

to sign. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Williams and passed unanimously.

FRED MANNING ONE-LOT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT OR ABOUT 13500 NORTH 10000 WEST, NORTH OF THE BOTHWELL AREA.

This one-lot subdivision is located in an un-zoned area of the county and consists of three acres. The petitioner has established proof of all utilities with water being provided by the Bear River Water Conservancy District. As the petition is in accordance with the currently existing Zoning and Subdivision requirements, Mr. Day recommended granting Preliminary and Final approval at this time.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Eberhard that the Fred Manning One-Lot Subdivision be granted **preliminary and final approval** and authorize the Chairman to sign. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Williams and passed unanimously.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

SHENE GORING ROAD VACATION PETITION, LOCATED AT OR ABOUT 15200 NORTH, IN THE HAMPTON FORD AREA.

The petitioner has requested that this road, located in the Hampton Ford area on the west side of the river be vacated. At the Planning meeting held in August, the Commission reviewed this request and it was then sent to the County Commission for their approval. In their recommendation, the Planning Commission proposed that the road be vacated up the top of the hill (State Highway 81). The County Commission returned the petition to the Planning Commission for their review in vacating the entire road and not just the 975 feet as was stated in the original petition. All of the landowners (Lloyd R. Adams, Hampton Ford Properties, LLC, and Larnee Hansen) have agreed with this recommendation of vacating the entire road and it will not have any adverse consequences on them. There is a private cabin that will be given an easement to its location (probably across the *Lloyd R. Adams* property). The County legal assistance and Surveyor's office told Mr. Day that vacating a county road does not vacate any private easements. Mr. Day recommended to the Planning Commission members that they forward this petition back to the County Commission with a recommendation to vacate this road back to its point of origin (i.e. Highway 81).

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Tea that a recommendation be made to the County Commission to vacate 15200 North in the Hampton Ford to the point where it meets State Highway 81. The motion was seconded by Commission Holmgren and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

VACATE THE WHIPPLE THREE-LOT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT OR ABOUT 7985 SOUTH HIGHWAY 89 IN THE SOUTH WILLARD AREA.

This three-lot subdivision was approved in September of 2000, but the improvements were not installed as per the ordinance. All improvements were approved as private and no streets were dedicated to the County. None of the lots were sold and now the property has changed ownership. The new owner does not want to sell any of the lots and intends to convert the land back to farming. The petition is in accordance with section 17-27-808 of the Utah State Code and the Box Elder County Land Use Management and Development Code, and Mr. Day stated that it is in the best interest of the County and the current property owner to vacate this subdivision. Also, vacating this subdivision will not financially harm any landowner or affect any existing street, easements, or Agriculture Protection Zones.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Williams to vacate the Whipple three-lot subdivision and was seconded by Commission Tea, passing unanimously.

TWIN FALLS TWENTY-TWO LOT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT OR ABOUT 7800 SOUTH HIGHWAY 89 IN THE SOUTH WILLARD AREA.

This subdivision contains twenty-two lots and is located in an area of the County that is currently zone R-1-20. This (conceptual) review was for the entire subdivision, although it will be done in two phases, with Phase I consisting of eleven lots. The petitioner, *Mr. Bob Davis*, was of the understanding that this review would be for preliminary approval for Phase I. However, when large subdivisions are proposed, the entire petition is reviewed conceptually to apprise the petitioner of any problems that the Planning Commission and/or Staff may have concerning it. According to Mr. Day, the petition appeared to be in accordance with the existing subdivision ordinances and Zoning Requirements; however, documentation for all of the utilities has not been received along with approval from UDOT allowing access from US 89; the Bear River Health Department in regards to the septic systems; approval from the South Willard Flood Control District; and documentation from the South Willard Water Company granting water service (or from some other water provider). *Mr. Davis* stated that he has received all of the above-mentioned documentation verbally at this point and there are letters in the file from Utah Power, Questar, and a feasibility study from the Health Department concerning the septic systems. Other recommendations that Mr. Day made concerning this subdivision were:

- ⇒ Lots one and two should be restricted from having access to US 89.
- ⇒ Lots twenty-one and twenty-two should be restricted to not allow access from the frontage road that is adjacent to the railroad tracks.
- ⇒ Lot twenty-two should have an additional restriction to require proper maintenance of the detention basin located on its west side.
- ⇒ A north/south stub road should be provided in the vicinity of lots eighteen to twenty for access and prevent "land-locking" any adjacent properties.

- ⇒ As this property is located within the vicinity of an Agricultural Protection area, the plat must be so noted.
- ⇒ All lot lines must be radial to the street unless approved otherwise by the Planning Commission.
- ⇒ The Planning Commission may also want to impose additional requirements to the west side of lots twenty-one and twenty-two to buffer them from the railroad.

