

SOUTH WEBER CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the **Planning Commission of SOUTH WEBER CITY**, Davis County, Utah, will meet in a **REGULAR** public meeting on **July 17, 2014**, at the **South Weber City Council Chambers, 1600 East South Weber Drive**, commencing at **6:30 p.m.**

A WORK MEETING WILL BE HELD PRIOR TO THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT 6:00 P.M. TO DISCUSS AGENDA ITEMS, CORRESPONDENCE, AND/OR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

THE AGENDA FOR THE REGULAR MEETING IS AS FOLLOWS:

- 6:30 P.M. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Commissioner Osborne
 - May 8, 2014
 - June 12, 2014
 - June 26, 2014Approval of Agenda
Declaration of Conflict of Interest

- 6:35 P.M. Discussion/possible action to recommend approval of the General Plan Update.

- 6:40 P.M. Public Comments –Keep public comments to 3 minutes or less per person.

- 7:00 P.M. Adjourn

THE UNDERSIGNED DEPUTY RECORDER FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF SOUTH WEBER CITY HEREBY CERTIFIES THAT A COPY OF THE FOREGOING NOTICE WAS MAILED OR POSTED TO:

CITY OFFICE BUILDING	SOUTH WEBER FAMILY RECREATION CENTER	DAVIS COUNTY CLIPPER
www.southwebercity.com	SOUTH WEBER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	STANDARD-EXAMINER
Utah Public Notice website www.utah.gov/pmn	TO EACH MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION	THOSE LISTED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: July 15, 2014 Jennie Knight, City Recorder

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, INDIVIDUALS NEEDING SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS DURING THIS MEETING SHOULD NOTIFY SOUTH WEBER CITY, 1600 EAST SOUTH WEBER DRIVE, SOUTH WEBER, UTAH 84405 (801-479-3177) AT LEAST TWO DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

Agenda times are flexible and may be moved in order, sequence, and time to meet the needs of the Commission

1 **SOUTH WEBER CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION**
3 **SPECIAL WORK MEETING**
4

5 **DATE OF MEETING:** 8 May 2014

TIME COMMENCED: 6:00 p.m.

6
7 **PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS:**

8 Delene Hyde
9 Rob Osborne
10 Wes Johnson
11 Rod Westbroek
12 Wayne Winsor

13 **CITY PLANNER:**

Barry Burton (excused)

14 **DEPUTY RECORDER:**

Emily Thomas

15
16
17
18 **Transcriber:** Minutes transcribed by Deputy Recorder Emily Thomas.
19

20
21
22 **VISITORS:** Bruce Dickamore, Jared Bryson, Linda Marvel, Bob Marvel, Rachel Chase, Toni
23 Johnson, Sherrie West, Randy Mills, Lorraine Mills
24

25 **GENERAL PLAN MAPS UPDATE:**
26

27 Commissioner Hyde began the discussion by asking if everyone had reviewed the public
28 comments. Commissioner Winsor stated that he recognized several themes throughout the
29 comments: concerns over 1900 going up the hill towards HAFB, concern over higher density
30 through the new zone along the frontage road next to the canal, no trail along the canal, and the
31 new proposed zone becoming apartments. Commissioner Hyde added that people also want
32 bigger lots.
33

34 **Vehicle Transportation**
35

36 Commissioner Osborne stated that there is a balance between the comments for and against the
37 1900 connection. Agrees that if he had children going to Northridge High School, he would
38 prefer they use that road instead of the highway. Commissioner Westbroek stated that he would
39 not want his high school drivers to have to maneuver the road at such a steep grade.
40 Commissioner Hyde asked about the grade of the toll road. Commissioner Johnson stated it is
41 about 16-18% and is also very well maintained because it is a private road. Commissioner
42 Winsor added that this road is also a north facing slope.
43

44 Commissioner Hyde stated that if the connection is not made, then we need to consider removing
45 the property that is being proposed for annexation. She feels that this would be a mistake
46 because the City can provide service to the property and we shouldn't give up ground that can
47 potentially bring money into the City. A developer will have to propose and install the proposed

48 road. Commissioner Westbroek asked if it would be feasible for the road to connect only through
49 Layton and not come through South Weber. Commissioner Hyde stated that this would mean all
50 services (fire, public works, etc) would have to go around and that is not feasible. Commissioner
51 Osborne stated that there is a 60' ROW already graded that exists as an access road.
52 Commissioner Johnson stated that the road needs to be viable and safe before we annex the
53 property. Commissioner Hyde stated that the term "viable" needs to be defined. It was
54 determined that the 1900 connection to Layton should not exceed a grade of 10% unless
55 otherwise determined by transportation standards. There is also another option being proposed
56 that brings the connection from 475 E up and around into Layton. He thinks this is a viable
57 connection because it has less of a grade.

58
59 The Planning Commission then discussed 6650 East on the west-side of the City. Residents have
60 stated they want the road to be improved. Commissioner Hyde stated that it is not feasible for
61 this road to be improved and would cost the City a lot of money. Commissioner Johnson asked if
62 it was possible to make this a requirement for developers who develop the surrounding property.
63 Commissioner Westbroek stated that this is not something the City can demand. Commissioner
64 Hyde agreed that it is not a feasible or fair request and would be something that would stop
65 development.

66
67 Commissioner Osborne asked about the proposed intersection of 6650 and 475 E. He would like
68 to see the traffic carry up to 475 E. and onto the State-maintained road. Emily stated the purpose
69 for the proposed intersection design was to pull traffic off of 475 E and onto the proposed
70 frontage road. Doesn't serve someone well to take toll bridge and come through South Weber to
71 get to HWY 89 or possibly Layton if it is faster to take the freeway and connect. Staff also
72 proposed this design to enhance the existing commercial corner property.

73 74 **Items to Address:**

- 75 • The 1900 connection to Layton should not exceed a grade of 10% unless otherwise
76 determined by transportation standards.
- 77 • On the west-end area of 6650, add "minimal access off of 6650" as a note to the map and
78 address in the text of the document.
- 79 • Look at possibility of creating dead-end on west-end of 6650.
- 80 • City Engineer will provide a copy of the map/drawing showing impacts of widening
81 existing 6650.

82 83 **Annexation Plan**

84
85 The Planning Commission had no changes and no further discussion on this.

