

Minutes of the Work Session of the Ogden Valley Planning Commission for April 26, 2022. To join the meeting, please navigate to the following weblink at, <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85703169095>, the time of the meeting, commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Ogden Valley Planning Commissioners Present: Trevor Shuman, Chair; Shanna Francis, Vice Chair, Jeff Burton, John (Jack) Howell, Dayson Johnson, Jared Montgomery, Justin Torman.

Absent/Excused: None

Staff Present: Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner; Scott Perkes, Planner; Courtlan Erickson, Legal Counsel; Marta Borchert, Office Specialist.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**
- **Roll Call:**

Chair Shuman asked if anyone had any ex parte communication or conflict of interest to declare. No disclosures were made.

Chair Shuman then rearranged the agenda; he moved to agenda item six and invited Planning Director Grover to provide his comments about John Lewis, who recently resigned from the Ogden Valley Planning Commission. Mr. Grover reported Mr. Lewis has served as a member of the Commission since 2016, serving as Vice Chair and Chair for several years. He has provided a great deal of time and effort to serving the Ogden Valley through his position on the Commission. He always allowed public input on the items being considered by the Commission and conducted meetings very effectively and professionally. He then noted that the vacancy created by Mr. Lewis's resignation was advertised and the County received two applications. The County Commission selected Dayson Johnson to serve as a member of the Commission. Before any member of the Commission can serve as a member of the Commission, they must receive specific training and that has been conducted. Planning staff has also been working closely with Mr. Johnson to bring him up to speed on items before the Commission at this time.

Chair Shuman then read Mr. Lewis's letter of resignation for the record; he echoed Mr. Grover's gratitude to Mr. Lewis for his diligent service and thanked him for always striving for responsible planning.

Chair Shuman then reported that item two, Commission training, will follow item three.

1. Approval of Minutes for February 15, 2022.

Chair Shuman announced there have been no corrections or edits suggested for the minutes and he declared them approved as presented.

3. Petitions, Applications, and Public Hearings: Administrative Items.

3.1 ZTA 2021-07: Discussion and potential action on an application to amend the Form-Based Village zoning ordinance, along with other sections of the Weber County Land Use Code, to add provisions and exhibits intended to create a Nordic Valley Village Area. *Staff Presenters: Scott Perkes & Charlie Ewert*

Planner Perkes noted Planning staff has received a great deal of public input regarding this application from 28 individuals; this input has been summarized within the supporting documentation for the item. He then summarized a staff memo regarding the application to amend the Form-Based Village Zoning Ordinance to add provisions and exhibits intended to create a Nordic Valley Village Area; the memo provided a comparison of the most recent version of the draft ordinance amendments with those that were initially presented to the Commission on March 22.

Commissioner Burton cited a proposed ordinance amendment that is specific to the Nordic Village; he asked if the ordinance can include other references to specific project areas. Mr. Perkes answered yes. Commissioner Burton asked if employee housing can be called out and regulations for specific project areas included. Mr. Perkes answered yes.

Commissioner Burton stated that bullet point 22 in the memo addresses hard-surfaced asphalt or concrete in parking areas. He stated in the past there has been discussion about using a material that would allow water to percolate through. He asked if that

has changed. Mr. Perkes answered no; the applicant has indicated a willingness to use a material that will allow water to percolate through; they will work with the County Engineer to identify a material that can be considered 'hard surface' to address concerns about muddy parking areas, but that will also allow water to percolate through. The Commission reviewed the language in the ordinance document that addresses hard surface parking areas. The indicated that traditional hard surface parking may be acceptable so long as there is an area nearby where run-off water can be stored and allowed to percolate into the ground; however, there was concern about pollutants that are collected as water runs off a hard surface parking area causing damage to the ground. Chair Shuman invited input from the property owner encouraging the amendments that would address the Nordic Valley Village Area regarding their ideas for parking surface.

