

**MINUTES OF A WORK MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL  
AND PLANNING COMMISSION HELD THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2000:**

**Mayor and Council Present:** Mayor Merle Cole. Council Members: Byron Anderson, Craig Anderson, Kevin Hall, and Karen Watson.

**Appointed officers and employees present:** Wendy Palmer, City Recorder (8:20 p.m.), Steve Larsen, Dianne Hunsaker, Brent Bunderson Planning Commission Members.

Citizens and Guests: Mary Ruth Hammond (press), Gary Christley, Alan Johnson, Janet Cook, Annette Anderson, Chleo Boyer.

Mayor stated that due to the many changes of the proposed general plan we are having a work meeting to work out the changes and understand what the changes have meant. Mayor the biggest change talked about is the two-acre lot size on the exterior of the city and Planning Commission.

Bruce discussed the public input. Bruce stated that he has about 12-13 pages of notes. I want to present my broad classifications of comment that I heard. On one side, we heard specific landowner property issues the appropriateness of the light industrial zones on old Lincoln Highway. Not a reason to expand the Light Industrial and scale back the light industrial or move it to the Burmester and the proposed by-pass road of SR-112.

On the Clegg property they believe they are in the process and due diligence with the city and are already vested. If they can show that they are vested as per the city Attorney then nothing we do will affect them.

Bruce expressed two philosophical discussions 1. Qualities of life – protect and preserve this quality of life the ability to maintain the range of housing stock around the city. In addition, protect the rural character of the city. That issue speaks to policy. The residents speaking to the Council on these issues believe that they potentially have invested everything in their home and they have the right to discuss with the City Council the quality of life for residents now and residents in the future. The Citizens are saying, “Just replicate what we have in Grantsville now that would be a nice way to go.” We need to talk about how to achieve that goal.

Bruce stated that in a broad philosophical discussion –It is inappropriate for the Planning Commission and the City Council to get involved in this discussion. The property owners say that they know what is best for their property, economy will drive the property absorption, and the property owner should have the right to guide the growth. The one thing that is missing from this general plan is that we don’t want to mandate ten-acre lots in the ten-acre zone. What we are saying is that we want one resident per ten acres with the possibility of clustering homes on smaller lots but holding to an overall density of 1 unit per ten-acre density. Now the discussion is a density issue. This is a way to replicate what you have already and achieve a reasonable density with open space. This is broad guideline for the city. We should be continually evaluating this document so responsive to the community. This is not a document that is locked in stone but, you must try and carry through with it. If we could just replicate what we have here today is what I heard as I sat through the several public hearings. The only reasons the vacant land is vacant today is that the current residents have not acted on the zoning density that is there now. We need to think about protecting the current open space that exists in the core of the city. Bruce asked the Council to keep in mind the window of time that your general plan is addressing, is it current residents or current residents & future residents for your general plan design.

Byron asked if a property owner owns 100 acres and what if he wants to build or develop? Would he only be able to build 10 homes? He may not have to have one home on a 10-acre parcel but he would have to try and recoup the costs on ten buildable lots. Bruce stated that that is correct. Byron asked what is the difference. Bruce stated that I don’t have to recoup the full 100 acres. Cost of the infrastructure and don’t have a lot of development costs up front.

Mayor stated that I think that there are two things we need to discuss. I think the intention of the light industrial is that we would like to annex out to the mountain. Craig stated that we should leave it gray on the map and, and go out on the far northwest edge of the city to a small area to the north. Brent stated that part of the reason that we designated the north west corner as industrial is that it has the best access to I-80. There was an issue with putting the industrial area on Burmester and then we put a strip on the road at 850 North on SR 138.

Justin stated that I am worried about trapping us a little. The economic team from Salt Lake comes out to look at the industrial area. If we say that is the industrial zone today that is like saying that we don't have an industrial zone.

Kevin we need to consider the impact the people who are already there. What reason would we have to make a blanket industrial zone through an area that is already established as open property? I agree with Craig to go out to the northern edge and consider later working back or annex out. We need to carve the residential area out of the industrial area.

Brent asked who owns the property along the highway on the northwest? Mr. Nielson stated that he did not consider zoning the property industrial. Justin stated that Mr. Nielson has stated that he would consider selling to an industrial user.