Commissioner Tea asked the petitioner about the curve of the road through the subdivision and *Mr. Davis* stated that it was an idea of his engineer; however, having the road straight would help with the lot lines being radial. *Mr. Richard Day*, representing the South Willard Water Company, was also in attendance at this meeting and stated that there was some discrepancy between two engineers regarding the availability of the water for this subdivision, thus there is no official letter regarding the water for the subdivision. *Mr. Davis* said that he would get in contact with the water department for their approval to go ahead with the first phase. If all of the necessary documentation and engineering changes are made regarding this subdivision the Planning Commission could grant preliminary and final approval for Phase I of this petition at their next meeting. After some further discussion Vice Chairman Thompson asked for a motion approving the concept plan for the **Twin Falls Subdivision**.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Williams to approve the *conceptual* plan for the Twin Falls Subdivision (subject to meeting all of the requirements of the Planning Commission). The motion was seconded by Commission Eberhard and passed unanimously.

THE KING EIGHT-LOT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT OR ABOUT 14000 NORTH 6000 WEST IN THE RIVERSIDE/NORTH GARLAND AREA.

This subdivision consists of eight lots located in an area of the county that is currently un-zoned. Six of the lots in this subdivision were originally set as one-acre lots, but are being cut back to one-half acre each. The remaining parcel which contained lots seven and eight are being combined into one remaining parcel which consists of approximately fourteen acres. This remainder parcel of lot seven/eight will be labeled as the remainder parcel helping to prevent a possible subdivision amendment in the future should the petitioner want to utilize that area later on by subdividing. The petitioner has provided proof of all utilities, including water being provided by Riverside/North Garland Water Company. Because of the changes being made to the size of the six lots, and lot seven/eight being changed to a remainder parcel, Mr. Day recommended that this subdivision be given preliminary approval at this time in order for the engineer to make the necessary changes to the plat map. Once the changes and corrections are made, the subdivision may be considered for final approval.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Williams to grant preliminary approval to the King Six-Lot Subdivision based on the reduction of the six lot sizes from one acre to one-half acre each and lot seven/eight being eliminated and classified as the

remainder parcel. The motion was seconded by Commission Holmgren and passed unanimously.

At this time the Planning Commission adjourned into their work session in the Planning Commission Conference Room 32.

Mr. Day spoke with the Commissioners concerning the Snowville area of the County. Residents from that area (Tom Flinders, Charlie Taylor, Chip Ritter) approached the County Commission and asked for some zoning in the Snowville area, thus the County Commission has asked that the Planning Commission begin discussing zoning in the Snowville area, i.e. Curlew Flats. There are two items that have some of the citizens in that area concerned; they are a salvage yard off Highway 30 and another salvage area starting up with Mr. Hurt's property. It would appear that the residents in that isolated area of the County are viewing zoning as a "necessary evil" according to Mr. Day. "The residents are at least considering that if they want some control of their destiny out there, if they want to have some control over how that area develops and how it grows and what uses happen out there, they are going to have to have some kind of zoning in place," Mr. Day continued. Since then, an issue has come up in the South Willard area where many larger developments in the County are occurring. A feasibility study has been completed for the South Willard area regarding the infrastructure for a sewer system deeming its possibility. There are some landowners in this area that are interested in the beginning phase of developing their property. One such landowner, *Ms. Georgia Sullivan* was representing the White Farm located in South Willard. She addressed the Commissioners regarding their intentions for the future of this White Orchard area. Ms. Sullivan's comments were as follows:

She encouraged the Planning Commissioners to work with Mr. Day on the community plan as the White property consists of eight hundred acres and anything that is done with it will have an impact on the area as a whole. They are currently going through some planning process to determine what it is that they want to do with the property, and their desire is to work with the County, water people, and sewer people as a "team". Although they have maintained a "wait and see process" over the years, they are now ready to start more serious plans to develop this property. They are hoping to sell large-scale pieces of this property to developers (although at this point the family does not have any concrete plan(s) other than conceptual for the property). Mr. Day added that the property west of the canal in the White Orchard consists of approximately five hundred acres, which could easily house one thousand homes. Mr. Day then asked the Commissioners to consider what it is that they want South Willard to look like when considering this type of development. There is already zoning in that area, but planning will need to take place above that. Commissioner Tea made a comment regarding the possibility of a thousand septic tanks if there were no septic system in place. Some of the other issues that Mr. Day brought up were:

- Sewer issues, the area will be saturated with septic systems
- Water service delivery
- Recreation area
- Fire service
- Police service
- Other basic services that the residents would want and/or need.

