



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Thursday, April 14, 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. Public Comment.
5. Approval of minutes for February 24, 2011, March 17, 2011 and March 31, 2011.
6. Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision: To consider an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Morgan County General Plan in the Croydon Area to designate certain properties as Commercial and Ranch Residential 10. No zoning changes are being made.
7. Discussion/Decision: Snow Basin Sketch Plan Planning Session.
8. County Council / Staff update.
9. Adjourn.

**MORGAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MORGAN COUNTY COURTHOUSE - RM. 29
THURSDAY April 14, 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
Charlie Ewert, Planner Tech/Code
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.
Member Erickson offered the prayer.

2. Approval of agenda.

Member Lundgren moved to approve the agenda as noticed. Second by Member Hales. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

3. Declaration of conflicts of interest.

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

4. Public Comment.

Member Toone moved to open a public comment. Second by Member Anderson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

There was no public comment at this time.

5. Approval of minutes for February 24, 2011, March 17, 2011 and March 31, 2011.

Member Lundgren moved to approve the minutes of February 24, 2011 as typed. Second by Member Erickson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Member Erickson moved to approve the minutes of March 17, 2011 as typed. Second by Member Hales. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Member Anderson moved to approve the minutes of March 31, 2011 as typed. Second by Member Lundgren. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

6. Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision: To consider an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Morgan County General Plan in the Croydon Area to designate certain properties as Commercial and Ranch Residential 10. No zoning changes are being made.

Mr. Crowell noted the following:

- This is a county initiated proposal to do some modifications to the future land use plan in the Croydon area.
- This decision to initiate this proposal was decided in December 2010 when the county adopted the general plan. In the general plan was the first county wide future land use map. It was easy to correlate future land use mapping when recent mapping had been done such as Mtn. Green and Peterson. There were a few areas of the County where there was not any land use mapping, but some text descriptions of what they intended to do. 1997 was the last time a specific planning study had been done and written down. The County Council adopted that Croydon study in 1997.
- Presented the official County land use map for the Croydon area. He noted there are some areas that are already designated as 10 acre. The land use plan and the zoning map look pretty much the same.
- This is not a zoning application.
- The text description from the 1997 plan talks about areas to establish future commercial zoning and area to establish future 10 acre zoning areas.
- The general plan tried to go through all the area plans and try to create a consistent vocabulary for what ranch residential 10 means. So it will mean the same in Enterprise as it does in Croydon.
- Ranch residential 10 designations accommodate rural large lot development with generous distances to streets and between dwellings and a viable semi-rural character setting. The density is a maximum of one unit per 10 acres.

Member Erickson moved to open a public hearing to consider an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Morgan County General Plan in the Croydon Area. Second by Member Hales. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Paul Toone - Property owner/Committee member

- Served on the original Planning commission sub-committee for the Croydon area in 1997 and that committee proposed the original changes. Also on that committee was Ron Crouch, John Toone, Steve Pentz; All present tonight.
- Initial charge was to look at the cement plant up to Hell's Canyon. They opted not to go around the reservoir because they did not know what the State Parks were going to do in that area.
- Because he was not living in the area after the sub-committee met he was under the impression their recommendations had gone through. Was surprised there was never any action taken on this. It never did go to the County Commission and it just sort of died.
- Determined that it was a 200' frontage with a contiguous 10 acres on either side of the County road. The County Road was oiled or surfaced with a hard surface in 1991.
- He deeded over to the ground that the County road went on. That was one of the pre-requisites to getting the road built.

Ron Crouch – Property owner/Committee Chairman

- Asked about the frontage requirement for the RR-10. Mr. Crowell noted that 310' of frontage is required in the R-10 and A-20.
- The current zoning map does not match what was in the meeting minutes. Zoning should go to the Crouch/Pentz ditch.
- Asked about the potential build out in that zone. It was noted the calculation would be 80 frontages on one side of the road. Potentially if it all got zoned there could be 160 frontage lots.
- Proposed commercial area is impacted with utilities. Three pipelines, one fiber-optic line, and a power line. Present owner has not been able to sell because of these utilities. That area needs to be looked at more closely.

Steve Pentz – Property owner

- His understanding was that the 10 acre zoning would be on both sides of the road in section 04. Would like to see that happen. The intent was to get the 10 acre lots
 - Paul Toone noted it was also his understanding that the RR-10 zone was suppose to be on both sides of the County Road.
 - Ron Crouch – asked who makes the call, when you have two property owners on both sides of the road, who gets that zone and who doesn't?

