

OGDEN VALLEY CITY COUNCIL  
 MINUTES FOR OGDEN VALLEY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING  
 April 6, 2026, 2:00 p.m.

Huntsville Town Hall, Council Chambers, 7474 East 200 South, Huntsville, Utah

Name	Title	Status
Janet Wampler	Mayor	Present
Tia Shaw	Council Member	Present
Peggy Dooling-Baker	Council Member	Present
Kay Hoogland	Council Member	Present
Chad Booth	Council Member	Present
Don Hickman	Council Member	Present
Sharon Robbins	Recorder	Present
Kathy Zindel	IT Director	Present
Nate Smith	City Engineer	Present via Zoom

**1. Call to Order** by Mayor Wampler at 2:01pm

- a. **Roll Call** – all members present; Council member Hoogland was late
- b. **Pledge of Allegiance** led by Mayor Wampler
- c. **Moment of Silence** for approximately one minute

**2. Planning Update:**

The public hearing on March 31<sup>st</sup> was very well attended – standing room only, and 100 people on-line. The City Attorney provided a review and intent and format for the meeting. The public provided organized and clear thoughts. Written comments were collected, with more over the weekend. Some of the more prominent topics for comments were changes to setbacks, animal rights and STRs. The Planning Commission responded to the comments and revised some items including the setbacks and animal units.

The next Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for April 14<sup>th</sup>, with a long list of items to review. The third public hearing is expected on April 28<sup>th</sup> for the remaining items.

Mayor Wampler expressed concerns over the Admin section in the next hearing not aligning with the City’s form of government, with the section going from a Class 2 County to a Class 5 City. Planning Commission should be removed from Admin section since it is included in the adopted municipal code.

**3. Consent Agenda: Minutes 3.23 Work Session, 3.23 Special Meeting**

Council member Dooling-Baker sent changes for the minutes.

#### **4. Update on Impact Fees**

The impact fee hearing is scheduled for April 13<sup>th</sup>. The Impact Fee Funding Plan was developed by JUB and Funding Analysis completed by Zions. Postcards are not required for this hearing. Once approved, the 90-day pause (cure time) starts, in line with the lifting of the moratorium.

#### **5. Update on Building Permit/Inspection Contract**

Council member Hickman indicated that Beacon Code Consultants were selected as the vendor to support building permits and inspections. We will get the building permit and capabilities from the vendor. They will help to select a platform, create forms, and draft fee schedule. We may want to determine if this consultant can also provide the business license capability and select a platform with that capability.

He indicated the City can hire a code enforcement officer from the same company using this contract and also can hire a zoning administrator ('desk' person) as an option to the contract.

Council member Hoogland is working with Beacon Code on the contract that will need to be voted on. The vote on April 7<sup>th</sup> will be about moving forward with the recommendations of the RFP committee.

#### **6. Demonstration of GIS including new/proposed OVC Planning Zones**

Commission member Hickman indicated the OVC GIS is ready. It includes the proposed zoning map from the Planning Commission.

Nate Smith, the City Engineer, displayed the OVC GIS. There is a link to this map on the OVC website. It shows the current zoning, and has a layer for proposed zoning.

Mayor Wampler asked how deep is the GIS. City Engineer Smith indicated that all Weber County layers have been referenced on the OVC GIS. Parcels can be looked up to get ownership. It is similar to what is on GeoGizmo. Mayor Wampler asked about future plans. The plan is to move the data to the OVC GIS

Council member Hoogland asked about the labels and the cross-hatch sections. The labels should display in the legend. The cross-hatch is the Master Plan Overlay Zone, it highlights the development agreements. The Weber County information is incomplete and does not display

most of the development agreements. City Planner Carver indicated his team is looking at getting all the development agreements mapped. It requires taking survey measurements and plotting the polygons.

Mayor Wampler indicated having Master Development Overlays will be nice to have and something to aspire to. The GIS will still display the underlying zones and all of the information on the parcel. Intention of the maps is to show current zoning and proposed zoning.

Council member Hickman indicated the top priority is to show zoning as of the end of last year as compared to the proposed zones, and what is approved from the City Council.

Mayor Wampler asked about proposed changes that cannot be represented. City Planner Carver indicated that STRs are vested in some master development agreements. It would need to be handled if new STRs are allowed. The STR ordinance would need to be clear to the public.

## **7. Discussion on Revised Planning Commission Ordinance & Bylaws**

Planning Commission was included in the municipal code stating the City must follow the Utah code.

Council member Hickman indicated he had no problems with what is there.

Council member Dooling-Baker indicated she thought we did not want to include alternates. That language is in the current version. Mayor Wampler recollected that City Attorney Gordon recommended leaving the language in case it is needed. That does not mean it is required. Mayor Wampler indicated it can be removed. The language is may, so a future council can do it. There is a section on filling vacancies. There is a section on rules of conduct the planning commission is expected to follow.

This resolution is for adoption at the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **8. Discussion of the Resolution Adopting the Enforcement Code**

Mayor Wampler indicated the ordinance was adopted last week. This resolution is to enact the ordinance. Some language in the ordinance was also in the municipal code. New language was added to take care of those differences.

There are several fees and forfeiture not included in the municipal code that have been added. It also references enforcement code procedures and fines. The new version does not supercede those references.

Mayor Wampler left the meeting and turned over the meeting to Mayor Pro Tem Hickman.

Council member Dooling-Baker asked for clarification of the term “the City”. She was asked to send her question to the City Attorney.

## **9. Discuss the Planning Commission’s Recommended Land Use Items**

Council member Hickman asked what administrative land use codes need to be in place in addition to the zones. City Planner Carver articulated a partial list, that shows many other items would need to be passed before permits could be issued.