86 87 **Projected Land Use Map**

88
89 Area #8:

90
91 Commissioner Hyde stated that she is concerned about giving up potential commercial property
92 (north side of canal between 7800). She expressed her concern at the lack of understanding – the
93 zoning will not change from the current residential until the property owner makes application
94 for the change. If the property owner never makes the request, it won't happen. Commissioner
95 Westbroek stated that if the property owner doesn't want it to be projected as commercial, then

96 why does it matter if we respect this wish? Commissioner Hyde stated she just doesn't like the
97 fact that we keep eliminating what little potential for commercial development we have left.
98

99 Commissioner Osborne stated that the other area, north side of the canal (not shown as part of
100 #8) should still be commercial – no change needed to the maps.
101

102 Commissioner Westbrook inquired about the proposed zone. Residents do not want apartments
103 but were in favor of patio homes. The City has already determined we meet requirements for
104 housing, why should we add more? Commissioner Osborne added that residents have stated
105 they want a rural feel; maybe the new ordinance only allows patio homes / single family.
106

107 Linda Marvel stated that she is in favor of a 55 and older type development, but does not want
108 apartments or townhomes or the like. She does not want to add more families and impact to the
109 City. Commissioner Winsor asked where existing residents' children are supposed to live. He
110 added that Mrs. Marvel's statement leads to the idea that you can only live in South Weber if you
111 are established economically. He added that the City has developed over time and someone had
112 to develop for the existing residents to be here. Linda stated that she feels it is important for the
113 City to use what property is left wisely.
114

115 Commissioner Hyde suggested taking the new zone off the table. Commissioners Osborne and
116 Winsor both agree that re-wording and working on the ordinance was a better option because
117 there is a need for patio homes and this type of zoning can become a buffer between other zones.
118

119 Areas #1-5:

120
121 Commissioner Hyde stated that people want half-acre lots. The topography of the east-end of the
122 City verse the west-end of the City is different and the look will be different even if the zones are
123 the same. It is not feasible to build one-fourth acre lots and half-acre lots tend not be maintained.
124

125 Commissioner Osborne agreed that half-acre lots lose the look that we are trying to create due to
126 maintenance. Commissioner Johnson added that there are those larger lots that are maintained
127 and he does not want see homes too closely grouped. People want to be able to have gardens and
128 room to landscape. He prefers half-acre, but at a minimum should be one-third. He added that the
129 more homes we add the more burden to infrastructure and to the City we add. Commissioner
130 Hyde added that all homes are an expense to the Cit.
131

132 Commissioner Westbrook feels that one-third is a good balance.
133

134 Commissioner Winsor stated that the perception we are creating is that we are getting comments
135 from people who live in the City and they are determining what people who move here will
136 want. There needs to be a balance between current residents' desires and overall demand outside
137 of the community culture.
138

139 Commission Winsor proposed making a transition between moderate high to one-third acre.
140
141
142
143

144 Areas #1-3:

145

146 Jared Bryson stated that the proposed Bryson Meadows development has been given preliminary
147 plat approval based on RM zoning. The proposed development has 66 lots and does not
148 maximize the zone – which could be 88 lots. The lots are aligned to provide buffer lots between
149 the RH zone and the RM zone, with both one-third and one-quarter acre lots throughout the
150 development. They have also had several challenges with the property, placed by the City, such
151 as the requirements for the transportation plan and installing a regional detention basin

152

153 Commissioner Hyde stated that the City sets parameters and the developers have to come in with
154 something that meets the set parameters. Commissioner Johnson stated the rule of the sixth. The
155 cost of the land must offset the cost of the development by one-sixth in order to be profitable.
156 Jared stated he disagrees with this slightly because times have changed and every development is
157 different.

158

159 Commissioner Winsor proposed doing a blend of both zones. Emily stated that the preliminary
160 plat is already doing this. The fear is that if this development goes away, then what will come in
161 its place?

162

163 **Items to Address:**

164

- Areas #1: One-third acre lots (does not include zoning that has already been approved)

165

- Area #2: Create a blend of one-quarter and one-third acre lots by splitting the zoning in all directions.

166

- Area #3: No change.

167

- Area #4: No change – zone renamed to Residential Patio (RP)

168

- Area #5: Split the zoning north and south with one-third acre lots to the south and one-quarter acre lots north bordering area #4.

169

- Area #6: No changes.

170

- Area #7: No changes.

171

- Area #8: Small northern property should be projected to remain the same as current zoning. The other property (Utah Shape) should remain as projected to new zone (now called RP)

172

173

- Area # 9 : Remove narrow rectangular section shown as C-H and project to the same as surrounding (RL).

174

175

176

177

178

179

179 **Pedestrian Transportation Map**

180

181 Commissioner Hyde stated that this gives us the opportunity to put trails in new development.

182

183 Commissioner Johnson added that Weber Pathways has stated that our map has proposed

184

185 connection with increases the vitality of more funding.
186 Commissioner Winsor asked about the proposed canal trail. Commissioner Westbroek stated
187 that it may never be covered.

188

189

190

191 Commissioner Johnson stated there should be a connection to the Bonneville Shoreline trail.

192

193

191 **Items to Address:**

- 192 • Add a note to the map and address in the text of the document the canal trail should be
- 193 completed upon the enclosure of the canal.
- 194 • Designate a connection via South Weber Drive to the Fisherman’s Trailhead.
- 195 • Make sure note about Charter School access is removed.

196
197 **Sensitive Lands Map**

198
199 No changes.

200
201 **Direction to Staff**

202
203 The changes addressed during the meeting should be addressed by staff and updated maps
204 provided.

205
206 **Proposed Ordinance 14-02, an Ordinance amending Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter**
207 **5 Zoning Districts, Addition of Article P: Residential Moderate High Zone.**

208
209 Redline changes were made to the ordinance, are attached to these minutes, and were provided to
210 the City Planner for further review.

211
212 **Other Business:**

213
214 Commissioner Westbrook stated he has had complaints about Nix Construction violating the
215 boundary of the property. Commissioner Hyde stated that Mark Larsen should be directed to
216 inspect the issue and if warranted, the Conditional Use should be brought before the Planning
217 Commission for review.

218
219 **ADJOURNED:** The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

220
221
222
223
224
225 **APPROVED:** _____ **Date**
226 **Chairperson: Delene Hyde**

227
228
229
230
231 **Attest:** _____
232 **Deputy City Recorder**

233
234
235
236
237
238

1 **SOUTH WEBER CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **SPECIAL MEETING**

3
4 **DATE OF MEETING:** 12 June 2014 **TIME COMMENCED:** 5:30
5 p.m.

6
7 **PRESENT:** **MAYOR:** Tammy Long

8
9 **COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

10 Scott Casas
11 Randy Hilton
12 Michael Poff
13 Marlene Poore
14 David Thomas

10 **PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:**

10 Delene Hyde
11 Wes Johnson
12 Wayne Winsor
13 Rod Westbroek
14 Robert Osborne

15
16 **STAFF:**

16 Barry Burton, City Planner
17 Brandon Jones, City Engineer
18 Jennie Knight, Temporary City Recorder

19
20 **VISITORS:** John Grubb, Jared Bryson, Gardner Crane, Bruce Dickamore, Jan Ukena.

21
22 **Commissioner Hyde called the meeting to order.**

23
24 **GENERAL PLAN UPDATE DISCUSSION:**

25 Commissioner Hyde explained the Planning Commission has been working on an Ordinance for patio
26 homes. They are looking for feedback from City Council on whether they have interest in pursuing this.
27 Feedback from residents indicates they do not want more high density housing, due to these standards
28 having been met. This proposed ordinance would allow 6 homes per acre for patio homes. Residential
29 Moderate housing has been modified slightly and they are now requesting some feedback. Mayor Long
30 asked if they would remove the high density housing. Commissioner Osborne clarified they would not
31 rezone any more high density housing. Already developed high density zones would remain the same.
32 Council Member Poff said he has been an advocate of having something in between the high density
33 housing and residential moderate.

