

**Mountain Green Area Plan Committee Meeting
Wednesday, July 2, 2008, 6:30 p.m.
Mountain Green Fire Station**

Committee Members

Bill Weaver, Planning Commission
Blair Larsen
Lana Walters
Brad Richards
Mary Ellen Rollins
Seth Wallace
Tyler Quigley
George Sousa
Blair Larsen
Ann Taggart
Ron Blunck
Don Paul
Dixie Munsee
Jim Manning
Janeice Loveridge
Bill Warner

Administrative Staff

Sherrie Christensen, County Planner
Teresa Rhodes, Transcription

Public

John Triplett
Bruce Nilson

Committee Members absent

Shad Guffey
Tony Pantone, AIA/DAT Representative, non-voting
Tina Kelley, County Council, non-voting

*** * * * M I N U T E S * * * ***

Chairman Weaver welcomed everyone.
Member Taggart offered the prayer.

- 1. Review and approve of the agenda.**
There was no approval for the agenda.

- 2. Review and approval of the June 11, 2008 minutes.**

**MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 2008 WITH THE
NOTED MINOR CORRECTIONS.
SECOND BY MEMBER BLUNCK
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

- 3. Public Comment**

**MOTION BY MEMBER TAGGART TO OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT.
SECOND BY MEMBER MUNSEE.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.**

THE MOTION CARRIED.

John Triplett –

- Believed it would be a real shame if the area plan did not take advantage of the stream and move the whole commercial development around the stream with parks and walkways along both sides of the stream with commercial buildings set back a ways.
- There are many towns that have a river walk.
- Take the rivers and creeks that were a nuisance and make them into assets.
- Believes it is a fantastic opportunity and if that is the way the area plan wants to go they should not miss it.
- The commercial development would be a real attraction. And a lot of things could be done with it to make a river walk and tie a park into it.
- Understands that this is not the committee's charter and it would ultimately be something the planning commission would need to approve.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

SECOND BY MEMBER MUNSEE.

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Weaver noted that since Member Quigley had property in this area and a conflict of interest he had asked him to leave while the committee discussed this next agenda item.

Member Quigley left the room and went outside.

5. Trappers Loop Commercial LLC, Tyler Quigley.

Chairman Weaver noted the reason he brought this up is because Mtn. Green is being taken over by events. And that location is recommended residential by the DAT.

Member Rollins noted she would like to change it to commercial believes we have enough residential without it. Members Loveridge, Munsee, and Blunck also agreed.

MOTION BY MEMBER ROLLINS TO CHANGE THIS AREA TO COMMERCIAL.

SECOND BY MEMBER LOVERIDGE.

There was discussion on the motion.

Member Richards suggested that the committee gather consensus from everyone and then when that has been gathered we can make the changes on a proposed map for review and then after reviewing the proposed final map make a final motion to accept the changes to the map if that is what the majority vote is.

- Chairman Weaver asked how we could document this procedure.

Mountain Green Area Plan Meeting

July 2, 2008 – approved 0716

Page 2 of 12

FOR REFERENCE ONLY
OFFICIAL COPY FILED IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

- Member Richards noted the main documentation would be the map itself.
- The committee could make a motion to make changes to the map and then that would move the process forward.
- Member Taggart – let's vote to see if we have a consensus of discussion on this point and then move on.
- Member Richards – Asked for clarification on the location.

