

2008 MOUNTAIN GREEN
AREA PLAN/DAT COMMITTEE MEETING
MOUNTAIN GREEN FIRE STATION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2008 – 6:30 p.m.

AMENDED AGENDA

6:30 p.m. Meeting called to order and Prayer.

- 1. Approval of agenda and amendments.**
- 2. Review and approval of previous minutes.**
- 3. Public comment period.**
- 4. Discussion/vote on the following items:**
 - a. Final Maps to be recommended to Planning Commission**
 - b. DAT acceptance recommendation**
 - c. Mountain Green Area Plan Amendment recommendations**
- 5. Worksession scheduled with Planning Commission (Sept 4, 6:30 p.m.)**
- 6. Adjourn**

Note:

In compliance with American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Lyn Montgomery at 845-4008 at least 24 hours before this meeting.)

**MOUNTAIN GREEN AREA PLAN/DAT
COMMITTEE MEETING
MOUNTAIN GREEN FIRE STATION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2008 6:30 P.M.**

Committee Members

Bill Weaver, Planning Commission
Blair Larsen
Lana Walters
Brad Richards
Mary Ellen Rollins
Seth Wallace
Dixie Munsee
Shad Guffey
Ron Blunck
Ann Taggart
Jim Manning (arrived late)

Administrative Staff

Dave Manning, GIS specialist
Teresa Rhodes, Transcription
Tina Kelley, County Council

Public

Mike McMillan
Ann McMillan
Brent Bohman
Bonnie Brown
Debbie Session

Committee Members absent

Tony Pantone, AIA/DAT Representative, non-voting
Tyler Quigley
George Sousa
Janise Loveridge
Bill Warner
Don Paul

***** MINUTES *****

Chairman Weaver welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.
Prayer was offered by Member Richards.

1. Approval of agenda and amendments.

**MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO AMMEND THE AGENDA TO
REMOVE ITEMS 4B AND 4C DUE TO THE FACT THAT THEY WERE ALREADY
DISCUSSED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD AUGUST 6, 2008.
SECOND BY MEBMER WALTERS.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Member Guffey requested that a quorum be verified.
There were 8 voting members present. It was noted there was a quorum present to go forward with the meeting.

**MOTION BY MEMBER TAGGARTS TO APPROVE THE
AGENDA AS AMENDED.
SECOND BY MEMBER MUNSEE.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

2. Review and approval of previous minutes

**MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 6, 2008
WITH THE NOTED MINOR CORRECTIONS.
SECOND BY MEMBER GUFFEY.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

3. Public comment period

**MOTION BY MEMBER BLUNCK TO OPEN THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Mike McMillan – Noted he had some questions on the Mtn. Green Town Center. They were as follows:

- Asked what the dimensions of the town center were?
 - Member Richards – noted the maximum it can be is equivalent to the 3000 foot radius.
- Concern that there has been some discussion on the McMillan Farm and Bonnie Brown property. This group has been taxed with reviewing the DAT recommendation. He believed those two farms fall outside of that discussion.
- He did not believe the town center would include active Ag properties. If it was it would be much denser. It is so non-descriptive. This committee has been task with reviewing the DAT not the Mtn. Green Master Plan.
 - Member Taggart – noted Member Creager had clarified the minutes from his motion in the council meeting which included the committee the option to accept all or part of it. If the committee did not accept part of it that they make recommendations in place of that.
- Mr. McMillan noted on the DAT, not on the Mtn. Green area plan.
 - Member Larsen noted he understood what Mr. McMillan meant, in that he believed his property was outside of the DAT.
- Mr. McMillan stated that is correct, and the committee really should not even want to address it. The McMillan place is a fairly complex development challenge but it can have some really, really good results.
- There is a 14 acre gravel pit without a time limit on it.
- For most of you, it doesn't look so good, but from his standpoint it looks really good when he drives from his driveway to the church house because he can see over on the hills.

