

prepared. He explained that the current code allows development over 25% slopes, but the draft would apply an average lot calculation rather than removing the 25% standard entirely. He also observed that the existing definition of buildable area already referenced an average lot approach.

10. Approval of January 22nd, 2026, Planning Commission Minutes

Member King motioned to approve the January 22nd 2026 Planning Commission Minutes, second by Member Sessions. All in favor, motion carries unanimous.

11. Adjourn

Member Watt motioned to adjourn, second by Member Wilson. Motion carries unanimous.

Approved:

 Date: 2/26/2026
Chairman, Maddie Maloney
Morgan County Planning Commission

 Date: 2/26/26
Jessie Drage, Transcriptionist
Planning and Development Services

Planning Director Cook – responded that the requirement was not new and clarified that it was not unique to the state, as similar standards exist elsewhere..

Member Sessions- stated that she had not previously encountered an amendment within an amendment and questioned whether it was necessary.

Planning Director Cook -responded that the additional language appeared to outline the reasons for the amendment.

County Attorney Janet Christopherson- stated that there was nothing improper about the approach and noted that including explanatory language can be helpful when documenting why an amendment is being made.

Member McMillan motioned that we forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission for amendment to the Rollins Ranch Development Agreement to revise road alignment for improved safety and to accommodate existing infrastructure as listed in the staff report based on the text listed in exhibit C of the staff report dated February 12th 2026 with the added condition to label exhibit D as Concept. Second by Member Watt. Motion carries unanimous.

9. Business/Staff Questions: Election of Planning Commission Officers (Chair and Vice Chair)

Member King- stated that the packet under Item 8 referenced discussion on a previous date but contained an incorrect date.

Transcriptionist Jessie Drage- responded that the error would be identified and corrected.

Member Taylor- asked why double-frontage lots were considered problematic and why they were prohibited.

Planning Director Cook- stated that he did not view double-frontage lots negatively, noting that they are sometimes used to buffer lots and are commonly fenced by developers, often providing additional frontage and fencing benefits. He stated that such lots exist in subdivisions in many jurisdictions where he has worked.

Member Taylor- commented that he had been involved in a subdivision in Herriman consisting entirely of double-frontage lots with rear fencing and described it as successful. He suggested that staff review the code provision to determine whether it should be removed if it reflects outdated standards.

Planning Director Cook- responded that a motion and second would be required to initiate that review.

Member Taylor motioned for the Planning Commission to review the section of code prohibiting double frontage lots. Second by Member King. Motion carries unanimous.

Planning Director Cook- stated that he would conduct additional research and bring the matter back before drafting a text amendment.

Member Maloney- asked whether ridgelines could be addressed first.

Planning Director Cook - responded that ridgelines would require further research but stated that he was not postponing the issue. He noted that a draft geohazard text amendment had already been

Planning Director Cook- stated that the Commission could recommend changing the title to “Concept Plan” and then turned the presentation over to the applicant.

Ty Reese -presented a PowerPoint showing the original proposed road alignment and an earlier relocation that would have placed the road closer to Paul Clayton’s residence. He explained that concerns regarding a double-frontage lot and snow storage had prompted redesign efforts. During that process, it was determined that the Rollins Ranch HOA lacked the capacity to adequately detain and mitigate stormwater, which required the inclusion of a detention pond per the County Engineer’s direction. He stated that a civil engineer had completed the necessary calculations and that the team was confident the detention pond would be sufficient.

He described the revised amendment as creating a 0.27-acre lot between Paul Clayton’s property and the proposed road. He noted that the road could not be placed closer than 150 feet centerline to centerline and that the design met that minimum standard while maximizing separation. He added that the road had been straightened to improve sight distance for pedestrians and motorists and that snow storage could be accommodated in the detention pond area.

Member Taylor- asked how the pump station location had been determined.