Ronda Kippen, project manager for the Nordic Valley Team, stated she was shocked by the language regarding the hard surface parking throughout the project as this was not what has been discussed by the Team and Planning staff; her client's proposal is proposing to use asphalt or concrete in all commercial parking areas, but the temporary day skier parking lots would be similar to what is allowed under current code, which indicates that temporary parking lots are not required to be paved. She referenced several parking lots in the Valley that are not paved based upon this code language and stated that her client would like to be allowed to continue operating in that manner. She added that storm detention basins do not filter run-off water; rather, they only store the water and pollutants are allowed to percolate in the ground. She stated that she would like to reduce the footprint on the environment by reducing the amount of asphalted areas; her client would use an integrated grid parking format that would include pavers with grass growing between it; it is easy to maintain and is green throughout the spring, summer, and fall months. It also allows water to percolate into the ground. She asked that the Commission consider altering the language in the proposed ordinance to allow a varied type of parking area rather than strictly hard surface.

The Commission discussed the language in the document and focused on possible edits that would provide flexibility while addressing concerns expressed by the community about parking areas that turn to mud during the warmer months of the fall, winter, and spring. Commissioners acknowledged the presence of other parking areas in the Valley that are not asphalt or concrete, but that also do not turn into mud as does the current parking area at the Nordic Valley ski resort. They also debated the definition of hard surface with a focus on whether grid pavers mentioned by Ms. Kippen could qualify as hard surface parking. Planning Director Grover stated he would be comfortable with allowing that type of parking in the Nordic Valley Village Area, but not in other areas of the Valley that could be assigned this zoning designation. Commissioner Torman suggested that the ordinance read 'concrete, asphalt, or Engineer Division approved alternate surface' as qualifying for hard surface parking. Mr. Grover stated he feels that language is adequate. Commissioner Burton stated staff has communicated that the ordinance can include regulations specific to the Nordic Valley Village area without concern that the same regulations would be applied to other areas of the Valley.

Mr. Perkes then addressed the street regulating plan in the draft ordinance document; he oriented the Commission to renderings included in the ordinance document to familiarize them with the adjustments that have been made since the Commission's last review of the document.

Commissioner Johnson then cited references to a requirement to use a licensed architect for design of buildings in village areas but noted that State law requires an architect or structural engineer for residential projects. He suggested that the language be amended to indicate that a licensed architect not be required for residential lots in a village project. He stated this will ensure the County is conforming with State law. Chair Shuman asked Legal Counsel Erickson to look into the State law referenced by Commissioner Johnson and provide input regarding the proposed adjustment or whether the Commission can strike the language entirely and direct developers to rely upon State law governing such issues.

Discussion then shifted to the order of actions taken by the Council for projects such as the Nordic Valley Village area, after which Chair Shuman invited additional input from the Nordic Valley Team. There were no comments provided at this time.

Mr. Erickson then addressed the discussion regarding using a licensed architect for design of buildings in village areas; the State Code provides an exemption from licensure for an architect working on one- or two-family dwellings, including townhomes. There are also provisions under which an engineer can perform similar service without being licensed. As a general matter, the County has the authority to regulate matters above and beyond what is required by the State; however, he has not had enough time to review the State Law and his input should not be considered to be a definitive legal recommendation. He can research the matter further if the Commission does want a formal recommendation before taking action on the proposed ordinance. The Commission debated the matter and ultimately concluded to continue discussion of the matter following the receipt of public input.

Chair Shuman then invited public input, asking each commenter to limit their comments to two minutes.

Kimmy Wright stated he lives adjacent to the Nordic Valley ski resort; when he moved to area 45 years ago, he dreamed of a Nordic Valley Village. He is supportive of the Village concept and for the ski resort to be developed and improved. He believes the developer will address the water and sewer concerns, but he does not believe the ski resort itself is quite big enough to compliment the actual Village development.

