



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Thursday, August 22, 2013

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

Administrative Items

5. Discussion/Decision: Anderson Subdivision
6. Discussion/Decision: D&N Porter Subdivision
7. Discussion/Decision: LDS Mtn Green Cottonwood Canyon Road
8. Discussion/Decision: Flexible Subdivision Survey Results

Legislative Items

9. Hearing/Discussion/Decision: Karen House Rezone
10. Staff Report.
11. Approval of minutes from June 27, 2013
12. Approval of minutes from August 8, 2013
13. Adjourn.

Members Present

Shane Stephens

Page 1 of 15

Morgan County Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
August 22, 2013-Approved 12 Sept 2013 FINAL

David Sawyer
Debbie Sessions
Roland Haslam
Michael Newton
Darrell Erickson
Steve Wilson

1. Call to Order- Prayer

Chairman Haslam welcomed everyone. Member Newton offered prayer.

2. Approval of agenda.

Member Sessions moved to approve the agenda and switch item #8 to after item #9. Second by Member Newton. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

3. Declaration of conflicts of interest.

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

4. Public Comment.

Member Newton moved to open public comment. Second by Member Sessions. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

There was no public comment.

Member Sessions moved to go out of public comment. Second by Member Newton. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Administrative Items

5. Discussion/Decision: Anderson Subdivision

Brice Anderson: Presented his proposal. Stated that the right of way and boundary lines were taken care of. Mentioned that Mr. Potter was in attendance and could attest to his right of way. Nothing had changed from what was originally discussed.

Chairman Haslam wondered where the fence line is in the back of the house- for septic reasons. Mr. Anderson stated that the chain link fence is for the existing home. They had the ok from the health department.

Chairman Haslam inquired about needing a new drain field. Mr. Anderson responded that Great Basin asked for an alternate location. Chairman Haslam wanted to make sure they would have adequate room if needed.

Charlie gave his presentation. He stated that they have a health department letter of approval. Explained zoning on the property and explained flood plain standards, with a few corrections on the set-back plat. He asked if there were any questions on conditions of approval.

Member Sessions stated there were too many conditions to forward toward final. She stated that she wants the requirements met before going forward with final approval.

Charlie offered to go through the conditions.

1. This is necessary to be a condition of approval.
2. An approved and executed deferral agreement, meeting the approval of the County Attorney, to be recorded prior to the final plat recording. Member Sessions inquired as to why this hasn't been met now. Charlie stated that this item may postpone a finalization.
3. Some discussion took place on geologic conditions but no specific issues indicated they would delay approval.
4. Concerning water rights shares: this is going to be normal for subdivisions.
5. No concerns.
6. Irrigation rights and shares: same comment as number 4.
7. Concerning the flood plain. This is related to condition #1, an administrative correction.
8. Will serve letters are a condition of approval. Service companies are saying approval is based upon conditions being satisfied. He affirmed that final approval is void if utility companies don't get what they need.
9. An updated title report is a necessary condition for approval.

Charlie explained he has told the County Council that the time frame for building permits is diminishing and wants to move forward so people can get building permits and start building this year.

Member Sessions wondered what the difference is if they can't get a building permit until the final plat is recorded and the final being held up.

Charlie stated that the time frame is the difference between getting it to the County Council and Planning Commission which could be a difference of up to a month.

Chairman Haslam wanted to clarify that it will speed up their process, to which Charlie responded that it would, indeed, speed up the process.

Member Sessions emphasized that she doesn't want to hold up Mr. Anderson either. Charlie explained that things have to happen before final plat approval but the Planning Commission and County Council meeting schedules are at times conflicting.

Member Sessions wanted to know if the applicant was given a check-list to prepare for final approval?

Charlie said that when they are given the application, it is referenced in the code. Sometimes the applicant's engineer or developer may submit something, but they may get pushed back for more pressing issues or time sensitive issues. He explained that more pressing issues take precedence, but if the issues are in compliance with the law, they should proceed.

Member Sessions observed that if it doesn't meet code, the Council shouldn't be seeing it. She suggested that it meet code before the Council sees it.

Charlie wants to get going with landowners and get things going.

Member Sawyer said to get it out there for approval and if there are things needing approval, they can be met after.

