Parkway extension in the future.

There are many other potential uses for that land. We talked last month about maybe a school. Maybe the city doesn't need a school, maybe a regional stormwater detention pond, maybe amenities. It would be totally up to the city with no restrictions on what you want to do with that land in the future. That's option two.

The next one, option three, shows what we've also talked about over the last six months, which is a small third phase connecting to the existing phase one. This would add an additional 18 lots there, and if we're able to do that, then in addition to donating all of that green open space land to the city, we would pay at our expense and no cost to the city to put in amenities, and then donate those amenities to the city.

Those amenities based on the feedback we've received from all of the individuals we've worked with and the neighbors and some city council members walking trails, not horse trails, would be a good addition, potentially pickleball, potentially a playground. Those amenities we could do at our cost and then donate them to the city. We feel the options two and three are much better than the current plan better for everyone involved. The last appraisal that we had on the open space has that valued just under a million dollars for that open space of land. The amenities we estimate would cost us 300 to \$500,000 to install and then donate to the city. We're talking about over a million dollars of value that would be gifted to the city at no cost whatsoever to the city. That's why we feel strongly that option three is the best of the three options.

I'm not going to go through all of these but attached to the three options are a list of 15 comments and feedback that we've received. Things like, "Is anyone actually going to use the pickleball or the trails?" We feel that we've addressed every one of those concerns that's come up and incorporated all of that feedback into the plan with supporting documentation behind it. I did want to give Nicole and Greg a chance just to speak briefly on the plan and how we've worked together with them.

**Greg Wall** – I just want to introduce myself. My name is Greg Wall. I am the chairman of the Government Affairs Committee for the Home Builders Association. I grew up in a little town in Wyoming that's actually smaller than Grantsville. I am not from here, but I'm fairly familiar with the area. The company that I worked for did the engineering for the Mid-Valley Highway. The company I work for is called Avenue Consultants. We consult on engineering and land development on both sides. We design roads and help municipalities and cities update their municipal code, much like if you were doing here earlier tonight. We also help developers and home builders with the civil engineering for their developments as well. I appreciate what you're doing as a planning commission. I was on a planning commission for four years in Farmington. I had hoped that there would be a public comment. I just wanted to come and give a public comment tonight, but I appreciate Barry letting me speak.

Since this is kind of my profession as a consultant, I've seen a lot of different plans come in and you can see some where, as there were comments earlier tonight, someone's trying to do a PUD to get around the rules instead of enhancing what is being offered. I think, especially with the option three where the city potentially would exchange some additional lots for those amenities, it's kind of a win-win and a benefit for everyone. As the government affairs chair, it's kind of interesting that the Home Builders Association asked me to do that since I'm not a home builder, but where I can kind of see where the cities are coming from and where the home builders are coming from, I'm happy to always offer to interface with the city on any questions or concerns. I wanted to put that out there, but I also wanted to tell you that I've worked with Barry on the Home Builders Association. You won't find a more honest person. If he says he will do something, he will do it. I think it would bring some really nice homes on large lots to the area, so thank you for your time and for your service as well.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Nicole, I definitely want to hear, because this is next to you. What's your input here?

**Nicole** – You guys know who I am. You know that for several years we've been dealing with this. Trying to get to the point where my dad and I can both propose a plat and build our homes on just about 10 acres that we've got here. I do like the walking trails. That's directly bordering our property. That's something I personally would use as well as pickleball. I think the amenities are great. What I do want to say to you is that in all of our concerns and our dealings with Barry, Stetson and Hamlet Homes, they have done everything that they said that they would do. They've been very upfront and honest with us. You guys know my dad. In dealing with him, he can be difficult sometimes. His heart's in the right place, but they've been very accommodating to my dad's requests, even to the point where they dug up a trench to remove water bottles that were thrown in the trench. We all appreciate that, like they said, they're honest. They said they would do it and they did.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – If we don't allow any changes, does that affect your ability to go forward on your property?

**Nicole** – No.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

**Nicole** – No, and I appreciate you asking.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Yeah. Do you guys have questions, comments?