- He is going to be able to see when the Sessions develop pods of homes and open space. But if his assigns or heirs duplicate what Gardner's have done across the street, what a disaster that will be. Gardner's is fine, but if they build homes where the 14 acres are, that will be so ugly that all you will be doing is driving down a tunnel and you won't be able to see the hills; He has turned down numerous proposals on the gravel and this is the reason why.
- There is probably about 90 – 100 acres. In development of that property he believes quite a lot of material will need to shift around.
- He believed it should be cut so that the people on the other side of the road can still see and that the next person can still see.
- He is really opposed to seeing the tunnel build up of it.
- He does not have any financial pressures to do anything at all.
- Can't see trucking the gravel out and beating the road and then when there is development trucking the gravel back in to build the development. He does not want to see anything done on that material until he can see if quite a lot of that material doesn't need to go into the development.
- He believed if there was development if probably needed to include the brown property in order to transfer those developments rights out.
- If the county decides that they are going to have a buffer along the freeway, it will be pretty ugly because it is too little to water, it is too little to farm and it just turns into weed grass and it is ugly.
- Noted if there is any chance to put increased density, make it a condition that it has to transfer up so that those margins are big enough to still be a third or half of those fields so that it can actually be pasture land; he cautioned not to leave a strip because it would be ugly.
- Noted if you moved it so that there was enough that over a period of time it could remain irrigated pasture; that is why it is beautiful now.
- Stated that if we do this and we don't do it right we will take away more ambiance away from our community than we could ever create in this town center because when you drive up there it is beautiful.
- He would like to see a motion, if you are doing the town center, to leave his property out of it.
- Noted it could just sit there and then when somebody comes to develop it, He will go ahead and work on the wetlands at that time.
- Mr. McMillan explained the wetlands on the property. *(At the request of Member Larsen the following section was typed verbatim. Because of some unclear statements, The committee upon approving the minutes, asked the transcriptionist to ask Mr. McMillan if he would like to clarify his statements for the final minutest. On behalf of the transcriptionist, Member Larsen contacted Mr. McMillan who stated it was ok to leave them as they were stated in the original minutes.)*
 - Don Paul probably explained that it gets created by the Cottonwood River in a 22 days period when somebody flushed a toilet up at Preston it came down; it is a single luvial deposit.
 - What happens in the water that is in there is not from the River, the water comes from Cottonwood? If the water runs to the Cottonwood Bridge the next day there will be water.
 - He farmed Browning's property for about 12 years and then Morgan County had a little earthquake in the 80's and after that we didn't have it (water?). But it has (oak pond ?) where the grills are and when that water would run, in about three days they would have it.
 - After they built the subdivision where Ann Taggart lives then Harry did not farm it. So waste water did not come over so it got really dry.

- The reason it hadn't been irrigating the ranch is because it was too hot.
- He took a Cat and equipment and went back two fields in his ditches and made the ditches about this high (showed with hands). Changed the culvert from 18" to 36" and made it for his house that he could hold enough ground to irrigate.
- Elwin didn't get water in the winter and he has stock water right and it is non-consumptive, so he discharged it through his and then the more he irrigated, it made Williams produce more hay.
- He noted he has been in discussion with the Corp of Engineers and at this point we think that we are irrigating that is not in the file.
- It is his water, but it is suppose to go only on certain (?).
- So what happens is in true wetlands we might have two or three acres.
- Deverl (?) Harry to take a CAT and push a dam in, then he put a dam and head gate across and so he has some #1 cat tails.
- It has all the correct grasses to be wetlands.
- We have no choice; we are going to turn the water off.
- The Corp of Engineers had told him it may take up to two years for those to go away.
- If you're going to create wetlands you want to go into a program where you get credit for wetlands and other people have to mitigate it, renting it, or whatever the court takes care of.
- They are going to go through the process and for awhile the area will not look good because it is going to go back to what it was.
 - Chairman Weaver asked if the Corp of Engineers was ok with that.
- Mr. McMillan noted they don't have a choice because he is illegally putting water on it. There is no water for it.
- Member Rollins – so everything that Don Paul thought was natural wetland is not.
- Mr. McMillan noted that some is natural wetland. On the toe of the hill from the church house around and into Bonnie's property there is a little (?) that comes out. It was so insignificant that when they did the Weber River adjudication, nobody filed on it. Finally later in the 70's Elwin and he filed on historical use because they had ditches.
- He noted when the State put the freeway through, there were the Olsen Brother sleuths and they filled them. It diminished the size of the ranch, so when the owner got paid by the State, he had Harry Wilkinson level all the fields. So the soils are already (they burn on the spectrograph) stirred up with gravel. He then had Harry push in a little dam there to try holding any water; so there are wetlands, but not very much. .
 - Member Rollins asked what percentage Mr. McMillan thought there was.
- He noted Bonnie probably had 1 ½ - 2 acres and he probably had 3 acres.
- He noted the Corp of Engineers delineate wetlands by grass types.
- He noted he moved the spring. He piped the spring from Lake Point 2 ½ miles and in one year they had little willows and cat tails. He has no idea how the seeds transferred.
- Whoever develops it should have commitment enough to the community that when they are done it still looks nice.
- He would encourage this committee to not support development on those benches. Possibly not on the piece that was the school ground.
- He noted for his purpose and the community he has to drain that area and have the Corp of Engineers come and delineate.