- There was discussion on the location and size of this area.
- Member Rollins – we can change it and then hold it in reserve for future.
- Member Richards noted that it was not legal to hold property in reserve.
- Member Loveridge – It was her understanding we could do this in phases.
 - Sherrie noted that restriction on phasing needs to occur in a development agreement.
 - Member Richards – the point is that you can not take a section of this map and say you can not develop it right now.
- Member Rollins noted she would rather see it zoned commercial because it can sustain where homes can not.
- Member Richards – What you have to be careful about is that at some point, someone who owns land above that area can come in and request a re-zone.
- Member Blunck – did not believe the committee wanted the whole 40 acre piece in commercial.
- Member Taggart – asked if it was everything up to the school site.
- Chairman Weaver noted that Mr. Quigley's property is a total of 5.4 acres.
- Member Paul- concern how this piece, and Old Farm Market, and the pieces with the bank could fit into the town center. Somehow that will effect how the town center will look. How do these structures in existence fit in?
- Member Rollins – would like to see the tourist look taken out of the town center. Hotels, etc. are contained on the highway and up Trappers Loop and not going through out little town.
- Member Richards – once you make it commercial you have no ability to say what will be there. We have talked before about the town center and he believes it is too big.
- Member Rollins – we have enough town home/condo space.
- Member Richards– it makes sense to connect that into a commercial area along the frontage and then maybe residential up above that and over to where the school site is.
- Member Larsen – asked when Mr. Quigley submitted his application?
 - Sherrie – it has already been through the planning commission.
- Member Blunck – it is relevant because it is a five acre pieces, but the broader perspective is how far up do we want that to go. Tyler's property is water under the bridge. He likes the way Member Richards has depicted it.
 - Sherrie – Tyler is showing it on his map as Vehicle Oriented commercial.
- Member Taggart – this is obviously on one of the pages we will talk about after page 23. Can we talk about this when we are doing the map pages? She would like to hear each subcommittee opinions on pages 1-23

THE ABOVE MOTION DIED DUE TO NO VOTE.

Review pages 1 -23of the Design Assistance Team final report.

- Member Rollins – noted the following concerns on page 26
 - Creating housing choices in the town center.
 - What she is hearing is that it is a good concept but it is not selling very well.
 - People are not buying like envision Utah thought they would.

- Does not want to set aside a lot of living space in the town center.
- Member Larsen - how do you know what is going to sell if you don't even have a plan.
- Chairman Weaver – What we are really talking about is densities aren't we.
 - Member Rollins – absolutely.
- Member Richards– if you read the wording it is pretty vague and general. There is nothing in there that says we are going to have high density/low density.
- Member Rollins – also thinks we need to recommend to the County Council and Planning commission to have some studies done.
- Member Richards noted he believed the market will control it. It is vague enough that it is not going to make a difference. Unless we change the area plan to some specific thing to say that a certain % is going to be multi family housing.
- Chairman Weaver– you are going to use this document as a guide for the County Council and Planning Commission.
- Member Taggart – noted that every time it says “could” in the document it does not mean it will.
- Member Richards – believes you can have the control you want by adjusting the density.

Member Quigley returned to the meeting.

Committee C –

Tyler Quigley presented for Committee C and noted the following:

- The only concern their committee has is tying the map together.
- Possibility of adding language that the County could have some type of board/committee to police the trails system.
 - Sherrie noted that HOA does usually have the responsibility to plow snow and have someone to police those duties to make sure it happens.
 - Chairman Weaver noted the County Road Maintenance now does all of that for areas not under an HOA in the County.
 - Member Taggart noted that the County does have a County Park Board now.
 - Blunck – be careful because we do not want them to own it, what we are talking about is a policing agency to insure that they are maintained. HOA should take care of it but it is not always done.

There was discussion on maintenance of trails.

- Member Munsee –Noted the existing trail through Mtn. Green has been torn up by developers and has not fixed it.
 - Bruce Nilson – Asked if Member Munsee was referring to the area across from Nilson Homes town homes because it was just recently fixed in the last few days.
 - Member Munsee noted that was one of the areas and it has been fixed, but not restored to its original condition.
 - Bruce Nilson – Noted he did not look at the quality of it just notice it is restored.
- Member Richards – Noted you won't find anyone to take care of the path if they do not own it.
- Member Blunck – noted the conclusion we have before us then is that the county parks do not want them and the HOA's are not taking care of them.
 - Sherrie – there were certain trails that were not going to be plowed because they were equestrian and proposed to be used for winter skiing trails or snowmobile trails.
- Member Taggart – suggested the committee or County look at a special improvement district in Mtn. green so the trails are maintained how Mtn. green wants them.
- Guy in shirt –how are trails in cottonwoods maintained now?

