

**2008 MOUNTAIN GREEN
AREA PLAN/DAT COMMITTEE MEETING
MOUNTAIN GREEN FIRE STATION
WEDNESDAY, August 6, 2008 – 6:30 p.m.**

Committee Members

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

Administrative Staff

Sherrie Christensen, County Planner
Teresa Rhodes, Transcription
Garth Day, County Administrator (left early)
Sid Creager, County Council

Public

Ann McMillan
Bruce Nilson, Nilson Homes
Linda Smith, Historical Society
Deanne Fresh, Historical Society

Committee Members absent

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

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

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

Member Weaver welcomed County Administrator Garth Day to the meeting.
Mr. Day took a few moments to introduce himself and explain his current responsibilities in the county.

- ◇ New position is economic developer as well as the County administrator.
- ◇ Spent the previous eight years in Box Elder County doing their economic development work, building industrial parks, and some pretty complex planning in south Willard.
- ◇ Prior to that he worked for North Ogden City and South Ogden City.
- ◇ Left the state in 2007 and took a position outside of the State and decided he wanted to come back to Utah.
- ◇ Council is making a high priority on affordable housing and has directed him to begin to establish a redevelopment agency. He noted this agency is a vehicle to begin administrating affordable housing programs as well as generating some tax revenue and things that can build up a tax base.

- ◇ His charge is to oversee the operational departments of the County; everything that is not elected.

Member Larsen –

- ◇ The DAT talks about an implementation committee and also a community development corporation and asked for Mr. Day's opinion on those with regard to brining in professionals.
 - Mr. Day – noted he would always encourage seeking professional help and assistance. He noted the county would try to make that available the best they can.
- ◇ Member Larsen asked Mr. Day to discus his thoughts with regard to items on page 34 of the DAT.
 - Mr. Day noted he was not familiar with how they were using community Development Corporation in this term. He further noted there is actually an organization that is certified by the State that is CDC's (community development corporations). They are small business lenders. He was not sure the language in the DAT was appropriate and he did not know what a CDC would actually do.
 - He noted in two weeks the Council would be creating a Community Development renewal agency which is a part of County government that is going to specialize in development issues; re-development, housing, etc. This is probably something that would be right in line with that agency. It is formally known as a re-development agency. Its focus will be on affordable housing, maybe in industrial and economic development and any renewal things that happen in parts of Morgan City.
 - He believed the implementation committee should be quickly implemented.
 - The community development is working toward updating the County ordinances and analyzing all of the processes to make them both more efficient and hopefully more updated to the current times. He believed everyone would see some major improvements in the process itself.
 - He noted Sherrie does a great job, but she is dealing with some ordinances and policies that are antiquated. In his opinion it has snowballed into something that it really is not suppose to be.
 - We need to make sure the plans we are working on here are supported by our ordinance processes.

Chairman Weaver –

- ◇ Noted the County has many representatives on this committee that have a lot of expertise that is being talked about.
- ◇ We should have some continuity between this team and the future committee. He noted when you get a whole bunch of new people, not knowing where this committee came from, then you have to start over.

1. Review of agenda and amendments.

It was noted that the approval of the agenda was missed. The Chairman called for a motion.

MOTION BY MEMBER LARSEN TO APPROVE THE AGENDA OF AUGUST 6, 2008
WITH THE NOTED MINOR ADJUSTMENT TO MOVE
MARY ELLEN ROLLINS DISCUSSION UP TO 5A.
SECOND BY MEMBER ROLLINS.

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. Review and approval of July 16, 2008 minutes.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES
OF JULY 16, 2008 AS AMMENDED.
SECOND BY MEMBER GUFFEY.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. Staff comments.

Chairman Weaver welcomed Sid Creager.

Sherrie noted she had brought the copy of the GIS map. She had reviewed it with Brad and as the committee reviews it if there is anything that needs to be corrected, please let her know.

4. Public Comment.

Linda Smith read a letter addressed to Chairman Weaver (Please see attached exhibit A)

Ann McMillan –

- Thanked the committee for all of its time and effort.
- Would like to refresh the committee of their concerns. The McMillan's own the ranch across from the Mtn. Green church and they would like their property to have the same density as those that are on all three sides of their property.
- If you make a corridor along the freeway for setbacks, they would like the same density for the homes that would be there to be incorporated in another area on the ranch.
- Down in the field below the church that looks like a wetland there are a couple of small streams. They have tried over the last 30 years to enhance it into wetland because of the water foul that come into it. However, it is not natural wetlands and they will be drying that up. It is only that way because they run their irrigation water over to there and supplement the streams. They will be diverting that and changing that. Asked that the committee not block that out as a total wetland. There will still be some that remains wetland but not near the area that it looks now because of the way they have managed the irrigation into it.

Member Walters – would you please write those things down so we can have them?

- ◇ Sherrie noted they will be in the minutes and recorded.

Loydeane Berg – owns property just west of the bank.

- ◇ Spoke with Member Rollins last week.
- ◇ Impressed with the work the committee is doing.
- ◇ Their place in the future will be a commercial area and they were aware of that.

- ◇ She noted she has been approached on a number of occasions for someone to come in and purchase her property. One particular company, Aquila Development Corp, approached her right before Christmas and was pretty anxious to get her to sign over the rights for them to buy her property. She did not sign anything over.
- ◇ As far as the architectural, she believes it would be good to preserve the heritage of whatever Mtn. Green is. Believes that it should be a little unique. It seems like there is a western flavor in surrounding areas but it all seems to run together.
- ◇ She personally likes the idea that Member Rollins has, the French colonial, but to her something unique, homey, and cozy.

Member Munsee –

- ◇ Asked if Ms. Berg's neighbor had also been approached by Aquila Development.
 - She noted her neighbor never talked with them directly but the gentlemen who talked to her gave her their card and ask that she give it to her neighbor.

Member Rollins –

- ◇ Did they give a set price for the property?
 - Noted he did not give a price but offered her \$2000 if she would sign a paper stating that they could buy her property within a year. He was pretty interested in the short term.
 - He did kind of portray what he would be doing and some of the things he told her did not match the plan that she saw presented.
 - When she asked what they would do with her property the Aquila Representative stated it would certainly be Commercial and they were probably looking at a bar or something like that.
 - Tom Hussion was the representative and Mark Bingham from Hooper was with him.
 - She noted they stopped buy about four times in three days and called by phone quite a few times.