We have 6 documents from the Planning Commission that we can look at for approval. The General Plan needs to be adopted first, followed by the zoning map. There is no imperative to get the land use codes passed tomorrow since they cannot be implemented.

### General Plan

City Planner Carver provided a summary of the changes to the General Plan including additional goals and objectives about water quality / water management.

There was discussion of TDRs as a tool for the valley to use. City Planner Carver asked that all references to TDRs be removed. He said the Planning Commission did not find the county’s application of TDR program did not include adequate rules and standards. Council member Hoogland indicated there were many comments from residents that TDRs are a good tool. She indicated TDRs should be left in.

Council member Dooling-Baker should be left in as a tool with appropriate ordinances put in place. Making larger changes to TDRs would be in the larger review of the General Plan. Council member Booth asked City Planner Carver about what it would take to get the TDRs ordinances in place is a long process. Council member Hickman also indicated TDRs should remain in the General Plan with ordinances later. Council member Hoogland is conservative about any changes in the General Plan and thinks TDRs should remain.

Council member Shaw indicated septic tanks in the General Plan. City Planner Carver said that septic tanks are managed by the Health Department not the City. Council member Booth indicated this does not stop septic systems to be implemented.

Council member Hickman indicated a process to continue the feedback on the General Plan. Everyone should provide comments to the General Plan to City Planner Carver to get on next working session for discussion.

City Planner Carver removed Form-based zone and gravel zone, and making changes from FV3 lots to AV3.

For the gravel zone, the thought was it does not fit with the character of the valley and are proposed to change to AV3. They do not want to see it as an encouraged use in the community.

The form-based zone changes include Nordic Valley, Eden Crossing to be rezoned to prior zoning code. Nordic Valley to be rezoned FV3. Eden Crossing and Dog & Bone were rezoned to AV3. The FB parcels in Old Eden were changed to CV2. The Planning Commission indicated there is unfavorable characterization of this zone.

Council member Hoogland asked if you can ‘unring the bell’. Plans were made, development agreements are in place. Is there a need to change the zone when it is already vested. City Planner Carver indicated removing the zone does not change the underlying master development agreement or what product the community will receive. Leaving form-based will only open the door if the City Council allows it.

The General Plan does not have much in it about how to create ‘village’ areas. There is no fixed timeline on when this would be created. City Planner Carver indicated that removing it could result in a loss in property value and provide challenges for financing.

If a property owner wants a form-based type zone and it does not exist, does not mean the City needs to approve. No request since no zone. Even with the zone, terms of the master development agreement can be adjusted to include rights not within the zone as long as the City Council agrees. Master development agreements supercede the zones in all cases.

Council member Booth indicated there is good information with the form-based zone to make the valley great. We need to work together and more input from our residents.

Council member Hickman asked what zones are receiving areas for TDRs. City Planner Carver indicated CV2 is a receiving zone. If TDRs can be bought / sold they need a zone where they can be received.

Council member Dooling-Baker indicated the village is

Council member Carver indicated there is ambiguity in taking the value of the property if the zone is changed.

City Planner Carver recommended one of two solutions (1) to retain the zone but agree not to approve new parcels in FB zone in the future. This provides time to new develop ordinances. (2)

remove the form-based zone and use the Master Development Agreement Overlay to manage the parcels.

The last zoning changes were FV3 to AV3. There are a few parcels implicated. City Planner Carver indicated there were three comments – one for the changes, and two changes against. FV3 allows bed and breakfast, AV3 does not. Some agricultural used from AV3 were added to FV3 zone.

Council member Hickman indicated that the properties under discussion are in his District. He has not been presented with a problem to fix. His thought is to leave it the same.

Council member Hoogland indicated we need more input from farmers before changing the zones that impact farmers.

Council member Hickman asked how to approach feedback to the zoning map. We should have a work session for April 13<sup>th</sup> to continue discussions on the 6 land use ordinances.

#### **10. Discuss the Pros/Cons of Rolling Back the Moratorium in Stages**

Once the zones are passed but cannot be acted on until other sections are in place. If passing it does not move it forward then why adopt it. It might be better to delay adoption to give more time for review.

Question about whether we can roll back in waves. May cause resident frustration.

City Planner Carver indicated we could pass AV3 next week but it would create complications due to standards not in place such as STR, Agritourism.

Council member asked about building standards. City Planner Carver indicated those are generally not included, they are part of the international standards.

Adopting AV3 does not remove the moratorium. That requires amending the moratorium. For AV3 adopted next week the Lighting standards are not in place and any lighting would be allowed.

What other codes must be in existence to be able to remove the moratorium. Most have been addressed – City Planner Carver indicated these standards must be in place: conditional uses, single housing design standards, noncompliant/nonconforming structures, STR (maintain current if needed).

Council member Hoogland asked about how impact fees can be collected based on timing of lifting the moratorium. City Planner Carver indicated there are options in state code as to when the impact fees are collected. He indicated there are about 40 applications that would not collect impact fees. Fees are around \$30K per application. Council member Hickman indicated this should be a consideration.

Council member Dooling-Baker indicated we should move quickly on release of the moratorium. We could start releasing the moratorium by May 15<sup>th</sup>.

Council member Hoogland indicated what is the harm in moving STRs forward since we need more time. The problem with STRs is enforcement.

### **11. Council Comments**

Not discussed.

### **12. Closed Meeting (As needed for any purpose as allowed in UCA 52-4-25.)**

No request was made for closed meeting.

### **13. Adjournment - Council member Shaw moved to adjourn the meeting. Council member Booth seconded the motion. All members voted aye (5-0).**

The April 6th, 2026 Work Session meeting minutes were Approved by the Ogden Valley City Council on the 21st day of April, 2026.

Signature: *Sharon Robbins*

Printed Name: Sharon Robbins