PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
Thursday, November 5, 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:	**Absent PC Members:**	**Public Attendance:**
Chair Sessions		Tina Kelley
Member Taylor		Roland Haslam
Member Maloney		Angel Cardena
Member King		Nicole Nuñez
Member Wilson		Mark Apuna
Member Watts		Bill Chipp
		Jeff Mathews
		Skyler Gardener
		Kameron Spencer

Staff:
Kate Becker – Administrative Manager
Janet Christoffersen – Deputy County Attorney
Kent Page – Senior Planner
Brynnlee Savage – Planner I
Kayli Smith – Office Manager/ Permit Tech

1. Call to order – Prayer by Member Watt
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Agenda

Member Maloney moved to approve the agenda for Thursday November 5th, 2026. Motion was seconded by Member King. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

4. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest – None
5. Public Comment

Phillip Cook- –requested that the application be continued until the HOA and applicant reached an agreement. He raised concerns about disputed ownership of Parcel A, the HOA's lack of consent to the plat, the loss of approximately 1.1 acres of open space, and missing access easements. He requested conditions preventing the plat from being recorded until these issues

were resolved.

Ryan Parker –read an email from Jared Johnson, who was unable to attend the meeting. Johnson expressed concerns about the water tank property's poor maintenance, including an unmaintained access road, mud and gravel runoff, and unauthorized individuals accessing the property. He stated that the original development agreement required the property to be deeded to the HOA so residents could maintain the property and access to Hancock Park. He opposed dividing the property into two parcels and requested that the original development plan be followed.

Tina Kelley- stated that she had reviewed older meeting minutes and packets and found that previous packets contained more detailed information. She offered to share examples with the board to demonstrate how more comprehensive packets could help members make better-informed decisions.

Angel Cardena- expressed concern that many residents may not have been properly notified of the public hearing. He stated that he learned of the meeting through a posted notice near the water tank and that other residents were unaware of the hearing. He requested that additional notice be provided through email or regular mail to give residents an opportunity to attend and share their concerns.

Bill Chipp - disputed comments regarding unauthorized access and alleged drug use near the water tank. He stated that he regularly visited the area on his RZR and had not observed the reported mud, rocks, or debris being tracked onto the road. He felt the earlier comments did not accurately represent the conditions at the property.

Brigham Miller - stated that he frequently hikes to the water tank area and had not observed any suspicious activity. He also noted that a homeowner had invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in developing the area as a park. He emphasized the importance of preserving residents' access to the property and their ability to continue using it for recreation.

Administrator Becker – explained the Planning and Zoning Administrator position was vacant, and the county had received applications for the position. She introduced a potential candidate, Joshua Bake, and invited him to give a presentation to the Planning Commission to demonstrate his presentation skills. She explained County Commissioners were also present because they would make the final hiring decision.

Joshua Bake – introduced himself to the Commission and presented a proposed swimming pool ordinance amendment that would allow qualifying private residential pools to use approved safety covers instead of the county's current six-foot fencing requirement. He recommended aligning county regulations with state standards while maintaining safety protections and requiring verification by the building official. He noted that the proposal had not undergone legal review and was presented for discussion only, with no action requested.

Planning Commission - discussed safety concerns, enforcement procedures for broken or unsecured covers, and temporary protective measures.

Joshua Bake - agreed to provide manufacturer examples and specifications, research other counties' regulations, and further examine enforcement options. No action was requested.

Member Taylor - asked whether the county had the authority to override HOA covenants and restrictions regarding pool fences.

Attorney Christoffersen - confirmed that it did but noted that the HOA could prohibit pools altogether, making the issue a matter for the HOA to address.

Administrative

6. **Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision** – *Rollins Ranch Phase 5 – 3rd Amended.* Subdividing the area around the water tank located at approximately 6203 N. Lariat Lane in the Mountain Green area in unincorporated Morgan County.

Planner Page - introduced Application 26.018, the third amendment to Rollins Ranch Phase Five. The applicant requested to divide Parcel A, the existing open space, into Parcel D, containing the existing water tank and access, and Parcel C, containing the remaining open space. He recommended approval subject to addressing all recorder comments, providing an updated title report and access easement from Parcel D to Parcel C, paying all outstanding consulting fees, and complying with applicable local, state, and federal laws.

