

**MINUTES OF MORGAN CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

FEBRUARY 27, 2024; 6:42 P.M.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

PRESENT:

**Mayor Steve Gale, Tony London, Jeffery Richins and
Dave Alexander**

STAFF PRESENT:

**Ty Bailey, City Manager; Gary Crane, City Attorney;
and Denise Woods, City Recorder**

EXCUSED:

Jeff Wardell and Eric Turner

This meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Morgan City Offices, 90 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah. The meeting was streamed live on YouTube and available for viewing on the City's website – morgancityut.org.

This meeting was called to order by Mayor, Steve Gale.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION – LISA BENSON, LANDMARK
DESIGN AND JAKE YOUNG, CITY PLANNER, CITIDESIGN**

Jake Young, City Planner, CitiDesign, informed the Council that after the Planning Commission meeting last week, the Planning Commission had given a favorable recommendation with a 5-0 vote on the General Plan Update. A public hearing took place, and the venue was full, with approximately 30 members of the public present. About one-third of the attendees provided comments during the public hearing. The comments mainly focused on concerns about Morgan's overall growth, with some expressing opinions about having large lots exclusively in Morgan. Others were concerned about affordable housing, while some residents emphasized the importance of planning for the future and managing growth. Several residents also voiced concerns about street connections, emergency access, and efficient transportation across town.

Jake said it was up to the City Council if there were any further changes to be made to the General Plan Update or to go forward with it in its current form. He clarified there would be a public hearing for the Annexation Declaration Policy on March 12th, but no further public hearings were required for the General Plan Update.

Council Member Alexander mentioned he was at the public hearing and some comments were in favor and others opposed to growth and a changing of their rural lifestyle. He mentioned the Mayor's comment that it didn't force the farmers to sell their property and they could continue farming for as long as they wanted. He stated he felt good about the General Plan Update and didn't have anything further he wanted to discuss.

Jake mentioned one individual stated they wanted one acre lots everywhere.

Council Member London asked if the General Plan Update was adopted would the City need to amend the zoning map.

Jake said in terms of the succession of planning, the General Plan was considered the highest level. The densities mentioned were in gross terms, not necessarily net, covering a broader range. Zoning changes were stated to occur per application with landowners. He stated if the City wanted to make proactive changes, it was possible but typically it focused on updating zoning codes rather than immediate rezoning.

Conversation touched upon the idea of updating ordinances to reflect changes in the General Plan Update, but it was noted that an immediate overhaul of the entire zoning system wasn't seen as a priority. The primary focus was on downtown zoning for the Master Plan Community. It was acknowledged that ordinance work needed to follow up on the General Plan Update, and there was much to do, for example, certain elements like river-oriented zoning were not currently in place and needed to be included in the Code.

Jake explained that the General Plan was advisory, allowing the City to potentially request a rezoning based on the Plan's guidance. The flexibility for developers to apply for a different zone, such as changing from LDR to MDR, was acknowledged, with the process involving steps and potential changes in development plans.

Lisa Benson, Landmark Design, pointed out the flexibility intended for the boundaries between zones. She explained that these boundaries could shift as some crossed through parcels, allowing adjustments based on what suited the community best. The General Plan Update aimed to reflect an intention for lower density on the perimeter and higher density towards the interior. She emphasized the idea of maintaining a consistent vision but acknowledged the possibility of updating the General Plan as needed, recommending not doing so more than once a year. She clarified that the General Plan Update served as a higher-level and more advisory aspect of planning.

Discussion regarding the new designations, LDR (Low Density Residential) and MDR (Medium Density Residential). The question was raised regarding whether these designations would become the new zoning classifications as changes were made going forward. An example scenario was presented where a piece of property was currently zoned as R-1-12, and if a developer wanted a higher density, such as R-1-10, it was questioned whether it would now be categorized as MDR (Medium Density Residential) zoning or still fall under the existing R12.

Jake clarified that zoning designations would generally stay the same unless a decision was made to create a new zone or category.

Jake stated overlay zones were mentioned as not necessarily applying to these discussions, and the idea of an overlay could potentially go anywhere, impacting LDR or MDR.

Discussion regarding the possibility of developers seeking a rezoning, and if a significant deviation from the General Plan was desired, a request for a General Plan modification could be made. The General Plan, although advisory, guided zoning decisions. Past instances of amending the General Plan were discussed, with the hope that the recent update would align with community expectations.

Concerns were raised about the practicality of certain zoning recommendations. For example, Low Density Residential (LDR) was defined as two to three units per acre, potentially excluding 10,000 square foot lots (R-1-10). The impact on existing zoning was discussed, with the decision to leave existing zoning in place, even if it contradicted the General Plan's suggestions for higher density.

Questions arose about the fit of existing zones, such as R-1-10, into the proposed categories. The discussion acknowledged the need for further evaluation and the possibility of making changes to the General Plan if

needed. The confusion regarding the compatibility of existing zones, particularly R-1-0, with the proposed Medium Density Residential (MDR) category was addressed. Changes could still be made if necessary.

The discussion concluded with consideration for potential adjustments to the map and a reminder that it was not too late to make changes if deemed necessary.

TRAINING – GARY CRANE, CITY ATTORNEY

No training provided.

This meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.


Denise Woods, City Recorder


Steve Gale, Mayor

These minutes were approved at the March 12, 2024 meeting.