Bruce Nilson –

- Thanked the committee for allowing him some time for an open dialogue to allow the committee to better understand what Nilson Homes intends to do.
- Nilson homes have been in business for over 35 years.
- They did do a project in Morgan City – Fox Point, a 90 lot subdivision on 2nd south and State Street.
- If anyone would like to see the amenities they are putting in their units they could stop by their town home project just down the street.
- When Nilson Homes became involved they worked with Duane Johnson who has an office close to them in Layton.
- The Johnson's approached Mr. Nilson after they found an engineer.
- They also worked with Mr. Johnson to rezone the entire 100 acres.
- The Council has been working for a long time to put together the CD zone.
- They did not create the CD zone, they inherited it.
- He noted he had thought many times about the DAT and what a blessing it was to look at a group of professionals and see what they would recommend as a new town center.

- As a developer, upon finding a piece of property, they usually come in and ask the County what their ordinance is, what the zone is, and what the ordinance will allow. Then they proceed to try and develop within that.
- Needless to say they had some descending votes on the kind of things they wanted to do.
- PRUD – is a planned residential unit development and what that means is you take a piece of ground and put some clustering in. The idea of clustering is to put the housing in specific areas fairly tight and then have a lot of open space attached to it.
- Mr. Nilson displayed a map of what they would like to do and noted it was probably the 10th or 11th rendition. Finally staff approved it and felt it fit all the requirements of the Mtn. Green Area Plan Committee.
- Most of you do not live in attached housing and so the thought of going down to look at their property is probably not too appealing but there is a lot of people that would like to live in that type of property including this committee's children and grandchildren.
- The least expensive lot in the County right now is probably \$125,000. Once you put a home on that it would be close to ½ million. That is not affordable and affordable housing is one of the items your County Administrator was speaking about today.
- He noted their phase I is dense, he will admit that, they have used every bit of ground.
- Moving to the east in Phase II they wanted to do a dramatically bigger type of product of density and the style.
- He has talked to several individuals about patio homes. They find that patio homes do not do as well segregated as they do integrated.
- They would like to do single living units on the end units and then on the inside they would do a unit that would have a main floor master with bedrooms upstairs. They believed that would fit many needs.
- If people do not want to live in an attached community then they will not like this, there is no question about that.
- Patio homes are typically about 5000 square foot lot (60 x90). If it is a zero lot line and the house is actually placed on the side property line then you have a 50' side yard on the other side and about a 20' rear yard with a 20' setback so the intent of patio homes is that they want something with one level that they can get in and out of comfortably.
- If you don't want to maintain your yard, want to be able to leave, have it taken care of, and the snow removed then this project would be able to offer all of those things.
- The entrance to Phase II is opposite the church entrance. There would be a configuration of anywhere from a 4 – 6 plex.
- They want to maintain the mountain area design and look.
- Over 60% of these homes back on to a common area. They either back the pool, Dry creek, and the south berm.
- Most of the time in a town home/multi family unit they back onto each other. It is something that is very common.
- They have planned a lot of trail systems throughout the project.
- They have found that single, retired, and younger couples seek this type of facility.
- The minimum density for the CD zone would allow 5.4 DUA (dwelling units per acre). They have proposed for this 6.5 DUA for this project, compared to 10 DUA on the project that is being built now. The area consists of 39 acres and 251 units.

- Member Richards asked if that included the green space down by the freeway.
- Mr. Nilson stated yes it was the entire 39 acres.
 - Member Rollins asked if Mr. Nilson could show the committee where the snow removal areas would be.
- Mr. Nilson noted they really are not that far yet, but there are a few areas where you could push it off.
 - Don Paul – This is to be phased over several years. What will the adjoining property look like? Will it be more of the same as you move to the east?
- Mr. Nilson noted he does not own nor control that so he could not answer that questions.
 - Chairman Weaver - there is a proposal right now for a complex very much like this with 337 units being proposed to the east.
 - Member Taggart – are you categorizing this as affordable housing?
- Mr. Nilson noted that current units start at 240K and they are a little over 1500 square feet. The plans they design now is about a 1400 square foot rambler with a full basement. He believed as they move to the new project they would probably do full basements.
- Their Town homes range for 1600 – 1800 square feet. He is hoping in the 275K range.

Don Paul –

- Asked Sherrie, with regard to when Mr. Day made his presentation to the County on affordable housing, does she have any idea of what affordable housing would be?
 - Sherrie noted it is a scale. It is based on family size. If you look at a family of four then what happens in order to meet the standard for moderate income housing, it has to be a family of 4 that makes 80% of whatever the median income level of the county.
 - The current median income is \$63,000, then that family would be at 80% of that income level and you have to go backwards into how much house can they afford and what is the difference between the affordability price and the price of actual homes in Morgan County
 - That is one of the things the County has been struggling with is how do we assess affordable housing and how do we determine what the fee in lieu of providing affordable housing units should be or how many units the developer should provide.
 - There will be an advisory committee that helps the Council with that.

Bill Warner –

- Are there any specific locations for affordable housing in the County that have been designated?
 - Sherrie – the Council of Governments (COG) right now is basically members of Morgan City Council and Morgan County Council who meet and they are the ones that have worked through the CGB program which is a community development block grant program. There is basically a pot of money from the federal government that is given out to the State and then it is given out to various jurisdictions throughout the state based on population.
 - Those funds have to be used towards projects that assist people who are in that moderate income range.
 - The projects they have done have been building a home in the first phase of Cottonwoods and by the time the developer had met all the covenants and the

standards, the home was not longer affordable so they sold that and that money will then come back to the County and the County will buy lots somewhere else.

- Right now the COG is working with all homes to buy a couple of lots, and then what will happen is All Homes will own the land and build the structure so the homeowner will only own the structure and not the land which then makes it affordable.
- But when they go to sell they can only capture so much appreciation in the value and the house has to be sold to someone else who qualifies under those guidelines so that it maintains it permanently.
- What the County is looking at is identifying sites for affordable housing throughout the county, but there are no specific sites.