Craig made the motion that we incorporate into our future land use map the existing industrial area and put a flag on the northern boundary. Seconded by Kevin. Roll Call Vote: Brent in favor, Craig in favor, Karen in favor, Steven in favor, Dianne in favor, Justin in favor, Byron in favor. Motion carried.

Karen wanted to discussion the other industrial zone. Karen suggested that on Burmester Road the industrial zone should extend to Koester Street. Byron asked why did we move the industrial zone north from Koester Street? Craig stated that we wanted to buffer the existing homes. Craig asked Bruce if the lines on the general plan map are hard lines? Bruce stated that when a rezone is requested the Council will have to determine the locations of those hard lines. Craig made the motion to set the southern boundary of the industrial area on Burmester Road approximately 600 feet north of Koester Street. Seconded by Byron. Brent asked if the north and south lines are going to remain the same on the east and the west? Byron described the shape of the industrial area on Burmester as an upside Utah shape - Yes per Mayor. Roll call vote: Brent – in favor, Craig in favor. Kevin stated that the difficult thing for me is are we impacting these people or are we just going to say let's go with that? Are we going to make sure we are 600 feet from residential neighbor on SR138 and Old Lincoln Highway? Are we going to impact the people the same. Craig stated that this issue would be discussed at the time of the zone change request. Mayor, I think there is a difference between these two areas.

Kevin stated that if we have 600 feet from residences on Burmester Road we should do that same distance on Old Lincoln Highway. Byron discussed a letter that he received that a person did not want the industrial zone is in "my front yard" it would devalue my property. Byron stated that an industrial zone does not devalue property and appraiser cannot devalue the property based on the existence of industry.

Brent is not saying that 600 feet is the way it has got to be I just agree with the natural break. Dianne asked to be shown where the house is that we are concerned about. Brent stated that if we move the industrial area further south the people in this area would be upset. Kevin stated that we are effecting people and they believe we have moved this industrial area north and now we are moving it back we should get their input.

Mayor call for vote: Brent in favor, Craig in favor, Kevin – abstain until the other industrial zone discussion is held, Karen abstain due to land ownership, Steve in favor, Dianne in favor, Justin in favor, Byron in favor. Motion carried.

Byron asked for a clarification concerning the soft lines of this general plan map. In the letter from Bruce to the Mayor in October 3, 2000. Paragraph read “With the adoption of the city Comprehensive General Plan Policy Statements, we should immediately proceed to make amendment to the Grantsville City zoning ordinance.” Does this mean that we will zone to match this plan or not? Mayor stated that we would get all of the conflicting information and fluff out of the Zoning Ordinance book. Bruce addressed this issue to the Council by stating that we would review the ordinance to see if there is anything in the ordinance that would have conflict with the general and would evaluate the uses allowed first. Then the discussion is how much of the use should be allowed. Then the issue of how I put the use on the property. Like how much buffer between the industrial and residential. Byron – we are not saying that we should match the hard line for the zoning map of the city. If you see that there is clear inconsistency between the general plan and the zoning map and then the question is raised do we change the zone or change the general plan. You can change the uses allowed into the zone.

Kevin made motion to move the industrial zone 600 feet from residences in both industrial areas. Justin asked if we are talking about Burmester and Old Lincoln Highway? Craig motion to come back ¼ mile south from the city limits on the Old Lincoln Highway from the city limits southwest on the highway. Justin stated that the only way to we would accept new industry in that area is to annex more property. Kevin amended the motion to go west ¼ of a mile on SR138 north to the corner of the city. Justin stated that we had better get more aggressive in annexing the property out north of the city limits. Mayor stated that what we are trying to sell is a flag of industrial zone and that we would like to annex all the way to Wendover.

Brent asked who owned the property and is he opposed to the industrial designation? Craig answered- Darrell Nielsen. By making the land use general plan does not change the zoning of it? Craig answered no. I think it serves the city best to leave a chunk inside the city limits as light industrial.  
City Recorder arrives at 8:20 p.m.

Mayor stated that he feels that we should go half way between the Lincoln Highway and SR138 and designate that area as light industrial. Mayor stated that we take 50 feet south of 850 North and extend to the west city limits. Karen stated that Marty Anderson wanted to leave the industrial area the way it was as well and James Christiansen and Paul Rupp.

The Mayor stated that this flag on the map that states Grantsville City is interested in annexing all of the way to Wendover.

