

Minutes of the Meeting of the Weber County Planning Commission for June 2, 2026, Weber County Commission Chambers, 2380 Washington Boulevard 1st Floor, the time of the meeting commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Weber Planning Commissioners Present: Andrew Favero (Chair), Casey Neville (Vice Chair), Cami Clontz, Kyle “KC” Lindsey, Jed McCormick, and Sara Wichern

Excused: Commissioner Wayne Andreotti

Staff Present: Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner; Felix Lleverino, Planner; Liam Keogh, Legal Counsel; Marta Borchert, Planner Technician.

Roll Call: Chair Favero conducted roll call and indicated Commissioner Andreotti has been excused from the meeting; all other Commissioners were present.

1. Minutes: May 5, 2026

Chair Favero called for any corrections or amendments to the minutes; none were noted and Chair Favero declared the minutes approved as submitted.

2. Administrative items:

2.1 UVP040926: Request for preliminary subdivision approval of the Prado at Powder Mountain Subdivision Phase 3, a 17-lot subdivision located in the DRR-1 zone located at the end of Summit Pass Road in Eden. Staff Presenter: Felix Lleverino

Principal Planner Charlie Ewert introduced the item as an administrative matter, noting that approval is required so long as the applicant meets all applicable code requirements, and that the item is not subject to a public hearing or public comment period.

Mr. Erik Anderson, 3699 West 1400 South, addressed the Commission on behalf of Powder Mountain. He presented the Prado at Powder Mountain Phase 3 subdivision plat, described the project's context within the broader Powder Mountain development, and noted its continuity with previously approved Prado Phases 1 and 2. The proposed subdivision includes 17 single-family residential lots ranging from 2.1 to 4.5 acres, located southeast of Summit Pass Road in the DRR-1 zone. The right-of-way for the proposed private road is 66 feet wide with a 26-foot asphalt surface and curb and gutter totaling 31 feet, with 17.5 feet on each side allocated for snow storage. Mr. Anderson noted that five fire turnarounds have been approved by the Weber Fire District and that all dead-end road segments are 750 linear feet or less, consistent with the adopted 2021 International Fire Code.

Planner Tammy Aydelotte presented the staff report. She confirmed that the subdivision is located within a geologic hazard study area and a natural hazards overlay zone, and that the applicant has submitted the required geotechnical report. She noted that the proposed road rights-of-way, while shown as public on the preliminary plat, are intended to be private, and that this discrepancy would be corrected prior to final plat submission. Ms. Aydelotte drew the Commission's attention to two recurring issues with Powder Mountain subdivision applications: terminal dead-end streets and the master trails plan. Regarding terminal streets, staff has asked the applicant to provide written documentation demonstrating how the proposed cul-de-sacs comply with the county's terminal dead-end street ordinance, noting that the ordinance was adopted after the original development agreement was executed, creating some ambiguity. Staff recommended that this documentation be required as a condition of final subdivision approval. Regarding trails, Ms. Aydelotte indicated that some proposed lot configurations may encroach upon existing public trail alignments, and staff requested an updated master trails plan prior to any further development applications.

Chair Favero and Vice Chair Neville asked clarifying questions about the terminal street standards and the proximity of adjacent roads. Ms. Aydelotte and Mr. Ewert explained that Powder Mountain has consistently cited topographical constraints as the basis for not connecting roads, and that the county's ordinance may or may not apply given the pre-existing development agreement. Mr. Ewert noted that if the applicant submits a defensible legal analysis supporting their compliance, staff would be prepared to move forward; alternatively, the development agreement itself might need to be revisited.

Significant discussion arose regarding fire safety and evacuation. Commissioners noted that Powder Mountain is served by a single primary access road and expressed concern about the cumulative effect of permitting additional density under such conditions.

Mr. Ewert confirmed that the Weber Fire District has required the developer to construct and equip a fire station on-site, that all structures are required to be fully sprinklered, and that Powder Mountain has consistently submitted emergency evacuation plans with each subdivision application, including designated helicopter egress areas. Mr. Ewert acknowledged that the fire district has expressed concern about dead-end streets but noted that state law limits the authority of fire officials to impose requirements beyond the International Fire Code.

Vice Chair Neville raised the question of whether approval should be withheld pending receipt of an updated trails plan. After discussion, staff and legal counsel indicated that because this is an administrative item and the development agreement does not specify trail alignment with precision, the Commission does not have grounds to impose more specific trail requirements at this stage. The Commission was comfortable accepting the trails plan update as a condition of final approval, rather than as a prerequisite to preliminary approval.

Staff recommended approval of the application subject to five recommended conditions, including: demonstration of compliance with the terminal dead-end street ordinance, submission of an updated master trails plan, adherence to geotechnical report recommendations during construction, resolution of engineering comments with Weber County Engineering, and standard final subdivision application requirements.

Commissioner Wichern moved to approve LVP040926, preliminary subdivision approval of the Prado at Powder Mountain Subdivision Phase 3, a 17-lot subdivision located in the DRR-1 zone, located at the end of Summit Pass Road in Eden, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Commissioner McCormick seconded the motion. Commissioners Clontz, Lindsey, McCormick, Wichern, Vice Chair Neville, and Chair Favero voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 6-0).