Mr. Day continued by stating that when a plan is devised, these are the things that need to be kept in mind while planning for the development whenever it occurs. The time is fast approaching for the Planning Commission to consider these issues as the County continues to grow, especially in this area, as well as others. Ms. Sullivan concluded by stating that until the infrastructure is done in the area, i.e. water, sewer, etc., nothing will be done. The Bear River Water Conservancy District has been approached regarding the water for the area. Mr. Day then turned the discussion over to Ms. Comarell to continue discussing the issue of zoning in the West Corinne area.

ZONING

Ms. Pat Comarell went over her outline (included with these Minutes) with the Commissioner. At the next meeting she will have a booklet prepared containing maps and also addressing the issues of historic preservation, transportation, water, etc. This will be a background report made available to the public. There will also be a chart that will summarize the major zoning designations. It will also explain the process of zoning to the public inviting them to participate. This first meeting with the public can be handled in a variety of ways, depending on the wishes of the Planning Commission. Because of the upcoming holidays, the meeting with the public will probably take place after the first of the New Year. Commissioner Eberhard asked for clarification on the area of Corinne that is being considered for zoning. Not all of the area will be zoned the same, but it should depend on what use of the land is desired. Ms. Comarell continued with her outline and discussion on this zoning issue, also referring to planning for Snowville and South Willard area. The County policy needs to be addressed looking at the entire County and not just isolated areas. Mr. Day sited an example in Perry along the highway where zoning (from twenty years ago) was not planned, but only zoned. At the next meeting several policies will be looked at for consideration in zoning West Corinne. What works in one part of the County will not necessarily work in another part and those issues, or policies, need to be looked at individually.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 p.m. by Commissioner Holmgren; all concurred.

Passed and adopted in regular session this 24th day of October, 2002.


Richard Kimber, Chairman
Box Elder County
Planning Commission

PLANNING & ZONING OF WEST CORINNE

SEPTEMBER 26, 2002

OBJECTIVE: Continue brainstorming what the plan should like

Background

At this meeting, we will continue to discuss the planning and zoning for the West Corinne area. Again, the key questions are:

- What do you see happening there in the next 10 years?
- What planning concerns should we be aware of as we ask the public to participate in with us in planning the area?
- What type of zoning is worth considering and what is not?

What we are hoping to do by these discussions is:

- To further define graphically and in written form what ideas the Commission may have for this area
- To prepare a “reaction document” which will help start a discussion with the stakeholders at the open houses or with an advisory committee (if one is appointed to develop a plan for this area)
- To determine if the Commission wishes to take the next step and go forward with the planning process in this area

On the next page are the notes from the last meeting and questions for those areas we have not yet addressed. The reasons for the zoning effort and outline of the process to include the public are summarized starting on page 5.

Analysis of West Corinne

Boundaries of proposed area to be zoned

Brigham City boundaries on the east (the proposed planning area crosses I-15 to reach the Brigham City boundaries); Iowa String Road (6800 West) on the west; Bear River on the south (using the river as a boundary must be used with caution, i.e., the boundary has to connect to a stable location); Corinne and Bear River Cities on the north (following the section lines).

Environmental Restraints

- **Wetlands Plan:** Requirements must be met. Box Elder County has adopted a new wetlands plan which makes it easier for individual property owners to develop.

- **Bear River and water concerns**
 - Bear River itself exists on the west side of Brigham City moves across the Idaho line, back to Utah down from Cache County and Bear Lake. It makes a 700 miles trek and is an interstate waterway.
 - A Bear River Compact is splits water rights, some of which are owned by Salt Lake County. The division indicates: 60,000 acre feet for Cache County, 60,000 for Box Elder County, 50,000 for Weber County, and 50,000 for Salt Lake County.
 - Bear River Water Conservancy District also serves parts of this area. A 10-year water distribution storage capacity plan has been developed and will ready for adoption shortly.
 - Everyone can use more water, but the problem with Box Elder water systems is the delivering systems, e.g., distribution pipes, or no way to get the water where it is needed. There is 80 miles of pipe with 4-6" lines. West Corinne Water Company serves most of the area proposed for zoning
 - 1.2 million acre feet of water going into Great Salt Lake/Bear River. The bird refuge has a right to 200,000 acre feet

- **100 Flood plain** as illustrated on the FEMA panel map

- *Issues*
 - Water distribution and storage capacity
 - Water quality

Transportation System

- **Background**
 - Iowa String Road on the western boundary has an 80 foot right-of-way (arterial)
 - State Road 83 (arterial)
 - Other connecting roads designed to keep to section lines
 - As the County grows, the number of turning movements on and off the major arterials will need to be limited to assure the smooth flow of traffic. The present ordinance restricts a roadway entrance on arterials to 1300-1600'. The Utah State Department of Transportation (UDOT) limits access to 250'.