Richard Dillard discussed the old Castagno home would be across from the proposed industrial zone. Mr. Dillard stated that the reason I don't like the industrial zone in this area on SR138 and Old Lincoln Highway is because it takes longer to reach this area by using I-80 and the traffic would come through Grantsville Main Street. I timed the distance and timing between arrival at Burmester Road verses Old Lincoln Highway, the Burmester Road industrial area is closer.

Justin stated that he felt that both sites are attractive for industrial development.

Kevin made the motion to place the industrial designation 50 feet south of the northern city limit boundary at Old Lincoln Highway and SR138. Seconded by Craig. All voted in favor, motion carried.

Craig stated that he had a concern about the large area between Sheep Lane and Willow Street. Craig stated that the commercial zone allows the high-density designation in this area as well and he would propose to pull back the commercial zone 2/3 of the block. To show that it is in the corridor and this would provide for the ability of the city to have a general plan discussion as to how it would affect the general area.

Mayor stated that you would still have the same effect allowing the high-density development. Steve stated that we should leave it? Either leave it or remove it. Mayor stated that it is the intent to have commercial development and not allow for the high rise apartment buildings. Brent stated that high density is not that high of density it is only 12-15 units per acre. Brent suggests to leave it the way that it is as an invitation to commercial. Kevin agreed with Brent. Justin stated that Grantsville City needs to do things pro-active verses come fight your case and we will see. Diane stated that John Cook's property is on the East and I would like to leave this designation the way it is. Byron stated that the Matthews were here at the public hearing and did not object to this zoning designation. Craig withdrew his suggestion.

Mayor made comments concerning the remainder of the land use map. Mayor stated that the reality of his position is he is a land speculator. Mayor offered to sell his farm to a farmer and the farmer stated that he did want to buy his farm at farmland prices. Mayor stated that he realized that he wanted to sell the farm for development prices. Mayor stated that the only thing we do by ourselves as a city is the land use planning. Everything else is dictated to us by other government agencies. I was at WalMart the other day and contrasted WalMart to another shopping center that was somewhere else. The point of the conference of picking the public's pocket in taxes is to often we sacrifice the one tool we have which is land use planning is the chase for retail sells. We chase houses in hopes that we will get the big box retail market. Mayor of Farmington stated that every 250-lot subdivision that is approved he should hire a police officer and that officer costs \$70,000 a year. The property tax brings in \$65,000 a year. I think that the personal conclusion is that the land use-planning map should not create a market that guarantees Merle Cole maximum profit from my land. The market ought to do that. The plan should provide the vehicle to allow the market to work.

Justin asked the Mayor to correlate this statement to the map. Mayor stated that he felt that this land use planning map works. Byron stated that the inverse is true as well.

Dianne stated that I look at this from a standpoint of a young family. It is a reality that the young families go to WalMart to purchase the goods for their families. We are forcing these people to shop in another community.

Mayor & Justin stated that we shouldn't compromise the land use planning map with a nice scene of a big box store with 1200 parking stalls and three trees. Dianne stated that we should include that as a possibility to be there. Mayor & Justin stated that the plan does that already. Dianne stated that when she looks at the priority 1 area of the planning map it looks like segregated living based on income. Is that being Grantsville friendly? We worry about growth and what is market driven. As a result of Grantsville not growing as fast as other areas of the city we are going to lose a school board seat.

Kevin asked Dianne if she is aware of how many lots are available in our community today? 1386 available lots ranging in size from 6500 square feet up to one acre. Is that stopping growth; is it us as a city that has stopped the growth here? Why are the people going to Tooele? Dianne, Mayor and Brent stated that the land is cheaper. Dianne stated that she felt that the city is letting anything and everything in the name of infill. And some of that infill is not the type of infill that we want. If this is my General Plan I am nervous. Dianne suggested that maybe we should set some standards for infill if we leave the outer limits as larger lot sizes. Kevin stated that what troubles him concerning infill is I don't think we have ever stated to any developers that you can only develop the five acres on North Cooley. Brent stated that he believes that we have. Brent stated that if a developer want to develop 50 lots on the outer area of Grantsville he would have to buy 500 acres. That says that he can't do that because of the expense. So, what you have said is you have to develop on the inner portion of Grantsville. Kevin stated that there is as much open space on the North side of Durfee Street. Dick Johnson has 80 acres that is zoned R-12, the developers can buy this property. There are a couple of issues with me because we have provided a mixture of lot in our community. I want you guys to explain to how we create a mixture if we take away the 5-10 acre lot sizes. I had a conversation with Bart and Jeff and they are contractors that are struggling. What compelling reason is there for us to go out and approve additional lots when we can't build what we have? As a results our contractors are starving to death. Dianne stated to Kevin "why aren't you