Bruce McGill stated he has lived in the area since 1994. He noted the intent of a form-based code for the Village concept is to provide for an aesthetic transition from tall buildings in the village to nearby single-family homes. He noticed the developer has made a concession relating to the view shed for the area near Viking Drive by reducing the size/height of one of the multi-family buildings, but he does not feel that is enough. He recommended that the taller buildings be located near the base of the ski hill to protect the view of those that already live in the area, which would help to address concerns that have been expressed previously. He then addressed the southernmost roundabout near Viking Drive and Nordic Valley Way and recommended that it be moved further to the north to help to adequately disburse traffic away from existing single-family homes where many young children live.

Peggy Dillingbaker stated she is a 37-year resident of the Nordic Valley area and has been witness to two past attempts to rezone and redevelop the area. When she first heard about the small village concept, she was supportive; however, she does not think that the project that has been proposed meets the definition of 'small'. This project will contain 507 units, and that is not small for this area. She then noted that the presumption of the rezoning is concerning; if the County votes for the form-based village zone and assign it to 50 acres of space – one of the last remaining open spaces in the Ogden Valley – it will seem as if the action on the proposed development of the area will have been predetermined. She asked that the Commission hold off on making a vote tonight and take additional time to consider the plans that have been presented. She would prefer a plan that fits into the current zoning of the area.

Ron Gleeson stated he submitted information to staff prior to the meeting to express his concerns about this item. Specific to the form-based village concept, there is a concentration of buildings and multi-family units; he would like for the land use code to address lighting that is associated with a concentration of buildings. This would include the maximum number of lumens for any home or any light in a project area. This would help to preserve dark skies in the Valley. He referenced ordinances in other communities that are aimed at preserving dark skies.

Darren Robowski stated he has lived in Nordic Valley for seven years; he has been paying attention to this project for the last several months and has heard the many comments regarding the availability of water in the Valley. He referenced the comments made by the applicant regarding drilling into aquifers and noted the information included in those communications are not supported by a 1994 USGS, nor a 2019 UGS study regarding the aquifer under the Pineview Reservoir. He does not think the County is prepared to formulate requirements that address the depth of the aquifer when the information that has been presented by the applicant are not fact based.

Doug Weaver presented density calculations that could be allowed in a village project, emphasizing that the maximum density that could be allowed would be 14 times the current Nordic Valley density. He noted he lives on Viking Drive, and he identified areas surrounding him that are subject to future rezone that would allow a dramatic increase in density. He noted the existing development in the area conforms with the rural residential or estate lot definitions in the land use code; but they do not meet the definition of small, medium, or large residential areas at .07 to .5 acres in size. He stated that he feels the project threatens to erode the special rural character of the neighborhood; it is not needed in order for the village to be built at the base of the ski area and he is unsure the applicant even wants the zoning that is being contemplated. His understanding is that this proposal will impact the future zoning opportunities of the area and he wondered if it is a justification for the larger buildings that are being considered in the area. The text amendment should be considered concurrently with a rezone application as mentioned by Commissioner Francis and making a decision tonight would be very premature. He stated that he has performed an exercise to determine the potential impact that the text amendment could have on the entire Valley; he believes that there could be three village projects in a 1.2-mile radius. This is contrary to the communicated goal of the village concept, which is to consolidate development in one area. He stated public comments have been overwhelmingly in favor of increasing setbacks and reducing building heights, but he believes that minimum lot sizes are actually being removed from the text and this will impact people who live near the golf course. This will impact a homeowner's maintenance of their building and they will need to secure access to their own property through neighboring properties.

Jan Fulmer spoke to the regulations for short term rental properties; she stated she is unsure the County will be able to enforce the regulations requiring owner occupancy or use of a management company. She also addressed bonus density language in the Ogden Valley General Plan and indicated the word 'sparingly' is very subjective. Bonus development units were never supported by the public that participated in creation of the Plan; rather, they were added 'behind closed doors' by the County Commission.