Debbie Session – County Resident

- Noted she was on the planning commission at the time and zoning was intended to be on both sides of the road.

John Toone – Property owner/Committee member

- The committee did designate the one acre lots went to the bend in the road from the Crouch property line to the Pentz property line. He noted that would leave a little area that would be useless if someone wanted to develop it as a 10 acre lot. It would make it so there was an acre lot between the section line and the bend in the road.

- It was also his understanding that the RR-10 zone was suppose to be on both sides of the road to Hell Canyon where conditions exist that would allow that to be done.

Member Anderson moved to close the public hearing. Second by Member Lundgren. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Mr. Crowell clarified the map creation.

- As you cross the bend in the road, the left side of the road becomes steep. Logical planning uses topography to make density decision. However, roads can be made into the hillside to access homes if that is what is the desire is for the area; you can put the zoning on both sides of the road.
- Happy to make modification of the map and bring them back to the Planning Commission.
- Clarified that this did go to the County Council June 4, 1997 and they did adopt it exactly verbatim as presented on July 2, 1997.
- Utilities and capacity analysis have not been done.
- General plan and zoning are your last chances as legislative discretion. If members do not get their questions asked at zoning they may not have as many opportunities to ask them during the subdivision process...

Member Toone moved to refer this map back to staff with a recommendation to change it so it reflects zoning on both sides of the road for the RR-10 with the finding that under public comment that was the original intent. Second by Member Anderson.

Member Toone noted using 300' of frontage would mean for a lot to have 10 acres it would have to extend 1320 feet back from the road.

Member Anderson asked about the RR-1 zone. Does it go up to the Crouch/Pentz ditch?
Member Toone noted the map shows that it does not.

Mr. Crowell noted there could be a recommendation to have the general plan recommend 1 acre zoning up to the bend. Whether a previously occurred zone change occurred or not staff could look in the record and just change the map because the map is not accurate. He noted if staff cannot find documentation in the record then there would need to be a re-zone.

Member Toone amended his motion that the RR-1 zoning be extended to show on the map in approximation of the center line of section 4 where the right angle is portrayed. It would be a NW to NE turn in the road, going north. Second by Member Hales.

Mr. Lundgren noted Mr. Crouch mentioned that he believed the commercial zone should be re-visited. He asked Mr. Crouch for some clarification.

Mr. Crouch noted that he would like to see that area re-visited if the zoning is not workable. He noted he talked to Steve Peterson, who owns a considerable amount of land in Croydon. His concern in the commercial zone is that as a person comes into Croydon the first thing they will see is a commercial zone. If Croydon was ever to become a larger community the last thing you

would want to see is a commercial zone in that area. He believed this area should be looked at again.

Member Lundgren noted if it does not meet with the projected growth pattern then it should be looked at. It is not zoned commercial but the intent of the master plan is to propose where it is meant to be. He would suggest sending it back to the committee for a recommendation. It would appear that maybe a review of this plan, by a committee, may be appropriate due to some changes with how Croydon is developing.

Chairman Kobe agreed that if it needs to be re-looked at, now is the time to do that. Do we want to use a committee in that role? He is hesitant to send it to committee when the planning commission can also look at it.

He asked Member Toone what his thoughts were with regard to a committee. Member Toone noted the public comment tonight makes sense, but there are some valid reasons why the zoning was proposed where it was because of the proximity to the freeway exit and because there is a power sub-station nearby.

Member Lundgren noted it has been a long time since the Croydon Committee has met; whereas, a lot of our other areas are more current. He believes these are narrow questions that could be answered fairly quickly but would recommend that the committee look at it and bring it back with their proposed changes.

Chairman called for clarification of what the Planning Commission would like to do at this point. Member Lundgren called for an informal poll from the original committee members, that were present, to see if they would like to see this sent back to the committee or forward it on.

- Paul Toone noted he did not want to open it up again. He would recommend moving forward.
- Mr. Crouch stated it is a time commitment for the group to meet again, but it has been a long time. The commercial zone really did not work out and the reason it did not was because no one was interested in the area. It would give him a feeling of comfort if they met as a group again. He would like to request that Adam Toone chair the committee because he is involved and current with what is going on in Planning and Zoning. The one thing that is positive from a committee meeting is that you are going to hear from the landowners.
- Steve Pentz and John Toone agreed with Mr. Crouch.