worrying about the property owners?" Kevin stated that he agrees with the Mayor and with some of the public comment that it is not my responsibility to guarantee the property owners a profit on their property. Craig asked if we are going to force contractors to buy lots from existing subdivisions? Kevin stated that there is more land available that is not in subdivisions. Justin stated that this is what is started us down the road; we heard a lot of argument about Watt Homes as a good development but not in the best location. We wanted to build the city in a logical planning type of way. Where are the best locations for development and we started to plan that out. If we go to a certain number --say one acre- we say we have gone opposite of where we tried to go with. This is because we turn our whole city over to the developers anywhere in the city limits where we could put in subdivision. Karen stated that it is market driven. Justin stated that Watt Homes is market driven but who ends up paying for it? So if we allow one subdivision in each of the farthest corners of the city who pays to sustain those subdivisions. And the market drives this without infill, we will have south Grantsville because we have failed to have a plan to protect our city. Dianne stated that we are encouraging small lots and "don't you dare go on the outside of the city to have an acre lot for your home." Justin, Mayor and Kevin stated that we have that type of lot available already in our city. Dianne talked about a condo unit in the middle of an alfalfa field in Logan City. Why do we say that those kinds of things need to be downtown? Kevin stated in the same argument why don't we allow a light industrial operation next to South Willow Estates? Justin stated that what had happened in Logan City is that there was a Macey's and a light industrial lot right on the corner. The developers came into an area like the land between Main and Durfee and SR112 and Matthews Lane. There are many areas in our community in the priority one area are still alfalfa fields. Dianne stated that she wants to keep it that way. Mayor stated that House Bill 295 states that we as a city have to provide low to moderate-income housing. There is a study going on right now that will show how Grantsville City is doing to provide that kind of housing. Mayor stated that people want a big house on a little lot or a little house we have to allow for all of that. Brent stated that he feels that there is a probably a way around House Bill 295. Brent stated that we need to avoid low income housing until someone comes and says you got to do it. Brent related a story about pigs and density. If there is too many pigs they begin to bite each other's tails. It does not matter if there is 5 pigs to a pen or if there is two. People will do the same thing. Brent asked those present to take Main Street and turn it to run North and South. As you know the most efficient community exists in a circle the second most efficient manner is a square. Grantsville is built in a long thin inefficient use of space. Response time for emergency vehicles would be the same east and west as north and south. So you haven't hurt yourself by allowing development on the north and the south. Mayor stated that you have to temper that by density in the areas. Brent stated that by saying the density has to be ten acres and you have essentially told those people "you are out of luck." Mayor stated that every one of those people that complained about the ten acre density, have land in the contiguous areas of the lower density areas and they can extend those zones. Brent stated that he feels that the city is discriminating against those landowners. Mayor we don't have a responsibility to create a market for anyone. Kevin stated that the reason that Watt Homes built on the South end of town was because the ground was cheaper. Brent we are talking about treating people equal. You are discriminating. Justin and the Mayor stated that any zoning is discrimination. Byron asked that if 1300 some odd lots for sale are not selling? Do you believe that the ten-acre area is dropped to 2 acres, that this area will then develop? Byron stated that he believed that no it because it is market driven. So what is the difference, the difference is we have put a cap on the density of the land if we leave it 10 acres. Kevin stated that we are creating a market? Once you created an area as A-10 in year 2000 -- why do we need to jump to year 2050 or year 2020 right now? Byron stated that the ten acres zone is a cap. Justin asked Byron if we want to control anything in the city? Kevin stated that lets take all of the zoning and throw it out then, because we want to take away A-10 property in our community. Steve stated that he agrees with a lot of things that Bruce says and I feel that Brent is more clear to me all of the time. The plan is not set in stone. Is this plan actually showing our community in the future based on economics? This plan has started out fine and ha becomes clearer. Steve stated that possibly you don't have to look at this map in another way. I have no agenda all I care about is this town. Grantsville is getting another elementary school and we need another Jr. High. Justin I don't think I have any agenda except I am going to live here for a long time. I think we need to plan for it so it does not look like Tooele in 30 years. Byron stated that a plan is not locked in stone and

