



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Thursday, April 23, 2015
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. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of agenda
4. Declaration of conflicts of interest
5. Public Comment

Administrative:

6. Discussion on commercial use table text amendment.
7. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff
8. Approval of minutes from April 9, 2015
9. Adjourn

Members Present

Shane Stephens
Gary Ross
Debbie Sessions
Roland Haslam
Larry Nance
Michael Newton
Steve Wilson

Staff Present

Bill Cobabe
Gina Grandpre
Mickaela Moser

Public Present

Tina Kelley

1. Call to order – prayer. Vice-Chair Sessions called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. She excused Chair Haslam from the beginning of the meeting. Prayer was offered by Member Ross.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of agenda
Member Newton moved to approve the agenda. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.
4. Declaration of conflicts of interest
There were none.
5. Public Comment
There was no public comment.

Administrative:

6. Discussion on commercial use table text amendment.

Bill explained the 20 main sectors of the commercial use table and how he arrived at the current format. He explained that he excluded gambling and deep sea fishing from the County activities and also elaborated on the allocation of sexually-oriented businesses. Member Sessions commented that some of the agricultural descriptions are not appropriate or should not be allowed in commercial zones. There was some discussion about construction offices and on-site equipment associated with construction zones.

Chair Haslam joined the meeting at 6:44 pm.

Member Nance suggested omitting rice production and almond trees from the commercial

use table, as they are high water consumption. Member Sessions reviewed the locations of the different current commercial zones and asked the Planning Members to visualize these locations as the different areas are discussed. Member Sessions voiced that she looks at agricultural uses as a holding place for commercial uses in the appropriate zone until they are further developed, therefore the agricultural uses shouldn't be intense.

There was discussion about whether feed lots should be allowed only in specific areas and also discussion on potential commercial uses that consume large amounts of water.

Member Newton suggested making a potential pig farm a conditional use permit. There was discussion concerning the numbers 11211 on the commercial use table being intense agricultural operations, and therefore should be conditional uses. Member Sessions clarified the difference between a pasture and a feed lot concerning cattle. Chair Haslam asked whether the businesses affected by the zoning consolidation are aware of the changes and wondered if they would be concerned about being changed from the light manufacturing zone to the general business zone, as some of the uses permitted may be different than before the change. Bill clarified that those who were under the zones previously approved (for example "manufacturing"), but which are now consolidated under the current "light manufacturing" zone, have the same guidelines as before and, in fact, even more options than before. Bill explained that the businesses affected would not have any fewer uses than they previously did; but it is a name change. Bill further explained that if a business owner was very concerned about the specific name of the zone they were in or restricted uses, they could ask for a zone change.

Member Nance suggested putting the list in the same sequence as the County Code list, so those curious as to potential zoning and commercial questions could easily access their individual concerns. Bill acquiesced. Member Stephens asked about dairy farms and Bill clarified that out in the County, those things will stay the same. He further clarified that these discussions and changes are only concerning the commercial zones within the County and not individual residences or agricultural zones.

Member Sessions suggested that Beef and Cattle Ranching, Cattle Farming or Ranching, and Dual Cattle Ranching and Farming be acceptable in neighborhood commercial without a CUP. Member Newton debated why sheep farming shouldn't be permitted also, but Member Sessions had concerns with the milk part of sheep farming, 112410 of NAICS. She didn't have any problems with meat or wool production. Chair Haslam voiced that he didn't want to go through the list and debate the entire list of potential business opportunities, but rather, look at a County map of the commercial zones and allocate which zones should be allowed where. Gina pointed out that when you get into animals, you are limited to a Light Manufacturing or Manufacturing zone. Anything dealing with tourism is a Conditional Use. Bill suggested that the simple way to do it would be to allocate anything involving animal use to Light Manufacturing or Manufacturing zones. Member Sessions views that the changes made with the commercial use table in agricultural areas are just holding places until development, and therefore should be more general rather than specific in nature. Member Newton commented that land becomes more valuable with an increased number of uses.

Bill suggested that he prepare something for the agricultural section of the commercial use

table and come back with something more for the next meeting. He moved onto mining and clarified that those are numbers beginning with 21 on the NAICS table. There were thoughts for conditional uses within mining (gravel pits, Holcim). Member Newton suggested putting a conditional use on every one of the 21's (industrial zone) and then making it a C2 so that the Planning Commission may regulate it if the need arises. Member Sessions asked about gravel pits, which are found in NAICS 212321, and she suggested making them conditional under Light Manufacturing. Utilities: Section 22. Tina Kelley asked about the zone in which a septic system of Mountain Green lies and Bill showed on the map that it is in A-20. Member Newton asked about things associated with power systems and steam heating systems, saying it should be up to the individual business owner and their preference. Member Sessions asked whether Rocky Mountain Power had to abide by zoning restrictions. Bill suggested 221121 and 221122 be reviewed. There was discussion on industrial types of uses and whether they should be conditional (or classified as C3 in all zones or Industrial). There was also discussion about water, sewer and septic in commercial zones. Bill reminded that these standards being discussed tonight are a work in progress and could be changed by property owners in the future. Member Nance suggested adding page numbers and a map to the next packet for easier referencing.

Member Stephens moved to end the discussion on the commercial use table. Second by Member Sessions. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

7. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff
8. Approval of minutes from April 9, 2015
Member Newton moved to approve amended the minutes. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.
9. Adjourn
Member Stephens moved to adjourn. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Approved: _____ Date: _____
Chairman, Roland Haslam

ATTEST: _____ Date: _____
Mickaela Moser, Transcriptionist
Planning and Development Services