



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
Thursday, August 25, 2011  
Morgan County Council Room  
6:30 PM

**PUBLIC NOTICE** is hereby given that the Morgan County Planning Commission will meet at the above time and date at the Morgan County Courthouse, Council Chambers, 48 West Young St, Morgan, Utah. The agenda is as follows:

1. Call to order – prayer.
2. Approval of agenda.
3. Declaration of conflicts of interest.
4. Approval of minutes from August 11, 2011.
5. Work session to discuss:
  - Private Lane Standards
  - Flexible Subdivisions
  - Code Amendment Processes
  - County Animal Fencing Regulations
  - Future Land Use Planning Study Areas
6. Staff Reports.
7. Adjourn.

**MORGAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MORGAN COUNTY COURTHOUSE - RM. 29  
THURSDAY August 25, 2011 – 6:30 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Trevor Kobe, Chairman  
Roland Haslam  
Adam Toone  
Brandon Anderson  
Darrell Erickson  
Alvin Lundgren  
Chris Hales

**STAFF PRESENT**

Grant Crowell, Director  
Teresa Rhodes, Planning Commission Assistant

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**COUNTY COUNCIL PRESENT**

Tina Kelly  
Howard Hansen

**\* \* \* M I N U T E S \* \* \***

**1. Call to order – prayer.**

**Chairman Kobe called the meeting to order.  
The prayer was offered by Member Erickson**

**2. Approval of agenda.**

**Member Lundgren moved to approve the agenda of August 25, 2011. Second by Member Erickson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

**3. Declaration of conflicts of interest.**

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

**4. Approval of minutes from August 11, 2011.**

**Member Haslam moved to approve the minutes of August 11, 2011 with the noted one minor correction. Second by Member Toone. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

5. **Work session to discuss:**

**Mr. Crowell noted at the last meeting they discussed having some discussion on the following items.**

**a. Private Lane Standards**

Please see staff report (Exhibit A)

Pros-

- Economically feasible

Cons –

- Frontage?
- Should the County investigate some sort of language regarding a private lane and what criteria should be imposed?
  - Should there be less than the standard 60' road required in the County due to cost to the landowner/homebuilder.
  - Consider using minimum house number for criteria.
- What will the implication be to the County in the future if the county allows these private lanes and allows them to be smaller?

Planning Commission requested that staff bring back a draft on private lane standards.

**b. Flexible Subdivisions**

Please see staff report (Exhibit B)

**Member Haslam moved to limit the discussion time to 30 minutes on the following agenda items b, c, d, and e. Second by Member Anderson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

Suggestions:

- Small subdivision/large subdivision.
- Open space
  - Preserved or re-constructed open area

Following discussion of this item, Member Toone recommended each member comment, in an e-mail to staff, on the bullet points in staff's memo dated August 18, 2011. He noted maybe that would help staff draft something with regard to consensus of the members.

Bullet points to comment on were as follows:

- Base density is determined by zoning minus unbuildable land as previously defined (steep, floodplain, geo hazard areas).
- Units are distributed as the developer sees fit.

- No clustering is required; no minimum or maximum lot size.
- No open space requirement.
- Road and other standards adhere to the new subdivision ordinance.
- If road standards are modified, they are modified in the subdivision ordinance for all future projects.
- All standard fire codes and wild land codes apply.

**c. Code Amendment Processes**

Please see staff report (Exhibit C)

**d. County Animal Fencing Regulations**

Please see staff report (Exhibit D)

**e. Future Land Use Planning Study Areas**

Member Haslam requested the Milton/Stoddard area be discussed because of how the two areas were now split.

- Member Lundgren suggested that we put this on as an agenda item for the next meeting and directed Member Haslam to come forward with some suggestions and ideas because he lives in that area.

**f. Staff Report.**

There was no discussion.

**6. Adjourn.**

**Member Lundgren moved to adjourn. Second by Member Erickson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

**Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTEST:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Teresa A. Rhodes, Clerk**  
**Planning and Development Services**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_