34 Commissioner Johnson pointed out resident's negative response to apartment complex housing that is
35 associated with high density. He feels if they do single family dwellings like these patio homes, this is a
36 better reflection than the idea of more high density.

37 Barry Burton indicated they tried to find a middle ground with this ordinance. This also addresses the
38 change in demographics. He said there is an aging population, and at the end of 20 years there will be a
39 great need to address this type of housing. Empty nesters looking to down size both the size of their house
40 and yard. Mayor Long asked if this ordinance will regulate the size of homes. Barry responded the
41 setback requirements will regulate the size of homes to some point. Council Member Poff asked for
42 clarification of 6,000 square foot lots with a fully developed road. Barry said the density is 6 units per
43 acre lot. Commissioner Osborne explained this will be a single family house with a driveway and limited
44 front yard; just enough house and yard to look esthetically appealing. Barry pointed out this will look
45 very much like any other subdivision. Tim Grubb asked if they are changing the setback requirements.
46 Barry responded the front setback is 20 ft. with a 10 ft rear setback, and 6 ft side yard. Council Member
47 Poff said this is updating the setback requirements.

48 Commissioner Osborne pointed out they are not anticipation these homes to have large vehicles and RV's
49 to park on these lots and the setback requirements are to allow for more building space on the lot. Barry

50 mentioned there is a high demand for these types of homes and they are not currently available at this
51 time.

52 Planning Commission gave discussion on the Peterson property high density zoning and how the density
53 was increased through the process. Commissioner Osborne stated the ordinance specifies not more than 9
54 acres and no less than 2 acres can be zoned for patio homes. Commissioner Hyde referred to areas within
55 the city that would be conducive for this type of housing; other difficult pieces where residents would
56 prefer alternatives to apartments.

57 Council Member Hilton asked for clarification about the zoning; this will not eliminate the RH zone but
58 add an additional zone. Planning Commission clarified this would not eliminate the existing zoning but
59 not allow RH future zoning; alternatively giving another option. Council Member Poff asked if they are
60 including mandatory open space within these communities. Commissioner Hyde pointed out because of
61 the requirements there is plenty of space within these communities.

62 Council and Planning Commission gave discussion about club houses, common areas, and other
63 amenities usually included in these types of communities and decided they would promote PUD's and
64 HOA's, which sometimes have an adverse effect. Barry Burton specified the ordinance does not prevent
65 this, but is not a requirement. Suggestions about having a set amount of area requiring a common space.
66 Barry said this would require these being accepted as public parks, unless the area has an HOA where it is
67 deemed private space. He said historically the HOA's form and don't function properly. Council Member
68 Hilton suggested including trails throughout these communities to promote open space and allow for
69 physical exercise. Council and Planning Commission agreed all residents with the city live within the
70 space to use a recreation area. Commissioner Osborne commented he would rather limit the developments
71 to 2-5 acres and not have to consider so many parks. Council Member Hilton said having residents in
72 tight areas will need to have access to open space.

73 Commissioner Hyde pointed out the Spaulding property is within walking distance of the posse grounds.
74 Tim Grubb commented if open space is important to individuals they will locate to these areas. This is
75 just giving them more options. Recreation opportunities are within walking distance.

76 Council and Planning Commission began discussion on the possibility of requiring trail systems in new
77 developments, this was discussed further later in the meeting.

78 Council Member Poff asked if maintaining the road right-of-way of 70 ft. and wider sidewalks is a good
79 idea. Barry explained this will give the same wider open space feeling and the sidewalks will maintain
80 separation from the road. Commissioner Osborne pointed out giving a less cramped feeling; although the
81 ordinance does not allow for a zero lot line.

82 Commissioner Hyde explained the intent of Planning Commission was to ask for Council input on this
83 proposed ordinance so they can move forward. All Council Members agreed this proposal is of interest
84 for consideration.

85 Council Member Poff asked if the intent to limit the high density was to improve the economic purposes
86 of allowing moderate to low income. Barry clarified this will not address the low to moderate housing
87 issue. Although this does not prevent that by including any high end housing, these are not entry level
88 houses. These are inviting to those who are downsizing but not downgrading. The aesthetic appeal will be
89 maintained.

90 Commissioner Hyde asked if Council Member Poff prefers to include this requirement. He responded he
91 was just looking for pros and cons; trying to picture the developments that may be interested in this zone.
92 Barry clarified the limitations on low to moderate income housing would be created by the zoning map
93 for the future. Council Member Poff asked if this will potentially be the same situation with developer's
94 requesting more housing in a limited space. Barry responded there will always be requests for more
95 housing by developers. Planning Commissioners and City Council will just have to stick to the zoning
96 map plan for the future to maintain the integrity of the developments.

97 Council Member Hilton said he can see the need for this type of housing in the future with the aging
98 population and feels this is a good direction to go.

