MINUTES
AUGUST 18TH, 2020
Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes of Morgan City Planning Commission WORK and GENERAL combined meeting held in open public session electronically on August 18th, 2020 at 7 p.m.

MINUTES

AUGUST 18TH, 2020 7:00 PM MORGAN CITY COUNCIL ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY Chair Nathan McClellan.


EXCUSED George Hopkin.

CITY STAFF Mayor, Ray Little; Council Member, Tony London; City Council Member David Alexander; City Planner, Weston Appolonie; City Planning Attorney, Steve Garside; City Manager, Ty Bailey.

OTHERS PRESENT

INTRODUCTION Chair, Nathan McClellan welcomed all that joined from the electronic meeting room. Nathan advised the group that the meeting will be a video as well as audio recording. That the video and audio will be on the Morgan City website as well as you tube account and will be a permanent record.

COMBINED WORK AND GENERAL SESSION

MINUTES APPROVAL

April 21st, 2020

DISCUSSION Nathan stated the August Planning Commission packet is on Morgan City’s website and that the minutes of April 21st, 2020 are included for review. Nathan asked the Commission if they had a chance to review and had any comments.
The Commission had no comments.

MOTION Lance Prescott moved to approve the minutes of April 21st, 2020 as presented.
Second: Dave Carter
Unanimous

ITEM #1 Review and Discussion-Request for Proposal (RFP) General Plan Update submittal.

DISCUSSION Chair, Nathan McClellan invited Ty Bailey to address the Commission. Ty explained the request for proposal (RFP) being that of a joint project with Morgan County and Morgan City. The document the Commission received in the packet was of the request for proposal (RFP). The proposal has been reviewed by City staff, City Planner as well as County Planner. With the proposal joint with the County, the General Plan update will be the basis of the plan. As the project progresses, the City would like to possibly use the same contractor for details of items such as; trails, parks, open space, etc. Ty explained more of the chapters in the proposal. Ty indicated the next step is that the proposal will go out for bid.
Nathan asked about the contractor and qualifications. Ty stated that under the qualification chapter, there are specific requirements and sometimes the contractor is a planning group in conjunction with an engineer. Ty’s understanding is that there will be a list as this is part of a grant.

David Alexander asked if the contract has a value. David thought the scope had a value but might have been removed. Ty explained the Grant, reimbursement for the City and using County for matching funds. The total brings the project to $140,000.

Wes Woods asked if the City would be waiting for the County to present something and are we thinking that each Commission member take an area of the City and come up with ideas.

Ty indicated the purpose of this agenda item is to update the Commission on the process and progress of the General Plan update. The City intends to have Planning Commission take an active role in the process. Once the contractor is on board, there will be community meetings as well as meetings with the Planning Commission. The intent is to be more proactive with the Planning group. Ty will bridge the gap for contractor and the Planning Commission groups.

Wes addressed Weston regarding his involvement. Weston indicated he has read the documents with recommendations. Weston has been recently involved with a General Plan update with Layton City and will be actively involved with the General Plan update process for Morgan.

Tony London stated at the end of the day, the contractor will do a proposal that the Commission might not like, or they could bring to the table a plan that the Commission hadn’t even considered. Once there is a deliverable product, it is the City’s choice to adopt or to continue to modify.

Nathan discussed that tonight’s goal is to keep the Commission up to speed on the process, that the RFP is to be submitted and that currently no action is required.

The Commission, staff and Council continued discussing; potential mixed-use zoning designation, parks, enhancing the uniqueness of Morgan, second access from the Highway, adding a more detailed recreation component, the General Plan setting the tone for updates to the Code, etc.

David Alexander asked how binging is a General Plan and its importance. Steve Garside stated the General Plan is a living document as well as a guiding document for future development. Planning Commission is to support and enforce the plan. Changes can be made to the Plan if one of two criteria have been met. That being; there was an error made when creating the General Plan or there has been a significant change in the use. Nathan thanked the Commission, Council and staff for the comments made and is looking forward to working on the General Plan update.

---

**ITEM #2  Planning Commission project update**

Nathan indicated the Commission had assignments for research work on mixed-use in different cities and possible zoning designations for the use. We have not had a meeting where we have discussed these findings. During the General Plan update process, the Commission will have an opportunity to discuss mixed-use as well as other Code the Commission has been reviewing.

Tony London updated the Commission on the City’s purchase of land north of Tractor Supply. The land is mostly in the floodway which does not allow buildings to be built in the floodway area. The City sees a potential outdoor area for residents such as a dog park.