any good plan is a reaction to change. Justin stated that he does not willing to throw my arms up and give up. I am not going to back down because you don't think it is a good plan. Karen stated that as we look at the plan, any developers or property owner could come in and ask to have the zone changed. They ask the Planning Commission and they either say yes or no. There may be someone come in and want to put in a WalMart Store and we as a city say that is a good idea. Then pretty soon all of this ten-acre stuff goes away anyway. I lived in Sandy, my folks were farmers, and my dad got rid of his horses and cows because he is a man of character. In twenty-five or thirty years from now that will happen here. We plan our city not in ten acres but we plan for two or one acres and not 7,000 square foot lot. Our children are going to Tooele to buy a home because they can't live here. Justin stated that he disagreed with that because there is homes for sale at \$70,000. Justin stated that we see people developing lots in a natural transition. But if we go across the board and drop to one acre this year where are we going next year and the next year. Karen stated that she wants quality of life here in Grantsville. Karen stated that Heckert Cottages is awful and we are stuck with it. We drive into our town and we see twin homes. Brent stated that he felt that everybody has made up their mind. Is there anyone here that hasn't made up their mind? Kevin stated that maybe so if the Council and the Commission can convince me that there is any compelling reason to give up on the ten acres. I have been door to door and been on the telephone. One of the things that I have heard from the beginning is that we need to provide a mix. Byron stated that the disagreement is what the definition of mix is. We provided a mix of all things. What compelling need is there, in the year 2000, that we have to change the 10-acre property to 2 acre or 1 acre? Kevin read a portion of a letter presented by Grantsville Development that was signed by Brent Bunderson. Brent's letter states that infill should not be promoted. The citizens of Grantsville like Grantsville the way it is and if it is to grow we need to duplicate it and provide for our rural lifestyle. How do we create the things that you talk about in your letter by doing away with the A-10 zone? Brent stated that the development wants to go to the South. The rest is filling in the 5 acre pastures on inner portion of our city and I am against that. If I have my way I would have a 5-acre lot and a house throughout the city. My hope is that by opening up the entire city that filling in the inner portion of the city will take a little bit longer. Mayor and Kevin asked Brent how do you do that? Mayor stated that when Dianne Hunsaker and Merle Cole die their pastures will fill in with houses. Kevin stated that it has been said that nobody can afford 5 & 10-acre lots and they are weed patches. But by doing away with that you are automatically driving the market, which means that, no one can afford those lots ever. If we allow the smaller lots on the outside of the community you will have two communities. I don't think that it is our job to say that nobody can afford the 5-10 acre lots and you will never see it again if you change to 1-2 acre-lots. Because of the financial reasons we need to jump our to year 2050 right now. In the past the process when the developers come to the pulpit to negotiate for any amenities for our city. They do that in exchange for a PUD or density issues. When you automatically take that density down we as a city loose any leverage as a city to argue or debate or require these amenities. I believe that by jumping out making the blanket statement we give away our rights to argue those issue. The zoning will be set and there will be no way to change that. It is just like the water we want to start at the bottom here. We want to go from A-10 to the bottom and do away with any opportunity to negotiate. Once we are down we are never going back up. Dianne stated that when she looked in the audience she saw young people that would like to have a home where they have some space. Dianne stated that what we are doing, I hope we are not overlooking the needs of the people that are here today. Dianne stated that we shouldn't overlook the homegrown growth. Some of the people want to give their children and grandchildren a building lot. Dianne stated that she heard that they were building a Grantsville friendly plan. Dianne stated that this plan would look good in Beaver or Nephi – Mayor and Karen disagreed. Dianne stated that we want our own plan, not one that fits anywhere else. Dianne read that the most sensible most logical plan is to fill in and utilize the existing vacant areas. The strongest motivation for this approach because it is most cost effective. Mayor asked if that is not true. Diane said that if we are interested in the economic focused plan than that is what we have. But if we want to consider lifestyle and the aesthetic part of it. Justin responded that he has received from the city concerning a rezoning of property on South Hale Street from A-10 to RR-1 and they have the contiguous zoning to extend from. But we have some negotiating on our part. But if it was already at one acre zoning they come in and say they want ¼ acre if they are at one acre. Dianne stated that she did not want to