**Commission member Derek Dalton** – Well, I just wanted to thank Barry. I know we've been working on plans and you came forward with different options. Some developers don't when we ask requests or whatever, so I appreciate that you're willing to work and be flexible, so I just wanted to say, "Yeah, I appreciate it, so thanks."

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Yes. I guess here's my concern, I guess, and it's this, right? In as much as there's a change to what was already previously approved. Because I have relationships with some developers, one in particular, I'll just state that, but others who I've asked about this being approved, and then it gets sold, and then we are going to change it again. We want to change the density and add the amenities and all that. My concern is in our position is that obviously it was approved as it is. It was obviously financially able to do so the way it was proposed. My concern is our job's difficult as it is, without every time we have a meeting, to have somebody want to change something, and to me, sometimes we open a floodgate when we do these changes. Because we do it for you. How many other developers are going to come in and say, "Well, I've got an approval for one acre lots or five acre lots or whatever it is, and if we can change it up. For me, I just don't see where there's a huge benefit. I think that the pickleball courts and the things, the amenities that are in that are going to benefit the people in that, right? I don't think they're as many people from Grantsville. I may be proven wrong someday, but every development we see, they want to put pickleball ports or baseball bills, and so people are going to attract to the areas where they're at, right? So yes, is it a benefit? I wouldn't argue that. Is it a benefit to Grantsville, all the residents? I'm not sure of that. I can't say 100% for sure, but personally, I'd like to see it stay the way it is because that's what was approved, and it simplifies our ability to make decisions without change, and change, and change, and get higher density, and you know what I'm saying. That's my position, I guess.

**Barry Gittleman** – Part of what you just said, I absolutely agree with. Making changes does risk setting a precedent that anything that's approved can be changed, and that's not good government. As a counterpoint to that, I would say that we're not asking to change it just for change's sake and for no

reason and for no benefit. We believe that there's a substantial benefit to the city and the citizens, not a minor benefit, and that's why we've been working on this for the last six months. Some of the comments that we did receive previously were, "Is the pickleball going to get used? Are the walking trails going to get used?"

That document that we provided to you and the public shows that walking trails are the number one most used amenity in the entire country and in Tooele County. The mayor was on the health study that was done in Tooele County last year. That study specifically identified that there's a health issue in Tooele County and an obesity issue in Tooele County. Many of the residents cite lack of amenities to get outdoors and get exercise as part of the reason for that. They listed their top 10 requested amenities, walking trails and running trails was number one on the list. Playgrounds, outdoor open space, the pickleball courts were all in the top five. We're proposing to build at our expense and donate to the city four of the top five requested amenities by your citizens. We're not proposing that this be in the HOA where only our homeowners can use it. It's going to be available to any of the citizens. I agree with you that someone at the opposite end of Grantsville may not use this. It's not going to be used by every citizen of Grantsville, but I think it's shortsighted for us to think that nobody outside the neighborhood is going to benefit from it.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Well, if I said that, that is what I meant. I didn't say nobody would use it outside that, but again, and I hear what you're saying.

**Barry Gittleman** – That's fair. One of the planning commission members last month, I think it may have been John, made the comment that, "Rather than opinions and emotion, we should make our decisions based on facts and data." I thought that was a great comment. That's why we put together that summary sheet of the supporting documentation for how popular pickleball and walking courts are. There was another comment about, "Is that land to the east even buildable?" We went and paid an engineer to go do a geotechnical study. He confirmed that north of the wetlands, it is all buildable. Some of those homes may not be able to have basements if we do them, but we never proposed to build in the wetlands. We proposed to build north of that, if at all. We now have an engineer's geotechnical study confirming that that land is buildable.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Which thank you for doing that. That's a reputable firm, so test pit seven, where does that land at? Do you guys know? I can see where all the borings are, but where's test pit seven at?

**Barry Gittleman** – I don't have that in front of me.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Because the groundwater there is five feet. That's why you won't be able to put a... That's why you're saying you won't be able to put a basement everywhere.

**Barry Gittleman** – In some portions, that's correct.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – That was before it stabilized, but yeah. Yeah, it does say that you can build on it. That's what I was asking the other day when I asked that question, so thank you for doing that.

**Barry Gittleman** – You're welcome.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – So for me, it comes back to the last meeting we had. I asked the different staff members if Grantsville City wants all of that land or can use it, can we afford to pay for it, and the consensus was no.

