

Heidi Nettleton – We did our best. We also struggled with the numbers. We are amenable to the triggers we talked about. Doing will instead of may on the second park. I don't know if we need to address now or later when we do the plat. I can't apologize for previous amenities that were not built but we are amenable to those items and like I said we did the work session with the council and they did not have any notes for us so I guess we will see when we go back to them.

Planning Director Josh Cook – A member of the public was able to verify that the link does actually work.

Member McMillan - *I move that we recommend approval to the county commission for the amendment to the Cottonwoods agreement PUD overlay district to configure certain parcels as within development as outlined in the staff report based on the text listed in exhibit A of the staff report dated January 8th 2026 with the following additional changes:*

- 1. That the overlay report matches that of the development agreement, that the amenities be developed in proportion or roughly proportion to the development of the lots, and*
- 2. That the overall development density be that of the original 877 units*

Member King seconds. Voting was not unanimous. Member McMillan, King and Taylor vote in favor. Member Sessions votes nay. Motion carries.

Business/Staff Questions:

Planning Director Josh Cook – All I have for staff is that we will be setting up a training with Garrett and Mike Newton and Matt Wilson. We can keep you informed with conferences coming up if you want to do your training that way. We are looking at bringing back Greg Collson we have money in the budget to that. I don't have anything else.

9. Approval of December 11th, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes

Member King moves by to approve the December 11th 2025 minutes. Second by Member Sessions. Motion carries unanimous.

10. Adjourn

Member King moves to adjourn. Second by Member Wilson. Meeting adjourned.

Approved:



Chairman, Maddie Maloney
Morgan County Planning Commission

Date: 1/22/26


Jessie Drage, Transcriptionist
Planning and Development Services

Date: 1/22/26

amended to reflect these changes?

Planning Director Josh Cook – The overlay report is not a development agreement and not ordinances so it's just trying to set out the order of authority for what controls.

Member Sessions – But I would think the development agreement and overlay report should not contradict each other.

Planning Director Josh Cook - If you want to add that as part of the agreement then that is fine. If the concept plan has issues – that is when the overlay report comes into play.

Member Taylor so I think some of the amenities are private except for the trail?

Planning Director Josh Cook – Yes, except for maybe the Pickleball court in phase 9. It's up to you guys in your recommendation if you want to include time triggers or access to amenities outside of the phase.

Ray Nettleton – I don't think we should be held to the PRUD overlay. It's a 100 page document. We are agreeing to everything in the Cottonwoods. We have a concept plan that is subject to geotechnical. It's a layer of complication that was probably put in place to prevent...something and to tie us to that 107 page agreement with all that detail is not reasonable. We will address everything that comes up in the subdivision agreement.

Planning Director Josh Cook – Those phases are already bound by the overlay agreement. There is a lot design criteria in the overlay agreement that have to be followed...no way to actually opt out. If you want add your recommendation the stipulation that they go through and make the amendment and overlay match, that is a good idea.

Member King – could we get some clarification on actual total number of lots? We have heard a lot of numbers bouncing around but nothing consistent.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson – So what you can do is put that in your recommendations, to add max lots, or to address amenities you can add triggers that are negotiated at certain points (25% or 50%) those are all details you can include and detail in your recommendation.

Member Sessions the motion is a request to amend a development agreement that we have not seen. That makes this difficult.

Planning Director Josh Cook – The packet was available nearly a week ago. If we had known there was a bad link, we could have fixed it but we were not aware that the link didn't work.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson - Additionally, another issue is that some of these old development agreements that have been amended ...they are LONG so this amendment amends part of the agreement but you have to read it all as a whole. One of the things we have been bouncing around is going to the other developers and putting together one master development agreement to make it easier for everyone to track. It would make it easier to track density issues between phases.

Ray Nettleton – I did provide a comprehensive rewrite of the Development Agreement. And I noted where it applied to each phase. We can only address phase 6 and 9. That is uploaded into Civic Review. I did my best.