Mr. Crowell noted that all the area plans, as they exist, were incorporated into the new general plan. In Croydon the text was only adopted but the map was not there. He did not believe it needs to be an advisory board but can be an informal committee that can meet with Member Toone who can bring back recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Member Toone moved to amend the amendment as follows:

- **that an informal survey be conducted in the Croydon Lost Creek area to address the following:**
 - **Commercial development in the area.**
 - **Public infrastructure.**
 - **County maintained roads.**
 - **Public services regarding the bike races and widow maker.**

Second by Member Anderson.

The Chairman called for a vote on the amended amendment.

The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

The Chairman called for a vote on the amendment.

The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

The Chairman called for a vote on the original motion as amended.

The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

7. Discussion/Decision: Snow Basin Sketch Plan Planning Session.

Mr. Crowell presented his staff report (Please see attached exhibit A)

- 8000 acres are owned by the Snow basin resort
- In the general plan the property was designated as a master plan community.

Wally Huffman, representing the Holding family and the Snow Basin Resort.

- Begin his career in Sun Valley in 1968 and worked in various capacities. In 1973 became the manager of mountain operations. In 1987 he met Mr. Holding when he purchased the resort.
- Mr. Holding purchased snow Basin in the spring of 1984. At that time there was 6000 acres some of which was forest land and some that was private.
- 2000 they master planned the mountain part of the development and hosted the downhill and super G for the 2002 Olympic Committee. This got Mr. Holding excited about the potential of this resort.
- Cut the entitlements by 1/3 at Sun Valley and decided that his vision was different from the previous owner. It was that attitude that he has brought to Snow Basin.
- Snow Basin started their proposal for the resort in Weber County.
 - Begin looking at a second portal to the ski mountain at the base of Strawberry about ½ miles up from Trappers Loop.
 - Comprehensive plan that includes two counties but one that maintains about 80% of the land in open space.
 - A plan that is sympathetic to the access issues that are going to happen.
- Design Team
 - Clint Ensign, government affairs and Vice president for Sinclair Oil

- Becky Zimmerman and Scott McClain, Design Workshop out of Denver
- Ken Lyons, General Manager at snow basin
- Peter Duberow, Stantec Engineering.

Becky Zimmerman, Design Workshop, Denver Colorado

- Vision is to create a multi season destination resort.
 - Celebrate the natural beauty
 - Promote economic and environmental sustainability.
 - Un- paralleled recreation opportunities to both visitors and residents.
 - Less than 20% of the land is contemplated for development.
- Purpose of the application
 - Sketch plan requirements outlines
- Existing conditions
 - 3800 acres in Weber County and 8144 acres in Morgan
 - Current zoning is MU-160
 - Geological Hazards, topography and slope, aspect, elevation
 - Let the attributes of the land dictate where development should go and how much development should go in those locations. Took out sensitive and geological hazard areas. Looked for appropriate uses within those pods
- Overall conceptual master plan.
 - 50 year master plan – wanted to show a vision of the overall master plan.
 - 85% of the Snow Basin property in Morgan County would remain undeveloped.
 - Golf would become a summer recreation component.
 - Nine holes in each county. Would like to look at an inter-local county agreement.
 - Two village areas in the Strawberry location.
- Recreation Facilities plan
 - Hiking and biking trails
 - Outdoor amphitheatre at the new portal area in strawberry.
 - Open space trails plan.
 - Skiing/tubing

The Chairman called for questions from the planning commission.

Member Anderson –

- School district - When is the time to speculate the demographics in regard to the school district. Ms. Zimmerman not to be candid there is not an answer. She noted in order to do the infrastructure plans they have made some assumptions on the demographics.
 - Units that would be second home owned
 - Units that would have year around residents
 - Units that would be rented.

Mr. Crowell noted at some point we should invite Weber and Morgan School Districts to be part of the discussion.

Chairman Kobe –

- Having seen what we currently have in place what would the design team like to see as the next step or a good pathway to go? Ms. Zimmerman noted they have brainstormed. One idea was to look at what part of the MPDR is applicable and do you look at that and extract it out. Other option of going through a process to adopt a new ordinance. Weber County went through a process to create what they called a Destination/Recreation ordinance. It took a lot of years because they took time to look at other communities and what they had. They received a lot of input from the community also. Because of this the entire property in Weber County was re-zone Destination/Recreation resort.
- Good thought out development.