**Barry Gittleman** – So actually, we met with Dan, Cavett, Jesse, Brett, and James, the public works director. James said that he doesn't want anything that's less than 10 acres because it's not efficient for the city to maintain small pocket parks. That's not what we're proposing. In terms of the amenities that we're proposing, he said he does know that the citizens are requesting trails, playgrounds, open space and pickleball specifically, but he's specifically mentioned that if we're going to end up doing that, he would want them built to the high standards that are industry standards and references that he gave us. It's not a thin layer of concrete with some hand painted pickleball courts on it that the city's going to end up maintaining in poor repair. It would be high standards, and that's absolutely what we're willing to do and put in writing that we're committing to that.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. I don't have a report from any of those people to tell me that that's the case, and I'm not questioning your integrity at all. I appreciate the people who've come and said that you stick to what you say that you're going to do. That's not the concern. The concern is that this land was already developed, that it was set out, and like Kevin had said, when we opened the door to making changes to one, it creates a precedent for other people to come and ask for the same thing, and where do we draw the line? And while I think that personally these things are really nice, these amenities, I haven't gotten a sense from the staff of our city that this would be beneficial to our community.

The last time you were here, I said, "I might be open to 11 and more homes," and you now you're talking about 16, which I appreciate that it's not where it was. Well, 16 with a smaller one with no amenities, you're just donating the land, but no amenities. That was at 16, and now you're talking about 34, so you're talking about one-and-a-half times more than what was originally there.

**Barry Gittleman** – Well, not quite one and a half times more, but we've beaten us down over the last six months. The original plan we came with was 159 homes and everyone freaked out about it, and so now we're talking about 96 homes.

I think, to answer your comments, which are valid, and Kevin's. I agree that the city should not make arbitrary and capricious changes to a plan that's already approved I think the simple answer to how do you say yes to this and no to others, so you're not opening the door for everyone who wants any change, is if the benefits to the city and the citizens substantially outweigh the costs, then those are the rare cases where you do approve a modification to an existing plan. We feel strongly that this is not a minor benefit to the city. It's a substantial benefit to the city and the citizens at a substantial value that can save over a million dollars of future government expense that taxpayers would have to bear that burden.

This would cost the city absolutely nothing. When you look at the benefit to the city and the citizens in terms of dollars, and amenities, and land, and acreage, and the cost to the city is zero. It doesn't seem like it's a 50/50 proposition. It's a substantial benefit for zero cost whatsoever, and I would say to your comments and Kevin's, those are the rare exceptions where you approve an exception or a modification to an existing plan where it substantially outweighs the cost; the benefits outweigh the costs.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. Thanks for your input.



**Barry Gittleman** – We're still at the concept plan stage. We've not been given the opportunity to go before city council with the concept plans yet, and we'd still like to do that. I guess my question for the planning commission tonight is, "Do you have opinions on the options that we've laid out? Do you feel like under no circumstances, would you consider any changes, even if we donated a billion dollars to the city? Are you open to some modification to a plan if it's better to the city and the citizens than what was approved years ago?"

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Well, I think I said that the last time I was more open to 11 additional units with the amenities.

**Barry Gittleman** – Right.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I'm not seeing that, so I'm going to challenge you a little bit, this is just my own opinion, but I'm going to challenge you on the benefit of that land. You said it was appraised for a million dollars, but you can't sell it, so it's actually not worth that. You have "Development Agreement," and a plat that says, "This is what you have to do with the land."

**Barry Gittleman** – That's right. It's not buildable as currently approved. That's correct, but it still has some value. For the future homeowners in Worthington Ranch, their neighborhood is nicer. Their homes are going to be valued higher, appraised higher with open space adjacent to their land than without that open space, so it does have some value.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Right now, the way that it's approved, they own that.

**Barry Gittleman** – That's correct.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Those homeowners would own that and they could make the decision what to do with that. They could come together.

**Barry Gittleman** – They don't have the right. The way that the city has currently approved it, they don't have the right to do anything with that land, other than own it and maintain it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – The HOA can't develop it out to be something for them?

