



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
Thursday, June 9, 2016  
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

**Work Session:**

6. Discussion on the Commercial Use Tables, Conditional Use Standards Amendment, Commercial Zoning Maps.

**Administrative:**

7. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff
8. Approval of minutes from May 26, 2016
9. Adjourn

Members Present

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

Staff Present

Gina Grandpre  
Mickaela Moser

Public Present

Tina Cannon  
Darlene Musselman

1. Call to order – prayer. Chair Haslam opened the meeting and Member Wilson offered prayer.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of agenda – Chair added Member Nance’s and Member Ross’s updates on their respective area meetings before agenda item #6. He set a time of 8 pm to adjourn.

**Member Sessions moved to approve the amended agenda with these changes. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

4. Declaration of conflicts of interest  
There was none.
5. Public Comment  
There was none.

**Member Ross moved to go out of public comment. Second by Member Nance. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.**

Member Nance: He reported positive feedback from the meeting held about the Enterprise area zoning sub-committee. He invited representatives from Geneva Rock to the area meeting. He said the Enterprise residents don’t understand why there are industrial uses in the agricultural zones and they’re not supportive of keeping that. Many Enterprise residents are very upset about the Geneva plant, their hours of operation, production, etc. He also reported that there were several people in attendance to that meeting who were supportive of several changes while others were opposed to change. Some suggestions of businesses that residents wanted to attract to Enterprise were a convenience store or a general store-type of business. The location of a prospective store was not discussed. Member Nance said they discussed putting this idea on the future land use map, possibly on Kim Greene’s Family Trust land. Many of the changes discussed have consequences from zone changes that surrounding residents won’t anticipate. Member Sessions cautioned that they can’t pick and choose what goes in the commercial areas, and if it is zoned Commercial, there are many different options other than those presented that could be a possibility. Member Nance discussed the commercial use table during that meeting. There were also discussions about property values and possible up-zoning. They plan to meet again on June 22nd at 7:45 pm.

Member Ross: The Mountain Green area zoning sub-committee's second meeting is scheduled for June 14<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm. Their agenda is set to discuss the commercial zone.

**Work Session:**

6. Discussion on the Commercial Use Tables, Conditional Use Standards Amendment, Commercial Zoning Maps.

Chair began discussion at the maps. He removed the Mountain Green and Enterprise maps for tonight's discussion, as their respective areas are meeting in sub-committees and will be talked about in detail at another meeting.

**Round Valley Map** (Taggart's and Holcim): Member Nance referred to the General Commercial area at Taggart's and wondered if the descriptions of the zones fit in that area. Member Nance has trouble with the difference between commercial uses and residential uses in the same zone, and the loss of a buffer between the two. Member Sessions suggested using Neighborhood Commercial as a buffer. Tina Cannon wondered what the plan was in Planning and Zoning to protect areas during times of growth. Member Ross believes that for Taggart's, with the topography, General Commercial is appropriate, but that may not be the case County-wide. Member Nance asked if General Commercial is the best for the Taggart area, suggesting possibly changing it to Neighborhood Commercial. Chair Haslam stated that Neighborhood Commercial is more limiting than General Commercial and could limit additional businesses in that area. Member Sessions stated her support of the current definition of the General Commercial. The other planning commissioners are supportive of the Round Valley/Croydon Commercial Use map remaining as it is. After the public hearing in July, they feel comfortable forwarding that map to the County Council.

Chair Haslam suggested putting up yellow signs in each area in discussion to notice for the public hearing. Gina will also notice with letters in the mail.

**East Canyon Map:** There were no suggestions.

**Petersen/Enterprise Map:** Member Sessions referenced Rex Jensen's Machine Shop in Petersen, saying his business is not allowed in the Business Park zoning, which was what they were considering. It is currently in the Commercial Buffer zone. She doesn't think Light Manufacturing is a good fit for Petersen. They don't want to limit the current business or cause problems for Rex's business. Member Sessions referred to the NAICS table for all allowed uses for 332, which include many, many uses.

Chair referred back to the meeting with Brent Bateman and two of the County Council members, saying the Planning Commission will send maps to the County Council when they have been reviewed and are ready. Member Ross said that there is no way to move forward with the table and current zones for many of the areas within the County. As four of the County Council members do not want to rescind the NAICS table, in what direction does the Planning

Commission proceed? It is the Planning Commissioners feeling that the County Council members don't understand the repercussions of the NAICS table.

Tina Cannon said that she understands Mountain Green wants to open up for businesses, however the NAICS table is way too open. She doesn't believe that the County Council members understand how wide open the allowed uses are and the potential problems that will occur for existing businesses and residents by having a door wide open for so many businesses. It is difficult to respond to residents about why some of the controversial businesses are allowed to come in. It was the general understanding that by adopting the federally recognized NAICS table in the first place, it would entice businesses to Morgan County and easily classify them.

June 21<sup>st</sup> is the next County Council meeting in which Planning Commission members will attend to voice concern over the NAICS table and the problems it poses. They wish to communicate the problems and vastness of the table to the County Council. Member Sessions will use Rex Jensen as a prime example (and one of many potential examples) of a serious problem they face concerning commercial zoning. Enticing businesses to the County is a high priority to the County Council, however Member Ross believes this huge system just doesn't fit in Morgan County. There was some discussion on the growth of Mountain Green and their initial push to incorporate, but now they are trying to revert back to a residential area. Many local residents want to be selective in attracting a certain style of business to come, but not allow the big businesses. Member Ross suggested putting together some commercial use table that would be acceptable for current and future businesses.

**Member Ross moved to postpone indefinitely any further discussion on the new Commercial Use Maps until the Planning Commission can meet with the County Council to present to them our concerns and objections with the current use table and clarify the Council's goals and objectives. The Planning Commission's recommendation is to rescind the Commercial Use Table that was adopted on February 2, 1016, revert to the table that existed prior to February 2, 2016, stay with the current Commercial Use Maps and forward them our updated standards.**

**Second by Member Stephens.**

**The vote was unanimous, including Chair Haslam's vote in the affirmative. The motion passed.**

\*The time to adjourn has been changed to 8:30 pm.\*

Standards:

Section 8-8-4

A.3. Member Sessions would like to add wording **“a buffer may be required to provide physical and visual separation between incompatible commercial or industrial uses and residential uses.”**

B. nothing

C. 6. Member Nance clarified that the 25% slope is only where they're building.

D. nothing

E. nothing

F. Member Sessions would like a written statement from the County Engineer giving his approval. It appears the County Engineer did review what was sent to him and he approved all but one additional request that he added to the end of 8-8-4 C. It was unclear what was reviewed, as Member Sessions wanted further clarification concerning the TIA on F from him. Gina sent Mark a text message about what he reviewed and he confirmed that he reviewed what was asked and the only changes needed have been made.

G. There was some concern and discussion about the bond required for demolition. They need clarification to proceed.

8-8-5

B. Chair wants to add wording at the end "...for installation of all landscaping, fencing, and screening within **'and around the entire development'**"

C. Needs clarification

M. Character of District: Member Sessions wants to add **"Commercial, Office and Industrial developments shall require review by the Planning Commission of the site plan and the architectural building elevations."**

**Administrative:**

- 7. Planning Commission Business/Questions for Staff

As there are some items that have come up for discussion, the Planning Commission will hold a meeting on June 23. It will not be cancelled as previously decided.

- 8. Approval of minutes from May 26, 2016

**Member Nance moved to approve the amended minutes from May 26, 2016. Second by Member Ross. 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