99

100 Commissioner Hyde said they received a lot of feedback on the proposed connection on 1900.
101 Recommendation of no more than a 10% grade was received but not necessarily the reasoning behind
102 why. Barry clarified basically it became too expensive to build. There is a portion that is set to 14%. They
103 are trying to avoid that but sometimes that is not possible because of the natural land. Heavy trucks would
104 have to get a run at making it up that steep of a slope. Discussion was given over the placement of the
105 water tank in its current location. Council Member Poff said this was purposed as an access road.
106 He said they had to spend some money to give access to the water tank.
107 Council and Planning Commission gave discussion on the intent of this road, access to the water tank, and
108 whether this includes connecting through to Layton City. Commissioner Hyde asked if the intent is not to
109 access Layton, why is there and annexation proposal. Council Member Poff said the annexation is a
110 separate issue. Commissioner Osborne said the road is in place now. Council Member Poss said there is
111 only a 20 ft road access made of road base. Commissioner Osborne said he is not necessarily objecting to
112 the idea of this road connecting through to Layton. Commissioner Hyde said the planning commission
113 would like to leave this as is. Barry pointed out the future map is showing an additional road up there.
114 Council Member Thomas said the main concern is with the slope and cost of the road. Barry mentioned
115 there are possibilities that will reduce the slope below 10% grade. Council Member Poff indicated this
116 passes an elementary school and would not promote commercial development other than the corner area.
117 Barry said they are trying to provide alternate access in the immediate area and admitted the proximity to
118 the elementary school is a drawback. He clarified payment of the road is still the issue. Council Member
119 Thomas said the city didn't want to spend the money to upgrade this road, they would rather developers
120 absorbed the cost during development.
121 Tim Grubb asked if the grades could be addressed as an option. There was another previous plan; it was
122 just expensive to put into place.
123 Barry pointed out several options. Commissioner Westbrook said Brandon Jones did work out other
124 options that include another switch back. Barry concurred there might be a better option. Council Member
125 Poff asked if there would be sensitive land and pollution in the area of development. Tim Grubb
126 suggested a note be added. Commissioner Winsor pointed out 14% is an acceptable grade; although can
127 could possibly address the steep of the slope by included more property. He indicated all codes would be
128 met; they could be more restrictive than the code which might determine where the developer would
129 chose to place the road. They gave discussion regarding different road scenarios. Council Member Poff
130 also pointed out they can control the speed of traffic and insert speed bumps, if necessary. Commissioner
131 Johnson said this is a north facing slope and will get icy during the winter
132 Commissioner Hyde indicated they are trying to alleviate traffic on South Weber Drive; in addition to
133 addressing other issues. Council Member Thomas asked about minor collectors in the area of 6650.
134 Commissioner Hyde said this has been on the master plan, because of the no access onto 6650. She asked
135 if the no access should be put back in place. It was estimated at \$614,000 to improve from 475 to South
136 Weber Drive, not including the purchase of the land. They gave discussion on the Kendall property and
137 the other developments that would take place eventually. These developments will bring even more traffic
138 through this area. Council Member Thomas concurred the second access would be necessary.
139 Commissioner Hyde pointed out the Bryson Meadows subdivision lot numbers mandate a second access
140 be included in this development. They gave additional discussion on how to address and improve traffic
141 in this area. Commissioner Hyde pointed out all of the developments in this area will affect 6650. Jan
142 Ukena said she would like to see the city council step up and pay the \$600,000 to develop this road. Even
143 if other things would have to be put on hold. Commissioner Hyde reminded everyone most of these
144 resident's would lose their front yards. Jan Ukena said there are several people wanting to see this area
145 widened. In her opinion, this has to happen. John Grubb said this has happened before on 475. Barry
146 pointed out these residents would lose their entire yard. Commissioner Hyde said there are limited options
147 until the Kendall property is developed. Jan Ukena said 475 will just have more traffic then.
148 Commissioner Hyde said heavy traffic versus residents losing their entire front yards are two different
149 things. Barry said having 6050 east go through to Old Fort Road would be a much more convenient
150 option.

151 Tim Grubb asked if this makes financial sense to maintain more roads. Jan Ukena said she wouldn't want
152 to maintain that road. Council Member Poff asked about the possibility of aligning South Weber Drive
153 back to the elementary school. Horton comes out on the main artery. Barry said a four way stop would be
154 necessary in this area and eventually a stop light. Tim Grubb said they tried to align this as closely as they
155 could. Horton also continues east through the subdivision and goes up by the church. The intent was to
156 bring out traffic at multiple locations. Commissioner Johnson said this is not an official right of way yet.
157 Tim Grubb said the city does have a right of way. Commissioner Johnson said Old Fort Road would give
158 more impetus for developers to come through, giving the city some control by putting stipulations on the
159 portion that goes through the undeveloped area for the developers to pay back. This would continue with
160 the road the way the city intends. Jan Ukena said there is not currently a payback ordinance in place.
161 Commissioner Hyde asked for feedback.
162 They continued discussion on other available options to address traffic concerns in this area. Tim Grubb
163 suggested condemning the small piece square off 6650 to create this new road access. Council Member
164 Poff questioned if this would create a noise issue. Tim Grubb clarified by condemning this section of
165 property to square off would solve these issues. Council Member Thomas said he is fine with the major
166 collector going past the elementary school. Council Member Poff pointed out this is a big road up the
167 entire length of the hill. Council Member Thomas said there are possibilities for slope to be addressed.
168 Council Member Casas asked if this would be unstable. Barry said the entire hillside is unstable but the
169 installation of Adams Avenue on the North indicated this can be done. Commissioner Poff asked what the
170 slope is on Adams Avenue. Commissioner Winsor said its 12%. Commissioner Osborne said the fact of
171 the matter is, there needs to be more access. Commissioner Hyde said this need to be included on the
172 general plan. Council Member Poff asked who will be using this road, not the residents of South Weber.
173 Commissioner Osborne said he would rather have his children access Northridge High on this new access
174 than on Highway 89. John Grubb pointed out a good secondary road across would make Highway 89
175 safer by eliminating some traffic. Council Member Thomas also pointed out this allows for a second
176 access if there is a disaster on Highway 89. Jan Ukena said it will likely be closed off during snow storms.
177 Barry indicated there are areas of development that would mandate some access. Council Member Poff
178 agreed that development should drive this.
179 Council Member Poff said he would like to discuss the annexation plan. He feels this gives the
180 impression the city is interested in what happens to the neighboring properties. Commissioner Osborne
181 said the reason the area was removed was for sewer issues, not being able to service the area with sewer.
182 Council Member Poff said this is serviceable property. Barry said all that really does is allow a protest
183 with a proposed annexation into Layton City. He said if the intent is to protest annexations, put it on
184 there. Having participated in protests, he feels they will look carefully into who can provide the services
185 to the protested property. Council Member Poff said he feels it shows interest in the surrounding
186 development in the future. Council Member Thomas said if the county decides to do anything, there will
187 be options. Obviously if Layton City decides, they would have the upper hand.
188 Commissioner Hyde said they received the largest feedback that residents would like bigger lots
189 throughout the city.
190 Council Member Thomas informed planning commission and council there was a feasibility study
191 conducted to see if the pit could become a water source. Early information determined, yes, it could be
192 done. On the other hand, the cost without purchasing the land would be \$18 million. This could fit into
193 the future plan for Weber Basin. They would likely take the top 1000 acre ft, and the lining would allow
194 for 5,000 acre ft to seep through. The bad news is the slope would have to be reduced to 3 to 1. This cost
195 would be \$25 million to create this slope. There is adequate fill available but this would involve heavy
196 equipment. He suggested having future discussion about the potential for a recreation/commercial for this
197 area.
198 Commissioner Osborne asked if this is rim to rim. Council Member Thomas said they would have a
199 beach on the South Weber Drive side. Council Member Poff asked if this uses the Geneva pit at all. Jan
200 Ukena asked if UDOT was involved in this discussion considering the location of Highway 89. Barry said