Member Taylor- questioned whether the proposed plat amendment complied with the Rollins Ranch development agreement, which originally required Parcel A to be conveyed to the HOA.

Attorney Christoffersen - explained that the developer had instead deeded the property to a privately owned water tank company, resulting in ongoing litigation between the HOA and the developer. She stated that the development agreement did not prohibit dividing the parcel and that the proposed plat would convey the water tank parcel to the water company and the remaining open space to the HOA

Planning Commission -discussed existing access easements and the staff-recommended condition requiring an access easement between Parcels D and C.

Attorney Christoffersen - noted that the ownership dispute would ultimately be resolved through the courts.

Skyler Gardner- – stated that the property was intentionally not deeded to the HOA in 2017 because a water tank application was pending. He maintained that MG Tank owned the property and explained that the proposed amendment would separate the water tank from the remaining open space so the water company could own and control the tank property.

Member Taylor - questioned whether fee-simple ownership of the water tank property was necessary or whether an easement could provide the same protection.

Skyler Gardner – explained that the water company preferred ownership to maintain control of its infrastructure, although it was unclear whether state requirements mandated it. He stated that the remaining open space would be conveyed to the HOA through the plat. He also acknowledged that an access easement for the HOA would need to be added along with the narrow access portion of Parcel D.

Member Watt- summarized that the proposed plat amendment was intended to protect the water company's interests while addressing the HOA's prior entitlement to the remaining open space by conveying the parcels through the amended plat.

Skyler Gardner - stated that if county ordinances or the development agreement prohibited the proposed division, the existing blanket easement would remain in place, allowing the water company to maintain access to the tank within the open space parcel.

Member Taylor - stated that the proposed amendment would not change existing access, recreational use, or the ability to cross the property because the water tank and fence were already in place.

Member Taylor moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation with the following additional conditions to the Morgan County Commission for Rollins Ranch Phase 5 — 3rd Amended, Application 26.018, based on the November 5, 2026 staff report with the added condition:

1. ***That there be notes on the plat that convey parcel C to the HOA and that an easement is created on the plat that gives access up the stem access to parcel C.***

Seconded by Member Watt. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Legislative:

7. **Public Hearing/Discussion/Recommendation** – *Eagle Vista FLUMA & Rezone:* (Tabled from the October 22nd meeting.) A request to change the future land use map from Village Low Density Residential to Village Residential and to change the zoning on 6.29 acres at approximately 4428 W. Old Highway Road from RR-1 to R1-8 located in the Mountain Green area in unincorporated Morgan County. And recommendation of the overlaying Flagship Homes Development Agreement County Ordinance **CO 26-17** for the overall 37-acre project in the Mountain Green Area.

Planner Page – introduced the Eagle Vista Villas proposal, which had been postponed from the October 22nd Planning Commission meeting. The application requested a future land use designation change from Village Low-Density Residential to Village Residential and a zoning change from RR-1 to R-18. He also presented the draft development agreement for the project and noted that Attorney Christoffersen and applicant, Kameron Spencer, were available to answer questions.

Member Maloney- expressed concern that the development agreement allowed construction phases to occur in any order, provided at least 28.6% of the homes were detached single-family

residences with certificates of occupancy. The commissioner questioned whether the agreement adequately addressed phasing, traffic, and infrastructure improvements.

Attorney Christoffersen- explained that the phasing requirement was intended to ensure single-family homes were built alongside townhomes rather than allowing the developer to build only townhomes.

Member Maloney - questioned whether the development agreement required commercial space, parks, and amenities to be completed according to their designated phases, noting that the provision allowing phases to occur in any order could conflict with those requirements.

Member King – questioned whether allowing the developer to construct phases in any order effectively made the entire development Phase One, potentially undermining the intended phasing requirements.

Attorney Christoffersen - clarified that the three phases were intended to identify different sections and components of the development, rather than require construction in a specific sequence. She explained that the developer could work on multiple phases simultaneously, with occupancy percentages ensuring that single-family homes were built alongside townhomes.