- He stated that the ranch has enough acreage and change of elevation that it needs to be done carefully. If you have five acre lots all you are going to see when you drive down the freeway is a fence every 250', two head of horses, a little horse barn, a boat, camper, etc. And there are going to be eight of them down the freeway. That is not what we are looking for.
- Believed everyone wanted to see the meadows as much as possible and so you have to make it worthwhile for someone to irrigate.
- He did not think it was possible to show this attached to the town center. He would like to be excluded from it at this time.
- He noted he was guilty for not coming to the committee sooner and giving them some of the particulars that would change.
 - Chairman Weaver noted the reason the DAT was done in the first place was to identify the town center. But the DAT came out, and it included everyone.
- Mr. McMillan did not believe the DAT map reflect his property.
 - Member Taggart – asked for clarification. She asked Mr. McMillan if he did not want the density that the DAT placed on his property which is 8 DUA (dwelling units per acre). She asked what he would prefer be written on it.
- Mr. McMillan noted he did not think it should be developed right now. He does not want anything written on it.
 - Member Taggart noted the 8 DUA is what the DAT recommended to them. This committee did not make the density up, that is what was drawn on their map.
- There was discussion on which map was the DAT map.
 - Dave Manning – noted what he did with the map was took the DAT map and laid it over the area photos and drew basically areas that correspond to exactly what is on that map. They are not exactly perfect, but they are pretty close.
- Mr. McMillan – if you are going to do anything, put the 8 units but he believed the narrative should say that this area was only in a supportive function to the town center and did not represent an in-depth look at these properties and that these properties advancing to that should be reviewed and re-considered. He did not believe it was what should be done. He noted no one wants all that density put on the bench so that you can't see past it; you want to preserve the view shed.
- Mr. McMillan drew on the wipe board a cross-hatch drawing of how he believed the property should be developed. He believed the property should be terraced so that everyone can see the mountains.
 - Chairman Weaver asked what the committee had done to prohibit that.
- Mr. McMillan noted the committee has proposed five acre zoning on it.
 - Member Richards – noted they have proposed five dwelling units per acre.
 - Member Richards believed several issues need to be recognized. The Committee has closed the DAT and we really can't change anything now, but what Mr. McMillan is proposing is exactly what we are planning on.
 - We are in public comment and the discussion needs to be limited to public comment without all the questions.
 - Suggested he explain this to Mr. McMillan after the meeting and if Mr. McMillan still didn't like what the committee was proposing then he would recommend going to the Planning Commission.

- Mr. McMillan noted the County is probably going to pass an ordinance that says they want a 100' buffer zone along the highway. He would caution the committee on that because Reed's Canary grass will take it over in a few years and if you don't irrigate it the county will have a narrow strip that doesn't look good.
- He further noted that if you don't have enough so that someone can actually farm it, it won't be the pretty pastures that the County has.