Ann Taggart –

- Clarified that what Sherrie was saying with regard to qualifying people to meet that they could probably qualify, if they had two cars and no other debt, for \$150K – \$275K home if they are lucky.
 - Sherrie noted it is a sliding scale so if they had seven kids they could make more money and still quality.

Member Richards –

- This is a valuable discussion but beyond our purview.

Member Larsen – requested to ask Mr. Nilson some questions.

- What he believes he is hearing is that it would be more powerful if it was a genuine mix of housing with higher density and lower density. He asked Mr. Nilson if that would be something he would be willing to do?
 - Mr. Nilson – noted when they went to the County Council and had this denied based on that it did not conform to the earlier concept plan.
 - When he went back two weeks later to get feedback and he asked the entire County Council and only one council member gave him any type of feedback.
 - His goal was to go to the Council and try to work things out but because of the entitlement process he had 30 days, from the denial, to appeal the decision.
 - They then appealed it to the Board of appeals
 - He would love to get your input, but can he? He feels like his hands are tied. He has never been a part of something that has been so restrictive to try and get something accomplished because his fear is that he has this on the plate and to try and work something out when in the next round he would lose the entitlement that he has here. That is the fear he has. Please share any comments or suggestions.
 - He understands patio homes area real concern.
 - He believes the motion passed that this area would be 3 DUA. This is commercially zoned and if he had to build lots of three units to the acre, those lots would probably cost more than the lots in Rollins Ranch. He noted that he realizes that is not the committees problem, but it is a problem. The property does have a zoning and with that zoning it comes with entitlement and rights and that is the position he is in.

- He noted he would probably have to have a \$90,000 to \$100,000 lot for a patio home which means the patio home would probably have to cost \$400,000. He did not know if there was a market for a \$400,000 patio home. However, for an attached home they could be in the \$250 K - \$280,000 range.
- He noted it comes back to affordability. He has to do something that works financially and he is trying, pleading, to try and get some feedback.
- Basically all he gets is that we don't like it, we hate it, go away.

Don Paul –

- On the front end of your presentation you talked about the other developments in the area and he got the impression that Mr. Nilson would have been interested in that at some point in time, but he was restricted by zoning.
- If zoning could be changed, would that be something you would be willing to do that might reduce the density and came more into alignment with our desires?
 - Mr. Nilson - The problem is the other properties are picturesque/plateau, there beautiful. On his particular property it is beautiful if you stand on the ground and do a 360 degree turn, but he does not see there being a market for that just because the price code would be competing with the Rollins Ranch.

Member Rollins –

- Noted he would have the salability of the 360 where the other there isn't. There is one view basically.
- Her preference would be less density than what is being proposed.
 - Mr. Nilson – what happened to him was that they were put off 3-4 months in our presentation waiting for the DAT report, even though it was not accepted.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

SECOND BY MEMBER WALTERS.

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. Discussion/vote on the following items:

Agenda item #8 was discussed at this time.

Member Rollins –

- Would like to recommend that the actual architectural guidelines be put into the implementation committee.
- That we recommend a theme and use natural materials of stone/wood.
- We do have a lot of study to do.

MOTION BY MEMBER ROLLINS THAT THE THEME AND GENERAL BUILDING MATERIALS ARE INCLUDED IN OUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND COUNTY COUNCIL AND THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES ARE DRAWN UP BY THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE.

Chairman Weaver called for discussion

Member Walters

- Asked if the theme and architectural guidelines will be up to the implementation committee?
 - Member Rollins – the theme will be decided here. Guidelines in the implementation committee.

Member Paul –

- Page 30, DAT, says almost exactly that.
 - Member Rollins noted that page 30 was not adopted and their recommendations are for rusted or galvanized treatments for roofs and that should be done in architectural guidelines. She noted even the western mountain motif; you don't use the word motif when you talk about architecture. That is something to do with art; it is a little insignia (motif) or repetitive (a pattern).

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

Member Paul –

- What does that mean for page 30 then?
 - Member Richards believed Member Rollins motion was that we were not going to discuss the architecture guidelines. We still have to go back and address page 30 and decided what we are going to on the theme.

A. Town Center Basic Theme and architecture –

Member Rollins –

- There is no vernacular architecture in Mtn., Green – Vernacular meaning original people and materials they used.
- There are a couple of buildings on the Rollins property and the adjacent property made out of stone. It was a stone mason from Scotland. As far as she knows there is nothing left and a lot of buildings have been torn down.
- She toured Morgan City and took photos and looked very strongly at historic architecture. The rock church is a good example of stone. The sheet metal building also has the quoins in the corners. She does not know how old those buildings are, but felt like the consensus before she even came to this committee was that everyone wanted to capture the Trappers era idea.
- She has talked to a lot of residents and they have all said that would be so good.
 - Member Richards – believed the trappers theme was good, but not sure what the architecture should be for that.
- Agreed that there needed to be a lot of research done on that.
 - Member Paul – Did the Trappers theme have to do with the stone?

- Noted the trappers built with stone, wood, and natural materials. Not river rock, it was artisans that actually cut it and it was called the ashlar cut.
- Basically what that structure was is a rectangular building with hipped roof and high dormers. With joinery – joinery is where the wood is actually cut. It is mortar/Tennyson and wood pegs.
- It is like what Mr. Holding has up at Snow Basin.

Member Richards –

- Noted that at one point he has brought in existing Mtn. Green Area Plan policy 5.2.1 with some suggested changes.
- The committee has gone full circle and come back to similar to what he had proposed before and that would be that the policy would be pretty much the same other than striking the part that says “a western mountain resort design motif”.
- The policy goes on to read, “The desired theme of the Town Center commercial area is a historical context of the trappers, early western explorers that once frequented this valley, and future museums, public buildings, commercial buildings, public spaces and local outdoor art should reflect on and add to this theme.”
- He would suggest that the committee change the one policy then we can move on and let the implementation committee work out all the details.

Ron Blunck –

- Noted he likes the way it is. Believed it needed to be broad.

Don Paul –

- In his mind it would be very difficult to decide from a trapper’s perspective what the architecture should be.
- Would suggest maybe a natural product theme with maybe some pioneer heritage then the architecture wouldn’t have to fit but complement the theme; as opposed to trying to find architecture which you can not do.