Beth Austin stated she lives on Nordic Valley Drive and her greatest concern is the wide variety of permitted uses that would be allowed on the streets of Nordic Valley if the text amendment is approved. She stated that her zoning is FV-3, rather than a resort type of use, but her neighbors could apply for resort or village zoning that would allow so many different types of uses that would impact her and others' way of life. She added she does not understand how, if Nordic Valley Water rejected the form-based village zone, individual lot owners are to expect to have access to water. She is also concerned about uses that would be allowed in open spaces; these uses do not comply with the Ogden Valley General Plan, and they will impact the health, safety, and welfare of residents in the area.

Eric Van Arks stated he also lives in Nordic Valley Drive, and he read a letter that he wrote opposing the form-based village zoning; the letter communicated his concerns about the negative impact that a village project will have on the beauty of the area. There is no land more deserving of protection than the open space in this area and the overlay zoning would lead to the destruction of the open space; it will also be a catalyst for future projects and all open space will be in jeopardy. Once the open space land is developed, it is lost forever. He suggested removing form-based zoning from the list of options in Ogden Valley. Many people only see the open space from the road, but he encouraged everyone to visit it personally to gain a personal understanding of the environment that is home to many animals; it is beautiful and natural with unequaled peacefulness. The land is currently zoned O-1 and he asked that zoning designation be preserved.

Felice Quigley stated she is new to the Nordic Valley area after purchasing a home there a year ago. She has actively monitored this proposal and she is not opposed to development; she understands residents cannot restrict a property owner's right to develop and built upon their land as that is every property owner's option and right. However, the residents of an existing neighborhood should be able to comment on what is important to them. There are 300 residents of an existing community, and they are concerned with how their properties will be impacted; one of the things that should be considered is that this may not be the most appropriate zoning for the subject property. When the developer first made application for zoning, he requested DRR-2 zoning because DRR-1 was limited to 100 acres. She suggested that the County and the applicant revert to that idea rather than trying to force form-based village zoning into an area that has been established for many years.

Larry Irvin stated he has prepared an analysis of the form-based village concept and the reasons that it is inappropriate for the subject property; he feels many of the proposed text amendments are an attempt to shoehorn the Nordic Valley area into a form-based village concept because it does not fit naturally. Nordic Valley stands out notably from the other potential village locations on the General Plan Map, primarily because it is the only location that relies heavily on currently zoned open space for a significant portion of the building development. Total development size is over 500 acres, but the majority of the building will occur in the 54 acres across the road from the current Nordic ski facility, of which 40 acres is currently zoned open space. It is hard to imagine a high-density proposal getting as far as it has based on the concept of converting this much open space, but that would happen if the form-based village is assigned to the property. Open space will be physically consumed by high density development and will dramatically alter the area in a manner much different than the other proposed village locations.

Robbie Kunz stated one thing that residents are concerned about how the form based village zone will impact their properties; he understands that he and his neighbors have the opportunity to become part of the village zone for their own properties, but it does not seem like a viable option for them primarily because most of the homes in the area are on one acre and there are difficulties with water and septic infrastructure on lots of that size. Lot sizes will be reduced to half or quarter acre in size and that is something that the existing residents cannot support; the form-based village will not work as designed on those lots because there is not sufficient space to provide for proper transition between larger lots and smaller lots.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard.

Commission discussion centered on the timing of potential zone changes, with Mr. Ewert noting that is not to be determined tonight; the matter before the Commission this evening is whether to adopt the text that creates the Nordic Village Area. The zone would not be applied to any property tonight, but an application for the zoning will be presented to the Commission at a future meeting. If a neighboring property owner would like to pursue a similar zone change, they would need to submit their own application. Each application would be considered on its own merits and the Planning Commission would be the body

recommending an action to the County Commission. He then presented a map to orient the Commission to the areas that have been designated as being appropriate for small area plans in the General Plan. He also identified the areas that have been identified as being suitable for village projects; however, the boundaries of the villages have not been specified.

Commissioner Burton asked if there is any reason the form-based zone could be applied only to the Nordic Valley resort area. Mr. Ewert answered no. Commissioner Burton clarified that any adjoining property owner could also pursue the zoning and make their property part of a village project.