Member Munsee –

- Thanked Mr. McMillan for his foresight. She appreciated his concern for the future and what it will look like.

Brent Bohman –

- Seems when we get into these density discussions we go the wrong way and not the right way.
- Going into the 1950's there was no zoning ordinance in this County. The reason a zoning ordinance was adopted was because some of the old farmers (Paul Turner, Frank Bohman, Harry Wilkinson) determined we needed a zoning ordinance when Dale Smedley and Kent Smith came into town and wanted to develop about 1200 acres of ground (The Highlands).
- The County did not have building standards at this time either.
- There still is an old water color zoning map at the county and it has little circles for Peterson and the other areas. In Mtn. Green there was a much bigger circle and it always struck him and even those old farmers and ranchers had some vision because in Mtn. Green they had a big circle that said proposed new municipality. They knew back then that Mtn. Green would be a new municipality.
- He believed it would be in the County's long term interest to have a town that has a viable business center. He can think of nothing more detrimental to the long term health of this county to maintain AG and to maintain open space and beauty as a business district that is suppose to provide our tax base, that when you drive by it, it says "for lease, or for sale" and what we have is a bunch of shuttered up businesses that we had hoped would be a tax base for the County.
- We have professionals come in and help us do a DAT and they come up with densities. We have basically taken those proposed densities and cut them in half.
- Why does this committee believe that if we cut those densities in half Mtn. Green can have a viable business district and what information do you have that will sustain the densities.
- We need a viable business district. We want rural and we want a small town but he did not know if putting 5 units or 8 units on an acres made a difference in that respect.
- He questions why and it seems that if we are going to error we should error on enough density and not on the side of least density that leads to shuttered up businesses.

Member Weaver –

- Noted this committee had asked Tony Pantone what type of effort and study had been put into the proposed density by the professionals who put the DAT together. Tony noted that they did not spend a lot of time on the density they had just put some figures down and had not really planned it.
 - Member Blunck – noted with the exception of the town center.
- Member Weaver noted that was correct but in the surrounding areas they spent very little time.

- Member Taggart – Mr. Pantone noted that they took very broad strokes on determining density.
- Mr. Bohman – at some point someone needs to do that analysis.

Brent Bohman –

- We need to get to the point where we know what densities we need to maintain the business district that is being proposed and desired. We never get into that discussion. We get into discussion that we don't want traffic, we want rural; we want this architecture, etc.
- He noted not many in Mtn. Green contribute to rural but they all want it. This is a bedroom community.
- Instead of internalizing the cost of wants and desires everyone goes out to someone else's property and tells them what they want and desire.
- At some point, during the growth of this county, everyone needs to shoulder some of the burden. We have to get to the point of political maturity that we just don't say to the farm next to us that they should be our open space.
- We need to get to the point where we actually design a town.
- He asked about the density along the freeway.
 - Member Taggart - noted it is green space right now and it is recommended to leave it as it is until someone comes along and wants to change it.
- If it is going to be a green belt, then he agrees with Mike McMillan. Green space looks really good on paper, but someone needs to take care of it and the water is not going to be there.
 - Member Taggart – you usually don't change zoning until someone comes in and makes a request. We're leaving it as it is to be dealt with when a proposal came to the planning and zoning.
- If this is a plan then should it be proposed what the density will be there? To propose that it is nothing but to have 8 DUA in the strip next to it is a taking. You can not just declare greenbelt.

Member Rollins –

- Would like to make a correction in Mr. Bohman's assumption that this committee has not given thought to what is there.
- She has worked with planning in other states and has been on numerous committees and has called several planning companies to see what amount of rooftops needs to be in a business district. She believed decisions she has made on this committee has been made intelligently and have been based on lots of hours of study and thought.

Brent Bohman –

- It may or may not be that you have done that. If I were to review the entirety of this record am I going to find any evening where there was a detailed analysis with experts that came in and told us how many rooftops we need.
 - Member Rollins – Noted Mr. Bohman would have that opportunity.

Brad Richards –

- Called for a point of order stating that the committee should get back to public comment period.