Member Wilson – I suppose we are ready for a motion

Member King – do we want to add any stipulation on max lots? Where we at?

private parties. MOA and HOA are not shareholders in these unpurchased lots. There have been no plats or geohazard studies or anything recorded on these parcels. The owners are bringing something forward the MOA and HOA do not have a say. The packet has been available for a week it went out last Friday it has been available for nearly a week, the information and data has been available.

Member Taylor – Per state code how are we required to notice this?

Planning Director Josh Cook – We post agenda and packet the Friday or Thursday before the meeting. These packets are digital or we can email you them from the office if you call to request it. When we post to the state website, the packet is posted as well. Property owners are given ten days in advance minimum. Property owners are everyone within 1000 feet. For this one, we went over and above we noticed everybody in the Cottonwoods and within 1000 feet as well. It was a LOT of envelopes. Some of the streets in the Cottonwoods are public and some are private. Should I turn it over to the applicant?

Ray Nettleton – Thank you. Bill, yes we did come to you, you acknowledged that. A lot has changed since then. We will work constructively together with you guys if you vote us in, great, if you vote no then we do have the right to go on our own but you have my commitment that we will come to you and try to make things work. We thought about making amenities open to other people but if everyone is trying to use that we want to try and avoid other people driving and parking on other people's property. I hope you can understand that. I mean, no one is really going to police it but we are committing to maintain it, unless if you want to participate in the maintenance, then we are open to that discussion. Open space going to homes that is not true because Phase 9 had 107 homes and phase 9A is only going to have 90...not much different that area has always been in the plan to be developed so that's not quite accurate.

Member Wilson – let's discuss within the commission.

Member Taylor – The front phase of 9 that is being removed... it reverts to A-20 so 9 houses on 193 acres at max. Is that correct? Yes, okay.

Member McMillan – I don't have any questions. This is all the same part of the DA. Ownership was not part of the DA could develop so once again it was all in the DA and falls under the same standards. For myself the land swap doesn't concern me. No concerns on my end as it's not denser than originally proposed. This makes sense.

Member King – the question I had was regarding some of the slopes but I think that will be answered later on.

Member Sessions – My concern is not being able to see the DA it would have been nice if the information that we wanted to look at would have been sent to me. I can't follow a thing. I'm not against it, I just feel like I don't have enough of the information. The numbers are just bouncing all over the place.

Heidi Nettleton – It was my understanding that we sent all of that in the slide deck through Civic Review. I understand the confusion it took us a long time to figure the numbers out ourselves. Can we get you the information, by we I mean the planning department?

Ray Nettleton – I believe the link to the ordinance change was included and it's very similar to the Development Agreement. I don't know how that works. It should have been done at the same time.

Member Sessions - In the original DA, it says that to the extent there are inconsistencies between the concept plan this agreement and overlay report shall govern. Shouldn't the overlay report also be

complicated... I don't envy you guys, they have been working on it 18 months – it would have been nice to have more information. It sounds good but I would like to have had more information ahead of time.

Bill Horseman in Phase 2 been there 17 years. It appears that Phase 6 and Phase 9 amenities are private other than the trail. Does the HOA get any say in the matter? Comments? Is that part of the plan? We would request that the HOA does get a say in the plan. There is a President of Master Owners association all of the HOAs within the Cottonwoods provide a rep that goes up to the higher levels of the HOA. We were approached about having Phase 7,8 9 joining our MOA and the primary reason we didn't see what advantage it was for them to be a part of the MOA. There was really no benefit they will use our roads, access and the only amenity we get is the trail along the ridge. So, on behalf of the MOA we would like to have access to the park and other amenities just like they have access to our amenities now. The other thing is we are changing phase 9 from an open space to perhaps having homes on it. That is going to change the look of the Cottonwoods from Old Highway looking out. Maybe the MOA should at least have an idea of what is going on here and if the open space is getting rezoned we should get the MOA opinion on that.