Charlie: Hasn't been enough development for the County Council to see improvement.

Member Sessions emphasized she has complete faith that Charlie and his staff will follow through. She wants to see the process be a little cleaner, but recommends to go ahead with Andersons.

Member Erickson said it seems to have a triple-check in place. They will get a building permit and then things are again double-checked along the way. There is a system in place to double check.

Member Wilson wondered what conditions will look like when flood plain is in place. Charlie explained flood plain conditions and grading.

Member Sessions moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Council for the Anderson Estate Final Subdivision Plat, an amendment to the Enterprise Estates Subdivision, application 12.040, subject to the conditions and based on the findings presented in the staff report dated August 15, 2013.

1. That all final administrative items as may be required by respective reviewers are addressed prior to plat recording.

2. That an approved and executed deferral agreement meeting the approval of the County Attorney is recorded prior to final plat recording.
3. That all certifications from a licensed geologist, geotechnical engineer, and civil engineer are received in compliance with MCC 8-5I-12 prior to plat recording.
4. That a note is placed on the plat that indicates the water rights/shares being provided to each lot, the service provider for each lot (as applicable), and the required flow for each culinary use (800 gallons per day) is placed on the plat.
5. That if a well will be used for lot one that proof of well permit is submitted prior to plat recording.
6. That the irrigation rights/shares being provided for each lot for irrigation uses should be annotated on the plat as well as the amount of water flow and allowed irrigable acreage.
7. That a note is placed on the plat indicating the presence of a flood plain on a portion of lot one, and that all development shall conform to adopted flood plain ordinances.
8. That inasmuch as the Central Enterprise Water Association, Questar Gas, and Rocky Mountain Power have all given conditional will serve letters for the proposal, approval of the plat amendment is conditioned on the fulfillment of the various requirements of those entities. Failure to comply may result in voidance of this approval.
9. That an updated title report is submitted with the final mylar.
10. That staff can make a positive finding that all administrative corrections and information has been received upon completion of the above conditions.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The nature of the subdivision is in conformance with the current and future land uses of the area.
2. The proposal complies with the Morgan County 2010 General Plan.
3. The proposal complies with current zoning requirements.
4. That certain conditions herein are necessary to ensure compliance with adopted laws prior to subdivision plat recording.
5. The deferred improvements are not necessary at this time to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, and the required improvements would create a negative impact on abutting unimproved properties.
6. That the proposal is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Second by Member Erickson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Member Sessions then encouraged the Anderson's to get as many conditions accomplished before moving on to the County Council.

6. Discussion/Decision: D&N Porter Subdivision

Derrick Porter stepped up but deferred to Charlie to present.

Chairman Haslam stated he was trying to figure out the two lot lines; the pictures seemed to be different.

Mr. Porter stated that it's not square. The Planning Commission members agreed it was hard to read.

Mr. Porter explained that his lot is square on the side in back and one side in front, then it jogs back out to the field on the east side.

Chairman Haslam pointed out that the top next to his dad's lot is fairly square. But in the drawing of his lot it's confusing. Mr. Porter showed on the map that when they got approval from the state for right of way, they would only give approval for one right of way for that driveway. Rather than coming straight off the road, he had to build a driveway that is curved to get back to his house. Then they have access to fields in the back.

Sandra Porter said they have existing barns and didn't want to tear down the buildings, so the line jogs to go around that. She indicated the property slants and is at a difficult angle.

Chairman Haslam stated his concerns for future planning.

Charlie stated he didn't realize the current code allows the zoning administrator to give approval, and that is not for approval, but things will still be ready for County Council. Both roads have frontage. All the area is owned by the state and is frontage access. There's not even a driveway but the easiest thing to call it is a driveway, or a shared driveway with existing asphalt.

There is sufficient acreage in both lots, so they get benefit of using the whole property. Recommendations have been made in the staff report. Member Sessions expressed concern at the checklist, viewing it as a checklist for them. Should they just meet requirements for concept approval?

Charlie: We're not approving concept. We are designing preliminary concepts.

This is the first time we've done this. That's why it looks the way it does. Routine ones won't look like this.

Member Erickson commented that officially they don't need to see this.

Charlie replied that the expense was already made, signs were already posted.