work with each zone change each time someone wants a change? Byron made a motion to adopt the beginning map from the Planning Commission that designates RR-5 & 10 as rural residential from the Mormon Trail west and north wrapping around the north area to the east city limits. The low density 1 & 2 acre zoning to extend East from Mormon Trail on the south side of Grantsville to the East city limits. Byron added that all properties owned by the Grantsville Soil Conservation District will remain unzoned. Dianne seconded the motion. Craig stated that he had a long history with this process. I regress to the night that the vote was taken to approve Watt Homes. If you take Watt Homes out of this picture, the general plan is fine. The fact is that Watt Homes is there and the school district is planning to put a school in this area as well. I personally like this plan but it lacks practicality and long sense feasibility. We are trying to perceive what it will be when it changes. If we don't do that the chances of it changing to something we don't foresee it being, is far greater. We have never followed a general plan before because they were not practical. I feel that the plan that the Zoning Commission works if we tweak it to 1 acre as the minimum lot size and a density of .8. The zoning ordinance book eludes that the one-acre lot is the best lot size that allows the keeping of livestock. Is that not rural the ability to keep livestock? The problem is that we are moving one acre lots out of rural and putting it in low density with one half acre lots. Which means we won't get anymore one-acre lots. You are saying that you want ½ acre lots and then jump to five-acre lots. The practicality of five-acre lots is problematic. They are anticipated to be on septic systems. There are areas of our city that have to be on septic systems because there is no sewer available. Areas where the sewer can be practically hook in we should take measures that it happens. It is not practical on 5-acre lots. Also it is anticipated that they are on individual well system. With 10-acre lot those lots can be on gravel roads. We have heard from the public works director that gravel roads are expensive to maintain. I don't believe that under Grantsville's maintenance that is true. Some people are willing to live on gravel street. This plan needs to look down the road. Do we need to keep an area of our city livestock friendly? If we go much under one acre lot size we do away with that. If you look at the county there is two distinctly differently products out there. There is Stansbury Park that is not for livestock. There is one-acre lots through the hay field. There is 5-acre lots across the highway. It might not hurt to zone an area as livestock areas in our city. Byron asked Craig that it is not only the density that concerns him it is the definition of the zone? Craig stated that he voted against Watt Homes I thought it was the wrong project in the wrong place. But since I lost the vote I felt that it was my duty that I help make it work. Now we are going to have a school, the area around a school will be residential like it or not. It would delight me in 20 years that some aspect of the plan we adopt is actually followed. Craig stated that if we have a plan that shows what is expected the developers won't try to change it. We have farmers tell us it costs money to farm. Byron asked Craig if he can support this motion. Craig stated that he can support what the Planning Commission proposed. Steve stated that the night that the Planning Commission worked with the City Council he did not remember that the density was not lower than one acre. Steve stated that a developers will always lower the density. Brent stated that we wanted it a density of 1 residence per 2 acres. That density would include trails and roads. A development could have clusters of ½ acre lots but they had to be clustered. So a twenty-acre parcel would have 10 homes. But we talked about the ½ acre lots were cluster not one here and one there. Craig stated that farmers have taken one acre and put up for the home and mortgage and that is the logical thing to do. We should not require them to put up the whole ten acres. Dianne stated that the big water users are the ten-acre lot.

Karen stated that there is some little comments and things that I would like to present regarding the wording in the general plan.

Mayor stated that I have an administrative problem here. The process has been that the Planning Commission has made recommendations that has gone to the City Council. The City Council has amended the map. And now we are having this work meeting. I don't know where the process goes. I think it goes back to the Planning Commission and then send it back to the Council. Byron stated that I think we are directing Bruce to change the plan so we can vote on it. Bruce stated that the Council has already received recommendation from the Planning Commission. I would recommend that any motion that is made here tonight be voted on by the City Council members only. That motion would direct me informally to present an ordinance for the 20th for final action. Byron

asked if the earlier vote was out of order. Bruce stated that no, he took it as direction. Dianne withdraws her second. Brent asked to address the motion, our first recommendation it came back to the Planning Commission because we had excluded the property on North Cooley and North Hale and so to be nice guys we followed your recommendation and agreed to make the whole area as the 1-2 acre zone. Brent stated that we as a Planning Commission was split. It was not a unanimous decision. Craig stated that there is justification to leave north area because most of that area is on septic systems and there is concern about saturation levels.