Jennifer Lance - Current President of MOA we would really like a voice at the table for this. We would like to go through the development agreement and make sure everything is being followed and hopefully welcome the new phases as we go along together. The questions I have included is there a geohazard study done for the land they want to trade? The master plan also should be submitting a proposal to us as well that the MOA votes on and decides. We would like to enjoy the pickle ball courts! We don't see a big value to what would be added since we don't have access to it. We are shareholders to that open space and would like to know what is going on. Why were we not notified?

Kevin Curts – President of HOA in the Cottonwoods this feels rather short notice and descriptions of the items....we would like to have a better amount of time to review and be better heard and review the documents.

Heidi Dorrius My parents are Sheila and Mark Wilkinson owners of Phase 9. As much as I really appreciate the homeowners and shareholders, but the truth is that they are not actually shareholders in someone else's property. I appreciate their concerns but they actually don't have a say. They admitted that they were approached and they were not interested. They have provided way more amenities and they are bringing a water tank, reservoirs, there is no one else is providing that. What they are proposing is by far a greater commitment. Planning Commission please look at the bigger picture. This benefits the community besides just views. That's all.

Member Sessions motions to go out of public hearing second by Member King. Motion passes unanimously.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson points out that each phase applies to which property and what is managed by the MOA. These two phases are not a part of it. If there is issue with the amenities and other phases and what people have access to it goes back to the original developer and what he promised and didn't follow through with.

Planning Director Josh Cook Thank you. Currently the geohazard is not required at time of DA. It is required during plat. Also, the actual layout is not decided until the actual plat phase. The conceptual phase is just that, conceptual in nature. Given geology and infrastructure it typically reduces the number of lots. Conceptual is just to get an idea but that number usually goes down. Shareholders and CC&Rs unfortunately the County does not care about these. We review them to make sure they meet state statute but we don't write them or enforce them. They are enforced by

development per the original development agreement is 830.

Member Sessions Well no...and it was 868 with the golf course. But we are starting with this 877. Shouldn't be using this 830?

County Attorney Janet Christopherson Well, I think we could use a billion numbers here. Honestly it looks to me like The original agreement was bargained for with the golf course and the equestrian center. We are at a full new animal here, we are not bound to specific number in the original because we are amending it.

Member Sessions see, I can't see the amendments.

Heidi & Ray Nettleton offer to go through the amendments and the slide links that are not working.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson do you guys have a maximum number for the entire development or is this addressed just for Phase 6 & 9?

Ray Nettleton we can really only address our land so all we can do is promise that we will be WAY under the maximum density.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson which would probably run afoul to the prior phases that are limited to the 830. What do you think Josh?

Planning Director Josh Cook I know the number of entitled and developed lots is somewhere between 450 and 540. If it is 540 then since they are bringing additional amenities then I would say that the 877 should still apply which would give them 337 lots or something like that but that is under the amount that they are asking for. In my calculations, worst case is 540, but I heard it's actually 450/470, so it drops it even further. What they are proposing would not take it above the total allowed units at 877. If it does, you are entitled to amend the development agreement if you think the amenities would qualify the additional lots.

Member Sessions so since I don't have figures, in Phase 6 you are proposing 67 lots?

Ray Nettleton goes over a presentation slide with actual counts in different areas of the phases based on actual counts. So we are at 856 out of the 877. We may be slightly over but to the best of our knowledge there will not be 55 homes in Phase 8.

Planning Director Josh Cook you can allocate those homes anywhere in the phases. There is nothing in the DA that says they have to go in a certain place. This is complicated because there are multiple owners.

Member Sessions I want to make sure Phase 8 owner is protected and doesn't lose their density.

Ray Nettleton they are protected.

Heidi Nettleton we did approach phase 8 and they didn't want to work with us so we are trying to put the pieces together for our land while still proposing what will respect their land.

Member Sessions In phase 9B you said 20 lots but then I heard you say 35...

Ray Nettleton Yes there will be 20 lots in phase 9B, it is a private road and private community and 9A is the more traditional area.

Member Sessions motions to go into public hearing second by Member King. All in favor, motion passes unanimously.