**Barry Gittleman** – No, I don't believe so the way it's currently approved.

**City Attorney Brett Coombs** – The way that the development agreement reserves it is, it reserves it as a conservation ground. I don't know that there's any specific language that says HOA can't do anything with it, but it's limited.

**Barry Gittleman** – It says open space the way it's worded right now.

**Mayor Critchlow** – In perpetuity, yeah.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Right, but open space doesn't mean that they can't do anything with it. They could build. Brett, asking you directly, so does the conservation easement, would that allow them to build their own trail system on that?

**City Attorney Brett Coombs** – I believe so, but I don't...

**Barry Gittleman** – If it were a conservation easement, which it's not, I don't think they could do anything with it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay.

**Barry Gittleman** – It's open space right now, and I agree with Brett, it's open. It may be open to interpretation whether the H O A can put anything on that land.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – If it's open space, that doesn't mean you can't do anything with it. It means open space means potentially you can put walking trails on it. It's the HOA property to do what they do as long as it remains unbuilt, as far as homes and things.

**Barry Gittleman** – Yeah. I think it's open to interpretation whether putting amenities in the HOA'S open space would be considered changing the open space and what's already approved, but if they did, it would be exclusive to the residents and not open to the entire city the way that we're proposing.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Right. That I understand, but it also would be your expense to keep the HOA's expense to keep and maintain in their liability and not the cities.

**Barry Gittleman** – Correct, and in theory, the fact that the HOA is required to maintain that could make it less appealing for potential home buyers and make the homes worth less. There's also an increase in the tax base to the city of having some additional homes. I know, Jamie, you mentioned potentially 11 extra homes in the last meeting that I think we also need to figure out what's financially viable. If you were going to propose that we get one extra lot to donate a million dollars of amenities to the city, that wouldn't make sense and wouldn't work, and so we're trying to propose something that would work for the city and the future homeowners and the developer.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – John, I see you sitting there listening intently. You had some comments last time. Do you have anything to add today?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Yeah, I would say we were saying, "Hey, it's wetlands. It's not good to build on." They've gone out and got a report that says that it is, so that's not the reason we can tell them no.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Well, and I'm not saying that that's the reason. What I'd like to know on, I guess your opinion, and if you're willing to share this, how do you feel about making a change to something that's already been approved?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I guess I don't know if I have an opinion on that. If we're looking at doing higher density housing and these guys are already buying into higher density housing in phase one and phase two, I don't think this is a bad place to do it.

I don't know if I'm really hung up on making a change to something that was already approved. I don't know that I would just say no, because it was already approved that way. I don't have a problem with them doing smaller lots on this. We're all saying we need more affordable housing. I know we can't make them sell this at affordable rates, but it is going to be more affordable with the smaller

lots, and the ground's buildable. Some of the concerns we brought to them last time saying you can't do it, they can. So that kind of takes that off the table.

I guess that's my main, I would be okay with option three, personally. I'm not going to get hung up on, and maybe I'm wrong, but I'm not going to get hung up on, "Hey we approved phase one and phase two and now they want to come in and do something different." But they offer these trails and you've got the neighbors that are saying that they would enjoy those trails. I don't know maybe we're just like, this is the hill we're going to die on and we approved it one way and we're not going to change it. Why would we do that? We haven't heard back from the city, he's saying that those guys would say they would be okay with it. Maybe we ought to wait, table it, and see what they actually say, if they do want that land.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Well and today's definitely is only a discussion so I mean we don't really need to table it, but the feedback is what they're looking for, right?

**Barry Gittleman** – That's correct. I appreciate your comments John. I think one of the other feedback items we got from a few of the city council members we met with one-on-one was that they personally believe, and they think many home buyers believe, that having variety enhances a neighborhood. In the current plan we have 62 home sites that are all slightly less than an acre, plus or minus 10 or 20%. In the new plan we would have some lots that are one and a half acres, some lots that are half acre, more variety, which they felt improves the plan over the originally approved plan because not everyone wants one and a half acres to have to maintain that big of a yard. Some people want a smaller home site.

