

Minutes of the Western Weber Planning Commission meeting of December 11 2018, held in the Weber County Commission Chambers, 2380 Washington Blvd. Floor 1, Ogden UT at 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Blake Hancock – Chair; Jennifer Willener – Vice Chair; Gregory Bell, Jeanette Borklund; John Parke Andrew Favero

Members Excused: Bren Edward

Staff Present: Rick Grover, Planning Director; Charlie Ewert, Principle Planner; Matt Wilson, Legal Counsel; Kary Serrano, Secretary

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

1. Approval of minutes for November 13, 2018 meeting minutes

Chair Hancock approved the meeting minutes with the noted corrections.

- 2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:** None
- 3. Remarks from Planning Commissioners:** None
- 4. Planning Director Report:** None
- 5. Remarks from Legal Counsel:** None

6. Adjourn to Work Session:

Charlie Ewert said I am going to rearrange the order of the items. Work Session Items 3, 4, and 5 are applicant driven requests. We do have applicants for each one of these and I will walk you through and explained what they are.

WS 3: Discussion regarding Burton General Plan amendment

Charlie Ewert said this is the Burton General Plan amendment; and that one is for the south eastern area. There is the rezone we did for the elementary school. The zone was amended but the plan wasn't, and we should have encouraged them to amend their plan at the same time. The zone is consistent with the plan but their proposal is minor enough that we debated whether or not he needed an amended plan. It does mean that we relied heavily on the Ogden Valley consultants doing contract management with them. With some guidance, we would be looking at our consultants to provide some technical information beyond our daily experience. We will be doing more writing, formatting, and more working with the public; and reporting with the consultants.

Charlie Ewert said until the applicant gets here, I will represent the item. He reviewed the maps and explained where everything was located and what the applicant was requesting on the map. The applicant arrived and Mr. Ewert introduced Jeremy Yaggi; and continued with more information on the map.

Charlie Ewert said go to page 177; of the Southeast General Plan. This shows a detailed information of where they were platting on the streets. The solid black lines where the streets were in 1970, the red lines are where streets are now, and the dash lines were where they planned on having streets in the seventies. There is a through street that was provided but not where we thought it was. If you look at the green dash just above the school property, that's the cul-de-sac that we're talking about. Do we need a General Plan amendment, maybe not and that's why we wanted to run this through just to be sure that it complies with the General Plan? I do believe that we missed providing a sufficient through street on 5950 South. The stub that hangs off of 5950 doesn't currently connect, but there is a subdivision with a reserved right-of-way for future street attachment. Are we going to tear down this house to make a connection, or is it that important of a connection? If not, let make a minor adjustment on this map, and if you are comfortable, make this this as close to being into compliance. If you are comfortable, and this is close to being into compliance now.

Charlie Ewert said someone was taking some flexible interpretation of map at the time; but if you look there is still the same amount of dead end roads, cul-de-sacs, and connections. There's less efficient in connection in the way they have these streets; but that empty property centered on that map gets developed, that will be a good solid connection with the existing street, and our ordinance would require it. Director Grover asked Mr. Ewert to bring up that 5950 was to come down and connect in to Eastwood; that we would have an offset on the intersection, if we have a cul-de-sac it's not an issue. If its tied into 5950; that would be great, but with the homes already there, we can't. As staff we have talked about the challenges with traffic, and I would recommend not to require the connection here, unless we're looking at huge tax dollars here to negotiate with the School District to reconfigure the section so we're not tearing houses own. The code indicates that if there is a certain distance on the other side of the road between intersections; you are required to build a street.

The Planning Commission, Jeremy Yagi, and staff had a discussion about concerns with children walking home from schools, code requires pedestrian access for children, an easement is planned there, possibly having a gate, having a dedicated walkway for the kids, providing connection because of the school. The neighbor's primary concern is the increased traffic, especially during soccer games. It was suggested to do an adjustment in the plan that would be preferable. If that street connected to 5950, it would make things easier. The easement is connected all the way up to 5950 South. That intersection needs to be reconfigured as it could potentially have problems. They will probably have the connections that the neighborhood needs.

WS 4: Discussion regarding A-3 Zone Lot Averaging

Charlie Ewert said if you will remember that the County Commission changed the lot averaging in the A-1 and A-2 Zone. This proposal is to amend the A-3 Zone to allow for lot averaging there as well. We would stick with the same standards of no less than 20,000 sq. ft. and no less than 80 feet of lot width; and it would just be applicable in the A-3 Zone. The green area is the only zone that is being shown on this map; that's on the A-3 Zone is pretty far out west. That road that's on 4700 we just rezoned the property on, and the next one over is 5600 was zoned in the A-3 Zone. As we looked at the lot averaging, we didn't know that lot averaging would pick up traction as it did. The Planning Commission wasn't impressed with the idea and recommended it not be included in the ordinance; the County Commission thought we need some extra development tools so included that in. Without the Planning Commission recommendation, it was fully vetted. We only did A-1 and A-2 Zone, because there was an interested party asking for A-1 and A-2. Now that we're being asked by an applicant to extend it to the A-3, and I have been working on this. There's a few things that we will be asking if lot averaging does get passed; that certain nodes be placed on the plat. It will need to say, *"This is a lot averaging subdivision; any redevelopment of this needs to go back and find what those originals were, so we don't accidentally re-dividing any of that stuff."*

Charlie Ewert clarified what lot averaging is and what works. In the A-3 Zone, that allows for two acre residential lots, the overall average of all the lots in the subdivision can't be less than two acres; and the overall lot width, cannot be less than 150 feet. Even though you can have some lots, if lot averaging gets implemented in the A-3, it would be 20,000 sq. ft. and 80 feet wide. One of the drawbacks is not having much ability to cluster homes into a smaller footprint. My anticipation is to be doing lot averaging for people who already have frontage on an existing road, and not doing a ton of road building. If you have bigger lots elsewhere that could potentially sustain agriculture. When we went to the Ogden Valley Plan, I asked the Planning Commission and the public; do you want to preserve your agrarian lifestyle, because you believe you have an agrarian lifestyle, or do you want one because it's disappearing. Is it about open space, or about doing agriculture on these properties? The question was difficult because in Ogden Valley it's more about view shed; and the agricultural was the tool they used for someone to have a viable use of their property.

The Planning Commission and staff had a discussion and about questions about lot sizes and if the maximum lots are bigger, so should the minimum be larger too. There were some issues with the lot averaging comes in, that it doesn't preserve any type of agricultural. There was a question about having an ordinance that allows to have a home in a section where the agriculture land could be preserved. Lot averaging was not a tool used to prevent agriculture. We need to incentivize land when we run out of agricultural lands out there. Agricultural lands in the western part of Weber County is condensed where anyone doing agricultural for an occupation is rapidly coming to an end. We need to provide a balance so we don't push people out of agricultural; and there was a concern about changing it to A-2, until staff does a General Plan amendment. It was suggested to make this part of the Master Plan and get input from the public. There was a discussion about lot averaging

reducing lot to less than half acre is not increasing density, its increasing building density. People who live in the A-3 Zone is agriculture, but they live there for the view and not just the agriculture. It was suggested to move forward with the General Plan; there might be more options in the future.

WS 5: Discussion regarding Solar Farm in the A-3 Zone

Charlie Ewert said this is a photovoltaic solar generation is allowed in the M-3 Zone. There is a question whether we're going to allow it in the A-3 Zone. We do have an applicant who is looking at a couple of different pieces of property. If this gets changed to allow these kinds of solar farms in the A-3 Zone; and they are suggesting that it's on at least 200 acres. So they have 200 acres or more in the A-3 Zone, they are amenable to setbacks, berms, landscaping, and all sorts of things we can do. My thoughts for a better way to preserve open space, we can't farm it, and the properties they are looking at have a high salt content, they can't do much with that property. The applicant is trying to obscure the view of these solar panels as much as they possibly can; whether that be with berming, or keeping significant distance from other homes in the area.

Charlie Ewert said I did reach to a few of my colleagues; Duchene County, Iron County, and a few other counties have a robust code for this. I was surprised that we don't have one, considering we do allow these kinds of solar farms to exist in the M-3 Zone. The applicant is proposing a conditional use permit in the A-3 Zone as well. Director Grover said that if this does become a conditional use, it can't be denied, so if they didn't want a solar farm in this area, don't make it a conditional use because it is permitted with conditions. Mr. Ewert said the conditions need to be related to actual criteria that exists in your ordinance. Our ordinance talks about not creating extra demand on government resources and services, substantial compliance with the General Plan, and environmental care. My suggestion with this type of use, that we put more standards very specific to this kind of use. He stated they have these mirrored panels, with a tub of boiling water at the top of the tower that is used to create energy. This won't happen with photovoltaic because it converts light to energy, is non-reflective, and it moves with the sun to maximize energy in the area.

Charlie Ewert said the reason for this is because it is applicant driven with property in the A-3 Zone. The power would be sold to Rocky Mountain Power to its final destination; and it could be used to boost the generator in this area. Director Grover said when seriously looking at this, you need to think about setbacks and berming. A 30 ft. setback is not going to do anything when looking at something substantial; there needs to be the right type screening in that area to protect the integrity. Some of the items that we've discussed with the applicant; to have a 15 ft. buffer between any solar panel, building, or the next zone. If there any solar too close to the A-2 Zone, we would need at least a 1500 feet separation. We talked about landscaping, berms, and sign obscuring with 200 acres. In the Ogden Valley we said in their lighting code; if you can see a lit lightbulb then you are out of compliance with the Dark Sky Ordinance. That is really easy to enforce, if you drive by and you can see the lightbulb, they are out of compliance.

Charlie Ewert said that the applicant submitted a really good cost analysis in their application. They have enough acres in the A-3 Zone for 124 houses, and if they can't do this, they are going to maximize their property some other way. With 124 residential dwellings, the average cost per student to education is \$6500.00, yearly cost to the district for this residential development will be \$1, 213,840.00. His analysis on addressing the impact; the solar farm has impact on the education system. If you look at a household size of 3.0 people, the average gallons of water per person per day is 256. This development would require 34,898,826 gallons of water per year. When you go to build this thing, it may be a little water when constructing it that's it for the long term. With the sewer is the same results. With public safety, they are looking at a local cost from \$50,000.00 to serve that subdivision. They provided me with some resources on water fowl; and we will work with the Division of Wildlife Services on environmental impacts. We do need to have a reclamation plan and possibly have a bond to execute the reclamation plan, when they come in for a conditional use permit.

The Planning Commission and staff had a discussion and questions about this being more of industrial use rather than agricultural. There was a question if this was to provide power to a dedicated entity, not to grid. The response was it will provide more energy to the grid, and it's not Rocky Mountain Power asking for this but a private entity. There was a question if the solar made noise when they moved, and the response was very little. There was a question about multi-use for the land, if it were taller; the land could be used for grazing. hey made noise when they move, and the response was very little, maybe just a hum. What about multi-use for the land, because if they were taller, it could be used for grazing. It was suggested

to bring up some dirt to bring up the berms. There was a question if it had to be in the A-3 Zone, and suggested to cut that property out and rezone that property to make it into M-1, and was suggested to cut that property out and rezone the property to make it into M-1. Otherwise we would have this small section in the middle of all this A-3 Zone with this solar farm. The Planning Commission had concerns if the property was buildable to allow 124 houses on two acres, not having sewer, but it's developable the way it is. It was suggested to have 124 homes there with photovoltaic solar on the roofs and call it good. There was a discussion about allowing this in the A-3 versus M-3, and would rather see an island of M-3 in the middle of an A-3 Zone then to allow this into the A-3 Zone.

Director Grover said the one thing that could help this too, if we did this in the M-3 and entered into a development agreement with them, that says if you remove this solar farm and reverts back into an A-3 Zone. That way you protect the area so that it stays because M-3 allows a lot more manufacturing that could impact the neighborhood than a smaller scale solar farm could. So if you were to do something like that, then you could possibly accomplish both. Mr. Ewert said we will still need to mitigate the issues. As we were working with the applicant; we broached the idea of a rezone with a development agreement. Director Grover said we started looking in the A-3 Zone on where this could possibly go in those 200 acres. Mr. Ewert said in looking at all the obstacles and issues that go with this; my professional opinion is to change the A-3 Zone. That's primarily because this is renewable energy, even though this isn't the standard understanding of what a farm is, this is farming of a sort. I will get back with the applicant and get back with the development agreement. Currently we don't have a code that has any standards on solar farms; so we would have to create a code that does adopt that before we do any kind of rezone.

WS 1: Discussion regarding the creation of commercial design standards for the Western Weber Planning Area.

Charlie Ewert said this is commercial design standards; and as you know we have more commercial area out west. The big concern that I have with that is we don't have commercial design standards as it stands. There's a couple of things here you are going to say, in the Ogden Valley this is applicable, and in Western Weber this is applicable. This is a good start; the code is not great but this will be the bandaide until we get something a little more comprehensive.

Charlie Ewert said I just want to run through this really quickly just to get your ideas on this. So you have Purpose and Intent and it talks about making it look nice and work well with the community that it's in. We have Definitions that are specific to this chapter. I am giving this to you as homework; so you can get yourself familiarized with this before we get back to this again. Pay attention to the work Parkway; because it does show up in this code several times in the definition section. It just the area between the curb and the sidewalk, and I would call it the park strip. Go to Section 108-2-3 – Applicability; and he read subsection (a); and we are going to propose that industrial and manufacturing be not included in this. Director Grover said that this Applicability was too stringent for manufacturing to meet these design guidelines in this area. Mr. Ewert said this would also apply to multi-family dwellings of three units or more. In subsections (b) and (c) is applicable to Ogden Valley and does not apply to Western Weber.

Charlie Ewert said moving down to Section 108-2-4 - Minimal Standards Architectural. The following architectural design standards shall apply to exteriors of new and remodeled structures in unincorporated Weber County. Unless they are exempted by Section 108-2-3. Subsection (1) color and we are just talking about those commercial/manufacture and this does not apply to houses. External surfaces shall be predominately natural, muted earth tones, and white may be used as an accent color. Contrasting accent colors may be allowed by the Planning Commission. Director Grover said this is more like a bandaide fix for all the commercial that's happened out there. Mr. Ewert said the roof addition to an existing structure when matching the existing colors is exempt from this requirement. He read through subsection (2) Exposed fronts and street sides of buildings does include the rear of the building and he read that section. He read subsections (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8).

Charlie Ewert said Section 108-2-5 – Minimum Standards and Guidelines; General Landscaping. He read through Subsection (a) and said that 80 percent of the landscaping is excessive especially in the desert. I am going to propose that we adjust that 80% of living material. He read through Subsection (b) and said he is rewriting that sentence, but basically what that means if you're building a setback from the street, that first 15 ft. has to be landscaped. He read Subsection (d) and that may be a nice idea and it won't work if the building is on the street. He read Subsection (e) and striking out manual. He read through Subsection (f) and I want to talk about future expansion areas; there's a number of reasons why that would be appropriate

to allow a native vegetation blend into a curb on the back of the property where future destination may be. My original proposal for Dan Baugh was plant grass and irrigate it, and we want to include it as part of the required landscaping as long as it's grass and irrigated. He read through Subsection (h) Item (1) Quality, and said we will strike some of these words. We are going to clean this up a little bit, so there is not a lot of public debate. He read Item (2) Size; and Sub Items a through f; and noted that there were clarifications to be made. He read through Item (3) Selection, so what a lot of communities will do, they will list what you can plant. He read through Item (4) with no issues. He read Item (5) need to scratch out manual, and just say provided with an automatic irrigation system. He read through Subsection (i) Maintenance, Item (1) Responsibility; said there's that term parkway, should be park strip. He read Item (2) Materials, and changed the word health to healthy. He read Item (3) Replacement, and changing approval of the planning commission staff, whose decisions are appealable to the planning commission, and this goes to the Board of Appeals as the appeal authority. He read subsection (j) Design guidelines, item (1) Scale; and this is one of the reasons this doesn't work in the M-3 Zone. This is subjective and will be rewritten in this section code. He read item (2) Selection; need to change habit to habitat. He read item (3) Evergreens; no issues there. He read item (5) Mulch; need to add decorative stone or some other material have an industrial strength weed barrier underneath it, or it will just sink under the mud. He read item (6) Water conservation; just want to make sure you are using valves and such so you're not watering everything. He read item (9) Trails, he read through this and is going to be rewriting this to say you need to provide safe and efficient pedestrian access from the right-of-way to the main entrance of the facility. He read Subsection (k) Manufacturing sites, and this wouldn't be applicable if we don't apply it to the manufacturing zones.

Charlie Ewert said Section 108-2-6 – Minimum Standards – Off-street Parking. He read subsection (a) and (b), and my proposal for these two sections is to consolidate and simplify. This will be one of the bigger rewrites to consolidate and simplify. He read item (3), this conflicts with another section specifically talking about fencing. He reviewed Subsection (b), this is what happens when your building is more than 20 feet away from the right-of-way. The difference between the two; it talks a little bit more about earthen berms, berm height, and 3 feet for at least 75% of the entire length of the berm. He read Subsection (c) Parking areas, and he is removing 100% and change to along the landscape area. It's intended to say that you need to spread them out so it's consistent. He read Subsection (d) Necessary access, and if you are cutting through the landscape area, you can do so for parking and an extra accessibility. He read Subsection (g), this is one that I like best, because despite anything you might do, you have a sea of asphalt and just put a few trees in there it really changes the dynamic of that sea of asphalt looks like and how it appears from the street level. Director Grover suggested to have a diagram with this next item, it might be helpful to the public if we have time.

Charlie Ewert said Section 108-2-7 – Screening and buffering. He read subsection (1) screening device materials, and this is something you may want to allow out west. This is only when it's a screening device; chain link fencing is allowed in the Ogden Valley when it's not screening something. My thought on this if you do allow chain link fences; you may want to black vinyl coated or powder coated, or something that may make it more than just shiny galvanized fencing. He read subsection (2), combination of earth berming, it's a good thing that we are requiring 15 ft. for those berms in there. He read subsection (b) Parking areas, he proposed a change to this, don't think we should be proposing to screen the view of a parking lot from a right-of-way as that is a huge burden. We've got all these trees, we've got buffers, we've got berms, we've got all kinds of landscaping that will help soften the existence of these commercial buildings. He read subsection (d) loading and delivery, so one thing that we debated about as staff, what are we talking about when we say screened. Is this 100% site security, or does this just make it look a little less clear? We do talk about opaque once we get down to the garbage.

Charlie Ewert said Section 108-2-8 – Clear Sight Distance for Landscaping and Screening. He reviewed the information and said the two criteria below the paragraph is about site triangle. So we have talked about site triangle twice plus one more time; plus, we have another code that talks about site triangle The site triangle talks about you can't have anything that's over two or three feet in height, and I will have to check. Ultimately what we're looking at is 40 feet this distance; so if you are in a car on the approach and you're about to intersect with a street, you need to be able to see at least 40 feet that way, 40 feet this other way, and 15 feet between you and the intersection.

Charlie Ewert said Section 108-2-9 – Landscape Plan. He said landscape is required and these are all the requirements in the landscape plan. This will just help us verify they are in compliance with the ordinance.

There was a discussion between the Planning Commission and staff and there was a concern about signage. The response was there is something on signage on commercial. There was a question if they were going to adopt particular colors or just earth tones. The response we talked about earth tones, predominately natural, muted, or earth tones. In the Ogden Valley we talked about the color and how it works. Out here we're just saying earth tones, and it is defined as a color that comes from the earth, and other places in the code we talked about colors that come from the earth. One of the issues that we keep looking when we're talking about commercial development in the area is knowing how much land is needed to accommodate for what might go out there. When you start putting restrictions like this, you have to have a minimum width here, there, and everywhere. You are really restricting how much development can happen for the size of whatever you are developing in just the landscaping purposes. When you are talking about a small scale commercial like a restaurant, it makes a little more sense; but when you put it in a large scale like gas stations or grocery stores maybe they don't fit. When we come up with what we need and keep in the scale of commercial, that's a lot that we're going to have. The Planning Commission wanted clarification to what could be planted, because weeds grow pretty but not something we need to plant. We would need a list of appropriate plants. The response that we could provide a list of noxious weeds and say those are not allowed. We talked about rewriting this and talk with USU on planting schedules. There was a question about the 10 feet that was left, if you only have 12 feet, it should be the same. The 15 ft. makes sense, but the 20 ft. setback if you've got a building at 20 ft., what are you going to do with the other 5 ft. If what's left is parking lot, it's not a big deal with the building. The response was I don't know if it was to anticipate you can't get stuff to grow on the shoulder of the street, but it also states later on that you need to plant stuff right up to the asphalt. We do talk about 20 feet and further away in the next section. There was a concern that a berm would depend on how much the slope. The response was this does talk about berm needs to be tall, or 75% of the entire berm; and if we are talking about a minimum of 15 ft. wide.

Charlie Ewert said what you might see instead of a sea of asphalt out front of the building, with a little building in the back, with a little bit of asphalt in the front because that's all they can fit and a bunch off to the side. Which is not the worst thing in the world, if fact it might be more preferable. The Planning Commission do not want the landscaping the railroad tracks; so we need to have some kind of exception to that rule.

WS 2: Discussion regarding the creation of a consolidated land use table in the county code in place of the fragmented list of uses that currently exist.

Charlie Ewert said we're working on the land use table and consolidating. All of our zones have a list of permitted conditional uses. Our commercial zones have tables showing permitted and conditional uses. Tables are really nice to look at because you can see every single use and whether it's permitted or not permitted in each of those zones. The way that our ordinances is supposed to work, if it's listed and allowed in one zone but not in other zones, it's not permitted in the other zones. If it's intended to say something, then it's not allowed. Over 20 or 30 years of changing ordinances, we've added things in certain zones without thinking how that impact other zones. That plus a whole host of administrative nightmare issues with the volumes of pages that exists in all those lists, I suggest that we condense this into a table.

At this time Commissioner Willener excused herself.

Charlie Ewert review the table with a number of documents and today we are just doing review. He handed out various information to the Planning Commissioners. This memo is one that I did years ago, intended to help the Planning Commission keep abreast of what's happening next with all of this. He suggested that the Planning Commission go through the memo to help you understand the document; it talks about the color coding and that kind of stuff. What you can see from these tables here, trying to take the many uses here that are allowed in the ordinance and just put them all in on table, and see how each of them compare to each other. These are all categorized; you have agriculture, agriculture industry, commercial and industrial. There is also residential, quasi-public, public and institutional, and recreational also included.

Charlie Ewert said the last thing we worked on at the end of 2015, was filling in all the agricultural uses. So everywhere you see an "N", the code previously didn't specify whether it was allowed or wasn't allowed. We were supposed to interpret that it wasn't and I just filled it in. The objective here is to consolidate the ordinance and make it easier to use without changing what the ordinance currently says. The second objective, is once it's adopted to say exactly what it says in different format;

that's when we start making changes as necessary. It's going to be applicable to Western Weber as it to Ogden Valley; but in the Ogden Valley General Plan, they've got a very specific directive to do that

Charlie Ewert said what you'll see in the first column of this table packet. The first column is the Table of Uses; and I go on to explain a little bit more qualifying information about those uses, intended again what's in our current code. This one is all those same uses, and it tells you what it currently is that is being stricken out in red, it tells suggestions and changes are in blue. There a bunch of notes on the whys. You can go through and my comments aren't intended for public comments just for your information, observations, and frustrations about trying to put this together. We're going to be working in the work sessions and this is going to take some time, and you have everything in front of that I have handed out is being proposed for the agricultural section. All the agricultural uses are accommodated for are in there, so just make sure you agree with it, I am not asking for a huge policy changes. This document here are changes to these supplemental chapter; so one of the ways that we could consolidate, are list of uses that have a whole ton of qualifying information in it, is by putting the qualifying information in the supplemental chapter. As you go through and look at the rest of the chapter and the rest of these sections; you will see once we get to the commercial, it's going to be difficult to get through. A question was asked what was the coding in here with the "P". Mr. Ewert replied the coding is "P" is for Permitted, "C" is for conditional, and "N" is for Not Allowed. Once this is adopted, we can take this by use, by use, and make a real impact.

Director Grover said some of the intent with this is to help reduce your time in reviewing conditional use permits, because a lot of the times you can't deny conditional use permits, so either we make conditions, and actually put those conditions in the ordinance, or we just make it a permitted use. So that you can focus more on long range planning, and not this stuff that can be done administratively. We are going to be doing a lot of this, this coming year. Staff will be heavily involved because the funding that we have for the General Plan; so we're going to be having to accomplish a lot of it with staff plus the consultant. I am trying right now to get Scott Park, to allow us to carry over some portion of our budget that we have right now into next years, so that we can apply that to the General Plan to help increase that.

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kary Serrano

**Kary Serrano, Secretary
Weber County Planning Commission**