Chair Shuman stated that he lives in a zone that requires three-acre residential parcels and he likened the concept of someone applying for the form-based village zoning to him seeking commercial zoning on his property; the hurdles that the applicant will need to get over are fairly significant and assigning the zoning is not a given for any applicant. Mr. Ewert stated that is correct. Commissioner Francis noted the difference is that the Nordic Valley resort project will be built on open space and that is the matter that is concerning residents. Mr. Ewert stated that is correct and he sympathizes with existing residents.

Mr. Ewert then provided a high-level explanation of the process the applicant will follow to pursue a zone change and seek a transfer of development rights (TDR) to their property; this led to philosophical discussion among the Commission regarding their concerns and the concerns of the residents about the form-based village zone and TDR actions. Mr. Ewert responded to several comments and questions from residents, namely focusing on the areas designated for village projects; overall density of village projects and the Valley as a whole; infrastructure improvements; lighting restrictions in an effort to preserve dark skies; adequacy of water and health of the Pineview aquifer; the relationship between and timing of the form based village zone ordinance and the imminent application for the zone for the Nordic Valley project; the role of planning staff in assisting a developer through various development processes; permitted uses in the zone; and previous plans for the open space near the ski resort and developed residential neighborhood. Discussion then shifted to the present development options available to the developer under the current zoning; Mr. Ewert offered a comparison of the present development options with the option that the developer pursued and for which they are seeking to change the zoning of the property. He stated it is his opinion that the development that the developer is pursuing under the form-based village zone is much better, at least from an environmental perspective, than current development options. Additionally, the Planning Commission will have a great deal more input on the development plans under the form-based village zone than under the present zoning. If the developer were to prove they are able to meet all requirements of the current zoning, the County could not legally deny them from proceeding. He added that he feels the applicant is sympathetic to the concerns that have been expressed by residents and have made several modifications to their original plan; he believes they will continue to work with the community to improve the plan.

Commissioner Burton asked if the Nordic Valley Form Based Village Zoning will be available to other areas of the Valley or if it will only be allowed in the property around the ski resort. Mr. Ewert stated that it will only be an option for the area that has been identified in the Ogden Valley General Plan, which is the area around Nordic Valley; however, that is not just the property that is owned by the applicant, and it includes other properties.

Commissioner Howell moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission for application ZTA 2021-07, application to amend the Form-Based Village zoning ordinance along with other sections of the Weber County Land Use Code, to add provisions and exhibits intended to create a Nordic Valley Village Area, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Commissioner Torman seconded the motion.

Commissioner Burton offered a friendly amendment; page 59 of the ordinance discusses improved hard surface parking space and the applicant asked for an adjustment to that language. Commissioner Howell stated he will accept that amendment. Commissioner Francis added that she would like to modify the street map for the area. Chair Shuman stated the map is intended to be general in nature rather than definitive for any potential applicant to interpret as the only option. He stated he is not sure that an amendment to the street map is necessary. Commissioner Francis stated that the map will be on record and should provide all viewers with a legal expectation regarding the streets in the project area. Legal Counsel Erickson stated that the map will communicate the street classifications that would be present if someone were to change zoning to the Form Based Village Zone, but they could ask for a variation from the map to change a street classification. Chair Shuman added that would be a legislative action. Planning Director Grover agreed; the Form Based Village Zone will essentially create a small area plan as called for in the General Plan; it will define land uses for that area in ordinance form.

Mr. Ewert offered suggestions for the street classification map that he believes the applicant would be comfortable with. Mr. Erickson offered the Commission with guidance on the proper procedure/motion to make to pursue a change to the ordinance

document. He suggested the Commission discuss all potential changes to the ordinance rather than considering friendly amendments to the motion made by Commissioner Howell.

Chair Shuman then facilitated discussion among the Commission regarding the amendments to the ordinance that a majority of the Commission supports. The Commission discussed amendments to the text regarding hard surface parking improvements and licensed architect requirements, but Mr. Erickson advised that the Commission vote on the original motion as it does not include any amendments to the ordinance documents as presented.