Overall these are still very large home sites. We're talking about proposed 96 lots on 157 acres. So substantially less than one home per acre. It is still, to use many of the citizens' comments from earlier tonight, it's still small-town charm. It's still what is in the best interest of the city and maintaining that Grantsville feel that so many people are saying they want.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I guess I would just ask the city, there's not that going to be that much to maintain, the field's going to be that way either way. If they put trails in, are they going to have to maintain those trails? What would that cost, I don't know. I guess there's still some unknowns, but I'm okay with option three.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Okay. Any other discussion needed tonight?

**Barry Gittleman** – Okay, thank you for your feedback.

## **6. Report from City Council liaison Mayor Critchlow**

**Mayor Critchlow** – I thought you handled that very well. I'm just going to say a couple of things to the people as they're coming in and out. That's a lot of houses.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Where? Be more specific. Matthews?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Matthews, Like I said, what they really want is for you guys to come up with what do you want, basically.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Not our job.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I will say one thing about the place to put their poop. We're doing an RFP to get the design done for the sewer plant. That's in, we're probably two or three years behind schedule but we're moving on it.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Is the money intact to do the improvements, Mayor?

**Mayor Critchlow** – To do those? Oh no. The one that talked about up in Preston, I will do a little research on that because we have an estimate of \$27 million to build a new plant. It's a lot of money.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – And how much of that do we have in the bank, Mayor, do you know that question? Answer to that question?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Soon as I take the engineer and tip up we've got a couple more pennies on it, depending on what we get out of it, we're going to have to pay most of that out of, and it will mostly come out of impact use.

**Dan England** – We're also going through, we have somebody looking into getting grants to help with that too.

**Mayor Critchlow** – That's right. It's a lot of work. I mean if we maintained what we did 10 years ago, we wouldn't have to do this. But with what's happening right now, it's gone up and is going up drastically.

Like I said, the store is Solberg's, we need a new store you guys. I'm not going to make Kirk try to sell his property. We shouldn't. There's just a lot of houses and it's crazy up there and I don't know how we're going to adjust to that. They're going to have to come back with a better plan that will be more acceptable to you guys. I promised Jaime a long time ago that I wouldn't try to negotiate for you guys and I haven't. Okay? But I called you guys the other day to let you know that this thing was, that's their line in the sand basically.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – You didn't call me mayor.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I never find you at home. You're always out travel and chasing around.

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – Maybe you figured I'd already made up my mind. I don't know.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I wish the state wasn't so demanding that we do things. I mean they really are tough to deal with some days.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – We have to make a plan for affordable housing. We don't control what is actually built or what plans come in front of us, and it's not our job to propose those plans. Right? So, the state can tell us what we have to do, but at the same time we don't control what's going on.

In my opinion, we don't need to be changing all of our codes and everything because developers don't think that they can make it happen that the state has told us to do X, Y, and Z. That's not our role.

**Mayor Critchlow** – And this parcel, the parcel across the street, parcel on Old Lincoln Highway, all of that was changed and kind of bumped around a couple of years ago, about three years ago, in between those three years. And it really has changed what the outcome of ... Once the zoning gets changed, it's very difficult, in my opinion, to tell somebody we're not going to let you do these things because we don't like it.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Well, I just want to correct you just a little bit there. I'm not telling them we're not going to approve this because we don't like it. We're telling them we're not going to approve it with all of the variations. We have a code for a reason. Our job is to follow the code. And if they can't make it work under the code, maybe there's some variances that make sense, but not 40 of them. And not ones that deal with public safety.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Correct. And I don't disagree with any of those things told you that on the phone.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Any of the developments, it's not directed at any one specific development. That's the reality of all of the developments.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah, I wish some of those things just didn't get changed and I'm not sure all the reasons why. The ones up on the 112, that got changed long before any of us were around, well actually in this body.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Well and I want to just really quick comment about the mixed use on the Matthews. The city told us once the plan was in place to follow the plan. We did. That's exactly what we did.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yep.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – That's what the future land use called for.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I know that.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I know it's late, but can I ask a couple questions for educational purposes, Jamie?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Of course.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Mayor I keep hearing about deficiencies, right? We don't have enough city staff or city employees to keep up. Is that true?

**Mayor Critchlow** – We're doing okay.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – And I hear we have a sewer deficiency.

**Mayor Critchlow** – We do.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – And I'm just curious, what's the answer to, going forward, preventing that deficiency from happening? What's happened? Are the impact fees that have been collected to go towards that have been spent?