Member Maloney- acknowledged that the development agreement addressed the public park and playground but expressed concern that it did not clearly require commercial development. She worried that the residential portions could be completed over the 15-year period while the commercial component was never built or was sold off.

Attorney Christoffersen - suggested adding a condition to the development agreement specifying when the commercial portion must be developed. She noted that the current agreement did not require immediate construction but did require the commercial area to be graded and prepared for future development.

Chair Sessions - noted that several sections of the development agreement contained blanks, including the total open-space acreage, public park acreage, commercial exceptions, and findings.

Attorney Christoffersen - explained that the figures were left blank for the developer to finalize because the open-space calculations depended on whether trails would be included.

Chair Sessions - questioned the short-term rental language in Section 4.9.

Attorney Christoffersen- explained that the provision was intended to prevent guests from extending a stay by switching between booking platforms, such as Airbnb and VRBO.

Chair Sessions - questioned whether the development agreement addressed airport overlay requirements, noting that part of the property fell within the airport approach surface. She expressed concern that the proposed residential density exceeded RR-5 and that the agreement only addressed a navigation easement, not the requirement to cluster homes outside the approach surface.

Attorney Christoffersen - asked whether the airport overlay boundaries were clearly identified on the property map. After confirming they were, she suggested that the airport overlay requirements could be added to the development agreement.

Planning Commission - expressed concern that the development agreement lacked detailed maps, renderings, and site plans clearly showing the proposed layout. Members requested additional visual information to better understand the scale and design of the development. They explained that the legal description could change depending on the rezoning decision and that the applicant had only recently received clearer direction on key project requirements.

Kameron Spencer- clarified that the elevations, renderings, and design details for the town center and townhome portions had already been submitted as part of a separate town center application. The current application involved only the rezoning for detached single-family homes. He also explained that the original commercial design had been revised and that the updated townhome design reflected a product that had received general consensus.

Member Maloney - discussed that the development agreement was included on the meeting agenda as part of the legislative item. It was understood that the Planning Commission would serve as the recommending body, while the County Commission would make the legislative decision.

Kameron Spencer - explained that the exhibits for the town center application included building elevations, townhome footprints, clubhouse plans, and landscaping plans. Although those materials had not all been included or updated in the separate rezoning application, he stated that updated landscaping and park plans would be submitted with the final plat drawings for each phase.

Planning Commission- The Commission raised concerns that the development agreement exhibits were not all included in the meeting packet for review.

Kameron Spencer - explained that they had understood throughout the two-year process that the development agreement would be handled by the County Commission and would not require Planning Commission review or a public hearing. He expressed surprise that the process expectations had changed and stated that they were willing to provide the materials but had not previously been told that the development agreement would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Member Maloney - clarified that the development agreement required Planning Commission review because it was a legislative matter under state or county code.

Kameron Spencer - explained that Phase One would need to be developed first because utilities would come from the west side and a second access point would be needed at Cottonwood and the old highway. Phases Two and Three could potentially switch order, but the applicant indicated that the current phasing plan was the most practical based on infrastructure needs and market conditions.

Planning Commission - discussed the sequence of the rezoning and development agreement reviews and clarified that the applications had been combined after members requested the development agreement before making a recommendation on the rezone. They explained that state code required Planning Commission review because the proposal included commercial uses not permitted under the existing zoning. They also discussed the need to include the final development plans, including architectural designs, landscaping, and site layout, as exhibits to the development agreement.

Kameron Spencer - requested that the Planning Commission either recommend approval with conditions addressing its concerns or recommend denial. He stated that the development agreement remained subject to revisions and further review by the County Commission and committed to including the necessary plans and previously presented commitments to ensure the project met the County's expectations.

Chair Sessions- raised a question about whether the development agreement could override county code requirements for the airport overlay zone, particularly regarding development beneath the airport approach surface.

Kameron Spencer - stated that the issue had been addressed during the Town Center rezone and was expected to be handled through the MDA but had not been discussed further.

Chair Sessions - clarified that the Town Center designation did not require high-density residential development beneath the airport approach surface.