Member Larsen –

- Mrs. Smith mentioned that they might consider a Fort Bridger look.
 - Member Taggart – we probably do not want it to look like a fort.
 - Member Rollins – let the implementation committee work with it.
 - Sherrie – we are really talking about architecture that complements those monuments, markers, and streets signs. You could name your streets reflective of the Trappers era.
- Did we add in there that when it comes to deciding the architecture that the committee canvas the residents.
 - Member Richards – this is area plan policy we are talking about changing, so it probably is not good to suggest that type of thing.
 - Member Taggart – it does tell us in the implementation part to do that.

Bill Warner –

- Noted if pioneers were added in that definition it that would broaden it.

Member Walters –

- Noted she did some research also and agree with what Member Warner is saying.
- There was a wide variety when people first came into this valley. It was the settlers, trappers, mining people, American Indians, a wide variety of people that settled this land.
- In expanding that she was thinking of a western heritage, not as in cowboy/Indians, but in western United States; mountain, abundant wildlife, hunting, fishing, sage brush, rattlesnakes, clean air, snow, sun, hardworking families that settled this.
- Imperative that we preserve the Natural Mountain/rural character of Mtn. Green.
- There were no French that came to this valley. Her prerogative was to stretch it out to include everyone that settled this valley and not narrow it down to just trappers.
- The trappers did not stay. They would trap in the rivers and then they were gone.
- Western heritage or western mountain heritage would encompass it all.
 - Member Walters -suggested trappers, early western explorers, and pioneers.

Tyler Quigley –

- Noted that from his perspective, as someone trying to build, he is confused.
 - Member Walters – it is a rustic look. It is stone, timber but not cowboys and Indians.

.Tyler Quigley –

- Are we talking about the Mtn. green area plan now?
 - Sherrie - Yes, it came out of it and it becomes a part of it.
- Taggart – since we are not adopting some pages in the DAT we are recommending this in place of those pages as to one of the things we are recommending to the planning commission.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO RECOMMEND THAT WE CHANGE EXISTING MTN. GREEN AREA PLAN POLICY 5.21 TO REFLECT THE PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES AS DISCUSSED WITH THE AMMENDMENTS MADE AS FOLLOWS:

- Instead of “*common western mountain resort design motif*”, it would say “*common western mountain heritage design*”.
- Instead of “*Trappers and early western explorers*” it would say “*Trappers, early western explorers, and pioneers.*”
- The final motion to read: *The uses within the Town Center shall be unified by a common western mountain heritage design, utilizing natural materials (wood, logs, stone, etc.) and colors and design that compliment the mountain environment. Architectural design should promote variety and creativity in design styles while still visually harmonizing with established buildings and the mountain environment. The desired theme of the Town Center commercial area is a historical context of the trappers, early western explorers, and pioneers that once frequented this valley, and future museums, public buildings, commercial buildings, public spaces and local outdoor art should reflect on and add to this theme. The accompanying diagrams should serve as examples of appropriate commercial development*

design, rather than as a strict template for carbon-copy buildings. Developers shall demonstrate to the Planning Commission and the Governing Body that project architecture, signing, lighting and entrance markers are consistent with the design, scale, color, materials and character of the Town Center theme and all other provisions of this Area Plan.

SECOND BY MEMBER WALTERS.

There was discussion on the motion.

Member Larsen –

- Disagreed with the word “shall be”
- He noted the committee is here to recommend, not to do the “shall’s”.
 - Member Richards noted that every other policy in the Mtn. Green Area Plan says “shall”.
 - Sherrie noted it is still ok because it has to be implemented. When they implement it into the ordinance then they can put the strong language in it.

The Chairman called for a final vote.

THE VOTE WAS NOT UNANIMOUS WITH MEMBER RICHARDS, BLUNCK, GUFFEY, WARNER, QUIGLEY, PAUL, ROLLINS, MUNSEE, LOVERIDGE, WALTERS, AND TAGGART FOR WITH MEMBER LARSEN OPPOSED BECAUSE THE LANGUAGE IN POLICY 5.21 IS NOT A RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF ELEVEN TO ONE.

B. Town Boundary.

Member Richards –

- Clarified that this is the town center boundary of the town itself. What he had recommended discussion on is the boundary of the town, not the boundary of the town center which was already discussed.
- There is a very thin red line that goes around the map. That is the boundary of the town that was accepted. The problem is that it is not labeled on the map as a town boundary and it is not very noticeable.
- As long as we are doing this we should change it so that it gets labeled as a boundary to the town.
- It makes a big difference because if the developers on the edge of this, what is inside a town and what is inside a town, in terms of development makes a big difference.
 - Member Paul – what was the origin of the original red line?
- The origin was the last time the Mtn. Green area plan committee met they were asked to define the town center and the town itself. The red line came out of that.
- The problem was that the committee did their maps and turned them over to the planning and zoning department and this map came out and it was not labeled and there fore when it

was voted on it became official and so there has been some debate in times past as to what that red line really means.

- Sherrie stated it would be very helpful for her to clarify.
- Member Munsee –was it all checked out to follow recommend?
- What this boundary done on was based on topography. The committee had sat down with the topography maps and it was based on the distance from the town center and based on the topography.
 - Sherrie – the Cottonwoods will be outside of that actual town boundary. Whisper ridge would be in the town boundary.
 - Member Weaver – Sherrie has no problem incorporating that?
- Noted what Sherrie had indicated, (he asked Sherrie to correct him if he was wrong) that they will take the maps the committee has been working on and putting the GIS format so you will have the whole thing, but when you blow it up bigger you will see the detail on it.
 - Sherrie – the actual Cottonwoods development will be outside of that boundary (the red line). So do you want to tell those people they are not in Mtn. Green when they look at the map?
 - Member Blunck – what is there now is irrelevant.
 - Sherrie noted under the PRUD they will be.
 - Member Munsee – shouldn't it incorporate all of the villages in Mtn. Green?
 - Member Richards stated it does.
- Member Richards clarified where the red town boundary was.
 - Member Munsee – what happens if more subdivisions develop; The Cotton woods will get bigger and Whisper Ridge is over there?
 - Sherrie noted that Whisper Ridge is included.
- Member Richards noted that it is a fairly decent size town boundary. The reason you would do this is because otherwise, someone close to the town boundary says they have a large flat piece of ground and then you get this gradual enlargement of the town and you end up with sprawl.
- The idea of ending up with boundaries allows you to say this is where the development will be and outside of that will just be rural development. That is why town boundaries are important.
 - Member Taggart – this would be where you phase out density.
- Member Richards noted that outside that boundary you can have 5 and 20 acre zoning where inside you could have significantly smaller.
 - Sherrie – the committee may want to have that as a future agenda and really look at those neighborhood boundaries because the one across from Trapper's has some soils issues and we probably should reduce the size of that neighborhood.
 - Member Taggart asked if the boundary around the town would be different then the neighborhood boundaries in the town.
 - Sherrie stated yes except for the trappers neighborhood because some of that is unstable ground and should be adjusted.

