

**WORK SESSION OF THE
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL TO
REVIEW THE GENERAL PLAN
November 3, 2016
6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	Tyler Vincent	Mayor
	DJ Bott	Councilmember
	Alden Farr	Councilmember
	Ruth Jensen	Councilmember
	Tom Peterson	Councilmember
	Mark Thompson	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Mark Bradley	City Planner
	Mary Kate Christensen	City Recorder
	Paul Larsen	Economic Development Director
	Kirk Morgan	City Attorney
	Mike Nelsen	Police Chief
	Derek Oyler	Finance Manager
	Tyler Pugsley	Public Works Director
	Jason Roberts	City Administrator

Mr. Bradley came forward and introduced Jake Young and John Janson from Silver Solutions.

Mr. Janson stated that they had a long public outreach program, which included focus groups, online surveys, open houses and public hearings. This is a 20-year plan.

One of the questions asked was what residents would like to see more of. The results were:

- ◆ Jobs and industry
- ◆ Recreation and trails
- ◆ More local businesses
- ◆ Better maintained properties
- ◆ Art

The vision that came out of this process is, “Brigham City will continue to be the Hub City in Box Elder County with a vibrant downtown and a diverse tax base of large and small businesses.”

Following is a summary of the items discussed in the proposed general plan.

- ◆ Some areas previously designated as open space were changed to agricultural.
- ◆ Additional connecting roads.
- ◆ There is a chapter on Main Street and nodes, as well as parking lots.
- ◆ Addresses poorly maintained housing.
- ◆ Includes a Bicycle Master Plan.
- ◆ Proposed new parks in the north and south area of town.
- ◆ Additional trails.
- ◆ East bench hillsides.
- ◆ Public services, including secondary water.
- ◆ Annexation Plan

The rest is very similar to the current plan.

Councilmember Peterson said he would like to see the property currently zoned agricultural south of Forest to 1100 South zoned commercial. It would save a step for the development when it happens. He also asked if it was changed to commercial if it would affect property taxes. Mr. Janson explained that this is a recommending document, and does not set the zoning, it is just the plan. The final document is the zoning map. He added that if it were zoned commercial, it would probably increase property taxes. Mr. Young said he has heard of the zoning in the general planning increasing taxes; it depends on the county assessor.

Councilmember Farr said he attended a land use training session, and one of the main things they discussed was building a road to nowhere for a business. This leaves the City with the service area until more businesses come. He felt it would be better to have a step-by-step buildout.

Mr. Janson said this was discussed during the process. In the terms of long-term potential it makes sense. However, is it important to do it now? They felt that there isn't much demand for what the City has now, so adding to it didn't make sense. Councilmember Peterson said there isn't much demand for it because it is not on 1100 South or near the freeway.

Mayor Vincent invited Julianna Larsen to the table. Ms. Larsen expressed concern with Mr. Janson's comment regarding open space and how it has remained open, and that there may need to be some change to the agricultural areas, and maybe some designations moved to commercial and/or manufacturing. She said nobody bothered to talk to them. This property has been in her husband's family since 1952. It has been summer pasture for their cattle. It also provides open space for public service requirements, which includes secondary water systems. If their property is changed to commercial, they will be kicked out of business because their taxes will increase and it will be cost prohibitive to pay their taxes.

Ms. Larsen read from a letter she plans to give to the Mayor and Council. It states that the general plan has been in the development stages for over a year, and she felt the consultants have done their best to project and include theirs and other's ideas for the development of this community. In an effort to do this they used various medians, meetings, surveys, etc. However, as the Larsens became aware of the process, it was nearly at its completion stages. As development formats solidified in the plan, the Larsens believe that the farmers in the community were not clearly informed, nor were their ideas or input sought. When they first read the proposed general plan, they discovered a change in the proposed usage designation of their property from A-5 to rural-residential, all without any consideration or consultation from them. They also found information in the plan which contains inaccurate information that has no relation to the issue. On October 11, they were advised by the City Administration that they were aware of the changes in the document and that the changes were probably not something the Larsens would like; however, they did not communicate with them. From October 11 through November 3 they have only had email communication with anyone except the Mayor regarding the issues. They continue to hear offers of what the Administration, planners and staff can do for them, still missing the listening piece as to what they would like to see happen to their property while still respecting property rights of others. The Larsens would like an opportunity to discuss this with the Mayor and Council and find a mutually agreeable solution.

The Larsens were also concerned about the statement in the plan that states that, "*west of the tracks there are a large number of rural residential lots. These lots are five acres or larger. These residential lots are in the vicinity of important job generating manufacturing and businesses and such uses as the waste treatment plant. Quite often industrial uses and treatment plants conflict with residential living.*" Ms. Larsen said their house has been by the treatment plant for 14 years. They have never complained about the treatment plant. She continued reading from the plan, "*related to the residential versus industrial-manufacturing land use conflicts is the use of additional rural-residential west of the tracks in the old five acre plat area. The issue is that some residents would like the City to provide services to existing and proposed rural-residential lots. In general, cities are best at servicing larger, more dense neighbors and*

generally it is not financially feasible to provide the same level of service to large lot rural-residential uses as compared to more standard sized lots in the City. The services include: water, sewer, road servicing, road maintenance, sidewalks and snowplowing.”

Ms. Larsen presented a proposed agreement between the Larsens and the City. They feel that they have not been heard. Not only did they not know that the R-R designation was on the plat map, but it takes away their ability to keep it agricultural.

Mr. Janson explained that the old plan had manufacturing for this property, so the new plan is a concession to that area, realizing what the use was. There is not much distinction between rural-residential and A-5 zones. The permitted uses and the conditional uses are very similar. There are more conditional uses in the rural-residential zone. He added that if the City wants to change it to agriculture, he did not think it would be a significant difference as far as planning is concerned.

Another work session to discuss the general plan is schedule for December 1, 2016.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.

The undersigned duly appointed Recorder for Brigham City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the November 3, 2016 Work Session.

Dated this 1st day of December 2016.

Mary Kate Christensen
Mary Kate Christensen, Recorder