Neil Jakes I live in Phase 7 six years ago and fell in love and built a home here. This is super

County Attorney Janet Christopherson I think the slide shows that we are close to 58% open space?

Ray Nettleton There are different types and location of open space – native, agricultural and parks.

Heidi Nettleton so we came to 260 which is where we got the 58% of open space from.

Ray Nettleton He goes over the lineal feet of each trail and guarantees 4.7 miles of trails, we are more than doubling the miles of public trails for that area.

Heidi Nettleton Remember the red hatched area is what is being removed. If you're familiar with the area, that reflects the photos we showed. So the green area is what we are adding and we are proposing trail all along that ridge line. A nature trail. They may have to do a water line there in conjunction.

Ray Nettleton points out where the water tower and additional water sources might be located.

Heidi Nettleton you can see where the trail along Cobble Creek Reservoir. . The views are stunning here and that would be the trail all along looking out towards the mountains. This is a far better amenity than anything you will get from the other area.

Ray Nettleton almost all our 35 lots are right here in this area. By and large, this is all a good view – natural.

Member Sessions can you go over the amenities again?

Heidi Nettleton the main amenity is the big trail but in Phase 6 we will have a tot park and a pickleball court. Phase 9 will have a 1 acre pocket park. In addition, Phase 9 may add a pool/club house or pickleball court for Phase 9 members. The current owner is interested in that. We did put MAY because we haven't gotten to that specification yet.

Member Sessions where are these amenities codified at?

Heidi Nettleton they are in the amendment to the development agreement.

Member Taylor asks about triggers. When 25% of the lots go in do we have X percent of trails to be finished or something like that? In the past they have front loaded lots and rear loaded amenities. Are you open to doing something like that?

Ray Nettleton states that no, no triggers have been added in there but the tot park and the pickle ball court will be completed with the townhomes in Phase 6A.

Heidi Nettleton states that short answer is no, we did not put time frames in there as a requirement for getting each phase done. But they would be codified in there as part of the plat review to make sure that these are added.

Member Taylor you say naturally but I think this is the kind of thing that happens naturally...

Ray Nettleton states that the key difference is that these landowners are signing a development agreement and agreeing to these amenities going on to their properties and that is the difference.

Member Sessions This is for staff, states that the link for the full size document of the development agreement. It doesn't go to it when I click on it. The pages in our packet, the first page, when you click on the link for the full size...It's hard for me to make a decision when I can't see this. Another question, I wrote Janet an email and she emailed me back – I didn't expect that, thank you. My question was on the total lot number. She states some confusion since she wrote Janet an email asking about the total lots at 877 lots but the DA says 830.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson states that without the golf course, max lots for the entire

over a year. The consensus and advice given to us is that we should look at this more comprehensively. The owners have been fortunate to work together to get this done, minus Phase 8 to get the development and infrastructure to move forward. Do you have any more questions for me right now?

Member Sessions asks to go back to a previous slide with number of units on it. So you're the MC Cottonwood LLC, that's 193 acres with 165 units?

Ray Nettleton no that would be the maximum if you took .85 x the acres. We are asking for way less. There are more details and tables in the ordinances but we are committing to 170 acres of open space out of the 193 total and it might be more open space than that. We are codifying what is in the table. There is a table attached to the ordinance.

Member Sessions that 165 number...

Heidi Nettleton 165 is what is allowed under the current zone but we are only reserving 35 of those. So what we're saying is that we could get 165 by average but...

Member Sessions the current zone is MU160...

Heidi Nettleton we are only asking for 35.

Planning Director Josh Cook 165 is an illustrative number to show what would be possible if they stuck with the .58 density. They are asking for 170 acres to remain as open space and 35 units as building units.

Member Sessions so 170 acres open space so how much is that leaving in the bottom half or south portion.

Heidi Nettleton it's a little complicated because Phase 9 has multiple owners.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson there is a certain amount of open spaces that has to go throughout the whole Cottonwood Development. I don't think you could do a complete exact swap.