Brent Bohman –

- Stated to Member Richards that he was commenting and Member Richards was not the Chair.

Member Taggart –

- Noted she has sat on too many committees where Mr. Bohman was rude like this and in a public meeting it is not appropriate. She noted the kids behind him (scout group) needed to know that a public meeting needs to be conducted with personal courtesy to all and the Chair should say it will be discontinued if we are not personally courteous.

Chairman Weaver -

- Member Weaver requested that Mr. Bohman finish his comments.

Brent Bohman (continued)–

- Noted he sees a TDR area, that is part of the wetlands discussion, and then there is a receiving area for the TDR over to the right side of the map.
- Based on what he heard tonight he is assuming that some of this has some wetland sensitivities.
- You are encouraging the transfer of development rights from there up to the receiving area.
- The receiving area does not set forth a base density. He noted he would assume that the base density there is 2 units per acre and that would make sense since it is 2 units to the south, east, and north.
 - Member Taggart noted to Chairman Weaver that the committee did not even know what Member Bohman was talking about because they do not have the same map in front of them.
 - Chairman Weaver noted he found it interesting that Mr. Bohman had more information than the committee did.
- He noted if you take out of the TDR sending area the development rights and you move them over to the TDR receiving that is already 2 units per acre, what you are going to end up with, over where Mike's gravel pit is, is a density far higher than anything else around it and the area is far more removed than the central business district; how does that make sense. He noted that was the end of his comments.

MOTION BY MEMBER ROLLINS TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.
SECOND BY MEMBER MUNSEE
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

4. Discussion/vote on the following items

- a. Final maps to be recommended to the Planning Commission. – Taken off the agenda.**
- b. DAT acceptance recommendation. – Taken off the agenda**
- c. Mountain Green Area Plan Amendment recommendations.**

Member Larsen – noted he took a map over to Mike and Ann McMillan this morning because they are a stake holder and he believed they needed that information.

Dave Manning–

- Handed out maps to the committee.
- He noted these are two of the three maps that were discussed in the minutes.
- He had sent them out in an e-mail late this afternoon but a lot of them were returned because of the size of the file.

Trails Map

Dave Manning noted the following concern –

- Talked about this being called a circulation map but the only thing designated on this map is the trails. It does have roads on it, but they are existing roads.
 - Member Rollins noted they did not want it to be interpreted that the committee was suggesting where the roads should go.
- Dave noted that is why he would suggest it be “Trails” instead of “Circulation”
- He noted it was in the motion to designate it as a circulation map. Brad noted that was his motion and if the committee was ok he would be ok with changing it back to a “Trials” map.

**MOTION BY MEMBER BLUNCK TO CHANGE THE TERM CIRCULATION MAP IN
THE PREVIOUS MOTION AND ON THE MAP TO SAY TRAILS MAP.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Map #2

Dave Manning noted the following:

- Noted there had been discussion that he did not understand about the town center/town boundary map and it was not really clear what everyone was wanting.
- He showed the red town boundary line as it was on the CAD map.
- Again this goes back to the original problem that has been all along with the old CAD map in that this is the closest he could get it to what was shown on the map.
- He noted he pulled up section lines and quarter lines as close as he could tell.
- With regard to the Town Center his understanding was that it involved the vehicle oriented commercial area in the blue and the 5 DUA in the pink area.

Member Richards –

- Believed the boundaries for the town center and the town boundary were great.
- The committee had talked about wanting the boundary to go even all the way across along the cemetery.
 - Dave – there was nothing to indicate that it was suppose to go that far.
- Rationale for doing that was to say that once you get to that area the ground slopes up pretty steeply.
- Mr. Richards asked for clarification from the committee with regard to what they want.
- Don't think we want the vehicular portion of our town center to be too large.

- Could we have Dave draw it to terrain?
 - Dave there is some of the toe of the hill right below the cemetery in it. He was not sure what a topography line would do.
 - Member Blunck – does not see a problem leaving it the way it is.