Member Sessions moved to provide the recommendations for the D&N Porter Estate Subdivision Concept Plan, application 13.065, as listed in the August 15, 2013 staff report.

1. That it appears that the general configuration of the subdivision conforms to zoning and subdivision requirements, and that it is ready for preliminary plat application.
2. That a UDOT right of way permit is submitted with the preliminary plat application.
3. That field inspections of the condition of the existing pavement used for the driveway access proves that satisfactory pavement and emergency turn around exists.

4. That the actual recorded right of way for the utility line corridor shall be shown on the preliminary plat, with any additional necessary rights of way needed to facilitate current conditions.
5. That an easement shall be placed on the plat in favor of the ditch owner/company, as applicable.
6. That preliminary plat will also contain the well head protection zone for lot two.
7. That proof of culinary shares (800 gallons per day) and irrigation shares (3 gallons per minute) are provided for each lot at preliminary plat application. The allowed irrigable acreage should also be indicated on the preliminary/final plat.
8. That a residential building envelope is provided on each lot.
9. There are several errors or incomplete items on the plat. Please review MCC 8-12 closely prior to submitting preliminary/final plat application so that you may submit a complete application.
10. That all other local, state, and federal laws are adhered to.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The nature of the subdivision is in conformance with the current and future land uses of the area.
2. The proposal complies with the Morgan County 2010 General Plan.
3. The proposal complies with current zoning requirements.
4. That additional work is necessary to make the proposal comply with preliminary plat requirements.
5. That the proposed access is found to comply with accessibility standards of County Code.
6. That the proposal is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Second by Member Newton. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

7. Discussion/Decision: LDS Mountain Green Cottonwood Canyon Rd

Tony Pantone: Architect with Pantone, representing LDS church and Bonnie Brown, the property owner. Wanting a subdivision. Have a few issues with recommendations from staff report, in particular #3. All square footage is listed on the site plan. All 3 lots are more than 1 acre. Stated that they submitted a letter to the County Council for revision. Bonnie has 3-4 buildings on her lot that run along the north property line. She's explained to him that they were all built in the 1940s so they are 80 years old. Charlie is requesting paperwork for those buildings. Bonnie Brown is confident they are that old and wants to avoid filing paperwork. Also has concerns with item #5. Lot 1 is in greenbelt and she wants to keep it there. Lot 2 is her residence. Lot 3 is in greenbelt. The layout is challenging to try to divide without dividing existing lines. She does not want to subdivide, but perhaps her children will want to develop and tear down buildings to accommodate lines.

Also item #6 is summarized in #5. The rest of the items are pretty minor and can be discussed with the County Council.

Member Sessions wondered if Lot 1 had the required footage.

Mr. Pantone responded that yes, they are all over 1 acre.

Member Sessions wanted to know her total acreage, minus church property, to which Mr. Pantone replied 4.2 acres.

Member Sessions informed him that at least 5 acres are needed for greenbelt. With the residence, she needs six acres total, as the county assessor interprets it. Mr. Pantone was unaware of the greenbelt requirements. Member Sessions wondered how long the buildings have been on the property and suggested an affidavit from someone alive at that time to attest to the building's age. She has concerns with the lot lines running through the existing buildings.

Mr. Pantone reiterated that the issue of greenbelt is a big issue for Bonnie. She wants her farmland to remain in greenbelt.

Chairman Haslam asked if it is such that they'd like to continue or if they'd like to wait.

Mr. Pantone replied to proceed so it doesn't take any longer than it has already.

Chairman Haslam wondered what the disclaimer is of note #6? It's on the plat but not large enough to read.

Mr. Pantone deferred to Charlie to answer.

Charlie pulled it up and enlarged it. It appeared to be a typical note from the LDS church for developing parcels of land.

Charlie thanked Tony for his patience. Stated that this is not a single-family residential subdivision. There are additional issues and he'd like to go through the recommendations: #2 just explained. #3 Tony and Charlie will discuss. Zone line runs through Lot 3. He said the issue is how long the rear property line has been there. There are several options that can happen, but none of them are requirements. One building is of particular concern. The title of the property may say they're owned by the same person, but there may be two different people who own different sides of the same building. Also addressed greenbelt concerns with Bonnie Brown and he encouraged her to talk to the county assessor about greenbelt issues. Said six acres was communicated to the applicant. Last thing, dividing large land as a subdivision, is that it will need to be surveyed. There is some flexible discretion that can be done, but it must meet some requirements. This may have been misunderstood by Mr. Pantone. Item #7 comes from this.

