

**OGDEN VALLEY CITY
MINUTES OF OGDEN VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Tuesday, March 31, 2026, 5:00 p.m.
Huntsville Town Hall, Council Chambers
7474 East 200 South, Huntsville, Utah 84317

Name	Title	Attendance
Lisa Arbogast	Planning Commission Chair	Present
Andela Dean	Planning Commission Vice Chair	Present
Fred Blickle	Planning Commission Member	Present
Tyson Lloyd	Planning Commission Member	Present
Erin Shaffer	Planning Commission Member	Present
Teri Zenger	Planning Commission Member	Present
Jim Morgan	Planning Commission Member	Present
Brian Carver	City Planner	Present
Kathy Zindel	OVC IT Director	Present
Sharon Robbins	OVC Recorder	Present
Corbin Gordon	City Attorney	Present

1. Call to Order by Chair Arbogast at 5pm
 - a. Pledge of Allegiance led by Chair Arbogast
 - b. Moment of Silence for approximately one minute

2. Regular Business
 - a. **START TIME FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS AT 5:00**

Chair Arbogast opened the meeting by introducing the Planning Commission members, the City Attorney, and the City Planner. She indicated that each resident will be given approximately 2 minutes to provide their comments. Comments can also be emailed to the Planning Commission.

- b. Introduction of public hearing process (City Attorney)

City Attorney provided a summary of the process to create the land use ordinances and zones. She indicated the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and the approving authority is the City Council.

He indicated that the hearing process is for the Planning Commission to listen to comments from the public and not engage in discussion or problem solving with the public

due to time constraints. Each resident that makes a comment will be asked to stand near the tape on the floor and state their name and address. The Planning Commission will consider the public's comments and then provide their recommendations to the City Council for adoption, revisions or denial.

City Attorney stated that Zone FR3, or known as HR, would not be included in the hearing for the meeting.

- c. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on General Plan.
 - i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the updates to the General Plan. The plan was basically left intact. The changes were relatively minor including updating Weber County to Ogden Valley City, removing areas from the plan that are not part of the City and statistical updates. There were minor additions to updates to intents and goals for the City including Water Quality, Water Protection, Weed Control, Education and Density. For a complete list of the changes, there is a redlined document included in the packet for this hearing.

ii Public Hearing

Chair Arbogast opened the public hearing on the General Plan.

Les Vierra

Some proposed updates do not feel like small edits but major shifts. What has happened has been meaningful shift in direction. The homes have been spread across valley floor rather than protecting open space and rural character. He expressed concerns about TDR and form-based zoning removal. The system was not built out with Weber County, if the City removes tools what replaces them to achieve the goals.

Jan Fullmer

The General Plan mapped out commercial hubs, she asked if all commercial hubs are needed, the City should consider affordable housing for workers needed to grow businesses and support resort areas, and remove the amendment to grant bonus ADUs by Weber County Commissioners.

Scot Kelly

Asked how to handle the process for minor remodeling. If move past June / July the expenses are tabled for the year.

Glade McCombs

It is mistake to rubber stamp the General Plan. Revisions should be implemented on an interim basis with a target date to revise the entire General Plan.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on the General Plan.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Planning Commission members had a discussion about the public comments. They agreed the majority of references to TDRs should be removed. Minor references were left in the ordinance for future development.

The Planning Commissioners agreed to move the General Plan forward, good enough to get through the moratorium with the expectation of a further review later. They also noted that an awarded grant will provide funding for a complete review of the General Plan.

Vice Chair Dean moved to forward the General Plan to the City Council for its consideration with TDRs removed. Commission member Shaffer seconded the motion. All Commission members voted aye (7-0).

d. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on adoption of a Zoning map.

i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the proposed updates to the Zoning map. He indicated that the zones that are not being carried forward (FB, G, MRH-1-6) are replaced. The Gravel Zone parcels will be rezoned to AV3. The Manufacturing Zone will be rezoned to CVR1. The Form-based Zone will be rezoned based on its prior zone, either AV3, FR3 or CV2. There were some additional parcels that were changed from FV3 to AV3 to match existing uses. For a complete reference to the changes, there is a revised zoning map included in the packet for this hearing.

ii Public Hearing

Chair Arbogast opened the public comments on the Zoning Map.

Shane Dunleavy

Parcel 22406002 is proposed to change from FB to AV3. It will be mixed use commercial and is governed by a master development agreement. Rezoning from commercial to residential will be considered downzoning and will cause economic harm. The investors will require it to be commercial or will call the note. There are also two lots that are proposed to rezone from FB to CV2 that are being treated differently.

Ron Gleason

Mr. Gleason indicated the proposed rezoning changes will create density. There were rezones tabled by the Weber County Planning Commission that will come to Ogden Valley Planning Commission – what will happen to them.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on the Zoning Map.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Commission members discussed the concerns and changes recommended by the public's comments to consider changes to the zones represented in the Zoning Map. They agreed that they did not want to increase density.

Commission member Lloyd asked the City Attorney Gordon his thoughts about form-based. City Attorney Gordon indicated that the Commission consider doing analysis of down-zoning and step carefully.