Mountain Green Area Plan Meeting

July 2, 2008 – approved 0716

Page 4 of 12

- Sherrie – The trails in Cottonwoods are privately owned, but they have a public easement over them so that anyone can use them.

Committee A –

- Don Paul presented for Committee A and noted the following:
 - The DAT refers frequently to a trail and the town center.
 - Suggested we make a recommendation that it is part of the responsibility for developers to connect their trails and tie them into the town center
- Member Walters – when the area plan worked on the master plan years ago they had a trails system.
- Member Taggart – asked if continued maintenance was part of a development agreement. Something needs to be set up in escrow so that these are maintained.
 - Sherrie – stated it is. They have to put in seed money and
- Member Paul –the trick is going to be between how the trails come into the town center.
- Chairman Weaver – page 12 gives us a good working (middle paragraph)

- Member Richards – on page 18
 - Town center street scape. Concern that a lot of the buildings depicted in the DAT are modern style buildings which he does not believe is what we want. Concern that a builder will pick this recommendation and go by that.
 - Would like to see the building plan re-drawn to show the buildings as this committee and residents of Mtn. Green would like them.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ACCEPT PAGES 1-23 OF THE DAT AS WRITTEN WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE TOWN CENTER STREET SCAPE ON PAGE 18 WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PICTURE ON PAGE 18 BE DELETED.
SECOND BY MEMBER LARSEN.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

7. Sizing of town center.

Member Munsee – Would like to propose to take out the parking in the town center and replace it with a town park.

- Chairman Weaver asked where they would propose to put the parking
 - Member Munsee- Parking could be located on the outskirts.
- Member Richards – to comply with the general plan you need to have some type of central town center.
- Member Taggart –accommodating community events needs to be considered when we discuss location.

The following was noted:

- The proposed two story live and work would block the view outside the park.
- Member Munsee – likes the stream concept that Mr. Triplet noted. Only concern is the rise of the stream in the spring.
- Chairman Weaver noted that he has seen the creek leave its banks and become very dangerous.

Member Paul requested from the Chairman the floor to address issues of the stream.

- Requires some engineering because you have an unconsolidated bottom. Gravel does not hold water well.
- Before we make design elements associated with that system we should have a hydrologist look at it.
- Gordon Creek and Strawberry Creek run year around.
- Need to be very careful on how cottonwood creek is designed.
- If we could hydrate the stream we could put water in it on a year around basis.
- Could take a park and have a water feature in it.

- Would be nice to walk this piece of property before making final decisions.
- There are a lot of towns in the west that are using water parkways.

Member Larsen –

- Suggested the committee go to page 25 and go through the sustainable recommendation and master plan one line at a time and gather a consensus of whether this is ok or if it is not. If it is not, then we circle it and go back through.

The members chose to do that.

- Member Munsee – proposing to put a town center park where parking is and move parking to the two story mixed use area.
- Member Blunck – Remember that this is concept to begin with. So maybe if we just say we want a central park in the middle, then leave the parking to the developer and don't get wrapped around the axle of how big it is.
- Sherrie – what is the purpose of the town center park – social? Sports?
- Member Munsee – suggesting a park similar to the one in Huntsville. It is a multi use with pavilions, sports area, shade trees, etc.
- Member Richards – surround it with businesses similar to Jackson Hole.
- Member Taggart – right now it is designated housing.
- Member Rollins – making it a town center park would be perfect for a restaurant to locate and then patrons could come out into the park.
- Member Richards – based on what we are talking about, asked Sherrie if it would be possible to have the map redrawn with all of these things on it. Knowing now that we want commercial around that and have it available for the next meeting.
 - Sherrie – does not know what Craig Widmeir's schedule is but she could find out and see if he has time to do that.
- Member Richards – lets not hash over all the details, let's get the bare bones and go from there.

