



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Thursday, August 27, 2015
Morgan County Council Room
5:00 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. 5:00 pm - Rees Future Land Use Amendment Tour at the Round Valley Golf Course parking lot.
2. 6:30 pm - Call to order – prayer at Morgan County Courthouse
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Approval of agenda
5. Declaration of conflicts of interest
6. Public Comment

Legislative:

7. Discussion/Public Hearing/Decision – Rees Future Land Use Map Amendment

Administrative:

- ~~8. Discussion/Decision – Pettit Ranchettes PRUD Amendment 2.~~
9. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff
10. Approval of minutes from August 13, 2015
11. 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

Mark Rees
Debra Rees

1. 5:00 pm - Rees Future Land Use Amendment Tour at the Round Valley Golf Course parking lot.

The Planning Commission members met at the Courthouse and then proceeded to the site tour.

2. Call to order – prayer at the Morgan County Courthouse. Chair Haslam called the meeting to order. Prayer was offered by Member Newton.
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Approval of agenda
Chair Haslam decided to remove item #8 of the agenda, as the applicants will present at a future time.
Member Newton moved to approve the agenda. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.
5. Declaration of conflicts of interest
There were none.
6. Public Comment
Chair decided to forego the public comment as there was no one present in the audience. (Mr. and Mrs. Rees arrived just before their application was presented.)

Legislative:

7. Discussion/Public Hearing/Decision – Rees Future Land Use Map Amendment

Bill clarified the secondary access is not the emergency access, as no one but emergency vehicles has been granted access. He suggested that in the future the Rees' may dedicate a road through their property.

Member Stephens joined the meeting at 6:38pm.

There was additional discussion about the secondary access. Member Nance asked if the Bell Family was notified and Gina responded that they were noticed and were also present at the last Planning Commission meeting. Member Nance inquired about the configuration of the proposed boundary lines and it was noted that the applicant derived the lines for his proposed divisions, and the proposed lines may follow property lines; however it is the applicant's discretion to divide where he sees fit. Bill stated that the applicants understand the limited development options and are requesting the RR zone (as opposed to the A-20 zone) for flexibility, not for density reasons.

Member Nance asked Member Wilson if he remembered when this application was presented a few years ago. It was clarified that originally, Mark Rees was the sole applicant and currently, the application includes the surrounding property owners. Mark Rees clarified that the previous Planning Commission declined the original application because they considered it spot zoning. Bill clarified that he has written affidavits from all parties involved. Member Newton stated that he doesn't have any problem with the current application, or with the Bell's property in the Future Land Use Map re-designation. It was noted that the Bell's property will not be negatively impacted in any way from this decision, nor does it entitle them to anything.

Member Nance moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Council for the Rees Future Land Use Amendment, application number 15.058, changing the designation from Agricultural to Rural Residential, based on the findings listed in the staff report dated August 27, 2015 to include the Bell property that is located within the boundaries of this application.

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

Administrative:

~~8. Discussion/Decision—Pettit Ranchettes PRUD Amendment 2.~~

9. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff

Bill gave an update on the Pettit Ranchettes PRUD Amendment 2. He addressed the issue of PRUD's, and said County residents will ask for things that have been done in the past but the PRUD is not a current zoning option. Member Sessions stated that there still needs to be a lot line adjustment with that application before proceeding.

Bill discussed upcoming training opportunities.

Member Wilson asked Bill about PRUD's and a possible legal challenge with the County. Bill clarified that the Planning Commission is in the driver's seat and is not obligated because of previous approvals. Member Newton stated that the Pettit Ranchettes PRUD is different from most that come before the Planning Commission.

Chair Haslam asked about the 3-6 month application time period with the Pettit Ranchettes, as the time period for their application was 7 years ago. Chair wondered why they should be allowed to proceed with this application. Chair specifically requested that the original 2008 application concerning expansion to their PRUD not come before the Planning Commission, as it exceeds a reasonable time period.

It was decided to address and discuss bylaws at the next meeting.

10. Approval of minutes from August 13, 2015

Member Sessions moved to approve the corrected minutes from July 9, 2015. Second by Member Ross. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried. Member Wilson abstained, as he was absent.

11. Adjourn

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

Approved: _____ Date: _____
Chairman, Roland Haslam

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