Pheasant Run and Mahogany Ridge 4 & 5 were approved at the City Council level and are in the process of building the infrastructure.
ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm

__________________________________________
Teresa Shope, Secretary

These minutes were approved at the meeting.

__________________________________________
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BUZZY'S
Hi Teresa,

Attached is a drawing of what we have in mind for the facade at 145 Commercial St. (formerly Buzzy's). As it is just a pencil drawing (except for the Cafe sign) I will explain a little bit about it here.

1) On the left side, on the top part, there will be LP SmartSiding. This is a product that we used on the end building. It will have a natural cedar texture and will be a natural wood color.
2) On the bottom part of that side, the original wooden rectangle pattern has been exposed. We will be restoring that and painting it with colors from the historic pallette. The insides of those rectangles, as well as the inside of the rectangles on the doors, will be color CW804 George Pitt House Bisque. The exterior of the rectangles, as well as the rest of the paintable trim on that side of the building, will be color CW623 Brush-Everard Blue.
3) On the right side, we will be putting in the same thin brick that was used on the building at 101 Commercial St. in the areas shown.
4) As we removed the wood that was previously on the building, we exposed a stucco-like product with a red and green random "slash" type pattern throughout it. It was very unexpected. Cheryl from the historic committee, who has a strong historic art background, was very excited when she saw it and called it "priceless". A representative from the state historic office said it was from the Mexican Revival period of the 30's and is the only known example to exist in Utah. We weren't planning on anything like that, but we don't feel like we can cover it up now. So, since we plan on the place being a Mexican restaurant, we are thinking we can keep the stucco, repairing what needs repaired on it and having an artist turn the red and green slashes into red and green chili peppers.

I think that pretty well explains the changes we are wanting the committee to review for approval. Please let me know if more information is needed or if anything is unclear.

Thanks,

R. Doug Wickliffe
801-603-1381
Hi Teresa,

I know I sent you what we were thinking about doing on the facade for 145 Commercial St. (the old Buzzy's restaurant). However, there is a link in the forwarded email below that, just a couple days ago, someone sent the picture to me. It shows what it looked like originally with that Spanish Revival stuff on top and vitrolite on the lower part and bordering the windows.

We would like to see if we could change the plans that we submitted. We want to try to replicate the original look. We would be using high polished stone or tile rather than vitrolite (which is a glass product that was commonly used in that era) in the areas where there was brick on the drawing I sent you.

Below are some pictures of a couple of examples of stone products that we have found so far. The first picture is of the black that we would use. The picture doesn't really show very well what it looks like in real life because it has such a reflective and shiny surface. I had to adjust the picture just to show that it was black, rather than a light gray since it was reflecting my ceiling when I took the picture. But it is a very shiny, very black stone. The other two pictures below are a couple of examples that we have found so far that we are considering for the inside part where the rest of the vitrolite was originally. It's impossible to tell what the original color was, but we are trying to find something that would look like the glass may have looked back then.
Thanks,

**R. Doug Wickliffe**

**801-603-1381**

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Karen Wickliffe <karenwickliffe@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Aug 14, 2020 at 1:13 AM
Subject: testing
To: <rdwickli37@gmail.com>

[Link to file](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DZGRu6zMT7ax5ripaV8TZ1EBiUrD3ykx/view?usp=sharing)

**Karen Wickliffe**

**801-603-3234**
Teresa Shope

From: W Ap <wapplonie@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 9:48 AM
To: Teresa Shope
Cc: Rachel Turk; Ty Bailey
Subject: Re: Historic design review for buzzy's

Teresa,

Below are my comments regarding Buzzy's cafe facade. I don't think it's ready for the Planning Commission. Based on our brief discussion they haven't finalized their materials yet. You did mention that then intend on bringing materials to the meeting for review. It would be better if they could provide staff a full color palette for review first, so that the staff report and my recommendation to the Planning Commission can reflect the most up to date materials selected. Let me know if you have any questions.

I think the Buzzy’s café façade needs some work before it is brought to the Planning Commission. The applicant really should provide a full color palette showing the colors and materials together.