MOTION BY MEMBER MUNSEE TO CHANGE THE DESIGNATED CENTRAL PARKING AND OPEN SPACE IN THE CENTER OF THE TOWN CENTER TO A TOWN SQUARE PARK WITH COMMERCIAL SURROUNDING IT ON THE SOUTH AND EAST.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.

There was discussion on the motion.

- Member Sousa – noted he prefers to keep the park over by the Creek. There is open space over there that could be a park.
- Member Richards suggested the possibility of doing both.
- Member Rollins and Member Walters agreed with that idea.
- Member Paul – from his perspective both would not be a bad idea.
- Member Walters - Both have different purposes and both will have different uses.
- Member Sousa – one may detract from the other if you build one bigger than the other. If there is a defined purpose and one does not take away from the other it may be ok.
- Member Larsen – who is paying for all of this vacant land? Keep in mind the value of property. The more open space you have someone has to pay for that.
- Member Rollins – open space increases the value of the land around it tremendously.
- Member Larsen – this is going to be the burden on the developer.

- Member Taggart – whatever entities will come they will pay for it. Morgan City parks are paid by the tax base.
- Member Larsen – does not think the developers are going to come because it is depriving him of his development rights.
- Member Richards – it depends on what constitutes a taking. If you deprive a developer of all development that would be a taking. We simply put the plan down and then the planning commission and county council has to determine and negotiate it with the developer.
- Member Warner – what would be more advantageous to a developer a parking lot or a park? A park might be a good thing for a developer.
- Member Blunck – it is only a concept and when a developer comes in the planning commission will make the determination whether it meets the concept.
- Member Larsen – then when that happens and the planning commission and county council say to the applicant, “The DAT and area plan are only a guide”, then we have to go down to a meeting and say we sat in on those meetings and that is what we want.
- Member Taggart – it is not about land, it is about the environment we create for everyone that lives here. Did not believe it was about the soil.

There was discussion on the following:

- Having roads around the park.
- Discussion on parking.
- Discussion on art center and the section next to it and what its purpose was.
 - Sherrie noted the brown area on the map next to the art center, was probably the watch tower and all part of the art center.

Member Munsee amended the motion to read as follows:

MOTION BY MEMBER MUNSEE TO TAKE OUT THE DESIGNATED CENTRAL PARKING AND OPEN SPACE IN THE CENTER OF THE TOWN CENTER INTERIM MAP DATED 7/2/08 AND CHANGE IT TO A TOWN SQUARE PARK KEEPING THE ART CENTER ON THE WEST AND MOVING THE COMMERCIAL TO THE SOUTH AND EAST ACROSS THE ROAD.

SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.

THE VOTE WAS NOT UNANIMOUS WITH ALL THE MEMBERS FOR EXCEPT MEMBER SOUSA WHO ABSTAINED NOTING THAT HE BELIEVED IT WAS A LIMITATION WE DID NOT NECESSARILY NEED TO IMPOSE.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

- Chairman Weaver noted that he had talked to Earl Erickson, school board, and he had noted the school was happy keeping the ground on Trappers Loop currently owned by the school district, as long as they could have access from the east.
- Member Rollins – believed the hotel should be up behind Old Farm Market.
- Sherrie – you have to decide if the neighborhoods around the town center will have mixed use.
- Senior housing would be above old farm market.
- Member Richards – you need to decide where the boundaries are for commercial and where they are for residential.
- Sherrie – noted that in very broad brush what the developer is looking at is a gas station, car wash, and then feathering that back into town homes and lower density going back into Rollins ranch.
- Mary Ellen – does not like housing next to commercial.
- Member Richards – somewhere you have to have housing around the commercial.
- Member Warner – recommended getting rid of the senior housing label. Leave it up to the developer what he wants to call it. No purpose to call it senior housing.

- Chairman Weaver suggested that members of the school board be invited to the meeting to discuss the school site.
- Member Sousa and Member Walters do not like the school in the proposed location. Believed it was too close to the town center.
- Member Taggart - Old Farm to cemetery road is zoned commercial. (Dee jakes house)
- It was the consensus of the members to leave the school where the school property is.