Member Larsen-

- Did not know if the committee had the right to make those kinds of decisions on people's property.

- Member Richards – that is the whole reason we are here.
- The general plan calls for Mtn. Green and Morgan City to have the density and so what you are doing here is not allowing it to have the density.
 - Member Taggart –this is good clarification because the planning commission has met and gave us 3000 circles for neighborhoods and told us what they want the area plans to do as far as neighborhoods.
 - They stated they wanted them to be 3000 foot circle with discernable edges and to identify the town center around those. So this is just clarifying that assignment.
 - Member Richards – we are just labeling it to say that is the boundary because there have been questions in the past as to where that boundary is. .

Sherrie –

- Redefining the boundaries of those neighborhoods is probably outside the scope of your charter right now, but it might be something you want to request the planning commission to extend your charter once you are done with the DAT to re-look at the neighborhood boundaries and use the new soils information that we have and maybe tie those neighborhood boundaries a little better to landmarks that can be translated and correct the issues that Member Richards has addressed which is the transfer from the CAD to the GIS system and make sure we have them right.
 - Member Paul – requested clarification. It is probably not right for us to make a motion to define these with modifications, but make a motion requesting the planning commission to extend the charter to define those neighborhoods.
- She noted the committee would come back and bring in the soils in formation and really make sure those neighborhoods are developable.

Member Paul –

- How far towards Peterson is that boundary?
 - Member Richards – it starts at the end of the Lamb subdivision and then from there goes up above the reservoir on the Wilkinson bench.
 - Sherrie – just to clarify to, that defines the development area because the area plan covers a much bigger area.

Member Larsen –

- What would be the problem with having that line follow the sewer district boundaries or fire district boundaries, because a city has sewer. So if you did your municipality to follow the sewer district boundaries than anyone that wanted to annex into it, it would be like annexing into Morgan. It would be that difficult.
 - Member Taggart stated she would not be in the service district or Mtn. Green because Rose Hill does not have those services.
- Member Larsen stated other than Rose Hill.

Member Richards stated all he is requesting is that it is labeled.

MOTION BY MEMBER TAGGART THAT WE LABEL THE LINE AROUND THE TOWN BOUNDARY OF MTN. GREEN, THAT ALREADY EXIST, BUT LABEL

IT ON THE MAP.
SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS.

- Member Larsen – believes the boundary should follow the fire district and the sewer district.
 - Member Walters – Her family, section 18, isn't even included in the fire district and the sewer district right now, so there is no way that can happen right now. We did the best we could and we defined the boundary. If we put the boundary down below, the fire district and sewer district does not go up far enough in section 18. So the boundary needs to be above and not below section 18. It is not possible to do it right now. This is the way we did it before. We are just re-defining the line that we already put on here defining the boundary for Mtn. Green.

THE VOTE WAS NOT UNANIMOUS WITH MEMBER RICHARDS, BLUNCK, GUFFEY, WARNER, QUIGLEY, PAUL, ROLLINS, MUNSEE, LOVERIDGE, WALTERS, TAGGART FOR.
WITH MEMBER LARSEN OPPOSED BECAUSE HE BELIEVED IT SHOULD FOLLOW THE SEWER DISTRICT BOUNDARY.
THE MOTION CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF ELEVEN TO ONE.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY MEMBER PAUL THAT WE REQUEST THE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION TO EVALUATE THE CURRENT TOWN BOUNDARY LINE AND DESIGNATED NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARY LINES AND EXCLUDE AREAS OF UNSTABLE GROUND AND RE-EVALUATE WHERE THE LINE FALLS IN RELATIONSHIP TO CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND THOSE THAT ARE APPROVED FOR DEVELOPMENT.
SECOND BY MEMBER WALTERS.

Member Larsen –

- Noted he did not understand the motion.
- You are just going to go off the data that is now available because usually the process is when somebody wants to develop something then you hire a geo-tech and then they spend the money and go out and prove they can build on it.

Sherrie –

- We have a more updated soils map that shows the questionable soils.
- What she is saying and what the motion is saying is that the planning commission needs to go back and look at the soils map and compare them with the neighborhood maps and make any adjustments for areas that are unsuitable for development.
 - Member Larsen – and that has to do with the DAT how; and so we are away from our charter.
 - Member Weaver - because of the DAT we are trying to define the town boundaries.

- If you are making recommendation for the planning commission to do it she did not see that it was a problem to ask them to re-evaluate.

THE VOTE WAS NOT UNANIMOUS WITH MEMBER RICHARDS, BLUNCK, GUFFEY, WARNER, QUIGLEY, PAUL, ROLLINS, MUNSEE, LOVERIDGE, WALTERS, TAGGART FOR AND MEMBER LARSEN OPPOSED THE MOTION CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF ELEVEN TO ONE. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Member Loveridge was excused at this time.

- C. **Town Center Height, location, parking, signs, and use as described by future land use map and text. And**
- D. **Vote to accept or amend pages 34 through 40 of the DAT.**

Member Richards noted these were similar and should be discussed together.

There was discussion on pages 34-40 of the DAT.
The members were comfortable with the wording.

Member Richards noted this is advisory language and doesn't say we are actually going to do it. Believed it could be accepted as it is and move on.

Member Taggart - "Plantation committee" needs to be changed to "implementation committee".

MOTION BY MEMBER LARSEN THAT WE ACCEPT PAGES 34 – 40 OF THE DAT. SECOND BY MEMBER RICHARDS. THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS. THE MOTION CARRIED.