Ty Reese -stated that it predated his involvement. He added that the redesign shifted from a tighter to a wider radius to improve snow removal and allow plowing directly into the detention area.

Member Taylor -asked whether the road alignment could have been placed through Lot 22 but was limited due to spacing requirements.

Ty Reese- confirmed that the road could not be moved further east due to required separation distances and the need to accommodate the detention pond. He stated that the design attempted to meet code requirements while responding to public concerns and that although the road could have been placed closer to Paul Clayton’s property, the intent was to provide as much separation as possible.

Member Taylor- asked whether the space was adequate for the detention pond.

Ty Reese- responded that it was, noting that their civil engineer, County staff, and department leadership had reviewed the calculations collaboratively.

Member King -asked about the status of Lot 21.

Ty Reese- stated that Lot 21 had been removed and designated as open space, though it had not been renumbered. He indicated that the detention pond was intended to help mitigate flooding concerns raised by Paul Clayton.

Member Sessions- asked whether the landowner had previously attempted to address flooding.

Ty Reese- stated he was unsure whether the flooding issue had been known prior to earlier discussions and noted that recent conditions had not involved significant water events.

Planning Director Cook- clarified that under state statute, property owners are required to allow water to enter and leave their property at historical flow rates. He explained that because the development ties into an existing storm system, detention systems were designed to manage stormwater at specified storm levels.

Member Wilson- asked whether the requirement regarding historical water flow rates was a new regulation.

findings and conditions listed in the staff report dated February 12th 2026. Second by Member King. Motion carries unanimous.

- 7. Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision – Rollins Ranch Development Agreement Amendment:**
A request for a minor amendment to a street layout depicted within the conceptual development plan for the Rollins Ranch Development Agreement, which is identified by parcel number 00-0063-3521 and serial number 03-005-029, and is approximately located at 6113 N Hidden Valley Rd in unincorporated Morgan County.

Planning Director Cook -presented Application #25.063, a Development Agreement amendment request. He stated that the prior request had been denied due to a double-frontage lot and lack of snow storage. The applicant's engineer had since redesigned the proposal to eliminate the double-frontage issue.

Addressing concerns about vehicle headlights shining into nearby homes, he stated that interior lots terminating at roads are common in subdivisions throughout the County and that there is no code prohibition against such impacts. He explained that this condition is unavoidable in subdivision design.

He stated that the detention basin (referred to as a retention pond) had originally been required by the County Engineer during the 2022 Ponderosa subdivision review. The basin location had been reviewed by the County Engineer and appeared workable, though final approval would not occur until updated drainage plans and detention calculations were submitted. He clarified that it is technically a detention pond. Staff had determined that the new street location met AASHTO spacing requirements, and the County Engineer confirmed it addressed his concerns. Staff recommended approval before turning the presentation over to the applicant.

Member Maloney -asked how many feet the proposed road would be from Paul Clayton's property.

Planning Director Cook -estimated the distance to be approximately 40–50 feet but deferred to the applicant for confirmation.

Member King -asked whether the detention basin would be located within open space.

Planning Director Cook -responded that no additional open space was required. He stated that the detention basin would function as open space when dry but was not specifically designated as open space. He reiterated that the County Engineer would review it prior to bringing the Ponderosa plat forward and believed it would function adequately.

Member Sessions- asked whether the detention basin would serve only this phase.

Planning Director Cook -stated that each phase would require evaluation. He explained that the basin was necessary because existing stormwater lines were not sized to handle the drainage capacity. He noted he was not an engineer.

Member Taylor -asked about the origin of the pump station.

Planning Director Cook -stated that the pump station predated his tenure and deferred that question to the applicant.

Member Sessions- noted that if included in the Development Agreement, it should be reflected as part of the concept plan.

She noted that the County holds a first right of refusal agreement with the City, allowing the City the first opportunity to purchase the property for park use if it were sold. If declined, the property could be sold to a developer or other buyer offering the best value. She reiterated that the goal was to achieve the best possible outcome for the rifle range and invited interested residents to participate in the rifle range committee and submit research. She noted that the matter would continue on March 26.