Mr. Crowell noted he has been involved where there has been a special residential ordinance written. Considerations may be:

- We know that Morgan County does not have a TDR interest.
 - MPDR is a very in depth process.
 - What role is the County going to take in initiating the ordinance work
 - Want to make sure the grading, esthetics, roads, water, and public services all work.
 - Write an ordinance just for Snow Basin.

Ms. Zimmerman noted they made the rules pretty high but it absolutely applies to other properties in the Ogden/Weber Valley.

Member Lundgren –

- Visual impact
- Does not want to see this developed like the I-80 corridor has been developed up through Veil.
- If we developed an ordinance just for Snow Basin that would allow us a lot of flexibility to take it and develop it like the design teams hopes to develop it.

Member Anderson

- Copy of the Weber County plan and could we have some time to review it.
- At what point do we want to involve the community and get their input. Ms. Zimmerman noted they held a public open house in Weber County and they had 300 residents turn out most out of curiosity. They would appreciate the public input and what that did was when they got to the first public hearing 12 people showed up because they had got their questions answered. It was a tremendous value for everyone.
 - Applicant took care of advertising and marketing material.
 - Weber County also promoted it.
 - County officials did not present they just came to observe and listen. It was hosted by the applicant.

Member Lundgren strongly recommended several public open houses being held in Mtn. Green because that is the corridor. There are mixed emotions among the Mtn. Green residents. Some critical issues:

- Police services
- Utility sheds

- Fire protection
- Traffic issues

Chairman Kobe noted he would like to know if there were specific things that did and didn't work in the Weber County ordinance. Interested in knowing what the applicant's view of that ordinance was.

Member Erickson asked about the incremental pieces and in what order they would occur. Ms. Zimmerman noted they have had to make some assumptions for the analysis and studies they have done. Using those, they can certainly prepare an economic analysis on that and demonstrate the very positive impact that will come.

Member Erickson also asked if there were any plans for summer recreational events. It was noted there are some events that occur up there now. Ken Lyons, General Manager of Snow Basin noted they work hard to try to make sure they mitigate the impact that occurs to the County.

Member Erickson noted economics of the two counties are not equal. He would like to at least get some dialogue toward how they solve that issue. Mr. Crowell noted the level of service expectation of this valley is very different from Weber County and things will need to be worked out.

Chairman Kobe asked what their hopeful timeframe is to work through this. Ms. Zimmerman noted because there has been homework done by another County maybe a year would be something they would see as reasonable.

Member Toone noted he would like the following addressed: Emergency response plan, public transportation, occupations that will be provided, and a homeowner percentage because it correlates with crime rate.

Member Anderson noted initially there was to be no development on these scenic highways like Trappers Loop. On some, the development is there but it does not impact the road that much. He would like to know the proposed impact to Trappers Loop Highway.

Member Toone asked about possible incorporation. Ms. Zimmerman noted she did not believe there is any contemplation or rationale to incorporate.

Member Hayes asked about the economy and time line. Ms. Zimmerman noted they have had to look at this as what steps need to happen first. Obviously they need zoning and entitlement first. So they would not even begin to venture until they knew what they needed to work from.

Member Lundgren moved to continue this discussion with instruction to staff to come back with a presentation on the Weber County ordinance. Also be prepared to discuss some of the broad outlines to create a Snow Basin ordinance and also invite the people from Snow Basin to come back and coordinate with staff to comment on the positives and negatives of the Weber County Ordinance and what they would suggest for a unique ordinance for the next step to move forward.

Mr. Lundgren noted he believed that until we have the vehicle to carry this forward we can continue to talk about the concept, but we really need to be able to capsule that in some type of ordinance.

Second by Member Erickson. The vote was not unanimous with Members Hayes, Toone, Lundgren, Erickson for and Member Anderson opposed because he was under the impression that his feeling would be to coordinate with the applicant to hold an open house first.

Member Toone asked the applicant how long they would need to prepare for a public open house. Ms. Zimmerman noted that having gone through this before with Weber County, the preparation time is not needed. The key issue is what it will take to get the word out and make sure there is a good public attendance. She would say about one month. Member Lundgren suggested two nights; including some signage or banners throughout the County for notification and advertisement.

Mr. Hoffman asked about having it at the resort. Member Lundgren suggested one of them in the courthouse in Morgan and one at the Mountain Green Elementary. The resort may be a little less convenient, but that is the applicant's choice.