Chair Shuman called for a vote on the original motion. Commissioner Howell voted aye. Commissioners Francis, Burton, Johnson, Montgomery, Shuman, and Torman voted nay. (Motion failed 6-1).

Commission discussion on potential text amendments continued; Commissioner Francis stated she would like to see amendments to the street layout map. Chair Shuman refocused on amendments to the hard surface parking text and licensed architect requirements. The Commission debated whether to strike the entirety of Section 104-22-6.2(a) or just the words "licensed architect" from both sub items (a) and (b). Commissioner Johnson noted that the stricken language could be replaced with language requiring compliance with Utah State Law regarding design. Mr. Ewert suggested the Commission take a poll to determine if there is support for each individual text amendment before making a motion. Chair Shuman stated polled the Commission regarding proposed changes to sub items (a) and (b) as follows:

- (a) ~~Licensed architect required. In each village area, buildings shall be designed by a licensed architect.~~ A building's street-facing facade shall be designed to have a base, body, and cap, each of varying design features and building material. At least one of the building materials used on the building facade shall also be used on all other sides of the building.
- (b) ~~Modification of standards. After receiving recommendation from a licensed architect,~~ The planning commission may allow minor modifications to the applicability of the standards in this section as long as it results in a design that better aligns with the intent of the design theme and blends well with the design of adjacent buildings.

There were four Commissioners who supported the text amendments specified above.

Chair Shuman then discussed the street layout map and asked Commissioner Francis what specifically she would like to address. Commissioner Francis stated she would like to address the overreach of the map into existing neighborhoods. Commissioner Torman stated that he is concerned about changing the map as it is the result of years and years of work by County staff. Chair Shuman added that the map is similar to the directives in the General Plan; it is just a tool to offer some guidance to the reader of the Plan, but it does not necessarily mean that the streets included on the map will eventually come to fruition. Mr. Ewert stated that it is actually a bit different than a General Plan exhibit; if the street map is adopted and someone applies for a rezone, they will proceed with the roads as identified on the map. Chair Shuman stated that would only be the case after an applicant moves through the legislative process to secure a certain zone and subsequent street designation. Mr. Ewert stated that is correct; if someone desired a different street designation, they would need to submit an application to amend the map. Commissioner Francis stated that means a resident would need to submit such an application to change a street classification due to concerns of the impact a certain type of street will have on their property; the cost to pursue a text amendment is \$1,000. This led to high level discussion and debate among the Commission and staff regarding the process of amending the street layout map and the impact that the map could have on existing and future development, after which Mr. Erickson explained the role the map plays in certain development processes. He indicated that if the Commission approves the map as part of the ordinance, it is essentially like 'zoning' for streets; if someone desires a different 'zone' for their street, they will need to submit a formal application to the Planning Commission, which would be a recommending body to the County Commission.

Chair Shuman polled the Commission to determine who is in favor of amending the street designation map.

Commissioner Burton then discussed employee housing; he likes the idea of a commercial operator being able to house their employees on the site and he pictures employee housing as apartments rather than houses. He proposed that the text in the ordinance be changed to communicate that less than five percent of the total housing in the project will be for the employees of the Nordic Valley resort and will not count towards overall density of the project. This led to Commission discussion and debate regarding the appropriate amount of employee housing in a village project and the difference between employee housing and affordable housing. Mr. Perkes indicated that the County will need to adjust general guidelines relating to affordable housing in order to comply with State legislation regarding the matter. Tonight, the Commission can take action on a cap for the total

amount of employee housing that can be included in a village project, specifically the Nordic Valley village, and the specifics of how the employee housing will be governed can be handled via a development agreement for the project.