**Mayor Critchlow** – We have a sewer line down the middle of Main Street, water line down the middle of Main Street, that helped with gathering everything from that side of town to take it down to there. But with the plan that the guy presented, he thought we had five to seven years. Then we got into the nuts and bolts about what the population was in Grantsville and I don't think we have that.

We're going to have to get a sewer treatment plant in place. We're trying to find the money to do that. And these big developments are going to cause us a bit of a grief with it.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – And then my next question is, again, I hear the state mandating all these things and all this stuff's happening. I just can't get my head wrapped around the idea if we've got problems, why we keep approving this stuff. If we can't pay for what we got, don't we need to say, "Hey wait a minute here." Or if we have a deficiency financially do we need to raise the fees? I mean I guess I'm just trying to understand how we deal with all that.

**Mayor Critchlow** – We had a meeting today about water and how we can make sure that our fees are going to be structured correctly for that, and that's a work in progress. There's a lot of things that is a work in progress at this point. The sewer treatment plant is a big deal and it's going to that's a lot of money.

We need to really focus a lot of attention in getting the money so it doesn't impact the residents of Grantsville that have been here for a long time. We have to make sure we do a little impact on the citizens at that point. The impact fees are being collected. We have a, I can't remember. Brett, how much do we raise every year? We have a standard increase in the sewer rates to compensate for the cost of running that plant. It's a certain amount of money.

City Manager Jesse Wilson – It's about 3%.

**Mayor Critchlow** – 3%. Because it goes up. I mean over the last year it's gone up more than 3%. But things are what they are.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So obviously, in my mind I guess from shooting from the hip is that we've got 528 and I don't know how many out there, 700, 900.

**Mayor Critchlow** – 700 out there.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – It seems to me like we're already behind the eight ball. The reality of it is the impact fees are not, we're going to stay in that mode if we don't do something to say, "Hey, wait a minute here, we've got to catch up financially here." If we keep approving those things and we know we're adding dramatically to those deficiencies, are we not? Because the impact fees are going to come as people buy or build, right?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Correct.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Right? And so how do we justify all of this growth with no way to pay for it?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Well it's like I've told Howard and those guys on that Matthew's piece, I'd just as soon rename it Hayfield, because I was happy with it just being the hay fields. But it's not my property, it belongs to the Matthews. They have some things happened that the zone got changed, things took place that enabled them to have a different density than what I would be happy with and you'd be happy with. Upsets the heck out of me. But the fact is that there are deficiencies and we're working on them. We're trying our best to make sure that we're not going to fall behind and be in trouble in 10 years from now. That the people that are in those seats in 10 years from now are going to hate our guts because we shafted them. Do you know what I'm saying? Do you understand? Does that answer the question?

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I do, but to some degree I think we're a little bit in that position today, right? Because if we're \$27 million potentially into a sewer upgrade and we don't have the financial ability to at least cover what percentage of that, I think we're sort of in that position today, aren't we?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Well we're working on getting the funds for that and we're not going to build it until we do that. And the only other alternative we have is to enact a moratorium, and we don't want to do that.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Well, and again I hate to say that, that's my point.

**Mayor Critchlow** – But we can only do it for six months at a shot.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – But again, I just see the numbers, I guess, Mayor. I know we need all of these things. I agree 100% with all that, but with the deficiencies we're seeing, the situation we're in, and we've got ... How many lots are approved today currently? Anybody know kind of what that is?

**Mayor Critchlow** – I asked that at one point.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Do we know what that is, I guess? How many lots are currently approved in our community?

**City Engineer Dan England** – At one point about last year I had gone through and did a study, I think I presented to you guys and we had roughly 4,000 water connections at that time and we had planned developments at that time, it was going to take us about 12,000 additional water connections. It was going to end up being about four times the size. Things changed a little bit since then. Things slowing down. Some of those developments were proposed are adjusting or maybe not going forward at this point, or coming back later, but that gives you an idea of where we were about a year ago.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Does that make sense? That help you?

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Well it does, but still again, I have that question in my mind that yes, it's slowing down but so are the impact fees, correct?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Correct.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Isn't there a study for the impact fees? Are we still working on that study?