Planning Director Josh Cook The developer over the years did not put in the major amenities in the DA language. After 20+ years it's not going in, they don't even own the land to put it in. There is not going to be a golf course, there are no trails. The proposal is to bring meaningful amenities to the development to offset what was promised but not provided. If you look at phases that were developed, they front loaded the density in this development into the first phases and didn't develop the phases where the amenities actually are supposed to be. The remaining 177 lots are supposed to fill out the remaining three phases. Staff has been working with them to solve this conundrum. There are development issues with phases 6 and 8...elevations are too high so they won't have the water pressure to serve them anyways. Mr. Nettleton is the one person I know of who is trying to bring in a water tank to fix that.

Member Sessions the percent open space needs to maintain what is called out in the development agreement and PUD overlay.

Planning Director Josh Cook that is not technically correct because they are amending the development agreement and the PRUD ordinance attached to the code. As such, that can be amended as well. If they are bringing additional amenities that would have never come because the phases were not owned by Mr. Gardner and they are bringing other things to serve the community then that can make up for any changes in density.

Member Sessions but I haven't seen the changes in the density...as far as the Open Space. I don't see that as a change on any of the documents.

Ray Nettleton states that the requirement was for 40% open space and we are going for 60%.

They stated they will comply with the viewshed and ridgeline provisions of the original PUD overlay report. Amenities include a tot park and pickleball court for Phase 6, a 1-acre pocket park for Phase 9, and the potential addition of a pickleball court and/or pool clubhouse in Phase 9, along with the 4.5 miles of trails.

Member Sessions asked for clarity on what Phase 9 means.

Heidi Nettleton agrees that it is confusing and states that Phase 9 is what is originally there and Phase 9A is what they want to swap it with.

Ray Nettleton says that an equestrian center requirement is part of the DA, but they want to remove it because there is already an existing equestrian center in MG. This requirement is actually no longer possible either. The blue line shows the original agreement which the Equestrian Center was originally supposed to go on but it has been removed from the development.

Heidi Nettleton says they would like to have mansion homes in phase 6. These were included in the original PUD overlay zone. We would like the option to add the maximum of 25 of these. They are townhomes designed to look like a single home with garages in the rear. With open space and setbacks provided in this area it has less density than a typical townhomes development.

Ray Nettleton says the townhomes are envisioned to rear load and keep the look very classy.

Heidi Nettleton Regarding density and open space. We have worked with the planning department. We want to decrease density and increase open space. Overall average density was .85 dwelling units in the original plans. Our proposed density for phase 6 and phase 9 is .58 dwellings per acre. The DA required 40% open space and phase 6 and 9 owners are committing to greater than 58% open space. These commitments will be preserved for agricultural, native and community open. We would like to be able to ask to join the existing HOA or form our own we are not asking for any commitments right now for them.

Ray Nettleton explains that originally there would have been 369 entitlements but with the land swap they are asking for 253 as the cap. Once approved, no one can come in and ask to do more. The owners that are coming together do have the ability to trade and to move the lots around a little but the total will never change.

Heidi Nettleton This is all due to physical constraints and land slide areas. They would like to allow single family lots greater than 8000 square feet. This allows for mixing in some smaller lots needing less water and would decrease density overall. This gives us flexibility on irregular lots. So, some closing thoughts, our presentation commits to Phase 6, Phase 9 and new Phase 9. It is less than current average density, provides additional view shed, adds additional trails be used by all Cottonwoods residents, prevents any subsequent development of open space and all phases will still go through the review process. No changes to the dark sky lighting requirements.

Matt Wilkinson The original developer purchased 1-5 phases but defaulted on the completed purchase. This put everyone in a compromised position. The land they are asking to have removed was never purchased by the original developer but he has been leveraging it for 15 years. In my original presentation I only wanted my parents land taken out. As I was talking with Josh, this does two things it secures and utilizes open space. This accomplishes providing trails that were promised but never added by the developer. This solves a lot of problems. It looks complicated but it solves problems for us, for the county and for the owners and the residents.