Chairman Haslam expressed that it was his understanding that the fence in the back would be moved as part of a trade.

Mr. Pantone replied that in initial discussions there was talk about doing a trade, but at this point it's going to stay where it is.

Chairman Haslam said that to fit current subdivision codes, would Lot 2 and Lot 3, have to be eliminated?

Charlie supposed they could carve the lines around the buildings, so they wouldn't have to be eliminated.

Chairman Haslam clarified that in order for the lines to remain, the barns need to come down.

Charlie affirmed. Or combine the properties.

Chairman Haslam added that they can carve and move the lines all around, but they will have to solve it.

Member Erickson asked if there are any exceptions?

Charlie said County Council was concerned about using an exception for one but not the other. Variances may not be an option.

Member Sessions moved to provide the recommendations for the LDS Mt. Green Cottonwood Canyon Road Subdivision Concept Plan, application 13.041, with the conditions and findings as listed in the August 15, 2013 staff report.

1. That it appears that the general configuration of the subdivision can conform to zoning and subdivision requirements provided that the comments herein can be adequately addressed on a preliminary plat application. If substantial reconfiguration of the subdivision is necessary to do so then those revisions should be resubmitted as an amendment to the concept plan and re-reviewed for final concept recommendation by the Zoning Administrator prior to preliminary plat application.
2. A preliminary plat will not be accepted with the disclaimer of note #6. The applicant of the subdivision, and all existing landowners therein shall take full responsibility for the entire subdivision and any required dedications and/or improvements. The applicant shall identify an approach that unifies the responsibility for dedications and improvements prior to preliminary plat application, and submit such plan with the preliminary application.
3. We assume that sufficient acreage exists for lots 1-3 in the RR-1 zone. Please provide an acreage table on the preliminary plat that confirms this assumption. If this assumption is incorrect then the subdivision shall be reconfigured and resubmitted for concept plan re-review.
4. There are many existing buildings on lots 2-3 that do not conform to setback requirements, and no evidence has been submitted indicating their legal establishment. Either adjust the subdivision boundaries with the adjacent land owner to correct the violations, or propose an alternative plan acceptable to the County.
5. Lots 2-3 have a proposed lot line dividing an existing building. This does not meet setback requirements. Please propose a method of correcting it.
6. It appears that the division is only a portion of a larger unsubdivided parcel. The entire

boundaries of that larger parcel is required to be included within the bounds of the subdivision, pursuant to MCC 8-12-43(J). Please provide this revision with the preliminary plat application, and provide a method of preserving that additional ground in perpetuity on the plat the recreational or agricultural nature of the use of the property, as is required by the 2010 General Plan in association with §8-12-5(C) and/or current zoning, whatever the case may be.

7. Please include a note on the preliminary plat that indicates the code reference that exempts lot 4 from minimum zoning acreage requirements (MCC 8-6-35) as long as it is used for church/institutional development. Please also propose a plat restriction for the uses on lot four. Limiting it to church and institutional development only.

8. That access to the adjacent larger church property shall be addressed with the preliminary plat design.

9. That all easements for ditches within the boundaries of the plat are provided on the preliminary submittal, with applicable ownership.

10. That proof of culinary shares (800 gallons per day) and irrigation shares (3 gallons per minute) are provided for each lot at preliminary plat application. The allowed irrigable acreage should also be indicated on the preliminary/final plat.

11. That a residential building envelope is provided on lots 1-3.

12. There are several errors or incomplete items on the plat. Please review MCC 8-12 closely prior to submitting preliminary/final plat application so that you may submit a complete application.

13. That all other local, state, and federal laws are adhered to.

Second by Member Stephens.

Chairman Haslam called for comments.

Member Wilson wondered if they needed to work through issues before moving on. Member Stephens asked if a condition was needed between lot 2 and 3? Member Sessions replied that was already given with recommendation #5. Member Erickson asked for clarification that they could come back and say that the two lots were actually one lot. Charlie replied that preliminary shows different things.