Mr. Hoffman noted the economy is obvious a big factor in regard to how this will proceed. However, what would drive their skier days are overnight accommodations. The next big step for the resort would be overnight accommodations, but then they have to immediately start looking at things that would attract people in the summer months such as meetings, conventions, golf, and horse riding in order to sustain that lodging.

Chairman Kobe noted he would further recommend a public input after the open house.

Ms. Zimmerman noted they have found that putting the word out in utilities bills often works. In the meantime they will get with Mr. Crowell and work on the ordinance and help staff analysis the Weber County ordinance and maybe even provide one that would show things that are not applicable in Morgan County or maybe some things that Morgan County wants to add. That may help with the editing process. She further noted that Scott Mendoza, planner with Weber County, has offered multiple times to come and talk to the County about their process.

8. County Council / Staff update.

- Bylaws will go before the council this coming Tuesday.
- Kennels will be the week after.
- Joint meeting has been suggested for May 12th.

9. **Adjourn.**

Member Erickson moved to adjourn. Second by Member Anderson.

Approved: _____
Chairman

Date: _____

ATTEST: _____
Teresa A. Rhodes, Clerk
Planning and Development Services

Date: _____

Exhibit A - Discussion/Decision: To consider an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Morgan County General Plan in the Croydon Area to designate certain properties as Commercial and Ranch Residential 10. No zoning changes are being made.

This exhibit cannot be viewed on line but may be viewed with the official recorded minutes in the Morgan County Clerk's office.

Exhibit B- Discussion/Decision: Snow Basin Sketch Plan Planning Session. – Staff report

Planning and Development Services
48 West Young Street
Morgan, UT 84050
(801) 845-4015

STAFF REPORT

7 April 2011

To: Morgan County Planning Commission
Business Date: 14 April 2011

From: Grant Crowell, AICP, Planning and Development Services Director

Re: Snow basin Joint Planning Session

Application No.: 11.008

Acreage: Approximately 8,100 acres

Applicant: Design Workshop / Snow basin Resort

Request: Joint planning session with the Morgan County Planning Commission regarding the sketch plan submittal and Master Planned Development Reserve (MPDR) proposal for the expansion of the Snow basin resort.

SUMMARY & BACKGROUND

The Snow basin Resort and Sun Valley Corporation are large land owners in Morgan County. For years, the property owner has been developing a master plan concept for their property which involves ski area resort expansion and real estate and recreation development. This proposal has followed the requirements of the first two steps of the MPDR review and approval process and is intended to serve as a catalyst for further discussions regarding development entitlements, ordinance development, and process expectations.

The subject property owner also owns and intends to develop the adjacent land in Weber County and has recently worked through their initial entitlement processes for those 3,808 acres. Together, the Snow basin development project – if approved as proposed - will involve almost 12,000 acres, 4,799 dwelling units, and additional ski area and commercial development areas.

ANALYSIS

General Plan and Zoning. The Morgan County General Plan was adopted on December 21, 2010. With this adoption, the Future Land Use Map designated the Snow basin property in Morgan County as “Master Planned Community”. The description of this category is:

Master Planned Community

The intent of this use designation is to provide for planned developments and resorts that offer a mix of

residential and non-residential land uses. Potential development locations would capitalize on good transportation, the physical amenities of the area, and recreational opportunities. The Master Planned Community designation allows for flexibility in land uses in order to encourage property assemblage and coordinated infrastructure and access. Resorts require adequate infrastructure and necessary services for each development. The assignment of this land use category should precede zoning designations to Master Planned Development Reserve (MPDR) or other similar resort or planned development zoning designations.

What this general plan designation indicates is first that their land use proposal is already anticipated and that the applicant should be able to begin work with the zoning process. The MPDR process is a type of zoning process which combines the zoning entitlement process with concept subdivision planning and associated development agreements. New zoning will also establish use tables for permitted and conditional uses, and can also establish processing scenarios.

The current zoning on the property is MU-160. Without a MPDR or similar zoning mechanism, the base density would yield approximately 50.9 dwelling units and no commercial or multi-family development. This proposal identifies 2,447 development units and an unidentified amount and distribution of commercial square footage (acreage of concept mixed use have been provided). This is a substantial bonus density proposal which, per the MPDR standards, will require a considerable number of findings to be made in support of the plan.