Member Taggart –

- Asked about the area behind Old Farm.
 - Dave noted that it would go really close to the back end of Old Farm Market.
- The school access was discussed.
- Lets do it right and make the line where it should be. She believed it needed to be moved down and back where it was intended to be when they first voted on it.
 - Seth Wallace – it is below the hill and about as close to the property line as it can be.
 - Dave noted it looks a little different on the other map because it is blown up more.

There was further discussion on the boundary map.

- It was decided to line it up with the back of Dee Jakes and Old Farm Market.
- West boundary line would go as far west as the east side of the church property.

Member Walters –

- Has a concern with the trails map that she would like discussed?
- She noted some of the trails designated on the trails map will never happen and asked if that would matter.
 - Member Blunck noted it would not. It was just a proposal.
- She further noted the reason she was asking was because very often when an area plan committee moves on, and development is proposed, the Planning Commission or County Council will bring up the map and say this is in the plan and it shows a trail.
- She noted she is specifically talking about section 18 and noted there will not be an equestrian trail across section 18, which is right above the reservoir, because it is so steep.
- She noted instead it could probably go a little to the north and would recommend an equestrian trail to the northeast.
- The piece that sits just to the northeast of that is also steep.
 - Member Rollins –Noted she had brought the same thing up with the trails going behind their property because it is wetlands. When she had talked to Sherrie, she had noted it was just a suggestion and when it gets down to building the actual trail it then would have to be studied.
- Member Walters noted she just wanted it on the record.
 - Member Blunck – there are all kinds of hoops to go through to do any of this. The sub-committee intended it to be a proposal and general idea.

Member Larsen –

- Noted previous discussion with Mr. McMillan and ask if the committee couldn't recognize, within the commission of the DAT, the town center and adjust the area plan as it related to it. Areas

outside the town center, such as the McMillan's and Brown's property could be for another continued time past this committee's mandate.

- Member Taggart –noted the committee probably didn't want it to say what it said before and have it go back to the 8 DUA.
- Member Larsen referenced the minutes of August 6, 2008 page 20 – 24, #5, and noted according to that motion it would be changed and forgot about because whatever is on this map is what is going to count.
- The other one has to do with #2 in that same motion.
 - Member Richards –Believed what the committee was doing is clarifying what they are already working on to make sure the maps reflect what was voted on. That is different then going back and changing things.
 - He explained that what the committee has done is taken the pasture area from below and said Mr. McMillan can transfer density from there up on to the upper areas. If Mr. McMillan carves those upper areas down by taking gravel out to do the plan he has, he can do that because everything he described that he wants to do, he can do based on this.

The present and proposed zoning on Mr. McMillan's property was discussed. Existing zoning being A-20 and proposed being 1 DU per 5 acres.

- Mr. McMillan noted that the underlying zone where it is flat, not wet, and surrounded by ½ acre zoning should be no different than the surrounding properties.
- Member Rollins noted the reason the committee made this recommendation is because one of the committee members, who is an expert in wetlands, saw the wetlands assuming that everything there was natural wetlands. She noted it would have helped if they could have known beforehand that Mr. McMillan had taken water down there to make additional wetland area. She recommended Mr. McMillan go to the Planning Commission meeting when the area plan committee presents this update and explain this to them at that time.
- Mr. Larsen noted this is not a crucial part of the town center, just take it out and when it comes time to develop it then work on it.
- Member Richards noted the committee had quadrupled the density from where it was.
- Mr. McMillan believed the density was determined on erroneous information. He believed this committee was treating the entire area down below and there is only a part over by the church that is even in question.
- Member Taggart noted that Don Paul did not just talk about the wetlands, but the original Weber River bed from some maps he had studied that went up and over the hillside and something about the soils and water.
- Mr. McMillan noted what happens if you have a flood, it would take out Morgan City, the railroad and the freeway. There is no flooding and it is irrelevant to building homes.
- Member Rollins – clarified that Mr. McMillan wanted more homes.
 - Mr. McMillan noted absolutely because he did not see any difference between the ground below, unless the Corp of Engineers says it is wet, it is done. Other than that it should be ½ acre zoning.
 - Member Rollins again recommended Mr. McMillan state that to the Planning Commission when this plan is presented because the committee made their decision based on information they had at the time. She noted it would have helped to hear from Mr. McMillan.

