



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Thursday, April 24, 2014
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. Work session for review and discussion on the following items:
 - *Small Subdivision without Infrastructure Improvement
 - *Streamline Land Use Processes and Ordinance updates
6. Staff Report
7. Approval of minutes from March 27, 2014 and April 10, 2014
8. Adjourn

Members Present:

David Sawyer, via electronic participation
Debbie Sessions
Roland Haslam
Darrell Erickson
Steve Wilson

Staff Present:

Ronda Kippen, Planning Technician
Mickaela Moser, Transcriptionist
Bruce Parker, Planning Consultant

1. Call to order – prayer
Chairman Haslam welcomed everyone to the meeting. Member Wilson offered prayer.
2. Approval of agenda

Member Sessions moved to approve the agenda. Second by Member Erickson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Chair Haslam excused Members Stephens and Newton from tonight's meeting.

3. Declaration of conflicts of interest
There were none

4. Public Comment

Member Sessions moved to go into public comment. Second by Member Wilson. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

There was no public comment.

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

5. Work session for review and discussion on the following items:
 - *Small Subdivision without Infrastructure Improvement
 - *Streamline Land Use Processes and Ordinance updates

Bruce Parker: Gave an update of the Land Use Committee to streamline the process for small subdivision applicants. Stated the purpose and definition for improvement subdivisions:

“Small/ No Off-Site Improvement Subdivision” means the division of lands located in the unincorporated area of the County into ten (10) lots, or less, by certifying in writing that: (a) the County has provided notice as required; and (b) the proposed subdivision: (i) may be required to provide property for the widening to an already existing dedicated road or street right-of-way to meet County standards but is not required to provide any improvements to any such existing dedicated right-of-way; (ii) may be required to provide necessary, or required on-site dedications and improvements; (iii) has been reviewed and received written feasibility approval from the culinary water authority (iv) has been reviewed and received written feasibility approval from the sanitary sewer authority; (v) has received a written recommendation from the fire authority; (vi) is located in a zoned area; and (vii) conforms to all applicable Land Use Ordinances or has properly received a variance from the requirements of an otherwise conflicting and applicable Land Use Ordinance (see §17-27a-605, UCA).

Chair Haslam wondered if certain individuals would be penalized with acreage reduction upon approval for a small subdivision. He used the example of Dean House, whose property lies up Deep Creek, where the current road is on his property.

Bruce Parker stated that they could include the calculations before the dedication takes place, with a note on the plat indicating that the acreage falls a little bit short of the required 5 acres. Bruce stated that property owners whose land is shallow with significant frontage will be more greatly affected than those whose property has little frontage and is very deep.

Chair Haslam said that in his opinion, a landowner with a 20 acre lot who wants to subdivide into 4 5-acre lots, would be penalized and not able to develop his entire land because of the frontage he’s required to give for access. Members of the Planning Commission agreed that similar decisions have been made concerning this issue and there is a need for consistency.

Member Sessions stated that the County does not get involved until or unless the land owner decides to

subdivide or make improvements. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss dedication. Member Sessions read from the County Code book.

Chair Haslam suggested that before a subdivision, you could calculate acreage.

Member Sessions said that you can't have a lot until you subdivide and there is concern surrounding the definition and involvement of a "lot" in the code.

Ronda expressed concern that a landowner may be able to use road acreage to increase density, which could possibly evolve into other concerns for larger subdivisions.

Chair Haslam reminded everyone that these standards are for 10 or fewer lots, which constitutes a small subdivision. Bruce felt that subdividing could be encouraged by not penalizing land owners.

Ronda stated that it is important to clean things up in order to have distinct lot lines and titles. She gave an example of a situation where property lines are tied to the center point of a river and the water line can grow or drop and, in turn, take or give acreage respectively.

There was discussion about the benefits and costs on behalf of Morgan County residents and also Morgan County.

As development happens, the County desires an equal amount of frontage along main roads for consistency.

Bruce brought the focus back to the relevant items on the agenda with seven pages of drafted revisions to consider and he said there could be two options upon entering the upcoming public hearing. He suggested changing the language on item g in order to continue with the recommendation of forwarding this to the County Council, to which Chair Haslam expressed concern for residents who live on Deep Creek Road.

Bruce Parker reviewed the current steps for a Small/No Off-Site Improvement Subdivision Application. He explained the wording he chose for the title, where "Small" means 10 lots or less. Chair Haslam recommended adding infrastructure. Bruce explained that it still is "off-site", meaning that the property doesn't belong to the County. Bruce was open to suggestions for changing the wording to increase public understanding. He suggested, "Small subdivisions on existing County roads."

Ronda pointed out that the Planning Commission has been given direction to remove the infrastructure improvement requirement on existing County roads.

6. Staff Report

Ronda informed that the new Senior Planner begins next week and Keryl leaves the Planning Department as secretary the following day.

7. Approval of minutes from March 27, 2014 and April 10, 2014

Member Erickson moved to approve the minutes from March 27, 2014. Second by Member Sessions. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Member Sessions moved to approve the minutes from April 10, 2014. Second by Member Wilson. Member Erickson abstained from the vote. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Member Erickson abstained from voting on the minutes from April 10, 2014, as he was absent.

8. Adjourn

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

Approved: _____ **Date:** _____
Chairman

ATTEST: _____ **Date:** _____

Mickaela Moser, Transcriptionist
Planning and Development Services