The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

9. Hearing/Discussion/Decision: Karen House Rezone

Member Erickson moved to go into Public Hearing. Second by Member Sessions. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

No public comment.

Member Newton moved to go out of Public Hearing. Seconded by Member Wilson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Dean House: Has 20 acres to rezone to 10 acre lots for one home. Issues concerned are that all lots are in A10. Doesn't understand why his isn't in A10 when everyone else's is in A10. He also has concerns with the flood plain. Says it's 150 ft straight up from any flood area. Part of the road that goes up to it is already paved and the other part is recreationally maintained to support large trucks to use it 9 months out of the year. There were no questions for Mr. House.

Charlie gave his presentation. Mr. House is looking for a rezone. There are a lot of 10 acre lots that were perhaps created before zoning existed. Recommending entire area be rezoned. The entire property is above the flood zone, although nearly everywhere you are in a flood zone of some sort or another. Does it meet the projected future of the county? We have a table of uses provided of what's allowed and not allowed in this zone. Still recommending approval. Frontage: there is a special ordinance stating use of a private lane.

Member Wilson questioned about quoting the general plan from Charlie's presentation about the village center in Porterville.

Charlie was under the impression that Porterville is still listed as a No-Growth Village Center. I can address it.

Member Wilson asked if approved and they get their 10 acre zoning, how would that work?

Charlie said they will have to provide evidence that they have enough acreage and lots. Member Stephens asked if the road takes away acreage?

Charlie said no, it's about the existence of a public right of way. Not about the existing road. Because it's a public right of way, there is a requirement for a dedication to occur. If they dedicate it, their boundary would change. They are currently in compliance with the 20 acres. You have to dedicate to subdivide but not to rezone.

Chairman Haslam asked that, as it sits, do they meet all the requirements for a rezone? To which Charlie responded, yes.

Member Erickson asked if the county has a correct survey as to where that road is supposed to go.

Charlie responded no, not to his knowledge. If it's used under a certain way for 10 years, as long as it's been used consistently to where people are travelling, it changes the right of way.

Member Erickson stated that's a big open book with lots of room for discussion.

Member Newton moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Council for the Karen House Trust Rezone Request, application #13.049, rezoning 20 acres of property at 1645 W (mailing address)/1675 W (county address) Deep Creek Road from the A-20 zone to the RR-10 zone, based on the findings listed in the staff report dated July 30, 2013.

1. That allowing the rezone will provide the property owners their desired use of the land.
2. That the uses listed in the proposed zone are harmonious with existing uses in the area.
3. That the potential for a traffic increase along Deep Creek Road will not be detrimental to current traffic flows.
4. That the proposed amendment is in accord with the County's General Plan.
5. That changed or changing conditions makes the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Seconded by Member Stephens. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

8. Discussion: Flexible Subdivision Survey Results

Charlie presented the results of the survey and Planning Commission members discussed the results and findings. He indicated he is struggling to figure out exactly what the county wants. There were 11 votes on the first survey and 8 on the second. Not sure if there are any questions not asked that should have been. Discussed the responses given on the survey for county-created PRUD.

Member Wilson said there are people who don't want to live right by their neighbors.

Charlie offered that clustering only works under certain conditions, in his opinion.

Member Wilson said there are people who want to go out from their neighbors.

Charlie discussed base density, stating at this point it is just information; there is not a decision being made. The NPDR PRUD has been repealed.

Member Newton asked the purpose of repealing the PRUD.

Charlie responded that the ordinance wasn't being used as it was intended.

Chairman Haslam pointed out there were too many loopholes that developers found to get around its intent.

Charlie questioned if the open space should be required. There was conversation of intensity to build on a property vs. conversation of open space. We had ordinances to encourage open space but not require it. We may want to offer incentives for compliance.

Chairman Haslam said one of the biggest issues is the open space in the Cottonwoods; nobody to maintain it.

Member Newton said it's the law of the commons, unless it's part of a lot. No one takes care of it.

Charlie: Viewshed is ridgelines and whether people can see open space.

Member Sessions: Maybe bonus densities can be given for viewshed.

Charlie: If it is required, how much, the biggest response is "30%" and "I don't know." There's a split on bonus density provisions being allowed.