Craig seconded Byron's motion. Byron stated that housecleaning issue is that the turquoise is low density residential. R1-21 and RR-1 the legend on the map states low - low density. Byron stated that the turquoise on the map is low density and the green fucia- is rural residential RR-5 & RR-10. Craig stated that the low-density 1-acre should be in the rural residential and the half- acre is low density residential. Mayor stated that the motion on the floor doesn't say that. Craig withdraws the second. Craig stated that instead of calling it low-low density it is two-acre density it is still considered rural residential and the ½ acre lot is low density. Karen asked what is Otto Anderson Property. Craig stated that it starts at 2-acre density. If they want it at a higher density they would have to apply. Bruce requests that they restate the motion. Justin stated that they need to add RR-1 to Rural Residential. Byron stated that there are 4 categories. Turquoise would be #3 and redefine that. Craig stated that we would need to work out the details for implementation when someone comes in for development. If they want to have a PUD to yield them an .8 acre lot density. Mayor stated that RR-1 will move to item 4.

Motion by Byron, seconded by Craig to designate the low density as ½ acre. Move the RR-1 to rural density item #4 and add a color. Add RR-2 to rural residential. Page 6 definitions. The Mayor restated the motion to include in item 4 of page 6 will have RR-1, RR-2, RR-5 and RR-10 acre density.

Map is to reflect that the 2 acre zone south of south street even across to Mormon Trail South to City Limits, East to City Limits.

Kevin discussed the economics of the program is because in our discussions that the economics doesn't matter. The economics are apart of this process. The discussion was to always to leave that boundary in A-10 for several reasons. I think that was the recommendation of the Planner which we spent \$45,000 of taxpayers money. Byron stated that this is our plan not his. Kevin stated that he did not disagree with that but if it was our plan why did we spend \$45,000 of taxpayer money for his services. Byron responded that we hire a profession to do what a professional does. Put this plan in a comprehensive order. Kevin stated that the planner has made professional recommendations and we have ignored some of them. And along those lines we have ignored a certain amount of our community. Who also came when Watt Homes was approved spoke and said that we don't believe that this is appropriate. Kevin stated that he has talked with many people in the last two weeks I have been on the telephone and gone door to door. I realize that some will state that they have talked with people who don't support this plan. However, I think if you count the numbers you can see that the numbers are there support leaving the ten acres. Byron stated that he counted 24 people and 13 were against and 7 were for the ten acres. Kevin stated that there were many people in the audience that did not get up and speak. Kevin stated that in the water issue we pay an engineering firm on the water and we have ignored the engineers. Byron stated that the people got up and the numbers support the smaller lots not counting the 5 public hearings before that. Byron stated that he is supporting the will of the people. Kevin stated that he agreed that we have never followed the plan. Byron stated that plans are meant to be changed. Kevin stated that we have started at the bottom in an area. You have diagrammed out the prime agricultural property that is serviced by secondary water, and the rest of the property you have left A-10 might as well be A-600 because there is no secondary water. I think by arbitrarily going out there and taken everything out in the middle. Byron stated that some of the people think Watt Homes is a good thing. I would never support anything that couldn't be changed tomorrow. If it is locked in granite I would never support it. If it is wrong we will fix it.

Karen stated that we should go with the minutes. But what I did was go through the minutes and did a synopsis. I went through letters and made some phone calls. I talked with the Rupp's, Jerry Edwards, Max Coon, and Pectol. Karen stated that Maureen Erickson supports leaving the 5-acre lots, her wish was supported. Miscellaneous letters why no master plan? Stop the ready aim fire approach, outline businesses that you want to come to town. Brian Morris he said encourage small town image, and develop parks on west side, wide street. Janet Cook – water or will the man with the money get what he wants. I don't think not one of us here would have Watt Homes again. Keep the rural community, and warned the Mayor and Council about the food. Gary Buhler – water – free marketplace free to choose. Jack Pectol – ½ acre tree lined streets, interconnecting trails. Paul leave light industrial where it is. Marty Anderson – it does not matter what size your lot is. It the people that live there. You city people need to enforce your ordinances. And that was a clear message to me and that is true. There are people who own 10-20 acres here and they may continue to do that and we may have some development. **WE** as a city have an obligation to enforce our ordinances and **WE** the city people can enforce our laws and clean up our town. Mike Didericksen along time resident against the city telling people what they should do with this land, and favors one acre lots. Lynn Taylor expresses his concern about Grantsville Irrigation Company. Jill Thomas in favor of the industrial and one acre on the east end of town.