The Morgan County General Plan presents several policy statements that should be considered when evaluating this zoning proposal. Relevant statements from the General Plan include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Provide Flexibility to Respond to Market Changes.
- Encourage Sustainability.
- Support Employment Growth.
- Support Retail and Commercial Growth.
- Integrate Land Use and Transportation Planning.
- Manage and guide growth in a manner that promotes economic development and efficient use of services.
- Guide town-scale development to Morgan City, Mountain Green, master planned communities, or villages as shown on the Future Land Use Map.
- Require new subdivision development to provide adequate infrastructure and services, including but not limited to water, sewer, roads, and emergency services. The County should also require more secure methods of financial security from developers for required improvements.
- Limit the impacts of residential development in the Agricultural and Natural Resource and Recreation land use categories by encouraging compact development that allows for viable agricultural operations and avoids sensitive natural lands through the use of planned development ordinances, incentives, and other techniques.
- Require large scale development, if remote from existing infrastructure, to be developed as a master planned community, and to provide adequate infrastructure and services for the development.
- Require long-term management plans for all designated open space areas.

- Adopt new regulations for master planned communities, town center mixed use developments, and compact or flexible subdivisions.
- Encourage the use of centralized water and sewer systems for all new residential subdivision development.
- To provide flexibility in lot sizes and encourage better subdivision design, and establish unit density (residential units per acre) standards.
- Adopt hillside and ridgeline protection ordinances.
- Require costs associated with new development to be borne by the developer.
- Maintain clear policies and procedures to evaluate development proposals and identify both short-term and long-term financial impacts and costs.
- Consider requiring a fiscal cost analysis for all rezoning applications in order to determine the adequacy of services and infrastructure in the area.
- Ensure that new development provides the on-site infrastructure needed to meet the needs of the residents of the development.
- Consider the adoption or amendment of impact fees to cover the incremental costs of new facilities.
- Increase the number of businesses that are created, expanded, and located in Morgan County.
- Reduce sales tax leakage from Morgan County to adjoining communities
- Diversify the local tax base to become self-sufficient.
- Support second home development in resort and other appropriate areas to supplement the County's property tax revenues.
- Encourage, coordinate, and support commercial and business land uses in appropriate areas to ensure the provision of adequate public services including transportation, water, sewer, fire suppression, and utilities.
- Encourage retention of existing, and the creation of new, employment opportunities, including oil and gas; agriculture and farming; recreation and tourism; high-technology industries; services; and retail in appropriate areas.
- Provide a variety of housing types and options in Morgan County.
- Encourage and monitor the availability of affordable housing to support economic development efforts.
- Promote quality residential development in well-designed subdivisions.
- Encourage subdivision designs that protect environmentally sensitive areas or unique property characteristics such as, but not limited to, as stream corridors, the night sky, significant stands of vegetation, wildlife habitat and corridors.
- Keep County roadway systems at a minimum to maintain the rural character of the County and protect taxpayers from additional costly road maintenance, construction and re-construction.
- The County will not accept responsibility to maintain new road infrastructure unless it finds a compelling public interest to accept dedication of the road. Examples of a compelling public interest to add to the existing County road system would be to move people and goods safely and efficiently throughout the County, or to provide access to land designated for development by the General Plan.
- Development applications (re-zoning or subdivision) should be accompanied by a traffic impact analysis to determine the project impact on existing roads, and to project the need for additional new road,

trail and other transportation infrastructure, as required. Methods to manage and fund mitigation of those impacts will be a part of the analysis.

- Establish hillside street design and construction standards that are sensitive to topographical constraints, necessary grade separations and other special needs.
- Trail systems are an important alternative form of transportation and provide for recreational opportunities, and may be appropriate within future master planned communities and developing areas such as Mountain Green.
- All future major residential and mixed-use developments should be planned with trail systems. All new development will conduct pedestrian impact analysis studies and design and construct trail infrastructure to meet those needs.
- All future road construction and re-construction projects should take bicycle safety and accessibility into account, and should provide for bicycle routes where appropriate.
- Determine the appropriate level of service for County services.
- Discourage the construction of new infrastructure that would allow growth beyond existing plans and/or infrastructure.
- Ensure emergency services and response to meet residents' needs.
- Define an appropriate level of fire and safety support that can be provided by the County.
- Ensure that all new development has an adequate water supply.
- Maintain water quality.
- Encourage conservation of water resources.
- Reduce dependence on individual septic tanks.
- Support development of centralized sewer systems.
- Require new development to provide adequate infrastructure and services, including but not limited to water, sewer, roads, and emergency services.
- Develop a system of natural open space areas that protect and conserve natural, physical, and social resources.
- Identify, protect and conserve high value wildlife habitat and recreational open space areas.
- Explore implementation of flexible zoning techniques that promote open space preservation.
- Improve the quality, quantity and design of open space, park lands and trails.
- Encourage the development of increased year-round recreational opportunities.
- Develop a safe, multi-use trail system that provides connectivity throughout the County and to recreational areas.
- Provide for a wide range of non-motorized and motorized trail uses including hiking, equestrian, mountain biking, and off-highway vehicles.
- Promote ecologically responsible development patterns within Morgan County.
- Protect the health, safety, and welfare of Morgan County residents by directing growth away from hazardous areas and sensitive lands.
- Require utility providers to strengthen, relocate, or take other appropriate measures to safeguard pipelines, transmission lines, and other utility infrastructure in areas subject to elevated natural hazard risk.
- Reduce the threat of wildfire in Wildland-Urban Interface (WLUI) areas