Kameron Spencer - stated that the proposal had been adjusted to allow lower-density development beneath the flight zone and that reasonable accommodations had been made to the site plan to account for the airport flight path. He added that the commissioners had not previously raised the issue.

Chair Sessions - asked whether the comments and concerns raised by Bonnie Brown and her attorney in their letter had been addressed.

Kameron Spencer - stated that a final agreement had not been reached with Bonnie Brown but emphasized that ongoing efforts had been made to address her concerns, particularly maintaining and improving her access. He noted that storm damage had been repaired and other steps had been taken to be a good neighbor. They added that many concerns outlined in her attorney's letter were already covered by Morgan County Code and would be addressed during the final plat process. The speaker viewed the letter as a helpful checklist to ensure all outstanding requirements were met.

Chair Sessions - expressed concern that the proposed plan did not align with Bonnie Brown's existing gate, which she had requested.

Kameron Spencer - explained that the proposed road would enter more directly than the existing access, which curved down the hillside. He stated that he had worked with Bonnie Brown to determine the best alignment and grading to ensure the road was not too steep for trucks and

trailers. He committed to grading the road to her satisfaction and honoring the existing easement by maintaining the required width, drivable surface, and adequate access.

Member Maloney - asked about the developer's plans for the commercial component of the project, noting that the development agreement did not specify when or where it would be constructed. She sought clarification on the developer's intentions and acknowledged that commitments not included in writing were not guaranteed.

Kameron Spencer - explained that the developer intended to prepare the commercial site as a fully serviced pad, with utilities and infrastructure installed to the lot line. The site would be graded and equipped with sewer, water, power, and communication services so a future commercial buyer could quickly submit a site plan and begin development. He noted that several interested parties had already been contacted and stated that the commercial site was intended to be included in the first phase, expedited, and sold as soon as possible.

Planning Commission - discussed how the 28.6% residential phasing requirement would be tracked and enforced after plat approval, including building permits and certificates of occupancy. They acknowledged that the county lacked a formal tracking process and discussed improving coordination between planning, building, and code enforcement to ensure compliance with development agreement requirements. They questioned how that would get enforced.

Kameron Spencer - explained that other cities with complex Master Development Agreements empowered their building departments to review the development agreement as a final compliance check before issuing certificates of occupancy. He noted that this was a common practice in jurisdictions where he worked.

Member Maloney moved to go into Public Hearing. Second by Member Wilson. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Tina Kelley - stated that her previous comments still stood and noted that some information appeared to be missing from the packet, specifically on page 49, which contained a drawing with a white area in the center. She questioned whether the proposed R1-8 zoning was appropriate, expressing support for R1-20 zoning instead. She noted that the property had been excluded from the original Town Center rezone and argued that the application should be evaluated on its own merits rather than justified by negotiated density in exchange for a park and trail. She also expressed concern about the proposed development density and phasing.

Member Watt moved to go out of Public Hearing. Second by Member Taylor. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Planning Commission - reviewed the outstanding concerns and proposed conditions for Application 26.019, including airport overlay requirements, commercial development timelines, density tracking, phasing inconsistencies, missing information in the development agreement, and consideration of public comments and prior commission discussions. They discussed the need for clarification regarding the zoning intent and potential impacts of townhouse development on the Mountain Green community.

Member Watt moved for a positive recommendation with the following conditions or proposed Development Agreement modifications for Application 26.019, including the FLUMA amendment and RR-1 to R1-8 rezone, to the Morgan County Commission:

1. ***That sections 4.2 and 5.2C are clarified to eliminate conflicting language.***
2. ***That the draft Mountain Green General Plan and future land use map expressing opposition to additional townhouses is acknowledged.***
3. ***That the synopsis from the previous rezone request is added to the meeting packet.***
4. ***That a mechanism is established for the Planning Department to track density calculations.***
5. ***That a more defined timeline for commercial buildout is included.***
6. ***That all blank sections of the development agreement are completed.***
7. ***That Tina Kelley's comment is addressed.***
8. ***That the airport overlay zone is reviewed.***

Seconded by Member King. Motion carried with four in favor and one opposed. Member Maloney opposed.