- Ann McMillan noted she did come to the August 6th meeting and tell the committee that it was not wetlands.
- Member Richards noted that part of the problem is that the committee is constrained to have development in certain neighborhoods and that is the way the general plan reads. He noted because someone has flat developable property does not necessarily mean that it is going to be zoned higher density.
 - Mr. McMillan noted when property abuts a 900 home development and is a ½ acre zone on both ends; it is a pretty big stretch to make 5 acre zoning.
 - Member Taggart noted the committee was suppose to come up with 3000 foot circles and that 900 home development comes within that 3000 foot circle and this property is not part of it.
 - Mr. McMillan asked 3000 feet from where?
 - Member Richards stated he would have to look at the other map.
 - Member Taggart noted planning and zoning asked the committee to come up with neighborhoods in 3000 foot circles that were clearly definable so that there was open space between.

Member Weaver – Noted the committee had tried to increase Mr. McMillan’s density, but apparently it was not satisfactory to Mr. McMillan.

- Mr. McMillan noted not when it is 5 acre zoning and the neighbors on every side have ½ acre zoning he isn’t. He believed the only reason it was not plotted on to it was because no one has come in to develop it. It should attach right to the neighborhood of Gardners.
- Member Taggart believed when Mr. McMillan excavates the way he wants to and it is at the point where he wants to have the density, then it should be discussed because the committee is just going by how it looks now.
- It would be hard for the committee to make a change without seeing the excavation that is going to go on.
- Mr. McMillan noted he is back to his original question with regard to why it is even being considered because it is not part of the town.
 - Member Rollins noted it is part of the town. Mr. McMillan’s property is in the town boundary and the committee was asked to review that. There is also the town center boundary which is just the commercial and that was given to the committee as an assignment from the Council.
 - Member Taggart stated that Mr. McMillan should read the motion. Council Member Creager clarified it and that is what it was.
- Member Larsen noted we haven’t done our job because there isn’t densities identified everywhere within the town boundary.
 - Member Richards stated yes because the committee had passed the motion that said the other neighborhoods would be left exactly as they were.

Dave Manning asked for clarification of the TDR and TDR sending areas.

- Tina Kelly noted all you can do because of your motion last time is clarify what your intentions were.
- Mr. Larsen noted that the McMillan and Brown property were not over where they are because where it is includes Parson’s.
 - Member Taggart noted that was a correct statement.

- Mr. Larsen noted the map doesn't have anything for Baxter which will end up being part of (couldn't hear)
- Councilmember Kelley noted it was brought up that the committee hadn't done anything with other boundaries and that is true because it is not reflected on this map that they were the same. You need to incorporate what was already there, somehow showing that it stays the same.
 - Member Richards and Wallace agreed that it should show what they all are so the whole town is laid out.

Member Richards noted that on the one map we already have our existing neighborhood that overlaps with McMillan's. The committee needs to decide where to go with that. He noted the receiving area could be made the same as the boundaries of the neighborhood or the neighborhood boundaries need to be changed to match the receiving area.

- Member Weaver noted if the receiving area is changed then Mr. McMillan is getting more land than he wants.
- Member Richards noted the density that was given is significantly higher than the rest of the neighborhood because there are 2 DUA on top and 1 unit per 5 acres down below. Most of the area within the neighborhood is Mr. McMillan's upper bench and it was done that way intentionally. So the area down below, outside of the neighborhood, would have left it at 20 acre density because that is the way the general plan says it should be done. You have a neighborhood with residential density and then outside those neighborhoods you have rural density; 20 acre density. That is the reason it was drawn that way. However the committee needs to decide what their intentions on the map are for that bottom edge.
- It was noted that the two maps are in conflict and the committee needed to clarify their intentions.
- Member Richards noted the motion made automatically modified the boundary of a neighborhood. Or we can change what our map shows to reflect the boundaries of the neighborhood; he would prefer the second.
 - Mr. McMillan noted that he and Brown's have 150 acres adjacent to it that will always be open on the other side of the freeway.
 - Debbie Sessions noted the river is the boundary of the Peterson and Mtn. Green area plans.
 - Dave Manning noted the neighborhood is a combination of the Cottonwood, Fox hollow, Rosehill neighborhood.
- Dave Manning – clarification that the area up Old Highway road to the village center would be 2 DUA.
- Member Richards- to him it makes sense to drive the line across and leave the pink where it was.
 - Tina Kelley noted that leaves the neighborhood as it was defined, so you are not touching the boundaries.
 - Mr. McMillan noted that the TDR's need to be taken off because there is no where to move them because you have the density of 2 DUA.
- The sending and receiving area was discussed.