- The LP Smart Siding says it will have a natural cedar texture and natural wood color. Does that mean a natural cedar color?
- Please provide photos of the stucco with green and red slashes that was covered up. I am unable to find other 1930 Mexican Revival architecture that has a similar style. For context can you provide examples images of other buildings with this type of façade. Please also describe how changing the slashes into chili peppers will keep the historical integrity of the facade?
- What is the name, style, and color of the brick that will be used?
- What is happening with the windows, have they already been restored, if not what is the glass that will be used?
- What is happening to the door to the north-west
- The stone materials submitted on Aug 14, please provide names, colors, and locations of stone

There are a number of materials that are being suggested, and it is unclear how these materials will come together. Also, based on the Aug 14, 2020 email it seems that if the new plan is to change to stone and vitrolite and that the materials are not fully selected. For the Planning Commission to make an educated decision they need to be able to see the materials together. Please provide a full color palette showing the colors and materials that are being suggested. This palette should consist of all the materials intended for use. The Planning Commission prefers to see elevation renderings but at minimum a colored elevation image/drawing that is labeled with all proposed material types.

Weston Applonie
801-979-4244

On Thu, Sep 3, 2020 at 11:39 AM Teresa Shope <tshope@morgancityut.org> wrote:

Rachel,
I have attached the application from Doug Wickcliff regarding Buzzy’s and the façade to the building. Ty has asked I send you the application so that you could review and send comments. I would appreciate those comments no later than Thursday September 10th so that I can include them in our packet to the Commission. Thank you so much.

Teresa Shope

Deputy Treasurer/Planning and Zoning

Morgan City

90 W. Young St.

PO Box 1085

Morgan, UT 84050

801 829-3461 ext 1

tshope@morgancityut.org
Notes/Recommendations on Buzzy’s Façade Plan
From the Morgan County Historical Society
September 10, 2020

West Building Notes:

- The stucco on this building is very similar to the stucco pattern on the Depot at the end of the street. This is Spanish Revival, not Mexican Revival. Restoring the paint colors as they currently look would be appropriate, or a color similar to the Depot.
- Historically there was Vitrolite glass around the windows. Vitrolite is difficult to source and hard to maintain as it is easy to break.

Recommendation:

- Restore stucco as needed, discourage/reject painting the stucco pattern to look like chili’s. This would not be suitable for the historic district. Before commission gives approval, we need to get a color name that owner is planning to use.
- We recommend using a stone material that replicates the look of Vitrolite, but is much more durable. Match to historic colors as close as possible.
- Need to see the stone material planning to use. From the photos of the two marble style options I would recommend using the one that is gray and white, not the gold tone.
East Building Notes:

- It is difficult to tell from earliest picture what the façade of this building looked like, but for many years there was a brick stamped sheet metal covering the façade. It is still there, but in poor condition for restoration. Behind the sheet metal, there is horizontal wood slats. This may be the original façade of the building. The owner would like to put up a new wood siding with vertical slats. This would match what has been done at their other property at the end of the street, and may be appropriate. However, horizontal wood boards would be more historical.

- Color choices were ok.

Questions and final notes:

- What is being done with the windows and doors of each building? We need to have more information on this in order to approve the design.

- According to the Historic District Ordinance, a COLOR rendering of the proposed work needs to be submitted. Owner also sent a follow up email with changes to the design, so the submitted drawing doesn’t accurately represent plan.

- Do we need to see what the sign will look like or can that be approved separately? Owner will be using historic sign, but will be repainting it. We will need to approve colors.

Final Recommendation: We need more information about paint colors, and materials, as well as door and window information before approval of façade design.
REZONE REQUEST
RUPP PROPERTY
MORGAN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
PETITION FOR RE-ZONE REQUEST

NO._________  

Applicant Name(s):  
Address:  
Phone:  

(1) Darrell Rupp 451 N 300 W, Morgan, UT 801-231-4810
(2) Cheryl Rupp 451 N 300 W, Morgan, UT 801-791-5104

Property Owner Name(s):  
Address:  
Phone:  

(1) (Same as above)

I/We hereby petition Morgan City to Rezone Property Requested.
From A to R1-10 & From ___________ to ___________

On the following property: (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

a. Address of Property: Approx 550 N 400 W, Morgan, UT

b. Recorder’s Plat/Legal Description: Parcel #00-0055-3410, Serial #04-149-15

Please attach with property outlined in red.

(c. Vicinity Plan (total project) Please Attach

I/We have read and believe the petition to be consistent with the Morgan City General Plan. Further, I/We hereby grant, for the purpose of understanding the nature of the petition, Morgan City Planning Commission and staff reasonable access to the property described herein.

Signature:  
Date: 8/17/20  
Date of Meeting: Sept 15, 2020

Fee Paid: $160.00  
Date: 8/17/20  
Receipt #: 

*On the attached sheet, list the names of the property owners within 300’ of the subject property boundary.
Please submit a sufficient number of plain, white, legal size envelopes addressed to the listed property owners (return address not required) with the proper postage affixed.
Concept only.
August 31, 2020

RE: PUBLIC HEARING – Application Amending the Zoning Map from Agricultural to Single Family (R-1-10) Designation.