201 there would need to be a lot of sealing done for this to happen. Commissioner Osborn asked what would
202 go in the Geneva pit. Council Member Thomas said this proposal does not include the Geneva pit.
203 Council Member Thomas asked how the new frontage road that is being built will impact future
204 commercial development. Barry said they are building this in their existing right of way.
205 Commissioner Hyde moved the discussion towards #9 of the developable ground area map. Council
206 Member Poff asked what parcels might be considering the patio zoning. Barry and Council Member
207 Thomas pointed out the current residential, where the patio homes might go in the future. The owners
208 want to leave it residential. Council Member Thomas said going up the frontage road allowing for the
209 patio homes to mix in with the RM zoning. Barry said they have had several proposals but because of the
210 grades and the way it slopes to the west, they thought by offering smaller lots, they could get the utilities
211 in better. Council Member Thomas pointed out this is a hard piece, he is not sure they should put more
212 density. Commissioner Hyde said the property owner was not opposed to the patio homes. Council
213 Member Thomas said he was wondering because of the moderate density and the fact that this is a tough
214 piece. Tim Grubb said higher density allows financially the ability to provide more access onto the
215 frontage road. This gives the property owners some discretion. Council Member Thomas asked if the
216 parcel next to the charter school is zoned commercial. Barry confirmed yes, this is proposed commercial.
217 Tim Grubb said the last time they proposed this, they received terrible feedback. They agreed this can be
218 a projected use of this property and they don't have to rezone. Council Member Poff asked for clarification
219 on the mixed use overlay. Council Member Thomas said this allows some mixed use because of the
220 proximity of the highway.
221 Council Member Poff asked about the current testing recharge area. If the gravel pit becomes a lake, what
222 is proposed to fill this space? Barry said if they do a real recharge basin, this will have to be addressed.
223 Commissioner Hyde said they compromised on item #5 of the developable ground area map. Where Stan
224 Cook's property is green on the west side will stay one acre density. This will transition from the freeway
225 out with the lot sizing. Commissioner Osborne pointed out the power lines run through this area as well.
226 Barry said this is just a general location.
227 Planning Commission and Council gave a general discussion on item #3 of the developable ground area
228 map. Council Member Poff asked if this will be offered to the first developer and everyone else will get
229 the 1/3 acre lots. They discussed the options on the available zoning allowed in this area. Clarification
230 was made the proposed patio ordinance limits a 9-acre parcel as the maximum for a development;
231 although multiple developments can be authorized by the city. They gave discussion about having houses
232 up by the freeway. Council Member Thomas asked if developers must include a visual barrier in this area.
233 Council Member Poff said the property down by the dairy will be left natural land. Barry informed
234 Council UDOT suggested the city mandate sound walls on any developments near the freeway.
235 Commissioner Hyde asked for feedback on the lot sizes, saying the residents like the agriculture feeling in
236 the community of the west side. She asked if the rest of South Weber Drive should be allowed 1/4 acre
237 lots.
238 Council Member Poff said if the density is set in the patio zone would they have to provide more open
239 space. Council Member Casas said there is a natural buffer. Council Member Poff pointed out they have
240 the nine acres already set. Commissioner Osborne asked if 9 acres is too much. Tim Grubb said the
241 ordinance doesn't limit the amount of developments that can go together on the city's end, just on the
242 developer's end.
243 Commissioner Hyde asked for input on the zoning allowed on South Weber Drive. They gave discussion
244 on the landscape of the lots, giving the illusion the houses are spread out more on the east side. Towards
245 the west end, the same lot size will change the agricultural feeling. They discussed how to address the
246 housing and maintain the feeling.
247 Council Member Poff said a lot of this is driven by the developer; if they cluster the homes.
248 Commissioner Hyde said once it's zoned, the developers can maximize this. She said this sets a guideline.
249 Gardner Crane said things that look nice, sell well.
250 Council Member Poff asked about the Kendall property. Commissioner Hyde said they are set at 1/3 acre
251 lots. Heather Cove is 1/3 acre lots.

252 Barry clarified some items that were part of the reason why the plan on the west end is what it is today.
253 They gave discussion showing what currently exists.

254 Commissioner Hyde said the commercial property in the upper left will go back to light green. This
255 property is in the flight zone and has access issues. They will leave these as ½ acre lots. They could
256 potentially stub into Heather Cove and come out to South Weber Drive.

257 Commissioner Osborne clarified which parcels will remain yellow and what will change to green.

258 Commissioner Hyde pointed out some of this area is unincorporated Weber County.

259 Jared Bryson pointed out Louise's property has only one driving access and is one acre. This may need to
260 be addressed. He suggested this might need to remain high density. There is no access through there
261 unless. Council Member Thomas said the RH shows it is already zoned. They gave discussion about
262 which areas to include from the high density to ¼ to 1/3 acre lots. Commissioner Osborne pointed out this
263 has already passed through planning commission with a recommendation to Council. Council Member
264 Thomas said his impression is this was tabled for this discussion. He said when this originally came up
265 the zoning map was inconsistent. City Council received a positive recommendation from the planning
266 commission and they would like to see where they were coming from.

267 Barry also pointed out they can show this on the general plan. Council Member Thomas said when they
268 take a look at the land use map, what are the planning commissioners recommending. Commissioner
269 Osborne said they have sent their recommendation on to Council. Council Member Thomas explained the
270 Council was uncomfortable with approving this because it was inconsistent with the current land use map.

271 Jared Bryson said they have not maximized the allowed homes on the Bryson Meadows development by
272 20 homes. They have matched the back side of the development with ½ acre lots. Brandon Jones said the
273 preliminary plat was already approved. He said they would need the RM zone although they are not
274 maximizing the allowable lots.

275 Clarification was given about the high density housing having been given a recommendation. Council
276 Member Thomas said the question lays with the current zoning of ½ acre lots changing to RM. He said
277 this was inconsistent. The Council was anticipating the moderate density approval and are now waiting
278 for the appropriate recommendation.

279 Rod said this goes with the proposal. Council Member Hilton asked if this proposal is accurately depicted
280 on the map. Commissioner Winsor indicated about 80/20 or 70/30 percentage density of this area is
281 portrayed. Commissioner Hyde said the planning commission has been discussing this. Jared Bryson
282 again mentioned they have not maximized the lots and some of the bordering homes show the 1/3 to ½
283 acre lots. Brandon Jones said the 1/3 and ½ acre lots are consistent in an RM zone.

284 Barry said on the transportation element, they redrew the plans 5 times addressing the access requirement.
285 He recommended not changing this element in the plans.

286 Council Member Thomas said the Council depends heavily on the planning commission's
287 recommendations. He said he is usually comfortable voting in line with these recommendations.

288 Commissioner Winsor said he would like to add future water resources to the general plan discussion. He
289 said with the current schedule of the master plan the current water resources will not support the
290 additional growth. He suggested the financial decisions need to be decided with the master plan.

291 Brandon Jones presented the projected water information. He informed Planning Commission and
292 Council there is a difference between what is being used against what is required by the state as needed. If
293 they go off the projected necessity based on the state calculations they should be addressing the
294 possibility of purchasing water from Weber Basin. Based on the actual usage, they are okay. This is much
295 lower than what they originally thought. There is also a change that well development might provide more
296 water. The quickest water source is to purchase from Weber Basin. Commissioner Winsor pointed out
297 Weber Basin has recently sold more water. He informed Council the purchase of this water commits the
298 city whether or not they use this resource, they would still be paying for it. They purchase price of water
299 was discussed and also the possibility of this water no longer being available.