- Member Richards noted that the receiving area may end up being 3 DUA because it is a sending area from down below. It depends on how much density is down below. Mr. McMillan then won't lose anything.
- The Committee and Dave further discussed the boundaries of the McMillan property versus the boundaries of the neighborhood and requested that Dave adjust it accordingly.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ACCEPT THESE TWO MAPS AS CLARIFIED.
SECOND BY MEMBER TAGGART.

Member Munsee – noted there is an orange area above the BOC compared to what is on the other map and believed it was not matching.

Member Richards withdrew his motion because the proposed school site was never discussed.

- Dave – the school property sits right above there and the discussion was to let the school deal with it as they want to.

It was decided that the motion would stand.

Member Taggart had a question on a third map.

- Member Richards noted that the third map was the central map. It was suppose to be here tonight.
- Dave Manning noted that map did not get done.

Chairman Weaver asked if the committee was ready to present to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, September 4, 2008.

- Tina Kelley – you are going to accept all these maps as amended and then you are going to look at the third map and are any of the going to reflect the neighborhoods.
- Member Richards noted it was his understanding that the items worked on in the DAT would be incorporated into the current Mtn. Green Area Plan map; although it would be nice if the neighborhoods were more clearly noticeable.
 - Dave – clarified that the committee wanted a map that all the neighborhoods were on.
 - Member Richards noted they were all supposed to be on one map.
- It was noted that Dave would need to do the map of the town center.
- The members decided they would need to review the maps one more time prior to going to the Planning Commission.
- It was decided that a meeting would be held on Wednesday, September 2, 2008 at 7 p.m. at the courthouse.

Member Richards withdrew his motion due to the fact that they would need to be reviewed again on Wednesday, September 2, 2008.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ACCEPT THE
MOUNTAIN GREEN AREA PLAN TRAILS MAP
AS IT HAS BEEN CLARIFIED.

SECOND BY MEMBER BLUNCK.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO MEET ONE MORE TIME ON TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 2, 2008 TO REVIEW THE MTN GREEN AREA PLAN MAP, AND THE
MTN GREEN TOWN CENTER MAP, AND TO REVIEW THE MINUTES OF
TONIGHT'S MEETING.
SEOCND BY MEMBER MUNSEE.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

- d. Final maps to be recommended to Planning Commission.
- e. DAT acceptance recommendation.
- f. Mountain green area plan amendment recommendations.

5. Work session scheduled with Planning Commission (September 4, 2008)

It was noted the committee would be on the Planning Commission agenda for September 4, 2008 and Chairman Weaver encouraged everyone to be there for the discussion.

6. Method of presenting plan to Planning Commission/council

- Member Richards believed that Chairman Weaver should present the draft since he was on the Planning Commission and the following was noted:
 - The maps should be displayed.
 - Identify areas deviated from the map.
 - It was noted that the final motion in the minutes of August 6, 2008 page 20 incorporates all the motions made.
- It was decided that Chairman Weaver would work up a brief to have for the Planning Commission packets.

Chairman Weaver asked the committee to be thinking about participating on the implementation committee.

Thanked everyone for their efforts. He noted they had all done a great service.

MOTION BY MEMBER TAGGART TO ADJOURN.
SECOND BY MEMBER MUNSEE