MOTION BY BILL WARNER TO MOVE THE MIDDLE SCHOOL LOCATION BACK TO WHERE THE SCHOOL PROPERTY EXISTS.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.
MARY ELLEN ABSTAINED

John Triplett requested to make a comment from the floor
Chairman Weaver opened the floor to Mr. Triplett.

- Mr. Triplett brought the members attention to a brochure from Leavenworth, WA. A town he had visited recently that has a theme and has been able to maintain that theme. He gave the members a copy of the brochure and asked them to turn to page 6 of 8 where it talks about how this town came up with their theme and how they maintain it. He noted we can learn from what they did.

There was discussion on whether the committee wanted commercial on the north side of the town square park.

- What would go in place of the school?

Member Munsee – since we took parking out of the town center would be want to designate that area to be parking.

- Sherrie – did not believe it was a wise decision to put parking where residents or visitors have to cross a major collector road.
- Member Paul – Noted that the DAT recommendation was to keep parking as much out of the town center as possible.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO EXTEND THE VEHICLE ORIENTED COMMERCIAL NORTH OF OLD HIGHWAY FROM TRAPPERS LOOP HIGHWAY EASTWARD TO THE EAST EDGE OF THE TOWN SQUARE PARK AS DRAWN ON THE INTERIM MAP DATE 7 2 08
SECOND BY MEMBER BLUNCK.

Member Larsen – reminded everyone of Tony Pantone’s comments about Breckenridge and Telluride’s layout.

- Sherrie – traffic calming features can be put in.

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO DRAW THE TOWN CENTER BOUNDARY AROUND THE VEHICLE ORIENTED COMMERCIAL AND THE MIXED USE COMMERCIAL AREA AS DRAWN ON THE INTERIM MAP #2 DATED 7.2.08

SECOND BY MEMBER WALTERS.

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

Mountain Green Area Plan Meeting

July 2, 2008 – approved 0716

Page 8 of 12

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Member Warner –

- The DAT talks about green space around the town center.

Trails –

Member Blunck presented an aerial map of Mtn. green showing the proposed trail system and noted the following:

- When drawing the trails they tried to have a legend
 - Red is existing trail.
 - Paved arterial trail everything feeds from this.
 - Green - equestrian trail and basically follows Old Trappers Loop.
- Asked Sherrie where the proposed trail was over by the airport.
 - Sherrie – Gardener Development will take the trail from North Side Creek around the airport to Silverstone.
 - The following was noted:
 - There is sidewalk around Mtn. Brook Estates.
 - There is some trail in front of Coventry cove. Connection could be on the other side of the street to make a big loop.
 - Would have to cross the road because there are already homes there.
 - It was noted that it was always intend to tie the proposed trails into the trails in The Cottonwoods.
 - Member Walters noted that Old Trappers road will eventually be paved and it will stay locked until the upper piece of the Rollins property is sold.
 - Member Rollins – Old Trappers Trail connects all the way to Montpelier Idaho where the trading post was. The County should involve the historical society to nominate it for a national status trail because it ends at Mtn. green.
 - Lana Walters noted it would not be opened up until her family sells section 18
 - Member Rollins – it can still be designated.
 - Sherrie noted she would invite Linda Smith to the next meeting for discussion
 - Trails into Whisper Ridge and trail connecting to Trappers Pointe were discussed.
 - A trail continuing to the county line was discussed.
 - Tying in trails from Snow Basin to connect into Mtn. Green was discussed.
- Member Blunck – what do you think about a trail down by the river. It may not work right now, but in a few years it may.
 - Member Taggart the issue is the freeway, the right of way, and the river.
 - Sherrie – difficult to access but not insurmountable. Suggested drawing it in for discussion.
 - Member Paul –one leg would be to go through exit 92 and come up to where we have the proposed freeway exit and come into town.
 - Sherrie noted she would have Dave include trails on the map.
 - It was noted in Ketchum, Idaho they have sportsman access to the river and it is a huge draw.