Chairman Haslam stated he doesn't want to have bonus densities if people are going to bring trash in and not clean up.

Charlie: So what's the point of a flexible subdivision to be adopted?

Member Sessions stated that she doesn't think the public wants a cookie-cutter look. We want flexibility in some areas where terrain dictates. Frontage requirement.

Member Newton: Seems there's more interpretation if we go that route.

Member Wilson asked Charlie why, in his opinion, does the County Council ask for a PRUD?

Charlie responded in most jurisdictions, it's to gain more amenities.

Member Sessions: I hear the public clamoring for more soccer fields. That could be for a developer to provide an ordinance for that.

Charlie: Exactly, using an example that you can use a PRUD ordinance if you provide a soccer field.

Chairman Haslam: Our county is an agricultural county and we are trying to maintain that. People are moving to rural Morgan but bringing city preferences with them. Developers are trying to stuff as many houses as possible. There are few developers who understand the rural atmosphere. Those are some challenges. People want certain amenities, but want to keep the rural.

Charlie pointed out what Utah County has done, in doing 5 acre lots. Nothing more than 5 acres, period. No exceptions. And that's how they toe the line. But there is exceptional growth, but do we facilitate it?

Chairman Haslam: What good does it do to change a Flexible subdivision if someone buys a plot of land and changes the rules?

Charlie: The general plan says rural community, but we need to provide economic solutions for growth.

Member Wilson wondered if Utah County was flexible.

Charlie said it's a lot easier in Utah County because they have the city lines and all are defined.

Back to the survey, no clustering.

Wilson inquired how many responses to the survey.

Charlie replied there were 11 on this one, 8 on the other. The survey was sent to County Council and Planning Commission: 14 people. They may have been the same people on both surveys, with 11 maximum.

Sounds like people want at least a minimum lot size on a PRUD. People want to be more spread out.

No flag lots should be allowed.

Lots of people said gated communities should be allowed.

50% said maximum road length be extended.

Majority said no on a minimum project size, with Member Sessions offering the question may have been misunderstood.

How should the following regulatory controls be addressed? Only 2 people of the 8 said none. That was surprising. 4 said minimized.

Member Sessions wondered if foothills are considered hillside.

Charlie said it's worth a conversation.

Member Erickson asked when the survey will be reissued.

Charlie responded that he's not sure what priority this takes, hoping to get it reissued by November. Any suggestions for additional questions?

Member Wilson: I assume you looked at other counties and their PRUDs. Are there any that stand out in your mind?

Charlie: PRUDs are really a city tool; not sure why Morgan County wants one. It is used to incentivize density. Rarely used in a rural, agriculture setting. It's used in places like Mtn. Green where growth is already slated.

Member Sessions: What about other jurisdictions like Wasatch?

Chairman Haslam: We are spending time worrying about flexible subdivisions. The biggest complaint I get is that it takes forever for someone to get a building permit or subdivide. What is being done?

Charlie: What I perceive County Council is doing, is adopted policy, cost savings as opposed to time frame. It makes me look like I'm not doing my job and it's uncomfortable.

Chairman Haslam asked that if he wants to subdivide, why can't he walk in and get a list of items to accomplish and once they're accomplished, he can move on?

Charlie: Subdivision ordinances are complicated.

Chairman Haslam: Why can't we simplify?

Charlie: It's written to protect people and provide an orderly development for a plat. It's organizational. We don't have a full-time engineer and we have to wait for things to come back. People work hard and do a fantastic job, but it's a combination of issues. We have a lot of things to do and are things are always being added more requirements and conditions upon our already overflowing plate. If everything continues, by the end of the year we will have 80 subdivisions, as opposed to 3 last year.

10. Staff Report.

11. Approval of minutes from June 27, 2013

Member Newton moved to approve the minutes as amended for June 27, 2013. Second by Member Sessions. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

12. Approval of minutes from August 8, 2013

Member Sessions moved to approve the minutes as amended for August 8, 2013. Second by Member Newton. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried. Member Stephens abstained.

13. Adjourn.

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

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Chairman

ATTEST: _____ Date: _____

Mickaela Moser, Transcriptionist

Planning and Development Services