300 Jan Ukena suggested requiring developers to purchase water. Council Member Thomas said they would
301 have to implement a water concurrency order, where developers are required to provide water for their
302 developments. Brandon Jones pointed out this is not how it's historically been done. Council Member

303 Thomas concurred most cities don't handle water issues this way. Brandon said the ongoing contract
304 would eventually become the city's responsibility. Council Member Thomas agreed, this sometimes
305 effects a change in rates. Under this order, developers purchase the first contract which is typically
306 annual. Brandon said once the contract is in place, they city has to pay each year after. Obviously new
307 development in the city will bring in more water use. This is just a recommendation to consider
308 purchasing more water in the future. Commissioner Osborne said he doesn't want to pay for water for
309 future residents of the city. Brandon Jones said the current rates are low and so water can be purchased
310 cheaper now and pay a little less in the long run, otherwise you'll have to pay the going rate at the
311 necessary time. Council Member Poff said you can't offset the cost by having two sets of water rates. The
312 water rates must be the same for all residents. John Grubb asked what will happen when Weber Basin
313 runs out of available water. Commissioner Winsor said there are multiple districts available. There are
314 recharge wells, and a fourth district out towards Tremonton is being developed. Weber Basin considers all
315 of the cities it provides water for. He stated this needs to be considered when these new developments are
316 coming through.

317 Barry said water issues factor into density as well. 60% of water used in residential goes into yards. The
318 lower density requires more water to cover the yards. Commissioner Winsor estimated about 300
319 developable lots are available before they need to consider the water issue.

320 Barry informed Planning Commission and Council that Map #6, the Pedestrian Transportation Map, has
321 one controversial issue the canal trail. The canal company and others are not really in favor of having a
322 trail run alongside the canal. There is a trail that runs near canals in Clearfield. Obviously there are
323 hazards involved when considering this option, especially if this has been intended. Commissioner
324 Winsor suggested the trail system be put in place should the canal be enclosed. They gave discussion
325 about never intending to put it in with open canals. There has been a push to enclose canals. Mayor Long
326 said there is danger even when the canal is dry. Barry said if it's not included now, it will never happen.
327 Commissioner Hyde said this is only being considered if/when the canal is closed. Council Member Poff
328 said not to include this in the drawing, but in the text. Commissioner Winsor said contractors have a
329 tendency to read the drawings but not always the text. Planning Commission and Council agreed a note
330 stating "Future canal trail to be completed when safe access" should be included.

331 Commissioner Johnson there has been some discussion about the Weber Canyon Trail head connecting to
332 the Bonneville Shore Line Trail; also connecting South Weber Drive to Fisherman's Trailhead.
333 The Charter school trail access need to stay, but the note needs to be removed.

334 Council Member Casas pointed out some of the trail actually runs on sidewalk. His preference is to see it
335 be a trail. Council Member Hilton said the Weber River trail has the same problem. Council Member Poff
336 suggested having developers include the trail as part of future development. Council Member Casas asked
337 if what the definition of a trail is considered. Commissioner Johnson read the definition of what a trail is.
338 They gave discussion on how to implement this item. Council Member Casas agreed this would be
339 difficult to implement in the existing areas but would like to consider this in future development.
340 They gave discussion about where the local trails go through. Brandon asked for specific clarification.
341 Council Member Casas gave clarification and an example of where to run the trail system not necessarily
342 onto the sidewalks. Brandon said some trees may be lost to development. Tim Grubb says you can discuss
343 this when bringing in the development. Jared Bryson said the financial burden is hard for the developers
344 to put the 5 ft sidewalks with the 70 ft streets and expressed concern if a trail system is required as well.
345 Gardner Crane suggested they consider when installing 15-20 feet trail areas that sometimes pose a
346 problem for future maintenance, and then they would have to create a HOA to maintain the areas.
347 They discussed current access for trails. Brandon suggested swinging the frontage road out. Barry said
348 that was the original vision. There was a 15ft buffer with trees and open space. Brandon said when this is
349 part of the approval process to take away property to develop lots and install trails, money is lost. Barry
350 said one possibility is to allow increased density to encourage the trail implementation. Council Member
351 Poff pointed out the power lines. They could encourage developments to tie into trail systems. Council
352 Member Casas said the survey feedback says residents would like trails. Brandon said this is just to
353 connect through. Barry suggested allowing developers to put in trails in lieu of impact fees.

354 Gardner Crane said he lives in Kaysville where there is an equestrian trails. The home owners have now
355 been burdened to keep the weeds down. It turns out this is not being used for what it was originally
356 intended. This has become a concern in his area. They gave discussion about the rail trail that runs
357 through the county, just to raise some issues that may be considered.
358 Brandon asked for clarification on where to tie into after Heather Cove. Council Member Casas admitted
359 this development was put in without thought.
360 They gave discussion about UDOT corridor along the river. Council Member Poff said there will
361 probably be spots where it's necessary to tie into the sidewalks. He would like to suggest to developers to
362 incorporate these into the developments.
363 Commissioner Hyde said they will discuss this during their next meeting. This can move forward without
364 making all of these decisions.
365 Gardner Crane suggested including this on the map and then addressing it on a case by case basis by
366 doing what make sense for each development.
367 Commissioner Hyde said there were no changes on the sensitive lands plans.
368 Commissioner Johnson said there was a meeting with Hill Air Force Bases environmental consultant
369 Barbara Hill who said they should not build in some areas because of potential contamination. They only
370 tested for 4 types of chemicals. Others were not considered during the testing. There was documentation
371 contaminants were dumped on the hill.
372 Barry said the reason this was removed is because there was no direction as to what it meant. Council
373 Member Thomas said he had them chart out for the last 20 years. There is concern with taking it off
374 giving a false sense of safety and leaving it on is just a guideline. There was some discussion as to
375 needing something in place to indicate the city is aware. If there is a line determined, this may give a
376 false sense of security to those outside of the line. They gave some discussion as to how to offer
377 appropriate information to residents. Commissioner Johnson expressed concern with placing liability on
378 the city. Council Member Poff said there is doubt that anyone would come after the city. Barry said these
379 lines can be put back.
380 Commissioner Hyde said they will consider these items on the 26th at their regular meeting and give a
381 recommendation to the council regarding these issues. Commissioner Johnson said if these things are
382 included, they can put the burden on the developer. Council Member Poff said he's worried about the
383 procedure of having this on or off the map. Commissioner Johnson said he would like to see actual
384 documentation that sampling was done and came out clean. John Grubb said he lives within the area that
385 is tested for 14 years and it always comes back clean.

386 **Planning Commission adjourned at 9:06 pm.**

387
388 **Mayor Long called the meeting to order at 9:20 p.m.**

389
390 **BRYSON MEADOWS DISCUSSION:** Jared Bryson said they included some of the items during the
391 general plan discussion. He said now is an opportunity to answer any questions about the Bryson
392 Meadows development. Council Member Casas said he'd like to read through a development agreement.
393 Jared said there is one drafted. Council Member Casas said he would like to see that. Jared asked when
394 there might be a decision made. Council Member Thomas said the decision will be made the same night
395 of the general plan. Planning Commission will be discussing this at their next meeting. The posting
396 requirements need to be met. Gardner Crane asked if this is likely to take place within the next month or
397 two. The original motion states they are willing to consider this proposed subdivision with the
398 recommendation from Planning Commission. Council Member Thomas said they can give their answer
399 with the general plan. Gardner Crane said he appreciates them taking the opportunity to be here.