Heidi Nettleton We did have a meeting with the County Commission last November to head off any issues and they didn't see anything. We are confident in saying that we have been working on this for

community. They have convinced Craig North the current developer, to turn over the HOA to the community and found out that there were over \$50k of unpaid bills and only \$2k in reserves. He mentions that the professional company doing maintenance takes their cut but is very difficult to get to do any actual work. As a measure to battle the bills, they want to do self-management for a while. This request was approved by 90% when they brought it to the HOA meeting in May.

Staff discusses amongst them and no member presents issues with approving the line item.

Member Sessions moves to recommend approval for item#7, for an amendment to the Whisper Ridge at Stone Canyon development agreement, to remove the requirement for a professional property manager to maintain the open space, with the findings listed in the staff report, exhibit C, dated January 8th2026. Member Taylor seconds. Voting was unanimous, motion carries.

8. **Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision – Cottonwoods Development Agreement Amendment:** A request to approve an amendment to the Cottonwoods Development Agreement (“DA”) to remove specific properties from the land area governed by the DA, thereby reverting those properties to parcels within the unincorporated county; and to add additional land from adjoining parcels into the Cottonwoods Development to offset the reduction.

Planning Director Josh Cook introduces item #8. He states the applicant has been working with staff for about 18 months. There are owners who want to pull out of the Cottonwoods Agreement and have the land reverted to A-20. They are suggesting a 1:1 land swap with other owners who wish to join the Cottonwoods Development. The new property owners who would be part of the agreement would be putting in additional amenities and trails. It will affect phases 6 and 9 which have not yet been developed. He states that he is going to turn this over to the applicant to hopefully answer a lot of questions with their presentation.

Ray and Heidi Nettleton introduce themselves and explain that they will present a slideshow outlining their request. They thank the commission and audience for their time and state that they represent landowners east of Cottonwoods LLC, whose land is not currently within the Cottonwoods. Phase 6 owners are Eric & Peggy Plyer and Max Wilkinson, and Phase 9 owners are Ted Taylor & the Mark and Sheila Wilkinson Family Trust. They have been working with the Planning & Development Office to develop a plan that was initially presented by Matt Wilkinson in March of 2024 and has since become more comprehensive.

Heidi reviewed a map of the area, clarifying that they do not represent Phase 8. The dotted line shows the existing Cottonwoods boundary. The Wilkinson Family Trust proposes removing the hatched area and replacing it with the grey area as a 1:1 acreage swap.

Historically, the Cottonwoods includes the Gardner Development concept plans and Development Agreement, with Phases 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 previously under purchase options that expired in 2011. Phases 6, 7, 8, and 9 were later sold, creating the current complexity. The Wilkinson Family Trust requests removal of their land from the Cottonwoods DA Zone, while land to the east—previously contemplated for inclusion—would be added. The proposed changes include: (1) a boundary line adjustment to the Cottonwoods Overlay Zone and (2) minor amendments to the Cottonwoods at MG Development Agreement, including amenity commitments, removal of the equestrian center in Phase 6, and allowing mansion homes in Phase 6.

A total of 193 acres would be removed and 193 acres added. Phase 9 owners do not wish to remain in the Cottonwoods and would revert to the A-20 zone. Of the 193 acres, 163 acres would be preserved as native open space. The proposal includes 4.5 miles of trails, with the swapped land described as superior in views. The southern portion includes 23 acres already designated as RR-1 on the future land use map. Under the existing MU-160 zoning, only one lot would be allowed in that area.

Legislative

6. **Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision – *Wall Rezone***: A request to rezone property from a split-designation of RR-1 and A-20 to RR-2.5, and reflect that change on the Future Land Use Map from rural Residential and Agriculture to Rural Residential completely. The property is identified by parcel number 00-0005-4286 and serial number 01-RA1-0002 and is approximately located at 1210 S Hwy 66 in unincorporated Morgan County.