8. **Public Hearing/Discussion/Recommendation** – *Morgan County Code proposed text amendment: Land Use Notice Requirements and Procedures:* A request to change § 155.032 eliminating the requirements to provide public notification in a newspaper of general circulation in the area.

Administrator Becker- explained that the proposed code text amendment had been requested by the County Commission the previous year. The amendment would remove the requirement to publish certain public hearing notices in a newspaper while retaining all other noticing requirements, including the required posting timeframes, publication on the Utah Public Notice website, and other county posting methods. The department clarified that the amendment would not change land-use or zoning notice requirements, except for newspaper publication. General plan amendments and future land use map amendments would still require newspaper publication. The change was intended to reduce county expenses, particularly because the county no longer had its own newspaper.

Planning Commission - discussed clarifying notice requirements for petitions to amend a recorded subdivision plat. They agreed that notice should be sent only to property owners within the portion of the subdivision being amended, rather than to all subdivision owners. Staff planned to revise the wording and include the applicable state code reference.

Member Wilson moved to go into Public Hearing. Second by Member Taylor. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

No comment

Member King moved out of Public Hearing. Second by Member Watt. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Member Maloney moved for a positive recommendation to the Morgan County Commission for the Land Use Notice Requirements and Procedures Code Text Amendment to 155.029, 155.031, 155.032, 155.444, 155.445. 155.515, and 155.534, as presented in the attached red lines, based on the findings stated on the record. With Attorney Christofferson's additional finding:

1. ***That 155.444.E.2 should read: A public hearing is required because all the owners in the subdivision or portion thereof to be amended have not signed the revised plat.***

. Second by Member Wilson. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

9. **Public Hearing/Discussion/Recommendation** – *Morgan County Code proposed text amendment: § 155.359 creating new code addressing Mobile Food Vending & Food Trucks Courts.*

Attorney Christoffersen - explained the proposed changes to the food truck regulations. She clarified that gatherings of five or more food trucks would be treated as temporary events requiring an event organizer and additional oversight, while permanent food truck courts would require a conditional use permit. She also discussed the proposed commissary requirements, explaining that permanent food truck courts would need an off-site commissary but would not initially be required to have an on-site one. Phased development of food truck courts would return to the Planning Commission for review, allowing commissioners to determine whether additional requirements, such as an on-site kitchen or commissary, were needed as the number of food trucks increased. She noted that the language regarding these requirements still needed clarification.

Planning Commission - discussed whether permanent food truck courts should be required to provide an on-site commissary. They explained that a commissary was a permitted commercial kitchen that supported food truck operations by providing food preparation and storage, equipment cleaning, waste disposal, water refilling, and other sanitation services. They believed an on-site commissary would help support sanitary operations at permanent food truck court. They questioned whether an on-site commissary was necessary and discussed how other communities, including Holladay, regulated mobile food courts through requirements for vendor pads, parcel size, parking, signage, and compliance with Health Department standards rather than requiring a commissary. They noted that the Health Department's specific requirements were still being clarified. They also discussed whether restrooms, shared seating areas, and live music should be addressed in the regulations. They suggested that conditional use permits could provide flexibility to establish site-specific requirements.

Member Taylor moved to go into Public Hearing. Second by Member Maloney. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Jake Allen - explained that food trucks commonly used off-site commissaries in Ogden, Layton, and Salt Lake City. He supported a phased approach that would allow off-site commissary use during initial development, with the goal of establishing an on-site commissary as the food truck park expanded.

Member Watt- asked the potential food court operator to estimate how many food trucks he envisioned having at the food truck park, recognizing that the discussion was still hypothetical.

Jake Allen – explained that the food truck park would be developed in phases, beginning with approximately three to four food trucks and potentially expanding to 10 to 12 trucks in the future.

Member Maloney - asked whether the food truck park would operate daily or primarily on weekends, such as at Snowbasin.

Jake Allen - confirmed it would operate daily.

Member Maloney - clarified that the proposed food truck park would operate daily and asked whether the existing commissaries in Ogden, Layton, and Salt Lake City would be sufficient to serve the food trucks.