E. final vote or modification of final maps.

Sherrie –

- Do you want to set the next meeting and come back with the corrections and all the maps and would recommend a summary of all of the motions and actions that you want to recommend to the planning commission and make your final recommendation and the document that you are going to present.

Member Richards –

- Too the opportunity to summarize a draft motion with all the recommendations.

- Member Richards handed out to everyone a draft of the final motion to send this forward to the planning commission.

The members reviewed the motion.

Sherrie –

- Would recommend, if the committee is done and a final motion is made tonight, they set up a work session in September with the planning commission and the area plan committee to present all of the maps, what was discussed, and present the document of summaries. They can then start their public hearing process.

Member Taggart – We need to discuss the implementation committee.

Member Rollins –

- The actual building of the town is the half moon area.
 - Sherrie – yes, but the pink is wrong across the street it needs to be blue where the school is.
- We'll make sure they understand that.
 - Sherrie – yes, that is why I have those little lines on there. Member Richards –

Member Richards –

- Confirmed that the sending and receiving area was indicated on the map and that the upper edge of the town boundary line should be even with the bottom of the cemetery.
 - Sherrie – yes.

E. Final vote on MGAP content.

Member Richards -

- Noted when it comes to item #F on the agenda “Final vote on MGAP content” that is what he would propose doing here. Assuming that on #9 we include the same changes as listed in the draft motion.
- He read the draft motion as follows:

We move that

THE MOUNTAIN GREEN AREA PLAN (MGAP) COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION THAT THE DESIGN ASSISTANCE TEAM (DAT) DOCUMENT CREATED BY THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS (AIA) WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE MGAP COMMITTEE BE ACCEPTED AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE EXISTING MGAP, AND THAT THE MODIFIED MGAP DOCUMENT BE FORWARDED TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL TO BE ADDED AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL PLAN. THE MODIFICATIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE MGAP COMMITTEE ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Pages 1-24 of the DAT to be accepted as currently written.

2. The map on page 25 to be replaced by the similar full-sized map drawn up and accepted by the MGAP Committee with its designated boundaries, densities and land uses.
3. The text on page 25 to be accepted as currently written, with the exception of the first item under “Master Plan Includes:” section, which is to be changed to read: “Locations for future higher density (5 units/acre) housing” to reflect the densities on the revised map.
4. The architectural diagrams on pages 26-30, and pages 32-33 to be deleted, and to be replaced at a later date by diagrams chosen by the implementation committee that will better reflect the design of our chosen theme for the Town Center.
5. The map on page 29 to be replaced with the full-sized similar map drawn and accepted by the MGAP Committee.
6. Pages 34-40 of the DAT to be otherwise accepted as written.
7. The “Road and Trails Map” in the existing MGAP to be replaced by the “Circulation Map” designed and accepted by the MGAP Committee.

There was brief discussion on #7.

- Sherrie noted circulation map can be cars, pedestrians, and horses.
8. The rest of the existing MGAP future zoning map and density/use document be left unchanged with the exception that the existing Town Boundary line be labeled as such.

There was brief discussion on #8.

Member Richards –

- noted what that is saying is that Sherrie will, if everyone is in favor of this, take this stuff that we voted on and stick it in the middle of the existing map and not make changes to those other outlying neighborhoods.
 - Sherrie – noted except with the recommendation that the committee made a motion for the planning commission to take a look at soils.

Member Larsen –

- Noted on #9 the CD zone was approved and the density that has been listed is in conflict with the CD zone.
 - Member Richards – noted that is a huge topic and there is a serious question as to whether their CD zone has been approved or not. There are many that say that maybe the CD zone has not been approved yet. As we have talked on several occasions, we need to say what we want. If the courts come back and say yes there is a CD zoning and yes they are entitled.
 - Sherrie – asked for clarification. The blue and the pink or just the pink. That is a clarification that I need.
 - Member Richards noted that is a good question. He is assuming in order to do it you are going to have the town, in order to do anything, CD.
 - Sherrie – noted she just wanted to make sure she was not mis-interpreting.
 - Member Richards – noted that the area plan would say which is supposed to be vehicle oriented and which is pedestrian.

- Sherrie – noted as they go through the PUD process, in conformance with the area plan, it needs to be vehicle oriented commercial on that side (pointing to the blue area on the map) and the other side can be pedestrian oriented with the dwelling units.
 - Member Richards – that would be how he would interpret that.
 - Member Larsen – the way the area plan reads now is in direct conflict with the CD zone and the base densities.
 - Member Warner asked if this wasn't what we voted on last week.
 - Member Taggart noted it was.
 - Member Richards noted we didn't vote on #9 but #8. We talked about it earlier and all that is saying to him is the central area that we have already discussed and voted on would get stuck in the middle of our existing map so that it is all one map.
 - Member Larsen noted he would like to see all of the maps together and look at them.
9. The existing MGAP Policy 5.21 to be changed as follows: “The uses within the Town Center shall be unified by a common western mountain heritage design, utilizing natural materials (wood, logs, stone, etc.) and colors and design that compliment the mountain environment. Architectural design should promote variety and creativity in design styles while still visually harmonizing with established buildings and the mountain environment. The desired theme of the Town Center commercial area is a historical context of the trappers, early western explorers, and pioneers that once frequented this valley, and future museums, public buildings, commercial buildings, public spaces and local outdoor art should reflect on and add to this theme. The accompanying diagrams should serve as examples of appropriate commercial development design, rather than as a strict template for carbon-copy buildings. Developers shall demonstrate to the Planning Commission and the Governing Body that project architecture, signing, lighting and entrance markers are consistent with the design, scale, color, materials and character of the Town Center theme and all other provisions of this Area Plan.”

There was discussion on the proposed motion and review of the maps.

Member Richards clarified that the only differences from the draft then are the following:

- Pages 34-40 instead of 30 – 40
- That this is a circulation map rather than a trails map.
- And the section we have already voted on and changed.

Member Larsen – noted that the County requires a developer, or whoever comes in for a change, to cross all the T's and dot all the I's. He asked why we would vote on maps that aren't even made yet until we get a chance to look at them and approve them. We have not seen the final map.