Member Maloney – Stated that the work sessions are public. They are back and forth we would love for you to attend and discuss.

Administrative

- 6. Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision** – *WPR Phase 3A.1 Preliminary Plat*: A request for preliminary plat approval of the WPR Phase 3A.1 Subdivision, which is identified by parcel number 00-0094-0283 and serial number 12-004-020-01-2 and is located approximately at 5233 West Wasatch Peaks Road in unincorporated Morgan County.

Planner Lance- introduced Item #6 on the agenda, the WPR Phase 3A.1 Preliminary Plat application (File #25.045), submitted by the Wasatch Peaks Ranch entity. The property, located at approximately 5233 W Wasatch Peaks Road and identified by parcel and serial numbers in the packet, encompassed approximately 25.27 combined acres. The request was for preliminary plat approval of a 13-lot subdivision, in addition to the previously approved Phase 3A lots. Phase 3A included larger ranch-style lots. He stated that the proposal had been reviewed by the County Engineer, Fire Department, and Planning Department, and staff found that it met code standards and good planning principles. The applicant was present to answer questions.

Member Sessions -questioned a discrepancy in acreage, noting that one section of the proposal referenced 23 acres while another referenced 25.27 acres. She also asked why the proposal was presented as a new subdivision within Phase 3A rather than as a plat amendment, since most of the area was already contained within 3A except for a small portion of Lot D68.

Planning Director Cook -stated that staff had discussed various approaches and determined this was the most appropriate method, noting that similar items would be coming forward in future meetings.

Member Taylor -asked for clarification regarding fire review, specifically whether the review had been conducted by County Fire or the Wasatch Peaks Ranch Fire District.

Planning Director Cook- responded that Morgan County Fire was currently providing fire review and staffing the new station in Peterson until Wasatch Peaks Ranch established its own fire services.

Member Sessions -asked the applicant why Lot D57, which had previously appeared in Phase 3A, was included again under the same lot number and whether it had changed.

Brian Nestoroff -stated that Lot D57 had originally not been included in the recorded 3A preliminary plat and was now being added back in.

Planning Director Cook- added that there had previously been a discrepancy in lot count, resulting in the temporary removal of one lot, which was now being corrected.

Brian Nestoroff -clarified that the correct total acreage for the proposal was 25.27 acres.

Member Taylor moved that we recommend approval to the Commission that WPR Phase 3A.1 Preliminary Plat application number 25.045 allowing for a 13 lot subdivision. Land located at approximately 5233 W Wasatch Peaks Road in unincorporated Morgan County based on the

financially feasible. He suggested that remediation costs could exceed the land's value, leaving Morgan County residents financially responsible. He cited EPA best practices recommending excavation of 24 inches in berm areas and referenced estimates of approximately \$460 per cubic foot for soil removal and disposal. He estimated a minimum of \$1–3 million for soil removal alone, excluding additional costs. He also raised concerns about drainage and watershed management at the range. He questioned the underlying motivation for the proposal and noted that the land had reportedly been sold to a Texas-based LLC associated with multi-family housing development.

Tim Witt- stated that he and his five sons had used the rifle range for over 15 years. He noted that few counties in Utah maintain a rifle range and expressed concern about closing the existing range before a replacement facility was operational. He stated that doing so would be illogical and irresponsible and emphasized the importance of protecting community resources funded by local taxpayers.

Jason Rudd- stated that although he had not conducted as much research as others, he believed prior planning decisions allowing additional residential development in the area may have contributed to the current conflict over the rifle range.

Member Maloney – She clarified that for the record, none of the development that is being spoken about was done by Morgan County, it was all completed and approved by Morgan City, a separate entity.