Jake Allen -stated that the existing commissaries in Ogden, Layton, and Salt Lake City could adequately serve the area. He explained that Health Department requirements would determine how frequently food trucks needed to use a commissary, potentially ranging from every three days to every two weeks, rather than daily.

Member Taylor- asked how many food truck courts were currently being served by the three major commissaries in Ogden, Layton, and Salt Lake City.

Jake Allen - explained that permanent food truck parks were limited in northern Utah, identifying locations in Holladay, Salt Lake City, and Logan, as well as a larger park in Moab that reportedly had an on-site commissary. He noted that the Logan park used the Ogden commissary and clarified that individual food trucks operating outside food truck parks were also required to use commissaries. However, he did not know how many trucks each facility served.

Member Maloney- Asked about opinion on restrooms.

Jake Allen - explained that the food truck park would be developed in phases. He anticipated providing portable restrooms during the initial phase, with plans to install permanent, more substantial restroom facilities as the park expanded. He noted that the proposed ordinance required restroom facilities.

Member Taylor - expressed concern that the proposed regulations could make food truck courts too restrictive or costly to operate. He emphasized that food trucks were intended to provide affordable, mobile business opportunities that allowed operators to start small and test their

concepts. He questioned whether the requirements would create unnecessary barriers, while acknowledging the potential operator's support for the proposal.

Jake Allen - He agreed that food truck operations should remain affordable and accessible. He explained that his goal was to provide more food options for Mountain Green residents and travelers while offering small businesses a lower-cost alternative to opening a traditional restaurant. He considered the proposed ordinance a reasonable balance that was not overly restrictive.

Member Taylor- emphasized that any adopted code should be practical and workable, allowing food truck operators to succeed rather than creating unnecessary restrictions or barriers. He stated that the county should encourage these types of businesses.

Jake Allen - clarified that most proposed code requirements would fall on the park operator rather than individual food truck owners. He explained that providing restrooms and commissary facilities would be his responsibility, while food truck owners would only need to park at the site and operate their businesses.

Mark Apuna- asked where the location of the food trucks would be.

Planning Commission - discussed incorporating food truck court provisions into the countywide code, allowing the use to be proposed throughout the county rather than only in Mountain Green. Member Watt explained that the amendment would establish regulations for future businesses while still requiring applicants to complete the county approval process, including additional reviews and public meetings.

Mark Apuna - expressed concern that food trucks would have fewer requirements and lower operating costs than traditional restaurants, creating an unfair competitive advantage. He noted that restaurants must invest in infrastructure and meet parking requirements, while food trucks could operate with minimal investment and come and go as needed.

Jake Allen - clarified that the proposed ordinance included parking and infrastructure standards, including one parking space for every three and a half seats, electrical service, and an appropriate all-weather surface. He identified the proposed food truck park location as Mountain Green, near the Trappers Loop intersection.

Nicole Nuñez – expressed concern that portable restrooms at a food truck park would not align with Mountain Green's desired appearance and atmosphere. She stated that businesses operating in the area should provide permanent restroom facilities and meet expectations similar to those of other businesses. She felt portable facilities could detract from the community's appearance and the image it wanted to present to visitors.

Member Watt moved out of Public Hearing. Second by Member Taylor. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Planning Commission - discussed establishing regulations for food truck courts, including limiting them to zones where restaurants were permitted. They supported the potential for food truck courts to encourage local businesses and provide opportunities for future restaurants. They also discussed requiring an on-site commissary, clarifying the definition of a food truck, and potentially restricting towable food trailers if allowed under state law.