- **Issues:**
 - How will it be limited for residential? Commercial?
 - What do you want on Iowa String Road and SR 83?
 - What new roads are needed
 - Developing a collector road systems which provide access to local uses and connect the major arterial roads.
 - Bamberger Line is a possible road for a bike trail.

Open Space

- Box Elder County does not have parks, nor does it have the means to maintain them.
- Open space potential exists: (1) in wetland areas, and (2) where residential developments which are designed as cluster housing restrict development in the areas designated as open space.
- Box Elder, being an agricultural county, also has many open spaces as a result of these enterprises.

Sewer

- All development within the unincorporated County is on septic tanks. Some cities have sewer treatment facilities.
- There appears to be an awareness within the County of the problems caused by septic tanks.
- Any future planning of the unincorporated area will need to include a discussion of a major sewer system.

Historic Resources

- The railbeds for the Transcontinental Railroad and the Central Pacific Railroad, and the Golden Spike National Historic Site are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Other sites on the National Register are: The Hogup Cave; Lower Bear River Archeological District;
- Utah State Register Sites: Washakie Indian Farm; Harper House (highway 38 5 miles north of Brigham City); Call's Fort Site (1855; monument, 6 miles north of Brigham City); Promontory Caves
- Corinne and Brigham City is full of history, e.g., First Presbyterian Church
- Other historic resources of note on State Historical Society surveys: Rabbit Springs Dam (a CCC project; 1935); Bear River Bird Refuge (a CCC project; 1931); Bear River Duck Club (1901); Rosebud Field Camp (a CCC project, 1938; off State Route 30); Trail Pass Reservoir (a CCC project; 1939)

Commercial Potential

- Commercial services are provided to this area by Brigham, Corinne and Bear River Cities.
- A potential new site for a major shopping center is where Iowa String Road meets U.S. 83

Residential

- The main residential zone utilized by Box Elder County is R-1. The minimum lot size with septic tank is ½ acre (20,000 sq. ft). Some areas have to go bigger, e.g., to account high water tables

Agricultural Land

- What are family farms now may not be in ten years. What options are available for these lands?
- We can anticipate and guide future developments of these lands or let it develop naturally which may result in more piecemeal and erratic developments.

To keep track of what the Planning Commission has done at other meetings, a summary of our progress is summarized below. Ultimately, all this information will make its way into a handout for citizens who attend the open houses and town meetings.

<p>Major Questions –</p>	<p>Growth is coming –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will it be here? • What will happen with the farm land once the farmer does not want to farm anymore? • How do we provide for our children? Where will they live? Will they have jobs? Services? • How can we work together to plan for the future? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Large Federal lands? – Environmentally? – Transportation? – Housing? – Open spaces? – Jobs? • How will we afford the future? Residential does not pay its own way • What do you see? What do you fear?
<p>Who is the Planning Commission?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven citizens and property owners like yourself <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – They must be residents of the County – They are appointed by the County Commission – Their responsibility is to advise the Commission in land use matters – Their planning and zoning responsibilities focus on the health, safety, and welfare of the community
<p>What is Planning?</p>	<p>Deciding where these will go and how they relate to each other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets • Parks, trails and other open spaces • Housing • Historic resources • Environmentally sensitive areas • Agriculture • Commercial services • Manufacturing

<p>Why zoning?</p>	<p>We need to work together –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect our County from the negative impacts of development • To guide growth that we know is coming • To maintain our quality of life • To assure efficient and safe traffic movements • To preserve environmentally sensitive areas • To protect property values • To enhance economic development efforts
<p>Why zoning now?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is serious growth coming our way. This is an opportunity to get ahead of the game. • The Planning Commission is the right entity to address this problem with your help. • We feel the way we are approaching the problem, the way we are going about it, is reasonable, sensible, and responsible. • We do listen, and we do care about your concerns. • We want to hear from you.

Setting Up For the Open Houses

Stakeholders

Notice to: property owners
 General public
 Chamber members
 Churches

Format for the Open Houses - options

- Look at maps: land use, questions, master plan
- Illustrations to review and comment
- Information public hearing
- Establish an advisory group

Process

- Open houses
- Advisory Committee
- Open house w/ policy and zoning options
- Public hearing before Planning Commission
- Public hearing before County Commission

Handout

- Why zoning?
- Who is the Planning Commission: responsibilities, list of individuals
- What is the process
- Procedures for the meeting
- Map of area
- Zoning terms and choices
- What are the benefits to the citizen? Property owner? Parents?

Timing: enough time to get used to it, not too long they lose interest in it

Review with Planning Commission and County Commission

- Procedural and Substantive Due Process
- How to deal with controversy
- Procedures for the meeting
- Process
- What they can expect from staff