- Member Richards – Noted we can do that but he would rather just accept them and trust Sherrie to make the changes.
- Member Taggart – believed it would be fine to accept it as it is now and then before we meet with the planning commission that we would then look at those and see if there is any problem or issue with those.
- Member Richards – we are just advisory anyway. It is the planning commission that will recommend that the county council accept them.

Member Larsen – noted there has been more questions and stuff over maps because somebody said that this is the way it was suppose to be drawn and then when the map comes out this line isn't right and that line isn't right and we get maps that are the total flip flop. They are important, that is what everyone looks to. He believed we needed to have the maps in front of us and make sure they are all what the majority wants.

- Member Taggart asked if anyone was in opposition to the motion and/or is there anyone that agrees with what Mr. Larsen is saying.
- Member Blunck noted he agreed with Member Larsen because if we review them right before the meeting and there is a problem then we are in trouble.
- Member Rollins – suggested having a meeting right before the planning commission meeting.
 - Sherrie noted the maps go out at least a week before the planning commission meets.
 - Member Richards noted we are going to have to meet again to approve the minutes but then there is another meeting to approve the minutes.

Member Taggart asked when the next planning commission would be.

- Sherrie noted it would be September 4, 2008.
- It was decided to meet the 26th of August to approve the maps.

Member Richards made the following motion:

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS THAT THE MOUNTAIN GREEN AREA PLAN (MGAP) COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION THAT THE DESIGN ASSISTANCE TEAM (DAT) DOCUMENT CREATED BY THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS (AIA) WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE MGAP COMMITTEE BE ACCEPTED AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE EXISTING MGAP, AND THAT THE MODIFIED MGAP DOCUMENT BE FORWARDED TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL TO BE ADDED AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL PLAN. THE MODIFICATIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE MGAP COMMITTEE ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Pages 1-24 of the DAT to be accepted as currently written.
2. The map on page 25 to be replaced by the similar full-sized map drawn up and accepted by the MGAP Committee with its designated boundaries, densities and land uses.
3. The text on page 25 to be accepted as currently written, with the exception of the first item under “Master Plan Includes:” section, which is to be changed to read: “Locations for future higher density (5 units/acre) housing” to reflect the densities on the revised map.
4. The architectural diagrams on pages 26-30, and pages 32-33 to be deleted, and to be replaced at a later date by diagrams chosen by the implementation committee that will better reflect the design of our chosen theme for the Town Center.
5. The map on page 29 to be replaced with the full-sized similar map drawn and accepted by the MGAP Committee.
6. Pages 34-40 of the DAT to be otherwise accepted as written.
7. The “Road and Trails Map” in the existing MGAP to be replaced by the “Circulation Map” designed and accepted by the MGAP Committee.
8. The rest of the existing MGAP future zoning map and density/use document be left unchanged with the exception that the existing Town Boundary line be labeled as such.

9. The existing MGAP Policy 5.21 to be changed as follows: The uses within the Town Center shall be unified by a common western mountain heritage design, utilizing natural materials (wood, logs, stone, etc.) and colors and design that compliment the mountain environment. Architectural design should promote variety and creativity in design styles while still visually harmonizing with established buildings and the mountain environment. The desired theme of the Town Center commercial area is a historical context of the trappers, early western explorers, and pioneers that once frequented this valley, and future museums, public buildings, commercial buildings, public spaces and local outdoor art should reflect on and add to this theme. The accompanying diagrams should serve as examples of appropriate commercial development design, rather than as a strict template for carbon-copy buildings. Developers shall demonstrate to the Planning Commission and the Governing Body that project architecture, signing, lighting and entrance markers are consistent with the design, scale, color, materials and character of the Town Center theme and all other provisions of this Area Plan.

WITH ONE CONDITION THAT THE COMMITTEE MEET TO APPROVE THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION ON THE MAPS AUGUST 26TH

SECOND BY MEMBER TAGGART

THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

G. Development of an ordinance stating that “land Use” decisions be consistent with the general plan.

Member Weaver –

- Requested to give some background on this.
- He noted at a previous planning commission meeting Attorney Smith let the planning commission know that area plans are nothing but mere suggestions because Morgan County does not have an ordinance to make them legally binding.
- He noted he did a lot of research on this.
 - Member Richards – noted in the interest of time he would like to not that he agreed 100% but wondering if this is outside the prevue or scope of the committee.
- Chairman Weaver noted the committee could make a recommendation. The reason he put it on the agenda was because here the committee is spending all this time adjusting the Mtn. Green area plan that is a mere suggestion that no one pays attention to.
 - Member Walters noted several of them were at that meeting and were all very concerned.
 - Sherrie – noted when she had talked about this agenda item with Chairman Weaver, they decided they just wanted to clarify and make sure that right now this is a recommendation document. If you want it to be more binding then there needs to be an ordinance that calls for strict compliance with the area plan/general plan.
 - Sherrie further noted with that being said, if you have read the general plan, you can read one chapter and the next chapter conflicts it. So we have to get those conflicts out. Otherwise nothing will ever make full compliance. That is way beyond this committee, but she would like the committee to understand that this is what the Envision Morgan process is suppose to do is to get this visioning and then to come

back and do a general plan and fix all of the inconsistencies and anything that is out of whack with what the citizens see as their vision.

- Chairman Weaver noted in 17.27a-405 it talks about the effect of the general plan.
- He noted Section 17-27a.406 notes the general plan is an advisory guide for land use decisions determined by the ordinance. Morgan County does not have an ordinance.
- It says if you don't use the plan you will be criticized for being arbitrary and capricious, but if you do use it, it is a mere suggestion.
 - Sherrie noted Attorney's love that.
- Chairman Weaver further read, "The general plan alone can not be used to enforce the land use controls." He noted the teeth behind the general plan or the land use ordinances are the following statement "Every community which desires to control land use must also have a land use ordinance."
 - There was discussion on Morgan County's land use ordinance.
 - Sherrie noted that Morgan County's land use ordinance requires compliance with the general plan.
 - Member Richards noted we could make recommendation that that Planning commission pass language to adopt the general plan as ordinance rather than as an advisory document.
 - Sherrie - The general plan would need a lot of clean up before we could make it an ordinance.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS THAT THE MTN. GREEN AREA PLAN COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL THAT THEY PASS LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO ADOPT THE GENERAL PLAN AS ORDINANCE RATHER THAN A GUIDING DOCUMENT WITH THE CONDITION THAT ANY CONTRADICTORY LANGUAGE BE CLARIFIED.
SECOND BY MEMBER ROLLINS.