Obviously, the General Plan presents many broad statements, and some of which are subject to further interpretation or which may appear to conflict with others. They do serve to focus the discussion on what matters most to Morgan County. The MPDR code also reflects many of these goals and objectives. Staff is pointing out that the General Plan seems to encourage this type of proposal if done in the right way and if we can identify the true costs, impacts, and benefits to the County.

MPDR Review. The MPDR ordinance is a complex development code which has 57 pages of written regulations in the County Code. Staff encourages that the Planning Commission review and study section 8-5F of the code, as it is impossible to include the code in this report. The MPDR process was used to create the development of Rivala, for example. An approved MPDR would essentially replace the underlying zoning with a new designation and a unique set of rules and regulations which would only apply to the project. The ordinance process overview is as follows (we are on step 2).

1. Step 1: Sketch plan and pre-application review.
2. Step 2: Joint planning sessions with the Planning Commission.
3. Step 3: Master planned development reserve zone district application (rezone) and MPDR application (development agreement).
4. Step 4: Planning Commission work sessions and public hearings.
5. Step 5: Planning Commission recommendation on rezone and MPDR plan.
6. Step 6: County Council public hearings.
7. Step 7: County Council final action.

Before a MPDR is designated in any area, the Planning Commission and Governing Body shall determine the following:

- A. There are substantial tangible benefits to be derived by the citizens of the county that significantly outweigh those that would otherwise be derived if development occurred under the provisions of the underlying zone districts;
- B. There are unique circumstances, above the normal limitations and allowances of the underlying zone districts, that justify the use of a MPDR;
- C. The development proposed in an application for MPDR consideration is compatible with the appropriate social, cultural, rural, mountain and/or natural resource characteristics of the county;
- D. The development proposed furthers the goals and objectives of the county general plan;
- E. A specific development plan proposed under an MPDR zone approved by the county is implemented through a development agreement as described in this title;
- F. Approving a MPDR zone district will not adversely affect the public health, safety and general welfare.

Sketch plan and joint planning session process. No approvals result from sketch plan review or joint planning sessions. The pre-MPDR zoning application processes are intended to facilitate dialogue and identify concerns, and are not considered to be application or entitlement vesting for land use, zoning, or subdivision approvals. This process is intended to provide valuable feedback so that the applicant can make informed decisions regarding which steps to take next in the process.

Applicant Submittal. The applicants have submitted a very robust submittal for a concept sketch plan. These submittals which include two volumes of plans, text, and studies have previously been distributed to the Planning Commission in preparation for this meeting. If any members of the Planning Commission or general public need additional copies, they are available in the County Planning office.

Staff Review Comments. Staff has met together in an effort to provide observations and feedback to the applicant and the Planning Commission. Our input has been organized into some logical topical areas, and is preliminary in nature. As more details emerge and plans get more specific and technical, we will provide additional comments and recommendations. A separate review memo from the County Engineer is also attached to this transmittal.

Fiscal Impact. This proposal will create a significant impact on service provision in the County. The statement on p.45 of the submittal that the economic benefit far outweighs the cost of development needs to be further studied and analyzed. No data was presented to back up this statement. Extensive public road systems located in the hillside, for example, are expensive to maintain and have a shorter functional lifespan. Staff is recommending that the applicants submit a detailed fiscal impact analysis that addresses County costs and anticipated revenues and which also addresses recommendations for special service districts or similar mechanisms so that the general fund is not negatively impacted, etc.