Mayor call for vote- all those in favor – Craig, Byron, Karen. Opposed: Kevin and Justin. Motion carried.

Bruce stated that he present planning discussion for Utah League Cities and town and Utah Local Government Trust, Utah Risk Management Association and Planning Conference in and out of state. I make sure what happened here tonight. We said to increase the ruralness of Grantsville and the quality of life we want to give a 500% density bonus to people who presently own agricultural A-10 property. I'll use that as an example because that is the first community I have ever worked with that was increased quality and since of ruralness. Craig stated that what they have done is that they farmers that they don't have to keep farming. Karen stated that she was really troubled when the City Council with you we were looking at the Planning Commission map. You suggested that we consider the A-10 zoning. And you gave your reasons. I was not sure why you were doing this. I just gave up, because it is just a general plan. Then on the meeting on December 6<sup>th</sup> there were comments were made. I stated that was not a unanimous council decision to go back to the A-10 that was really yours. Mayor stated that he was the one that made the recommendation to the Council and the Council supported it. Bruce stated that he was offended stating that he has tried to be responsive to the direction of Planning Commission and the Majority Council. Karen stated that she pushed for this meeting to talk to the Planning Commission. I believe and made this commitment when I ran for office that I would support the Planning Commission in their decisions. The Planning Commission has spent over a year in this process with you involved and I was having a struggle with it. Mayor stated that the Council support the decision. Craig stated that Bruce has not done anything that the Council has not directed him to do. I will defend him, he the messenger don't shoot the messenger. Brent stated that he feels that we have preserved Grantsville. We have not increased the density to create rural we have preserved rural. Bruce responded that you haven't preserved rural in Grantsville. You haven't taken the step to change the zoning across the street from RM-7 to R1-8. And the areas that you see now as A-10 you have given a 500% bonus on in a way to try and lengthen out and try and slow things down. And you are going to end up you will see the Sandization of Grantsville. And that is not what I heard in the comments of trying to maintain the quality and rural life for Grantsville. Byron stated that if we have got it wrong we will change it next year. Bruce stated that I think that you will change it. Because I don't see any great commitment from you, Byron on maintaining the course. Byron asked if Bruce thought we should lock it in Granite? Bruce stated that no, but you should show a level of confidence and commitment of policy direction. That you are prepared to stick with. The instance that someone comes up to you and says that you have got it wrong I sense that the majority of the City Council is that you will change it again. Brent finishing his comments, you are right we haven't preserved and we won't do that unless someone is willing to purchase the property. Bruce related an experience about 300 acres of agricultural land that he suggested that this development be done in a cluster of homes and the open space preserved in perpetuity. Bruce stated that the first lot

sold for \$45,000 the last lot sold for \$120,000 because it was on open space preserved in perpetuity. Bruce stated that the cluster effect works. Craig asked Bruce if there was anything that has happened tonight that would prevent from happening. No says Bruce, but you have given them much more density than you necessarily need – to achieve the same goal. Karen tried to tell Bruce that the Council can say no to a developer and to a zone change. Bruce stated that you will say no until you are challenge in court for having policies inconsistent with the General Plan. You will loose when you go on a whim. Dianne stated that she feels much more comfortable with this plan that does not have the 30 units per acre. I really liked the Kennecott Copper planned community. It was a mix of everything. Neighborhood stores and walking paths. Mayor stated that type of community can only work when you start out with nothing. Bruce agreed with the Mayor. Karen stated that she sees Grantsville as an infant and has capacity to grow with trails and Tooele is destroyed. The quality people will come to live in Grantsville. We have a problem because we have no tax base. We need to consider annexation of egg farm, and lime, salt plant. Justin thanked Bruce for his efforts. Grantsville has not been easy to work with because we fluctuate back and forth. It has been good for us to have a professional. Let's face it we think we know what we are doing but we know it is a guess. I appreciate your professionalism. Kevin agreed. Craig hopes he is willing to hang in there until we are done.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mayor reminded everyone to get the registration for Legislation Day to Sue by the 20<sup>th</sup> of December.

Byron made the motion to adjourn the city council work meeting. Craig seconded the motion. All in favor motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

---

Wendy Palmer, City Recorder

---

Merle E. Cole, Mayor