Vice Chair Dean summarized the agreed upon changes to the zoning map: removing the form-based zone with all parcels reverting to their original zone, withdrawing the changes to the manufacturing zone – keep it in place, removing the gravel zone and reverting back to AV3, and changing the monastery parcels from FV3 to AV3 as currently shown on the zoning map.

Vice Chair Dean moved to forward the Zoning Map to the City Council for its consideration with the changes she summarized. Commission member Zenger

seconded the motion. Six (6) Commission members voted aye. Commission member Shaffer voted nay for the form-based zone. The motion was passed with (6-1) vote.

- e. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on Definitions.
 - i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the updates to the Definitions. Some of the changes included removal of words that share definitions such as beer parlor, tavern, and pool hall. Other definitions were added such as agricultural parcel, agricultural protection area, and manufactured mobile home. Other definitions were clarified or changed. He indicated that these definitions apply to all parcels within the City boundaries. For a complete list of the changes, there is a redlined document included in the packet for this hearing.

ii Public Hearing

Chair Arbogast opened the public comments on the Definitions.

Scott Brusseau

Agricultural building and barn definition are ambiguous, and some other definitions need further clarification.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on the Definitions.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Commission members discussed possible changes to the Definitions. Vice Chair Dean indicated that lodging houses, boarding houses were inadvertently excluded. For the barns and agricultural accessory buildings there may still be confusion.

Commission member Blickle moved to forward the Definitions with agreed changes to the City Council for its consideration. Commission member Morgan seconded the motion. All Commission members voted aye (7-0).

- f. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on proposed changes to Zone AV3.

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the updates to Zone AV3. He stated the purpose and intent for this zone were updated to reflect the emphasis on preserving agriculture. Sections were clarified to prioritize agricultural uses. The land use table in the document was updated with setback requirements. Changes to animal-related non-commercial uses. STR language was removed. Updates to utility uses and accessory uses. New language for farm educational activities. For a complete list of the changes, there is a redlined document included in the packet for this hearing.

i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

Chair Arbogast opened the public comments on Zone AV3.

Diane Nauman

We raise horses and livestock on these properties. Lots of 4H to support kids going to college need to be considered. In land use table Outdoor recreation not allowed – have clubs and arenas.

Scott Brusseau

As homes are built, they need to include minimum landscape requirements with the permit.

Christine Brown

Encourage ADU units to be allowed. We want our kids to live in the valley. Have small home they can live in.

Les Vierra

Removing the irrigation infrastructure and draining protection provisions may have long term implications. Without them there are risks from incremental modification patterns over time that may reduce system functionality, increase local flooding, or shift responsibility to mitigate to property owners from the City. These are closely connected to storm water behavior and may also have implications to runoff management under the City stormwater management program. These need to be clarified where these protections will be addressed elsewhere in the code.

Lee Schussman (via Zoom)

Asked if STRs will not be allowed in AV3 zone.

Ralph Nauman

Horses are allowed for personal use and limited boarding. If you want to keep your farm deferral you must have a profit motive. If you want to breed and train, it should be allowed. He also spoke about the 75 ft setback for manure storage and asked how will it work if someone develops next to you.

Abe Wansgard

He expressed concern about the setbacks indicating the previous rules were never enforced and indicated some structures are permanent and have been there for generations. To require structures to be moved is preposterous. Code is geared to new move ins rather than people that have been here.

Anya Fellson (via Zoom)

She agreed with prior comments and expressed concerns about setbacks. She does not agree with the prior comment regarding a minimal landscaping requirement.

Matt Clark

He indicated the setbacks are ridiculous. Asked what should be done with that area, and that he would not want double fences. If the City makes it harder for farmers, it will drive the cost up and they will leave. The less restrictions the better for farmers.

Scot Kelly

We need to protect against an increase in density. We need to protect against future downzoning.

Kelly Wansgard

He expressed concerns about setbacks that must be maintained and limits the amount of ground that can be used.

Christine Craven

She expressed concerns about how to maintain the setbacks. She is concerned about pesticides and herbicides as a quick fix for maintenance.

Kirk Langford

He wants to echo what we have heard. Farmers do not need setback, need to drive on the roads, farm as they want, have other ways to make money. You can sell what you grow, but there are other things that can be sold, like jelly, bread. You are trying to micromanage, and we will never get through this. Need to have respect for working farms.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on Zone AV3.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Commission members discussed possible changes to the AV3 Zone. The animal units should be consistent. Horses / stables should be included as a primary use.

There was misunderstanding of setbacks in the comments. It may need to be clarified that existing structures are not impacted. City Planner Carver indicated it should not be in the code.

The irrigation section was not included as part of the original code. It was put into the original draft and then removed. Chair Arbogast suggested the language should be put back in and fine-tuned later.

There was discussion about setbacks and impacts to both farmers and new families. City Attorney Gordon indicated that you cannot count on good neighbors, that it must be specified. There was concern expressed about needing to have double fencing due to setbacks.

