

Approved

MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON MAY 15TH, 2023 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ON ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 6:00 P.M.

Mayor and Council Members Present: Commission Members Present:

Mayor Neil Critchlow

Jaime Topham

Jeff Hutchins

Rick Barchers

Darrin Rowberry

Derek Dalton

Jewel Allen

Kevin Hall

Council Members Not Present: Jolene Jenkins, Scott Bevan

Appointed Officers and Employees Present:

Dan England, City Engineer (via Zoom)

Cavett Eaton, Planning Administrator

Braydee Baugh, Recorder

Jesse Wilson, City Manager

Brett Coombs, City Attorney

Shay Stark, Contract Planner

Lanise Thompson, Administrative Assistant

Citizens and Guests Present: Dave Jefferies, Carol Jefferies, Steve Miner, Brett Lovell, Connor O’Leary

There were many members of the public present in person and via Zoom

AGENDA:

1. Discussion with Dave and Carol Jeffries

Carol Jefferies was present for this item. Mrs. Jefferies advised this plan has been in place for years. Steve Miner with Associated Food explained some of the process that went into the studies associated with the project. Mr. Miner advised the first preference was to expand the location on Main Street but the surrounding development prevented that from happening. Mr. Miner advised there was a favorable feasibility study completed for the proposed location. Commission Member Barchers asked who will pay for the improvements needed to Durfee Street for the increase of traffic on Durfee. City Engineer, Dan England, advised it would be based off the Traffic Study. Mr. England advised his concern would be related to the increase of traffic. Commission Member Barchers asked if Matthews Lane would need to be widened. Mr. England advised the lane is called out on the Master Traffic Plan as a collector and would need to be widened to 90’. Commission Member Dalton advised the last meeting there was pushback on that road being categorized as a collector. Commission Member Barchers asked if the rest of

the development is subservient to this portion. Mr. Miner explained the surrounding development is needed for this store. Mr. Lovell advised the Jefferies are making a 15-million-dollar investment into the community and to receive the tax benefit, it is required to provide affordable housing. Commission Member Barchers advised parking is a big concern. Mr. Lovell advised the smaller lots make it affordable. Commission Member Dalton asked why the location is not closer to Main Street. Mr. Miner advised this would be the best alternative location to best serve the community and with consideration to the immediate neighbors. Commission Member Hall asked if the only reason the property is not going on Main is due to the traffic. Commission Member Hall advised there is currently not a Main Street and Grantsville needs something to be proud of. Mr. Miner advised the Jefferies did not want the residents to be dealing with the intersection of Main and Matthews to get groceries. **Commission Chair Jaime arrived at the meeting at 6:47 pm.** Commission Member Dalton asked why the project could not get moved down mid-block. Mr. Miner explained that it is extremely hard for a project to get approved “mid-block” as the success of the project is detrimentally impacted. Commission Member Topham asked what the difference between this and Stansbury Park location. Mr. Miner advised the highways make a difference. Councilmember Hutchins advised that Matthews Lane is called out to be widened and how is the City supposed to finance that improvement. Mayor Critchlow advised he had a meeting regarding the funding for the roads. There was continued discussion regarding the projected location and the improvements that would be needed to the surrounding area. It was determined more planning would be needed.

2. Discussion regarding the PUD Process

Commission Chair Topham stood to represent this item. Commission Chair Topham advised the main purpose of this meeting is the Commission wanted to clarify what the City would like to accept as far as negotiable to code variations. She advised the developer always wants to increase density and would like to know what is acceptable to the City for the Commission to allow a density increase. She noted it would be helpful for the commission to have it laid out plainly in the code. Commission Member Topham advised that she likes the tabled idea as represented in several other municipalities. Commission Member Barchers advised the City only has so much budget to take care of a park but the Developers continue to offer park space. City Contract Planner, Shay Stark, advised one thing that was suggested was not increasing the overall density but group the homes closer so there was enough open space to get a large regional park. Mayor Critchlow advised he does not have a problem with the “cluster” idea as long as the overall density does not increase. Councilmember Hutchins advised he felt as if the Developer is making their profit the City’s responsibility. Councilmember Hutchins asked Attorney Coombs about the PUD process and the municipality’s responsibility to have a PUD process. Attorney Coombs advised the PUD is not required but that if they are offered they have to be designed within reason. Commission Chair advised a PUD is required in MU, Commercial, and other zones. Attorney Coombs advised the Code can be changed to not require the PUD in the currently required zones. City consultant Gary Pinkham advised the PUD process should be the developer coming to the City because it does not match the code. Mr. Pinkham advised there should be a negotiation between the City and the Code. Mr. Stark advised the CRDA has to meet a federal threshold. Commission Chair Topham asked if the City Council would like to propose an option or if Planning Commission should make a proposal. Councilmember Rowberry

Approved

advised that City Council is not qualified to make a proposal. Commission Member Topham asked if the City wants more parks. Councilmember Hutchins advised larger parks would be preferred. It was determined that Attorney Coombs and Commission Chair Topham would work on a proposal and present it for approval.

3. Adjourn.

Motion: Councilmember Allen made the motion to adjourn

Second: Councilmember Rowberry seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Rowberry, “Aye”, Councilmember Hutchins, “Aye”, Councilmember Allen “Aye” The motion carried.

Planning and Zoning Adjourn

Motion: Commission Chair Topham made the motion to adjourn

Second: Commission Member Dalton seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Commission Chair Topham, “Aye”, Commission Member Dalton, “Aye”, Commission Member Barchers “Aye” Commission Member Hall “Aye” The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:32