3. Legislative items:

3.1 ZTA2026-03: A hearing for the consideration of a proposed amendment to the Form Based Zone's West Weber Street Regulating Plan, Section 104-22-8 of the Weber County Code. *Staff Presenter: Charlie Ewert*

Principal Planner Mr. Ewert introduced the item as a legislative matter, noting that the Commission's role is to make a recommendation to the County Commission rather than render a final decision. Mr. Ewert briefly described the proposed map amendment, which refines the West Weber Street Form Based Zone regulating plan by shifting the village center designation slightly westward and providing greater definition to the boundaries between zone designations. The Commission noted that substantial work had been done on this item in prior work sessions.

Chair Favero opened the public hearing.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Lindsey moved to forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission regarding application ZTA2026-03, proposed amendment to the Form Based Zone's West Weber Street Regulating Plan, Section 104-22-8 of the Weber County Code, with the following findings:

1. The amendment will further implement the general plan for the area;
2. The amendment will advance small area planning for the area;
3. The amendment is needed to make the map consistent with the recently amended form-based zoning text; and
4. The amendment will advance the health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

Commissioner Clontz seconded the motion. Commissioners Clontz, Lindsey, McCormick, Wichern, Vice Chair Neville, and Chair Favero voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 6-0).

4. Public Comment for items not on the agenda:

There were no public comments.

5. Remarks from Planning Commissioners:

Vice Chair Neville raised two items. First, he noted for the record that the Form Based Zone map amendment approved under Item 3.1, while disposed of quickly at the meeting, was the product of extensive work session deliberation by staff and the

Commission. Second, Vice Chair Neville asked for clarification on whether the Commission is required to formally solicit conflict-of-interest disclosures at the outset of each meeting. Legal Counsel Liam Keogh advised that there is no procedural requirement to do so at the start of every meeting; rather, individual commissioners bear the responsibility to voluntarily disclose any conflict and determine whether to participate in the relevant discussion. Mr. Keogh offered to conduct a refresher training on the matter.

6. Planning Director Report:

In Planning Director Grover's absence, Mr. Ewert reported that the comprehensive set of ordinance amendments the Commission had worked on during the first part of the year — totaling approximately 670 pages — was adopted by the County Commission the prior week. Staff is working to integrate the adopted language into the county code and publish it to the county website. Commissioners were advised to be aware that portions of the online code will be updated in the near term.

Mr. Ewert also provided an update on the Alfonsi development project, which had been presented to the County Commission in a work session. He reported that the project faces a significant infrastructure challenge: the preferred sewer connection route may not be feasible, and the developer is exploring alternatives, including constructing a gravity line to a distant trunk line or installing a new lift station. The County Commission has asked for a financial analysis to determine the cost differential and evaluate whether additional density or an extended timeline is warranted as compensation for the sewer infrastructure investment. Mr. Ewert noted that the developer is also in discussions with neighboring property owners about potential easement options for a more economical routing.

Chair Favero commented that this situation highlights a broader infrastructure planning issue in the area, noting that proactive coordination on sewer corridor routing — particularly along existing roads such as 1400 West and 2550 South — would reduce costs and complications for future development. Mr. Ewert agreed, acknowledging that the county holds responsibility for local sewer collection lines and that the existing sewer master plan was developed under different density assumptions and likely needs to be revisited. He noted that while County Commissioners have generally preferred to allow developers to resolve infrastructure challenges independently, there is growing recognition that a more coordinated, county-level approach may be necessary.

Mr. Ewert also relayed feedback from Commissioner Froerer regarding the design standards included in the motion for the Alfonsi project. He reported that Commissioner Froerer had initially understood the Planning Commission to have prohibited a specific architectural design, but Mr. Ewert clarified to the Commissioner that the motion had instead expanded the range of permissible designs rather than restricting them. Commissioner Brewer was reported to be satisfied with that clarification.

7. Remarks from Legal Counsel:

Legal Counsel Mr. Keogh did not have separate remarks beyond his earlier contribution on conflict-of-interest disclosures.

A brief discussion ensued among commissioners and staff regarding the county's ordinance requiring connection to a sewer line when one comes within 300 feet of a property. Mr. Ewert and Ms. Aydelotte noted that while the ordinance exists, it has not historically been enforced, and that state and health department standards do not appear to be as strict. The practical benefit of the ordinance, as noted by Mr. Ewert, is that the health department may decline to approve new septic systems where a sewer line is accessible, which effectively encourages connection without coercive enforcement.

A further exchange was prompted by Commissioner Wichern, who raised concerns about the use of pioneering agreements and proportionality arguments in developer negotiations. Mr. Keogh confirmed that development agreements are fully negotiable between the county and a developer, and that there is no statutory requirement for the county to reimburse a developer for infrastructure costs deemed disproportionate to their project. Mr. Ewert added that although some development agreements include provisions for exploring reimbursement mechanisms—such as Public Infrastructure Districts, Community Reinvestment Areas, or tax increment financing—the county has full authority to require developers to cover infrastructure costs as a condition of approval.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Brown

Weber County Planning Commission