Planner Lance introduces the *Wall Rezone*, item #6. He states that at this time, no action is needed from the commission as the Planning & Zoning department has spoken with the applicant to gain a more clear understanding of the request. Staff will re-notice and identify a future commission date and bring it forward again. **No Motion.**

7. **Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision – *Whisper Ridge at Stone Canyon DA - First Amendment***: A request to amend the Whisper Ridge at Stone Canyon Development Agreement to remove the requirement for a professional property manager to maintain the common open space.

Planner Lance introduces the project as the *Whisper Ridge at Stone Canyon DA – First Amendment line item #7*. He clarifies that this is the third amendment to the development agreement. The request is to remove the requirement for the professional property manager to maintain the open space. They wish to manage the HOA land themselves rather than hiring a professional. Staff reviewed the request with the county attorney and planning staff finds that this is a simple amendment in scope. The proposal is not detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public. Self-management allows reserves to build and maintenance needs to be addressed. This request maintains the intent of the development agreement and does not alter the land use standards or development density. The applicant is in the audience tonight.

Member Wilson offers to open public hearing to allow the audience to speak. **Member Sessions moves to go into public hearing. Second by Member King. Motion passes unanimously.**

Andy Andrayson states that he is from Mountain Green and lives in the development. He says that the professionals are supposed to be taking care of the monument and gate but are not. He and other neighbors are happy and excited to be able to help maintain the beauty and integrity of the area. He is sure community members can do a better job.

Bob Woodcock states that he is a resident of Whisper Ridge for 14 years and have been going through a horrendous problem with the property developers who have changed hands three times. All have performed terribly and haven't completed obligations under the CC&Rs or development agreement. The HOA has now been turned over the homeowners who are a group of very active and attentive people who want to turn this development into a very nice common area that they can all enjoy. They have hired some subcontractors that are doing a good job with the landscaping and will do a better job with the snow plowing. He states that he is a real estate attorney by trade and has never seen a development agreement where the County has been asked to approve the professional management of the HOA. He asks the commission to please support the agreement to allow the homeowners to help make it a nice place to live.

Member King moves to exit public hearing, second by Member McMillan. Motion carries unanimously.

Member Wilson invites the applicant to address the Commission.

Burt Shepherd (the applicant) from Whisper Ridge offers to answer any questions. He mentions that he appreciates the residents and how they are willing to help. He motions that the development has been through some bankruptcies, three developers and none of them have put time, care or attention into the



PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes

Thursday, January 8th, 2026

Morgan County Commission Room

6:30 p.m.

Minutes of the Morgan County Planning Commission meeting at the above time and date at the Morgan County Courthouse, Commission Chambers; 48 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah.

Present PC Members:

Member Sessions
Member King
Member Taylor
Member McMillan
Member Wilson

Absent PC Members

Member Watt
Member Maloney

Public Attendance:

Bert Sheffer
Carol & Rich Oldenburg
Bill & Jenn Coutts
Hugh Horstman
Heidi & Ray Nettleson
Dylan Nelson
Jennifer Lance
Michelle Stocking
David & Kay Andreason
Kevin Kurtz
Matt & Kathy Wilkinson
April & Steve Quillin
Rand & Cynthia Mattson
Bruce Gorham
Robert Woodrock
Heidi Dorius
Tyler Shaw
Ralene Blocker
Dale Clerey

Staff:

Deputy County Attorney – Janet Christopherson
Joshua Cook – Planning Director
Jeremy Lance -Planner I
Chris Tremea – Code Compliance Officer
Jessie Drage, Transcriptionist/Permit Tech

1. **Call to order – Prayer by Member McMillan**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval of agenda**

Member Sessions moves to approve the agenda for Thursday January 8th 2026. Motion is seconded by Member King. Voting was unanimous, motion carries.

4. **Declaration of Conflicts of Interest** – Member Taylor notes that he knows the applicant from the Whisper Ridge (Item#7) personally and has talked with him regarding this issue before.

5. **Public Comment** - Member Wilson introduces the newest commission member, Member Taylor and then opens the floor for public comment. No comment.