Member King moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation with the following conditions or textual modifications for proposed §§ 155.359 and 155.356 and the conforming amendments to §§ 155.132, 155.324, 155.366, and 155.369:

1. ***That it is determined whether trailers or carts can be restricted.***

Second by Member Watt. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

10. **Public Hearing/Discussion/Recommendation** – *Morgan County Code proposed text amendment: § 155.360 creating new code to allow and regulate portable storage containers used for accessory storage and temporary construction and household storage.*

Planning Commission - reviewed the proposed portable storage container ordinance and discussed whether newly placed containers would be subject to the pending regulations. They considered allowing containers without a principal building in certain agricultural, manufacturing, and rural zones, provided parcels met minimum lot-size requirements. They confirmed that permanent containers in authorized zones would need to be placed in rear yards, prohibited from front and side yards, and screened from public streets. They also discussed removing language that could unintentionally permit containers on otherwise restricted lots. Additional revisions included clarifying removal deadlines for temporary construction containers, correcting formatting and numbering, and clarifying zoning references and stacking restrictions. They also discussed whether stacking should be allowed in light manufacturing and industrial districts and the associated building-permit and height requirements.

Member King moved to go into Public Hearing. Second by Member Wilson. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Roland Haslam - thanked the commissioners for their time and thorough discussion of the ordinance. He expressed appreciation for their careful consideration of the issues and stated that, as a newly appointed commissioner, he would personally prefer to postpone the matter until the beginning of the year so he could participate in the decision. He acknowledged that the decision was ultimately up to the commission.

Member Watt moved out of Public Hearing. Second by Member Maloney. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Planning Commission - agreed that the portable storage container ordinance required additional revisions due to incomplete sentences, formatting issues, and language needing clarification.

Member Watt moved to postpone until the December 10th meeting. Second by Member King. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Administrative

11. Business/Staff Questions

Administrator Becker - explained that there were more code text amendments that were ready for the Planning Commission's approval. She stated that they had also consulted with Bruce Parker, who recommended a phased approach. She expressed confidence in the existing code language.

12. Approval of October 22nd, 2026, Planning Commission Minutes

Motion by Member King to approve the October 22nd, 2026, Planning Commission Minutes. Second by Member Wilson. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

13. Adjourn

Motion by Member Watt to adjourn the meeting. Second by Member Maloney. All in favor, motion carried unanimous.

Approved:

Date: 11/12/2026

Chairman, Debbie Sessions
Morgan County Planning Commission

Date: 11/12/2026

Kayli Smith, Transcriptionist
Planning and Development Services

After reading the Residents Guide to the General Plan, I want to share some concerns I have.

First of all, the heading says Preserve Morgan County's Rural Character. It states that we should keep working farms working. How is the general plan going to accomplish that? History doesn't support this. Early farmers planted peas and cabbage as row crops. There was also a canning facility in Morgan. These enterprises disappeared. In the early 1980's there were between 25 and 30 dairies in Morgan County. Currently, there are only 3 dairies left. There were also about 8 or 9 large sheep operations. Now just a couple operations remain and they are facing challenges to their future.

At one time the largest income producing agriculture enterprise was the local fur farms. A retired fur farmer explained that at one time.there were about 40 fur farms in the county. Currently, there are just 3 fur farms remaining. It is his expectations, that they will not continue operating.

Why did these agriculture enterprises disappear? Market conditions drove them out of business. Yet the General Plan has put the burden of providing rural atmosphere on agriculture's back, requiring agriculture to provide the rural atmosphere and open space that the residents enjoy for free. Agriculture shouldn't be the county's whipping boy.

Under "12 items that shape the plan", item #1, second paragraph promotes conservation options. The plan calls for appropriate conservation tools and funding where needed. If Morgan County residents want to preserve open space and rural character, their participation should be required to keep working farms working. That could be done by taxing or bonding to generate monies to purchase conservation easements and protect open space. Why should agriculture's blood, sweat, and tears provide it for free? Residents need skin in the game too.

The legislature passed a law that requires green belt roll back taxes to be set aside to purchase conservation easements or open space. I checked with the County Clerk, and there is about $300,000 in that account. Obviously, that won't conserve much ground.

The general plan hinges on agriculture remaining a viable industry. But it's hard to ignore history. Current market conditions and increasing input costs, make it difficult to run a profitable operation and stay in business. Add in the fact that the value of Ag ground in Morgan makes it a real challenge for the younger generation to buy the ground to start their own farm or ranch.

To wrap it up, this general plan wants to make agriculture a viable industry to provide rural atmosphere and open space. So I again ask, how will this be accomplished?