Member Rollins requested to discuss density and noted the following:

- If we go with the density on the map we will double.
- Proposed units of about 2000 units of DUA's of multiple family dwellings.
- We should not have more condo/ then single family.
- Does not want Mtn. Green to be a back yard ski resort

- Member Larsen – why did we move here? This board is not a good representation. It is almost like the people that want to be here are not represented.
- Member Taggart – in a village what to you normally end up with is multiple or single housing.
 - Sherrie – just because it says 6 DUA doesn't mean it has to be multi family.
- Member Warner - suggested diversity. Let's have patio homes, 8 plexes, town homes, and a variety of things.
- Member Rollins – came from the fasted growing county in the state and it ruined the schools, the trails, and the ruralness of the area. We need to be careful.
- Member Taggart – noted that when the committee did the last area plan they did 354 houses.
- Member Blunck – this board was legally formed by the County Council. It is up to the County Council and Planning Commission to filter out anything they don't like. To imply that we don't have the right to do what we are doing here grinds on him something fierce.

MOTION BY MEMBER PAUL THAT WE ACCEPT THE DENSITY THAT MEMBER RICHARDS HAS LISTED ON HIS PROPOSED MAP AS AN APPROPRIATE BALANCE WITH THE PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE 1 UNIT PER 5 ACRE CLUSTER TO BE A TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT SENDING AREA FOR THE R1-20 AREA AND TO BE LEFT AS OPEN SPACE.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.

Member Loveridge –

- Concerned because Member Richard's expertise is not deciding what density will support the town center. We need to make sure we listen to what the professionals say. She would like to stay with the DAT recommendation.
- She agrees with Tony Pantone that we can do density and still preserve green space.
- Just because they can build it if they can't sell it won't happen.
- Are we jumping the gun assuming everyone is going to come in and develop?
 - Sherrie – noted that on Monday the new county administrator started and she has invited him to come to the meetings. His expertise is in economic development.

Member Blunck and Member Warner – would like to hear from Tony Pantone before making a final decision.

Member Munsee – what our town center is going to thrive on is not necessarily the residents, but the traffic that flows through it.

Member Richards - his approach for the density was to create somewhere our children want to live. He does not want to base it on numbers just to get a big store up here.

Member Paul – The property that exists southeast of the current I-84 west bound rest stop and sites below the bluff (at the foot of the historic Weber River incised meander channel) and directly west of the LDS church portion of the Old Highway (zoned 5 units per acre) has extensive wetlands associated with it. From my experience it has important wildlife value and would be difficult to mitigate for.

Member Walters – would like to think about the density also. Has complete faith in Member Richards, but needs to think about density before she votes.

Member Larsen –

- ◇ Total density will be determined by the planning commission.
- ◇ We have accepted that part of the DAT. If you want to have straight subdivisions with no open space that is what you are going to get. This 4 DUA is not going to cut it.

Chairman Weaver noted there was a motion on the floor and repeated the motion.

MOTION BY MEMBER PAUL THAT WE ACCEPT THE DENSITY THAT MEMBER RICHARDS HAS LISTED ON HIS PROPOSED MAP AS AN APPROPRIATE BALANCE WITH THE PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE 1 UNIT PER 5 ACRE CLUSTER TO BE A TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT SENDING AREA FOR THE R1-20 AREA AND TO BE LEFT AS OPEN SPACE.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.

There was no final vote. The members decided they wanted more time to think about this.

Member Paul withdrew his motion so there could be future discussion.

The next meeting would be held July 16, 2008.

MOTION BY MEMBER LARSEN TO ADJOURN.
SECOND BY MEMBER WARNER.

I certify to the Morgan County Mtn. Green Area Plan Committee that these are the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, July 2, 2008 at the Mtn. Green Fire Station. The minutes have been transcribed to reflect the meeting as it happened.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa A. Rhodes
Transcriptionist

The minutes were adopted as submitted.

William Weaver, Chairman

Date

The minutes were amended

William Weaver, Chairman

Date