400
401 **FIRE DEPARTMENT PO #2400 FOR BREATHING EQUIPMENT:** Council Member Hilton said
402 there is a lot of discussion about equipment needs for the Fire Department. Council Member Thomas said
403 they have never used the ladder truck. Council Member Hilton said this is a lot of expense. They gave
404 discussion about what is required for approval of these purchases. Council Member Thomas said the Fire

405 Department gives great argument for the needs of the department. They gave discussion about the
406 requirements of needing a ladder truck for the houses up on 8200 which are elevated. This is greater than
407 35 feet. Council Member Poff asked if something happens, are they able to determine that the city didn't
408 support the need for the proper equipment. Council Member Hilton said there was \$20,000 set aside last
409 year, and nothing has come of that. Council Member Poff made reference to instances where a ladder
410 truck may be necessary. Council Member Thomas agreed it is hard to make a decision when you are not
411 the expert. Council Member Poore said the budget needs consideration; whether the needs are worth a
412 property tax increase to provide these things. Council Member Poff said he attended training at the
413 League conference that showed just how dangerous these circumstances are. Council Member Thomas
414 said this is always a tough call.

415
416 **MOTION: Council Member Thomas motioned to approve the Fire Department PO #2400 for**
417 **breathing equipment. Council Member Poff seconded the motion. All Council Members Thomas,**
418 **Casas, Poff, and Poore voted aye. Council Member Hilton voted no. Motion passed 4-0.**
419

420 **CONTRACT FOR TEMPORARY TREASURER SERVICES:** Council Member Casas said Dee
421 Murray followed up with him and indicated she can't work for the listed price. She would like \$35 per
422 hour but would probably be able to do the work in 20 hours or less per week. She needs to be bonded and
423 the city must pay for the bond. Council Member Poff said hopefully she can help them get through the
424 difficult stuff. Council Member Casas clarified she already has a full time job. They will not have to
425 provide a benefit package. At this time not contract has been drafted.

426
427 **MOTION: Council Member Poff motioned to approve the appointment of Dee Murray as**
428 **Temporary Treasurer not to exceed 20 hours. Council Member Thomas seconded the motion. All**
429 **Council Members voted aye. Motion passed.**
430

431 **OTHER DISCUSSION:**

432 Council Member Poff asked how many employees are left and expressed his desire to acknowledge the
433 extra efforts of the staff by giving a 3% pay increase retroactive to March as compensation. Council
434 Member Casas pointed out they agreed to compensate the employees for the extra hours they are working.
435 Council Member Poff said he thought this might help with moral; as this has been an issue as of late
436 based on the city's circumstances. Mayor and Council gave discussion about compensation for employees
437 extra efforts. They discussed offering a year-end bonus. Council Member Poff said bonuses can be
438 problematic. Council Member Casas indicated he is not opposed. Council Member Poff said he was
439 trying to figure out a way to do it without calling out a bonus. Council Member Poore suggested just
440 offering a bonus. Council Member Casas said he is in favor of doing something, but pointed out having to
441 change the payroll might be difficult. Council Member Poff said the only reason he is suggesting it was to
442 acknowledge employees efforts. Council Member Hilton suggested calculating out the amount based on
443 hours works and incorporated that as the bonus amount. Mayor and Council agreed to try to compensate
444 the employees.

445
446 **MOTION: Council Member Casas motioned to approve a 3% bonus based on the last three**
447 **months of the employee's salary to be paid out at the end of the fiscal year. Council Member**
448 **Thomas seconded the motion. All Council Members voted aye. Motion passed.**
449

450 Mayor Long asked if everyone received the letter from the Boyer's. Everyone did read this letter.

451
452 Council Member Casas said Mark has been asking about an appeal authority. Council Member Hilton
453 said he understood this was changed but never addressed. Council Member Poff said somebody came in
454 for an application to file an appeal. He asked if there is not an appeal authority in place, does it
455 automatically go through to district court. Council Member Poore said she thought the Appeal Authority

456 needed to be an attorney. Council Member Casas said he filed an appeal that was never addressed under
457 the old administration.

458 Council Member Thomas said there is a pre-appointed attorney with predetermined fees. Council Member
459 Poff asked if it is possible to bypass this, and go to the district court. Discussion about the time frame
460 after the appeal is filed. Council Member Thomas said it depends on what they are appealing. Council
461 Member Poff suggested the Mayor look for someone to appoint. They agreed to give direction to Staff if
462 this appeal is filed. Council Member Thomas said they could get a list of attorneys from the property
463 rights ombudsman and possibly choose someone from there. Council Member Casas asked if the Council
464 can be the appeal authority. They discussed how to address this to remain impartial. Council Member
465 Thomas suggested finding out the subject matter and then determining where to send the appeal.

466
467 Mayor Long said she received an inquiry as to why everyone pays the same on their water bill even
468 though the usage may vary. Council Member Poff said they set the minimum standard. Council Member
469 Hilton clarified a standard has to be determined. Council Member Casas said there is a minimum and if
470 usage exceeds the minimum the resident must pay more. He suggested the Mayor reply through a letter as
471 to why there is a minimum standard. Council Member Poff said it is possible to go through the
472 appropriate process to change this. Council Member Hilton said part of this is administrative cost.
473 Council Member Poore said she has seen something that shows a cost breakdown. Council Member Casas
474 said he would be happy to respond to this resident and explain the water billing process.

475
476 Council Member Thomas said he talked to Brandon Jones briefly after the planning commission meeting.
477 He asked what the capacity of the well is versus what is being pumped from the well. Brandon said
478 because of the new tank, there is better pressure and it's more affordable, that is why we are using this.
479 There is probably not as much of a concern with running low on water as previously thought.

480
481 **MOTION: Council Member Thomas motioned to enter into a closed executive session for the**
482 **purpose of discussion of character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of**
483 **individual(s). Council Member Casas seconded the motion. All Council Members voted aye. Motion**
484 **passed.**

485
486 Council Members convened into a Closed Executive Session.

487
488 **MOTION: Council Member Thomas motioned to close the Closed Executive Session and reopen**
489 **the public meeting. Council member Casas seconded the motion. All Council Members voted aye.**
490 **Motion passed.**

491
492 **Mayor Long motioned to adjourn at 10:12 p.m.**

493
494
495 **APPROVED:** _____ **Date**
496 **Mayor: Tammy Long**

497
498
499
500 **Attest:** _____ **Temporary City Recorder: Jennie Knight**

SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WORK MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 26 June 2014

TIME COMMENCED: 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS:

**Delene Hyde
Rob Osborne
Wes Johnson
Rod Westbroek
Wayne Winsor**

CITY PLANNER:

Barry Burton

CITY MANAGER:

Duncan Murray

TEMPORARY CITY RECORDER:

Jennie Knight

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

VISITORS: Mayor Long, Jared Bryson, Wendell Pasch.