The 75 ft setbacks are for feeding, confining. The Commissioners indicated they want horses to be able to pasture to the fence and not require double fences. The Commissioners determined the feeding should be 75 feet setback and remove the setback for confinement.

Remove corrals replace with barns change setback from 25to 10 feet . Setbacks for troughs be 75 feet, and removed setback for confinement.

Horse breeding was not included in the Weber County code. The Commission members indicated that it should be included. Stabling for horses should be a primary use, not accessory use.

Outdoor recreational club activities were not allowed under Weber County is limiting. It is overly limiting, and the Commission should consider making a conditional use and then add the conditions.

STRs are removed as with other zones.

Commission member Lloyd moved to forward the AV3 Zone with the following changes to the City Council for its consideration: (1) horses and stables are listed as a primary use, (2) in other uses, corral is replaced with barn and setbacks are changed to 10ft, (3) for concentrated feeding areas the setback will be 75ft, (4) setbacks will be removed from confinement. Commission member Shaffer seconded the motion. All Commission members voted aye (7-0).

g. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on proposed changes to Zone HR (formally known as FR3).

i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

FR3 was removed from this agenda for public hearing, discussion or recommendation to the City Council.

ii **Public Hearing**

No public comment was accepted.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

No recommendation to the City Council.

h. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on proposed changes to Zone FV3.

Council

i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the updates to Zone FV3. He stated that many of the conditional uses were removed and added as permitted uses, including permitted signs, accessory uses. For a complete list of the changes, there is a redlined document included in the packet for this hearing.

ii Public Hearing

Chair Arbogast opened the public comments on Zone FV3.

Diane Nauman

Comments on animal unit restrictions. People buy steers to butcher in the fall. This needs to be allowed.

Christine Brown

ADUS need to be allowed for future generations.

Abe Wanesgard

Expressed concerns about animal restrictions. We need to allow exceptions for kids projects.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on Zone FV3.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Planning Commission members discussed animal units. One animal unit per acre matches the Weber County code. There were concerns about higher density of animals. Residents have had higher density, but it appears the County has not enforced it.

Since it is a family use, not commercial use, the Commission members do not want to inhibit family's agricultural use. If the family has been doing this, they are grandfathered unless they stop the use. The residents commenting in the hearing would not be affected since they are already doing it.

City Attorney recommended picking a number of animal units so that it can be enforced for roosters crowing, etc. This can be changed as any time simply. Generally, these types of changes are brought up by the Planner based on issues that come up.

Chair Arbogast suggested doubling the animal unit number. It can be revisited later.

ADUs were identified as an issue. City Attorney indicated that the state regulation will require ADUs, and it should be left alone for now.

Vice Chair Dean indicated that AV3 and FV3 uses should be synched up to be consistent, including for cannabis production, dog breeding kennels, eliminating flood lights and special regulations for light, dust and noise.

There was interest in doing more research. City Attorney indicated as long as the items are conditional use, they can be controlled.

Commission member Dean moved to forward the FV3 Zone with agreed upon following changes to the City Council for its consideration: (1) bring in language from AV3 to FV3 for special restrictions or requirements for cannabis production, dog breeding kennels, and to change private parks to condition use, and (2) change animal units to 2 per acre. Commission member Shaffer seconded the motion. All Commission members voted aye (7-0).

i. Review and provide a recommendation to City Council on proposed changes to Zone RE15/20.

i Discussion of the Code Text Amendment

City Planner Brian Carver reviewed the updates to Zone RE15/20. He stated that the purpose and intent for this zone were updated. Conditional uses were moved to permitted uses. STR language was removed. He stated there were updates about parks, setbacks, and parking. For a complete list of the changes, there is a redlined document included in the packet for this hearing.

ii Public Hearing

Chair Arbogast opened the public comments on Zone RE15/20.

Jan Fullmer

Could not hear what planner said about STR. Planning group has documentation that shows 31% of dwelling units are allowed to do STR.

Chair Arbogast closed the Public Comments on the Zone RE15/20.

iii Possible recommendation to the City Council

The Commission members discussed possible changes to the Zone RE15/20. The Commission members agreed to limit STRs until they can be addressed in depth after the moratorium. The STRs can be removed from the RE15/20 zone but may be included in master development agreement which would supersede the zone. Removing STRs would limit the new developments from allowing STRs.

There was a discussion about licensing of STRs. This is considered an enforcement issue.

City Planner asked if clarification can be added to the tables to specify that STRS are not allowed unless included in master development agreement. Chair Arbogast indicated the STRS should be removed from all zones.

Commission member Blicke moved to forward the Zone RE15/20 with removal of STRs unless allowed under a master development agreement and/or PRUD to the City Council for its consideration. Commission member Lloyd seconded the motion. Six (6) Commission members voted aye. Commission member Shaffer voted nay. The motion was passed with (6-1) vote.

3. Adjourn - Commission member Shaffer moved to adjourn the meeting. Commission member Blicke seconded the motion. All Commission members voted aye (7-0).

The March 31st, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting minutes were approved by the Planning Commission on the 21st day of April 2026.

Signature: *Sharon Robbins*

Printed Name: Sharon Robbins

Sharon Robbins: