

Minutes of the Western Weber Planning Commission meeting of May 8, 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
Roger Heslop
Jannette Borklund

Members Excused: Mark Whaley
John Parke
Wayne Andreotti

Staff Present: Rick Grover, Planning Director; Felix Lleverino, Planner II; Chris Crockett, Legal Counsel

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

1. Approval of minutes for April 10, 2018 minutes.

Chair Hancock asks if there are any changes to be made on the minutes for April 10, 2018. Commissioner Heslop states that page 6 it was Commissioner Andreotti who made the comment regarding the cow and the green matter on his car. On the last page under the Directors report the word and was inserted between Chair and Hancock. It should be removed. Chair Hancock asks if there are any other corrections. There are none.

MOTION: Chair Hancock motion to approve minutes with noted corrections. Motion carries (4-0)

Chair Hancock turns the time over to Director Grover. Director Grover states item number 2.1 LVC101217 is an administrative item. He states that they don't need to take public comment but they can. He adds that Felix Lleverino will give a quick orientation and the developer will stand up and explain the project. The agriculture preservation plan has changed since last time.

Chair Hancock asks if there is any ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to declare. There is none.

2. Administrative items

2.1 LVC101217- Consideration and action on a request for final approval of Cameron Cove Cluster subdivision, consisting of 27 lots.

Mr. Lleverino states that this item is being brought back for final approval. It is a cluster subdivision in Western Weber it is in the A-1 zone. Mr. Lleverino gives an overview of the project as listed in the staff report. He asks if the Planning Commissioners have any questions.

Commissioner Willener asks if it has two open space lots and two agriculture preservation lots. Mr. Lleverino answers that every open space parcel is just that an open space parcel, not agricultural. Commissioner Borklund asks regarding the open space lot, can no buildings be built on that? Mr. Lleverino states that there is no plan to put buildings on those lots. Commissioner Borklund asks if a toolshed might be built there if a community garden is put in. Mr. Lleverino states that that is a possibility, with the cluster ordinance it is required that on the open space parcel they build what is called a building envelope and that is where that shed might be placed. Commissioner Borklund states that it would be good to let some buildings be acceptable for example a picnic shelter or buildings of that nature. She adds that the description just says no buildings at all. She just wants to clarify that.

Chair Hancock turns the time over to Mr. Douglas Hamblin to present his application.

Douglas Hamblin 2335 E 2400 N Layton states that as he has gone through the design and tried to figure out the best use for the open space he feels that he has been able to accomplish that. He adds that as far as the residents that will buy there, he believes a community garden will work very well. Parcel B will be a large open space parcel. He adds that with the lot size they have been able to meet the requirements for cluster zone. The plan is to have some nice homes. Commissioner Borklund asks how big the lots will be. Mr. Hamblin states that they are going to be 15,000 sq. ft. or bigger. There will be a 100ft frontage.

Mr. Lleverino states that Mr. Hamblin is requesting final approval of Cameron Cove subdivision. This proposal was granted final approval by the Planning Commission during a meeting that was held on Dec 12, 2017. He states that there were some items added to the plat to make it meet zoning requirements. The first one is the agricultural note. The second one is the public trail easement it runs along the Hooper line. The subdivision proposal is located within the A-1 zone and was reviewed against the uniform land use code of Weber County zoning and the subdivision plat requirements and the cluster subdivision standards. Final subdivision plat requirements have been met by this proposal as well as conforming to site development standards of the Weber County cluster subdivision code. All the lots within this proposal contain an area of 15,000 to 20,000 and ranges in width 65 to 150 ft. he states that before going to the County Commission for final approval the applicant is required to submit a cost estimate for the remaining improvements. The cost estimate will be reviewed by County engineers and approved by the attorney and the County Commission. The Weber County Planning Division recommends final approval of Cameron Cove Cluster Subdivision consisting of 27 lots. This recommendation is conditioned upon meeting all requirements from the county reviewing agencies and conditions stated in the planning staff report.

Chair Hancock asks if the Planning Commissioners have any questions.

Commissioner Willener states that she would like some clarification in the open space preservation plan it talks about parcel C and D pretty extensively as far as the community garden goes, and it talks about 2 open space parcels. She adds that she sees 4 parcels A, B, C, and D. Parcels C and D are the community garden, and A and B being the private park. She states the A and B aren't necessarily laid out in the open space plan, and there has been discussion in past meeting that parcels A and B would have a landscape plan, and that there would be a private park, and it does talk about the path that would be around parcel B and connect to the trail system. She adds that although it's not specified in the open space plan for parcels A and B, she just wants to make sure they are consistent with what was presented previously. Mr. Lleverino states that parcel B will have the tot lot and for residents within the cluster subdivision, there is also the public trail and the community garden, those are the two amenities they are available to the general public.

Chair Hancock asks if there are any other questions from the Planning Commissioners. There are none.

Chair Hancock opens the public hearing. There is none.

Chair Hancock close the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Heslop moves to approve the Cameron Cove Cluster Subdivision consisting of 27 lots. This recommendation is based upon the following conditions as part of the final subdivision requirements the Owner's Dedication shall contain language that grants and conveys easements to the appropriate parties, including showing all stormwater easements leading to the stormwater detention basin. Prior to recording the final plat, the applicant shall establish a Home Owner's Association as described in the LUC §108-3-9 and provide the County a copy to review and approve. The developer shall provide a financial guarantee for all improvements that have not been completed prior to going before the County Commission for final approval as described in LUC § 106-4-3. The recommendation is based on the following findings. The proposed subdivision conforms to the Western Weber General Plan. With the recommended conditions, the proposed subdivision complies with the applicable ordinances. A bonus density of 22 percent was granted during preliminary approval on December 12, 2017. Commissioner Willener seconds. Motion carries (4-0)

3. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda-None

4. Remarks from Planning Commissioners- Commissioner Borklund states that perhaps they should have added that the open space plan satisfied what the Planning Commission was looking for, because that's why it was tabled last time. Chair Hancock states that as he had mentioned in the pre-meeting they had a pretty good outline for the agriculture preservation plan. Chair Hancock asks if there are any further questions from the Planning Commissioners. He states that since none of the other Planning Commissioners have any comments he would like to take a few moments and talk about the ordinance and the APA meeting that he had the opportunity to attend. He states that they had some hydroponic farms, and it was an interesting tour to take. It was amazing to see the pipes sticking straight up into the air with holes in it and plants coming out of it. He there was also a culinary school that took a lot of damage from flooding hurricane Katrina and they provided the herbs and vegetables that were used in their school. There were also a few local gardening communities, he adds that he was extremely impressed. one gardening community was a 7-acre parcel that was granted by the city park, and the group it was 60 youth members of the community ages ranging 10-18 years of age that were committed for a year to work on the farm. 20 percent of the children were high achievers 60 percent were average and 20 percent that were at risk. They had to work 9 hours a week 7 of those hours was on Saturdays. They planted, watered, weeded, harvested, and sold the product. They were paid a minimum wage and if they attended and exceeded their goal they got a bonus. He adds that it was amazing to see that in the middle of a city park. He notes that there was another gardening community that was impressive, it was placed in a vacant lot that was unbuildable, they had a raised garden on an elevated growing platforms. It was about 30 ft. long 10 or 12 ft. wide. The plants were growing on rock no soil. They had fish ponds and each family gardens had rabbits and chickens. They grew worms for fertilizer and to feed the fish. They would pump the water out the fish pond take it up to the top of the elevated planters and it would trickle down through the rocks and go back to the fish ponds. He states that he was amazed. Commissioner Borklund asks if there was any information regarding the at-risk youth versus the high achievers. Chair Hancock states that there wasn't but everything was very positive they were given 3 chances and the money was a good motivator. He states that it was an awesome program. He asks if there is any further comments or questions from the other Planning Commissioners. There are none.

5. Planning Director Report- Director Grover states that on May 15th and also on May 29th at the West Weber Elementary school the Western Weber Visioning follow up open houses will take place at 6pm. Please mark those dates on the calendar. Commissioner Willener asks if the same information will be presented at both meetings. Director Grover states that it won't be the same information, on the 29th they will come back with additional information and comments. He notes that they will take the new information and add it to the presentation, and will generate a map and a conceptual plan, it won't be a part of the General Plan but it can be used towards the General Plan when the process begins. He adds that it may instigate some small amendments based on the comments they receive, there might be a need to look a possible text amendments or rezoning.

6. Remarks from Legal Counsel-None**7. Adjourn to Work Session-5:37pm****WS1. DISCUSSION: A discussion regarding a proposed General Plan map amendment and rezone from M-1 to A-2 for several parcels located at approximately 7900 West 900 South, West Warren, Utah.**

Mr. Lleverino states that he has a proposal to rezone M-1 to A-2 at approximately 7900 West 900 South West Warren, Utah. The intent of this proposal is to extend the A-2 zone. The current acreage is M-1 with the entire Weber County is 1103 acres. This proposal would reduce the area to 838 acres. Commissioner Borklund asks why not bring it all the way to 900 S. St and get rid of the A-1 that is in the middle? Mr. Lleverino answers that that is a great question and that's part of the reason for the presentation at this meeting, to get some feedback.

Chair Hancock states that the applicant John Price may address the Planning Commission.

John Price 400 S 6700 W West Warren states all of the land is being used for agriculture. He adds that as West Warren has grown the map has become outdated. It has become more for residential use. He states that as it sits right now it is limiting him on the uses for his property specifically for future use. He adds that there is no logical use for M-1, he won't be able to sell it to a manufacturer. It would make more sense to make it for residential use. It would be a more beneficial use and most of the neighbors agree and have asked to be added to the application for a zone change.

Commissioner Heslop asks when it was originally classified as M-1. Was it the property owners that originally requested it or was it part of the general service district that some government entity set up and automatically says this is going to be what it is.

Mr. Price states that that is correct they just drew it out because all the property owner have been property owners for years. Nobody would have said they wanted it as M-1, everybody would have preferred it be an A-2 another reason why their children haven't built out there is that they can't handle 5 acres they may only be able to handle 2 acres. He adds that it has prevented a lot of families from staying home on the farm. Not a single one of the neighbors were opposed to the change.

Commissioner Heslop states that as he drove down there along 900 South on the map just above where the 900 is he saw a manufacturing shop or a welding shop.

Mr. Price states that that building it was built in an agriculture zone, and it is located just to the right.

Commissioner Heslop states that he was just concerned about making changes where a business has already established and moved the business out of an area where the owner has already bought into.

Mr. Price states that ironically the only manufacturing owner is located in the agriculture zone.

Commissioner Borklund states that even if they did change the zone on the business owner, it would be his legal right be there, he wouldn't have to move.

Commissioner Heslop asks if it would change his tax bases? Director Grover states that it would most likely change the business owners tax bases if he was in the M-1 zone and it was rezoned to A-3 but this is not the case since he is in an agricultural zone. He adds that typically commercial zones have higher taxes.

Commissioner Borklund asks if this requires an amendment to the plan or does the plan they have an option for this. Mr. Lleverino states that that was something he alluding to, it would require a map amendment and a rezone. Commissioner Borklund asks if it can be done concurrently. Mr. Lleverino states that it can and they are looking at doing some General Plan text amendments as well. He adds that he will go more into detail when he gets further along with the review. Regarding the compatibility with the General Plan, there are a couple things that need to be done. The first one is the zoning map, and the next would be to removing residential uses as a permitted use from the M-1 zone. This would remove that use from every manufacturing zone. Support for this action is in the General Plan, where in the manufacturing section it talks about eliminating permitted single-family uses in all manufacturing zones it is an implementation action found in the General Plan to reduce the potential conflict between residential and agricultural uses and manufacturing uses. Throughout Weber County, it may require new zones or an amendment that specifically states it applies to the West Central Weber County area. He adds that part of the review was looking at different effects the rezone might have. A-2 sharing a boundary line with M-3, currently throughout the county there is almost a buffer. A-2 going to light manufacturing, going to heavy manufacturing. In some portions there is A-3 which is more intensive agriculture that share a boundary directly with heavy manufacturing. This rezone would create a boundary with between A-2 and M-3 which is heavy manufacturing. This is a possible negative result of the rezone. There is a tax base potential M-1 zone has more tax revenue manufacturing properties than for residential. Designating this area as A-2 would open up the land for residential development. This proposal is in line with the desires of the local residents. Arable soil in the area is better suited for agricultural and residential uses. Land further west is more sought after by manufacturing companies due to land price. This was something that was brought up by Mr. Price a manufacturing company wants to come in and buy some land it would be more economical out west where the land is cheaper than in the M-1 zone. Another effect that would occur is the M-1 zone would be reduced from 1103 acres to 838.

Commissioner Willener asks are there other M-1 areas that fall into this consideration and at some point would there be a risk of further reducing M-1, because of somebody's boundary conflict issues? Mr. Lleverino answers that there is another implementation action where it talks about a rezone approximately 20 acres along Union Pacific railroad which is not contiguous to any major manufacturing zones. Some of those items would be covered by public input, it will be a new General Plan including a new General Plan zone map. Commissioner Willener asks if there is going to be a need for M-1 zone. She asks are we going to be shorting ourselves as a community, or is there opportunity to rework. Is there opportunity to regain some of that designation somewhere else.

Commissioner Heslop states that after driving around out there he proposed they take some of the M-3 area that is on the west side of the street that is there. the cattle that are feeding out there at the present time are classified more agriculture than M-3. Mr. Price states that they can still operate in M-3 its cheaper and they can still purchase that land. M-1 land limits what can be done. It's easier and its right next to it. He adds that even though the M-1 ground is being reduced it doesn't reduce the M-1 opportunities. Commissioner Willener states that she

appreciates that explanation. She adds that she just wants to know if it's going to limit the community and making sure that those designations are available at some locations. Commissioner Borklund asks are there lot size differences between A-1 and A-2 and A-3. Mr. Lleverino states that once you get to A-3 there is. It's about 2 acres. Commissioner Borklund states that she is wondering is it should split and have part of it be A-1 and part of it be A-2. She adds that the goal is to keep all the lots in the same zone. Chair Hancock asks if Mr. Price has specific ideas about what to do with the land. Mr. Price states that Barbara Higgs place is under contract, and they want to know that they could eventually build on it, they don't have a set plan. They have a plan they eventually want to be able to develop it. Commissioner Borklund asks if it would be residential. Commissioner Heslop asks if the A-3 zone is already developed. Mr. Price states that the middle section where it U's that where Cliff Bells built all the homes along 7900. He adds that that is what led to wanting the change. Director Grover states that one scenario to keep in mind is thinking about development that's happened along Midland drive, where Wheelwright lumber is. That area is zoned M-2 and the other side of the street there is a recycling facility is zoned M-2. He adds that area is heavy manufacturing very similar to the M-3 Zone. He states that when you start thinking about future uses. How are they going to coexist, and the contextual element integration of the area? If there are residences that build right up to that street and if there is a potential for junk and salvage yards on the other side of the street; it important to think about what is being set up for the community, there if development does come in. It might be what the residents want, but it could set up for what they don't want. He states that it might be good as Mr. Ewert mentioned to look at M-1 on the other side of the street so that a transition is made and then step back in to agriculture. He adds that the step back in a piece needs to be rezoned as viable M-1. A good example of this is on Wall Ave by the American Nutrition there is a commercial area that stays vacant because it's not deep enough to make it viable commercial. If you look at M-1 in the area in question, maintaining an M-1 strip to make a transition it needs to be deep enough to make it viable manufacturing. It might be a smart thing to look at some light manufacturing in the area to make that transition, so that residents don't go up to the road and have the potential for some type of junkyard. Contextual there needs to be sensitivity to how will be fully laid out. Commissioner Heslop asks in the General Plan in the M-3 zone how many acres are involved in the M-3 zone. Mr. Lleverino states that he is not sure. Director Grover adds that they can look up that information for him. Commissioner Heslop states that having driven that road today, along the 100 North St because of the distance it has to be designated as a street. He states there has to be one designated about midway at the start of the subdivisions. That would be consider two blocks as far as the depth of the whole area. If that same designation going along 900 West and designate it as an M-1 zone, there is plenty of area there. He adds that one of the things that concern him is that there is one landowner out there. He came in and his land was designated under agriculture protection not too long ago. Commissioner Borklund asks if manufacturing zone allows for commercial uses. Mr. Ewert states that it does allow some commercial uses. Commissioner Borklund adds that there is not much commercial in that area at all. Commissioner Heslop agrees that there is nothing commercial there at all. Director Grover states that this is something should be looked at down the road. If it's going to be used for manufacturing uses typical there is also a need to look at the commercial uses to see if there are supporting manufacturing uses or if they are taking away from another commercial core that they are trying to create down the road. There should not be a lot of commercial uses in a manufacturing zone. It should not be a combination of both. There are many areas in Weber County that have done that. That is not what should happen here. Commissioner Borklund points out that if there is an industrial park out there and there are 1000 employees they are going to need to go to lunch. Director Grover states that there could be supportive commercial uses such as a gas station, a convenience store, or a restaurant. You don't want a JCPenney for example. It is something to think about. Commissioner Heslop states that his concern is that if the local residents didn't have a voice to label it M-3 to begin with and it was just included as part of the industrial park proposal, then there would be some grounds to take it and say they want it to be agricultural. Everything all the way around it agricultural. Chair Hancock states that that it sticks out like a sore thumb, everything around it is agricultural. Commissioner Willener adds that then there is a narrow strip of residential. Director Grover states that Mr. Lleverino should do an overlay of how the West Weber corridor will be located in this area, so that when it comes before the Commission they can see the relationship. Chair Hancock asks if there are any other comments. Mr. Ewert states that he wants to do a quick recap. He states that number 1 the General Plan states that the little island across from the railroad tracks needs to be rezoned. As a part of this the applicant has been asked to talk to the landowners and see how they feel about it. If they are comfortable with it, it can get done. Number 2 the General Plan also says remove residential uses from manufacturing zones. If it's done in the zone its self, that box can be checked. He adds that there is a bit of clean up and administrative work. If any event

in it becomes consequential to Mr. Prices request, there will be a need to start separating those, so that he can get what he is looking to get.

Chair Hancock states that he hopes that in sharing their opinion, it has given the applicant and staff some ideas or thoughts. Commissioner Willener asks that if in supporting the idea to go to A-2 zone does it preclude any support for doing an A-1 and A-2? Is it still on the table?

Commissioner Heslop Points out this is some of the most established residences that have been there.

Chair Hancock calls to adjourn the meeting

Adjourned- 6:13 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Marta Borchert