Blaine Freestone - stated that the proposal was being justified as “affordable housing,” but he expressed skepticism that it would be truly affordable for residents. He stated that the community wants housing options that allow their children to remain in Morgan County. He emphasized that younger generations are drawn to stay because of the amenities and lifestyle they were raised with, and that removing those community resources would diminish the reasons for them to remain.

Member Maloney – Clarified that this rezone is not for building affordable housing. It is simply to get the best value and then use those funds to find a better space for the gun range that is not next to multi-family housing and livestock.

Member Taylor motioned to go out of public hearing. Second by Member Wilson. Motion carries unanimous.

Kate Becker – stated that the application was not a proposal to sell the property and clarified that no County property had been sold or was currently intended to be sold. She stated that the Commission's intent was to open a new range if the property were sold, and that any decision would be dependent upon the EPA study. She expressed support for the idea of leaving the site in place and potentially converting it to an archery range. She announced a Commission work session scheduled for Tuesday at 4:00 p.m. to discuss EPA standards and form a rifle range committee, regardless of whether the rezoning passed. She acknowledged that the range had been neglected and that soil remediation would need to occur whether the range remained or relocated.

She stated that a culinary water study had already been completed and that alternative options had been explored, including expanding or extending the existing range. She acknowledged that remediation costs could exceed the value of the land but emphasized that the intent had always been to create a better rifle range, either by improving the current footprint or relocating it. She stated that the Commission had never proposed eliminating the range or developing affordable housing on the site.

identified by parcel number 00-0001-9024 and serial number 01-004-386-NA1 and is approximately located at 870 E Mahogany Ridge Road in unincorporated Morgan County.

Kate Becker (Applicant) – Requested that getting the commission scheduled to meet with Member Watt not meeting until next Tuesday. Also when the EPA came out to test the soil, it rained that day and we do not have the results. We are requesting to table again. Happy to hear any additional comments.

Member Watt motioned to table Morgan County Rezone to the March 26th meeting. Motion second by Member Taylor. Motion carries unanimous.

Member Maloney – She thanked the public for coming and stated that we will hear this items on March 26th. Offered to hold public comment tonight if the public still wants to speak.

Member Watt – He apologized for being part of the problem and not getting a work session scheduled sooner.

Member McMillan motioned to open public hearing. Motion second by Member King. Motion carries unanimous.

John Sherman- stated that he had two primary areas of opposition to the proposed rezone. First, he questioned the need to sell the land at all, noting that Morgan County has limited public and open space. He suggested that the approximately 30 acres could serve a community-oriented use—such as parkland or open range—rather than being sold, and cautioned against selling public land in order to purchase land elsewhere.

Second, he raised concerns about the process and timing. He noted that the staff report indicated the rezone was intended to establish property value rather than to directly sell the land, and he suggested that property value could be determined without rezoning. He also expressed concern that plans and budgeting for a new range were being coordinated before the existing range was closed, without assurance that a new facility would be built and operational in a timely manner. He stated that the proposed motion recommended approval but did not include conditions ensuring that a new range or replacement land would be secured before proceeding.

Cameron Porter- stated that he lives on Mahogany Ridge and that his parcel backs the subject property. He emphasized that the Planning Commission’s role is to determine whether a proposed change best serves the community. He cited concerns regarding the lack of water supply analysis, the need to move development away from hazardous areas due to potential lead contamination, and the importance of preserving cultural resources in Morgan County. He questioned whether improvements to the existing range had been evaluated as a viable alternative and whether the County had explored other options or produced supporting data. He recommended denial of the request.

Dee Rawson- stated that he had conducted background research regarding lead contamination. He noted that remediation costs would depend on parts per million (ppm) levels, estimating that removal and relocation could cost approximately \$20 million, while mining could cost around \$10 million with potential recovery of funds. He stated that once a range is established, it is difficult to relocate. He emphasized that the range serves law enforcement, hunter safety, youth programs, and the broader community.