Commissioner Burton moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission for application ZTA 2021-07, application to amend the Form-Based Village zoning ordinance along with other sections of the Weber County Land Use Code, to add provisions and exhibits intended to create a Nordic Valley Village Area, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, and with the following amendments:

1. Section 104-22-9(a) Parking required, line 842, shall be amended to state “all parking lots shall be hard-surface asphalt or concrete, or other improved hard surface, as approved by the Weber County Engineering and Fire Departments.
2. Section 104-22-6.2(a) & (b), as follows:
 - a. ~~Licensed architect required. In each village area, buildings shall be designed by a licensed architect. A building's street-facing facade shall be designed to have a base, body, and cap, each of varying design features and building material. At least one of the building materials used on the building facade shall also be used on all other sides of the building.~~
 - b. ~~Modification of standards. After receiving recommendation from a licensed architect, the~~ The planning commission may allow minor modifications to the applicability of the standards in this section as long as it results in a design that better aligns with the intent of the design theme and blends well with the design of adjacent buildings.
3. Section 104-22-11 shall be amended for Nordic Valley only to provide for a maximum of five percent bonus density for Nordic Village employee housing who earn less than 80 percent of the County median income as an incentive to house employees on-site rather than having them commute and create a demand on transportation infrastructure. The details of this provision shall be set forth in a development agreement for the project.

Commissioner Torman seconded the motion. Commissioners, Burton, Howell, Johnson, Montgomery, Shuman, and Torman all voted aye. Commissioner Francis voted nay. (Motion carried 6-1).

Chair Shuman thanked the public for their involvement in this process; their thoughtful input helped the Commission to modify the proposed ordinance in a meaningful way.

2. Training.

Chair Shuman indicated the training planned for this meeting will be provided in a future meeting due to the late hour.

3. Public comment for items not on the agenda.

Ron Gleeson reminded everyone that April 22-30 is “International Dark Sky Week”; this is a great reminder for everyone to get out and enjoy the dark skies of the Ogden Valley. He referenced the website darksky.org to give people ideas of things they can do and enjoy with their families to enjoy the night.

Doug Weaver clarified that tonight the Commission was voting on a text amendment that was included in the public notice for this meeting; but they also voted on a land use map amendment and that was not part of the public notice. He stated the Commission needs to recognize this is a very big issue and neither the residents or the applicant were asking for or promoting the idea of changing the zoning for the neighborhood and he wondered the driving force behind that action. He stated that it seems that this is being promoted by the Planning Staff, though Mr. Ewert declared that he has no pride in authorship in the document and map amendment. He stated the village node in the Ogden Valley General Plan was not perceived by the public to overtake the existing community; rather, it was intended to be a village node at the base of the ski area, and no one envisioned it growing beyond that. He noted that if the street map extends beyond the proposed base area, he would propose that the text be further amended to prohibit ‘leap frogging’ relative to zone changes. He is discouraged by the amount of time the Commission spent talking about issues that are already regulated by the State of Utah, but there was no time spent on very important issues that will impact the residents who reside in close proximity to the Nordic Valley resorts.

also referenced the action taken by the Commission tonight; he understands the Ogden Valley will continue to grow and he is not opposed to the village concept, but there are many matters that have not been adequately considered by the

Commission. In Nordic Valley, it would be nice to have an understanding of the realistic potential residential growth in the area. In other areas of the County, unit transference is more feasible while maintaining overall density, but in the Nordic Valley region, the vast majority of the density is being transferred from the ski resort. The 2016 General Plan addresses density and the 2019 Utah Geological Study addressing water provides information regarding drilling laterally to get and pump water to the area. The overall plan to serve the best interest of the public should consider the overall economic picture for the Valley. He thinks the area will be great, but he thinks that actions that are being taken regarding the ordinance and potential land use applications are being rushed.

4. Remarks from Planning Commissioners.

There were no additional remarks from Planning Commissioners.

5. Planning Director Report.

Mr. Grover reported on the recent actions of the County Commission.

6. Remarks from Legal Counsel.

Mr. Erickson apologized if any of the counsel he provided during the discussion of application ZTA 2021-07 was confusing to the Commission or the public.

Meeting Adjourned: The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Brown

Weber County Planning Commission