Member Larsen noted the current litigation and that right now the developers are vested according to the courts.

Member Richards – noted we are not talking about the Johnson's property we are talking about the whole general plan. Whether this applies to them or not is not our bit to say, that will come down to the courts and the county council.

THE VOTE WAS NOT UNANIMOUS WITH MEMBER LARSEN OPPOSED AND MEMBER RICHARDS, BLUNCK, GUFFEY, WARNER, QUIGLEY, PAUL, ROLLINS, MUNSEE, LOVERIDGE, WALTERS, TAGGART FOR.
THE MOTION CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF ELEVEN TO ONE.

Member Larsen noted he is opposed because he likes the process of the council doing things.

Bill Warner –

- A lot of this property is going to be public or owned by groups of people. I.e. Roads, water, and sewer.

- As a committee we want to make a recommendation to the county council to please address the infrastructure as you do all the other things; by ordinance and by code.
- No body knows how much water is down there. Please make sure there is enough water and that the sewers are adequate and that the roads are not gravel.
- Realizing that this is only a recommendation but they need to know how this committee feels about this.

MOTION BY MEMBER WARNER AS A COMMITTEE WE RECOMMEND TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL THAT THEY CONTINUE TO ADDRESS AND STRESS THE IMPORTANCE OF A WORKABLE AND EFFECTIVE PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE REGARDING ROADS WATER AND SEWER IN THE MOUNTAIN GREEN AREA.

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

Member Paul –

- Noted last time when he made a power point presentation he tried to emphasize using the more westerly portion of Cottonwood creek as it relates to a more full and abundant current standing riparian area and would be more attractive to a town center then where we are now looking at it to be.
- If we look at the esthetics of the area as they are right now and as we look at the natural systems as they relate to the Mountain Green Town center he believes it should be expanded to the west and south to incorporate that vegetation into the area.
 - Member Richards – Agreed it is nicer but the problem you run into is (1) the interchange is somewhat of a set deal. If you move the town center over you will have commercial on both sides of the interchange which is an issue. (2) If we already have that designated open space, it is already somewhat preserved, we are going to be better off to not encroach upon that nice open space.
- We have talked about having a stream that looks relatively nice and we have been basing a lot of our recommendations around how that would appear so he is trying to pick up on the esthetics of the existing trees.
 - Member Taggart – asked if Member Warner was saying it is a lovely area and should be developed to keep the loveliness of it and allow people to use it.
- Member Warner – Noted he was just saying if you incorporate it into the town center as a natural feature and maintain that natural feature that it would compliment the town center. Make it a preservation area.
- He noted existing cottonwoods are fast to grow and fast to die but they are also really important to wildlife.
 - Member Richards – since it is already designated on the map as open space could it be turned over to the implementation committee.
- Member Warner – noted that could be a way to deal with it. The other option would be to negotiate for the UA piece that sits immediately, or at least part of it. Since streams and natural systems are part of the DAT recommendation and part of the feel. The best existing/intrinsic values are to the West of the stream than they are to the east.

- Member Taggart – noted what we don't have in the DAT is a wildlife area or recreation area.
- Member Warner – we have talked about trials, but not wildlife.

Member Richards –

- The final thing is to make our recommendation to the county council and that the current Mtn. green committee is retained as the current implementation committee with some possible conditions.
 - Member Rollins – noted she did not believe we should recommend the whole committee because there have been people that have not been here the whole time.
 - Member Richards – He would suggest recommending the whole committee because the final committee will be decided by the planning commission and county council. He would just like to make sure that the ones who are active on this committee will be there to help move things along. A lot of what was done at the first couple of meetings is to re-hash stuff that had been discussed over and over in previous committees. He noted he did not want to see that happen again on the implementation committee.
 - Member Taggart – noted that it says on page 34 “The implementation committee will include community members, groups that will be effected by potential changes; it must be more than county officials. It should have new members and citizens who are passionate about the community and the DAT plan that will take stewardship of the vision of the DAT.
 - Member Richards believed this committee had a good group because there are business owners, representatives of Division of Wildlife; Ron Blunck is associated with the airport, large land owners, Shad Guffey who is into realty and mortgage.
 - Member Larsen – believed there needed to be a few more large land owners and ask if the committee would be opposed to the Johnson's or Bruce Nilson
 - Member Walters – noted it would not be up to this committee to decide who would be on that implementation committee.
 - Member Richards – we already have a planning commission here, Chairman Weaver, why don't we just let him know we would like to see continuity on the committee and let him take care of it.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO CLOSE THIS SESSION OF THE MTN. GREEN AREA PLAN COMMITTEE TO FURTHER DISCUSSION AND THAT WE WILL MEET ONE MORE TIME TO REVIEW THE MAPS AND MINUTES IN ORDER TO FORWARD OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
SECOND BY MEMBER BLUNCK.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

Member Larsen –

- Noted that Council Member Creager had listened to this CDC issue tonight and Mr. Day had talked like the County Council would be the Board of Trustee. If that is the case he would like to see some representation from Mtn. Green and not just the County Council.

Sid Creager –

- Noted, with regard to the presentation that was given last night on the CDC the primary reason the county council would be the board of directors was that it becomes a vehicle for the county council to use funds to be taken from the county and placed into an RDA or CDC organization for economic development or affordable housing. It is a vehicle to be used in many different areas.
- He believed that the county council would be well served to have input from multiple people and for all citizens to have input.
- Mr. Larsen's suggestion to bring outside entities onto a board would concern him because then do you all of a sudden lose control of the funding that is really coming from the County in the first place.
 - Sherrie noted she believed the County Council has to be the Board of Directors, but further noted that there was nothing that would stop the county from forming advisory committees on economic development that would then go out and gather the information for you.

MOTION BY MEMBER RICHARDS TO ADJOURN.
SECOND BY MEMBER GUFFEY.
THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

Exhibit A – Letter submitted by Linda Smith, Morgan County Historical Society.
This exhibit can not be viewed online, but may be viewed with the official recorded minutes located in the Community Development Department.