James Shupe -stated that he works with hazardous materials involving air, water, and soil. He expressed concern about the lack of a clear remediation plan and questioned whether the project was

given existing drainage issues at Rollins Ranch, requested clarification on the engineering and potential impacts.

He also referenced Exhibit C1, noting that the road entrance had shifted multiple times over the years. The original entrance location had changed due to the placement of a pumphouse, and he requested confirmation that the pumphouse had been properly permitted by the County. Otherwise, he indicated that his previous concerns had been addressed.

Robert Bunnell – who lives across the street from Paul Clayton, spoke regarding the Rollins Ranch development. He stated that he did not see substantive changes in the revised plan, noting that the road still appeared to align directly with his home and driveway.

He expressed concern that what seemed to be the most logical ingress and egress point into the development was now obstructed by a pumphouse. While he had read that one reason for relocating the entrance involved turn radius requirements, he stated that he could not discern a meaningful difference when reviewing the map.

He expressed frustration that the road relocation would again create frontage on three sides and suggested that traffic access should instead be borne by the developer's private drive, which he felt made more sense as the entrance. He acknowledged that the addition of open space was a positive step. He also noted that he was unable to determine online the exact distance between Paul's property and the proposed road.

George Pedderson - Stated that the public notice surprised him, noting that the previous year the Hidden Valley Road had been approved to shift 100 feet west to connect directly with the development property, where an existing road already provided access. He raised concerns about recurring basement flooding in several homes on Ranch Boulevard during heavy snow years and questioned whether an additional road could worsen drainage issues. He also noted that the proposed road sits on a hill and expressed concern that headlights from 25–30 potential homes could shine directly into nearby residences. He stated that many affected residents were unable to attend the meeting and expressed opposition to any changes.

Planning Director Cook - Responded that the prior denial was due to a double-frontage lot and lack of snow storage. He stated that the applicant's engineer had revised the plan to eliminate the double frontage issue. He clarified that the Durbano property to the east would be considered a driveway rather than a right-of-way if shifted. Regarding concerns about headlights, he explained that subdivision design does not prohibit light from vehicles entering nearby homes and that such impacts are not restricted by code. He stated that the retention basin had been required by planning staff in 2022 and had since been redesigned and reviewed by the County Engineer. He noted that full subdivision approval would not occur until the drainage plan and detention basins were approved. Staff had determined that the new street location met transportation spacing and engineering requirements and was therefore recommending approval. He then deferred to Ty to present a PowerPoint and answer questions.

Member Maloney- commented that seeing no additional public comments, she requested a motion to modify the agenda to move the legislative item, the rezone to the top of the agenda.

Member King motioned to modify the agenda to move the legislative item, the rezone to the top of the agenda. *Second by Member Taylor. Motion carries unanimous.*

- 8. Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision** – *Morgan County Rezone*: Request to rezone property from Multiple Use (MU-160) to Residential (R1-20), and reflect that change on the Future Land Use Map from Natural Resources and Recreation to Village Low Density Residential. The property is



PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
Thursday, February 12th, 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 Watt
Member Taylor
Member McMillan
Member Wilson
Member Maloney
Member King

Absent PC Members

Public Attendance:

Jeff Mathews
Dee Rawson
Marie Rawson
Milton L Vierow
Cameron Porter
Paul Clayton
Martin Quinlon
Dan Work
Brian Nestoroff
Ed Shultz
Jason Rudd
Dennis Jackson
Kate Becker

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 Sessions**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval of agenda**

Member Wilson moved to approve the agenda for Thursday February 12th 2026. Motion seconded by Member Sessions. Motions carried unanimous.

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

Paul Clayton – Regarding Item #7 on the agenda (Rollins Ranch DA), he stated that he appreciated the updated map showing the adjacent property as open space and the road shifted further from his property.

He had questions regarding water retention, specifically the location of the proposed pond and how overflow or backup would be handled. He noted that water had previously come onto his property and,