Open Space and Recreation. The proposal present 85% open space; MPDR considerations require the preservation of open space as a public system or with a conservation easement. The trail component is a great and ambitious goal. Who will maintain the trails? Are they for the general public to use? No trailheads are shown internal to any of the neighborhoods, even though sections of trail are miles from Trapper's Loop in some cases and are located off of proposed public roads. No parks are proposed, except in Weber County. Future residents of Morgan County should be offered the same opportunities.

Design. No specific design scheme has been identified. How and when will that be identified? Who will enforce design control once it is identified? The County has limited resources to address that type of issue.

Slopes, geology, views, etc. The County Code limits buildable area to that which is under 25%. Additional detail with smaller contour intervals will be necessary at subsequent stages to verify. What points of view were utilized in view and ridgeline analysis? No sub-surface geological studies have been conducted. The entire project will have to comply with the County's Geologic Hazards Ordinance. Public infrastructure crossing geo hazard areas will be evaluated in addition to home and structure locations.

Phasing. No phasing plan has been shown or committed to. Understanding the phasing of the commercial areas versus the large residential areas will certainly factor into the fiscal analysis of the project.

Utilities. Please also refer to the memo from Mark Miller, P.E., County Engineer. Also, is the project proposing an improvement district for sewer and/or water facility development and long term maintenance? Are more detailed tabulations on water demand available?

Transportation. There are several observations regarding the transportation network that merit further discussion: the internal network of roads are proposed to be publicly maintained, and include large stretches of remote road with no development frontage in an area that will require additional maintenance because of its elevation; Area D should have an additional egress back out to Trapper's Loop or other public road; development phasing will be critical to understanding how long or how many units will be placed on single access roadways; a discussion regarding parking and proposed transit impact needs more detail; where are the park and rides?; areas of potentially steep road grades need to be identified; proposals may require a modified impact fee study and an evaluation of the need for a special service district for transportation impact; and the overall traffic impact on the Mountain Green area needs further study and proposed developer driven solutions.

Housing. This project will generate a workforce population but no discussion of affordable or workforce housing options has been proposed or indicated. Do you intend to let each phase decide the single family / multi-family (attached) dwelling ratio?

Public Safety. This is another one of the big observations for the project. Our emergency service providers indicated that they have not been contacted by the applicant or Weber County regarding the development or the statements in the report about inter-local agreements, etc. This is a very important discussion. For example, the subject property resides in a fire district served from Morgan City, even though the closest fire station is in Mountain Green, because of current service district boundaries. Morgan County needs to understand Snow basin's expectations for public safety levels of service for the project as this project evaluation moves forward. Commercial structures may also necessitate new equipment which can address taller structures and Snow Basin may desire some sort of sub-station. Special service districts and inter-local agreements could turn out to be tricky, political issues.

Wildland Urban Interface. The entire subject property is within the Urban Wildland Interface area and, as such, will have additional fire safety issues to address during subsequent phases.

School District. Please provide information on potential demographics so that we can share that info with the school district, and they can provide comments. This project will shift the effective school district boundaries.

Consulting review. Subsequent reviews may involve significant staff resources and the need for specialized consulting services. The County may elect to have the applicant cover the costs of outsourced consultant review for subsequent reviews.

Previous approvals. Staff has reviewed previous approvals, and the conditional use permit for land application of liquid effluent was approved in 2005, with a five year time period. Technically, the last approval has expired. Additionally, annual reporting regarding this was supposed to be submitted to the County, and the Planning Department cannot find annual reporting submittals after 2005 (it could have been submitted to the County Engineer). While we understand that this was intended to be a temporary solution, we have no real time table for its replacement with the new facilities and the applicant should work to renew this permitting for the foreseeable future.

Public Process. The MPDR process does not require a public hearing or public input process at this stage. However, it allows for one, if determined necessary by the Planning Director. That statement puts a somewhat arbitrary determination to one individual. Staff would like the Planning Commission's input on this issue, but considering the scope and long term impact of the project, we believe that additional public input is warranted and that noticing to surrounding property owners for a future input session with the Planning Commission should occur.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Wherein there are no actual approvals being requests, the Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take input from the applicant, study the General Plan goals and objects, review the MPDR ordinance, schedule a future public input session, and take the time necessary to evaluate a project which will change the physical, economic, and demographic makeup of Morgan County forever. The size of the project warrants a dedicated and thorough study, and we believe that applicants are more than willing to assist with that process.