**City Engineer Dan England** – We just finished that study. It was done in '22. It was just approved by City Council how long ago?

**Mayor Critchlow** – About six months ago.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – So as a community then don't feel like we're in any kind of a situation where we should say, whoa. That's question I guess I'm asking from a city staff standpoint.

**Mayor Critchlow** – When I hired the new police chief, I jokingly told, I says, "I need you to place officers on all the entrances to the city, if they looked like they're developers to arrest them." But I jokingly did that and two of them caught the idea that I was joking. The third guy was like, "Really?" I was going, "No, I'm just joking." People have a right to do business in Grantsville.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I agree with that. Totally. I don't argue that.

**Mayor Critchlow** – Yeah. I wish we could have changed a lot of things prior to this. We kind of got, those 88 houses up there on Durfee and Willow really irritate me, and a lot of things irritate me as far as that goes. And the one up there on Northstar, is the Northstar guy still here? No, he must have left. Anyway, that was a lot of houses that was approved. But that was approved back in what, 2004, 2005. The stuff out there by Walmart was changed in 2001. All of those things we're just having to deal with that as they're going to build with them.

If we don't enough capacity down here, we'll have to shut things off. Okay? That's the deal. I don't want to flood Jamie's house with our sewer.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Thank you, I don't think you will, it's a little ways away.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – A grip on where that is today, Mayor? I mean are we actively monitoring that to know?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Oh yeah, yeah. They keep a good track of it.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – What percentage are we today?

**Mayor Critchlow** – I don't know offhand, Kevin. I can find that information for you.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Do you have a guess? I guess I'm just generally asking.

**Mayor Critchlow** – There's times when there's different levels of phosphorous that affects us and the state doesn't like it. There's also, there's times when the water, the amount of water going into our sewer plants is higher. But the sewer is being maintained correctly. Our staff is down there and they're doing a good job maintaining it. I mean if we added another thousand houses, we'd be in serious trouble.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – Well mayor, I'm not suggesting nobody's not doing a good job at all. I'm not, because I appreciate what's going on. But again, from my perspective, when I hear deficiencies it concerns me a little bit. Right?

**Mayor Critchlow** – Me too.



**Commission member Kevin Hall** – And I just, you know what I mean? I try to wrap my head around this whole picture, not just what's happening here or happening there. It's concerning because I'm a senior citizen and I keep hearing all these programs, the state's going to give \$20,000 for people to get a new home, but what was the last thing they did for senior citizens? They're not mandating anything for us.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I made a promise that we're going to try to negotiate with the developers. You guys do that. That's your job. There's things that I have found that we need to look at as far as bringing businesses to our city, and the amount of tax money that we use. Houses cost you money, I don't care what anybody tells you. Businesses make you money. There's lots of people that are trying to bring some businesses here.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – Yeah. Anything else?

**Mayor Critchlow** – No. What do you want me to take back the City Council? Do you like the meetings that combine?

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I thought our last one was really effective.

**Mayor Critchlow** – I thought they was sort of productive.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – I mean I was only there for part of it, but the part it was there. I thought it was very productive and I appreciated it.

**Commission member Kevin Hall** – I think it helps a lot to keep us on the same page. We're not always going to agree perfectly, but I think it helps to hear opinion and thoughts and all those kinds of things. Right? Emotion.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – We are insulated from the public because people aren't allowed to approach us. And so sometimes we don't know what you guys are hearing, the City Council and mayor, is hearing from the public about what they want. And so it does help us to ...

**Mayor Critchlow** – What I'm hearing from the public, they don't want any more houses built. Well they all wanted them on five acre lots. And you guys don't how that goes.

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham** – That I understand. But as far as amenities and things, it helps for us. Anything else? John, do you have anything?

**Commission Vice-Chair John Limburg** – I guess the only thing is, it keeps being brought up that the zoning is what it is and it was changed. When we did that we weren't able to ask what they were going to do with it. I guess the only control we could have had is what we're trying to do now and put more restrictions on mixed use.

## **7. Adjourn**

**Commission Chair Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commission Member Kevin Hall seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously, with John on Zoom. Meeting adjourn at 9:21 pm**