Dear Landowner,

This letter is to notify you of a Public Hearing being held by the Morgan City Planning Commission on Tuesday September 15th, 2020 at 7:00 pm for the purpose of hearing an amendment application to the Zoning Map from Agricultural to Single Family (R-1-10) designation. The property is located at approximately 550 North 400 West, Morgan, UT 84050; Parcel #04-149-15/11.25ac.

There will also be a Public Hearing for the same subject being held by Morgan City Council on Tuesday September 22nd, 2020 at 6:00 pm for the purpose of hearing an amendment application to the Zoning Map from Agricultural to Single Family (R-1-10) designation. The property is located at approximately 550 North 400 West, Morgan, UT 84050; Parcel #04-149-15/11.25ac.

This notice of Public Hearing allows you, a landowner within 300 ft of the proposed amendment area, the opportunity for the Morgan City Planning Commission and City Council to hear your input regarding the application. Below are directions to participate in the electronic meeting. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact Morgan City. **No physical meeting location will be available.**

**NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION**

This public hearing will be held electronically in accordance with Utah Code Ann. §§ 52-4-210 et. seq., Open and Public Meetings Act. Pursuant to a written determination by the Mayor finding that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present due to infection and potentially dangerous nature of COVID-19 virus, public meetings will be held electronically, until further notice. Invitations to join the meetings are below:
PUBLIC INVITED TO ATTEND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 BY:

You are invited to a Zoom meeting.
When: Sep 15, 2020 07:00 PM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

Register in advance for this meeting by going to:
https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMtcemgrz0oHNS9nsFZZxYm5XqVDxfGkoSN

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

Or monitor on YouTube recording on morgancityut.org

PUBLIC INVITED TO ATTEND CITY COUNCIL MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2020 BY:

Click the link to join the electronic meeting:

You are invited to a Zoom meeting.
When: Sep 22, 2020 06:00 PM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

Register in advance for this meeting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwrfuqhrj1vGNSbiFUZoBKezFNJhNzMzER

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

Or monitor on YouTube recording on morgancityut.org

Sincerely, Morgan City Corporation

Teresa Shope, Planning/Zoning Secretary
tshope@morgancityut.org
(801) 829-3461 Ext. 1

Denise Woods, City Recorder
dwoods@morgancityut.org
(801) 829-3461 Ext. 3
MORGAN CITY
STAFF MEMO

DATE: September 15, 2020
SUBJECT: Request for Rezone from Agriculture to R-1-10, Single family Residential
LOCATION: Approximately 550 North 400 West
GENERAL PLAN: Low Density Residential

BACKGROUND

The subject property is located at approximately 550 North 400 West, just south of the Island Road and 400 West Intersection. The property consists of 11.25 acres. It is currently zoned and used for agriculture proposes. The properties to the north and east are zone R-1-8. The properties to the north-west are zoned R-1-20 (single-family, 20,000 square foot lots), and the adjacent property to the south is zoned agriculture.

The current zoning for the property is Agriculture, requiring a minimum of five (5) acres per lot for any development. The proposal is to change the zoning classification to R-1-10, Single Family Residential, which requires a minimum of 10,000 square feet per lot. The proposal R-1-10 zoning is consistent with the General Plan, which designates this property as low density residential.

REVIEW

The proposed zoned change is consistent with the General Plan and is generally consistent with the surrounding uses. Safeguards, established by ordinance, will be placed to ensure the property protection for the existing agricultural use, such as fencing and notices on any plats that are to be filed.

The IRC (International Fire Code) has a maximum of thirty (30) homes that are permitted off a single access road. 400 West is a dead-end and has seven (7) existing homes that front 400 West, this would limit the subdivision to twenty-three (23) lots instead of the proposed thirty (30) lots as shown in the concept plan.

The concept plan shows a single cul-de-sac and two (2) knuckles. Due to the higher cost in servicing these types of road, it is recommended the applicant work with City Staff to identify potential solutions for transportation circulation that could limit and/or remove the cul-de-sac and knuckles.
As a part of the development process, the applicant will need to obtain letters from utility providers regarding capacity. The applicant will also need to meet with the Water Advisory Board.

RECOMMENDATION

With the understanding that the above issues will be addressed during the preliminary review, Planning staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the Rezone Request from A (Agriculture) to R-1-10 (Single Family Residential).