Recommendation of Proposed Ordinance 14-02, An Ordinance Amending Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 5 Zoning Districts, Addition of Article P: Residential Patio Zone.

Commissioner Hyde questioned where this zone would be allowed. Barry said wherever the general plan designates. He said the intent is to spread it out in locations that make sense so that it doesn't impact traffic. Commissioner Hyde asked if it would go on the Stauffer piece. She would also like to know if it is the first person who requests the nine acres to be rezoned. Barry said it would be a maximum of ten acres but it doesn't say how much separation is between that one and the next one. Commissioner Hyde feels it should be clarified. Barry said we can take the maximum off. Duncan said because it is a zone change the Planning Commission and City Council would have discretion. Barry said at the public hearing there was a lot of testimony for this kind of housing. Commissioner Hyde feels it should be specifically defined where this zone would be located on the general plan. Commissioner Winsor said his intent with the zone is to transition into other zones. Jared Bryson said he has been working with Brent Stauffer concerning the size of lots for the Spaulding property. Commissioner Westbroek is good with the limit of 10 acres. He questioned if it can be approved case by case. He feels there should be distance between the developments. Barry suggested a minimum of a certain number of feet between the zones. Commissioner Hyde suggested leaving it the way it was presented to the City Council. Commissioner Winsor said a call was made to him from a developer down south who told him to make sure a grading plan is submitted with the plat. He suggested requiring a drainage plan. The Planning Commission agreed to require a storm water drainage plan. Barry said we need to put it where people will likely find it. He suggested possibly putting them in the subdivision ordinance requirements. Duncan said maybe in the special conditions section (10-5P-9) you can reference the requirement. Commissioner Osborne discussed the purposes of the zone where it references this zone is designed for adult living. He said to him an adult living home should not be higher than one story. Barry said he doesn't have a problem with a height

limit. He would recommend 25 feet. Jared said the senior population does want the one level with no loft, but for younger generations, with families, it makes it difficult to fit on one level. He said this property would be located next to a commercial location and would be easier to market both demographics. Commissioner Osborne said the problem is this zone has already been sold to the City Council for adult living. Barry said there are other options in the city. Commissioner Westbrook feels it should be one level.

ADJOURNED: 6:30 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ **Date**

Chairperson: Delene Hyde

Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest: _____ **Temporary City Recorder: Jennie Knight**

DRAFT

SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 26 June 2014

TIME COMMENCED: 6:32 p.m.

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS:

Delene Hyde
Rob Osborne
Wes Johnson (arrived at 7:50 p.m.)
Rod Westbroek
Wayne Winsor

CITY PLANNER:

Barry Burton

CITY MANAGER:

Duncan Murray

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

A PUBLIC WORK MEETING was held at 6:00 p.m. to REVIEW AGENDA ITEMS

VISITORS: Mayor Long, Jared Bryson, Wendell Pasch.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Commissioner Westbroek moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Osborne seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Osborne, Westbroek, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 24 APRIL 2014:

Commissioner Winsor moved to approve the minutes of 24 April 2014 as amended. Commissioner Osborne seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Osborne, Westbroek, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST: None

Commissioner Westbroek moved to open the public hearing for proposed Ordinance 14-02. Commissioner Winsor seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Osborne, Westbroek, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

***** PUBLIC HEARING *****

Recommendation of Proposed Ordinance 14-02, an Ordinance Amending Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 5 Zoning Districts, Addition of Article P: Residential Patio Zone.

Barry explained that this ordinance began life with a different title as well as different provisions than what it currently has now. He said in the process of going through public hearings and the open house; subsequently, we made changes to it, including the title of the zone. It is now titled

a Residential Patio Zone. This zone encourages adult living development. He said it is now single family detached with 65 ft. minimum frontage. The density is six units per acre. He said in the work meeting held earlier, the Planning Commission discussed amending the ordinance to include a reference to the subdivision ordinance to require a grading plan for each lot and any subsequent building or the homeowner would be required to adhere to that grading plan. He said the Planning Commission also recommended changing the height to a maximum of 25 ft.

Commissioner Hyde asked for public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Westbrook moved to close the public hearing for proposed Ordinance 14-02. Commissioner Winsor seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Osborne, Westbrook, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

******* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED *******

Barry wanted to make sure there is to be no planned unit developments allowed in this zone. The Planning Commission agreed. Commissioner Westbrook is in favor of a one level home for adult senior type living.

Commissioner Westbrook moved to recommend approval of Ordinance 14-02 with amendments discussed in work meeting with limiting maximum height to 25 ft. and requiring a grading plan. Commissioner Winsor seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Osborne, Westbrook, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

Work on General Plan Update (Text of document & maps): Commissioner Hyde discussed 6650 South and stated it the text before it said “no access onto 6650 South” which has been deleted, but she feels there still needs to be wording. It was suggested it should state, “Minimal access to 6650 South”. Duncan suggested using “secondary non-exclusive access to 6650 South”. The Planning Commission agreed.

Commissioner Johnson arrived at 6:50 p.m.

Transportation Map:

It was suggested there will be no change to the transportation map concerning the road going up 1900 East and 1160 East by the elementary school.

Projected Land Use Map:

Commissioner Osborne would like the new zone to be defined better. The Planning Commission identified two separate areas in the city that would be designated Residential Patio Zone. Barry discussed Harper Way as low moderate on the plan. The Planning Commission discussed the Cooper property (1.5 acres) and whether or not to identify it for high density. The Planning Commission was not in agreement.

Pedestrian Transportation Map:

Barry suggested a note recommending a trail only where the canal has been piped. Commissioner Osborne discussed a trail access from 7400 South to Fisherman’s Trailhead. Barry suggested removing the note on the plan concerning the school access walkway. Barry

discussed what common language can be used for trails so that everyone knows what type of trail is being discussed. Barry will get more information on the state level.

Annexation Map:

Barry said we have taken some property off, but the City Council has recommended putting it back on.

Sensitive Lands Map:

Commissioner Johnson discussed the 2,000 ft. buffer. Commissioner Osborne said instead of drawing the circles, he said there are lines identifying the buffer. Commissioner Johnson feels there should be a requirement for a phase 2 environmental assessment inside the 2,000 ft. buffer before any development. Commissioner Hyde is wondering where the responsibility of the city ends. She isn't in favor of creating an undo burden on someone. Commissioner Osborne would like to know where the 2,000 ft. number came from and wonders why it is on there if no one knows where it came from. Commissioner Johnson recommends including the 2,000 ft. buffer. The Planning Commission decided to put the 2,000 ft. buffer back on the map. It was decided that a statement be included for the requirement of an environmental test for soil and groundwater contaminants within the 2,000 ft. buffer.

OTHER BUSINESS:

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on 17 July 2014.

ADJOURNED: Commissioner Winsor moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 7:26 p.m. Commissioner Westbrook seconded the motion. Commissioners Hyde, Johnson, Osborne, Westbrook, and Winsor voted yes. The motion carried.

APPROVED: _____ Date

Chairperson: Delene Hyde

Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest:

Temporary City Recorder: Jennie Knight