Project Management Meeting Minutes

Harrisville City Offices
363 W Independence Blvd
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 9:00 a.m.

Present: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Grover Wilhelmson, City Council, Matt Robertson, City Engineer, Sarah Wichern, City Planner, Bryan Fife, Public Works Director, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Cynthia Benson, Deputy City Recorder, Tyler Seaman, Building Official, Ryan Barker, North View Fire.

Excused: Mark Wilson, Police Chief, Angie Francom, Planning Commission Chair, Brady Hansen, Bona Vista Water, Dan Johnson, Pineview.

Visitors: Preston Mobius, Marv Farrell.

Jennie Knight, City Administrator, began the meeting by having the committee members present introduce themselves.

1. **Discussion on Dixon Creek Phase 3 Parks Master Plan Amendment located at approximately 1243 N Washington Blvd.** – Preston Mobius

Jennie Knight displayed the original concept plan for Phase 3. This concept differed from the one submitted to UDOT. Preston Mobius stated the differences are with the access point lining up with Canfield Drive. They had their discussion with UDOT. He followed up with the fire marshal to get connectivity based on the original plan, the one without the access point, and received a memo. He felt in the UDOT meeting they did not get confirmation on whether or not access is required, but they did get details on what they would like the alignment to look like and the street section requirement. They went through and made those updates. Essentially, they are moving forward with the application to UDOT. In the meantime, they would like to get more input on the access point from the city and whether it was required. Matt Robertson said access to Washington would be beneficial. However, what they are proposing is to have all traffic go to 1300 North with no lower access point.

Preston Mobius said the original traffic study was for Phase 1 and 2 along with the commercial area. He believed the discussion on the traffic light at that time was to be pushed further north. It references Canfield Drive. UDOT mentioned they want an updated traffic study as a memo for the proposed access on Phase 3. They would determine if it would need to be a right in right out or a full movement in based off how Canfield Drive exists now. Jennie Knight clarified when discussing this with UDOT, there has not been a solid confirmation as to where the light would be. The possibilities are 1400 North or 1500 North. Matt Robertson thought it was potentially at 1400 North with the commercial element. Ogden is pushing for a light at 1100 North. 1400 North would work better for spacing. Jennie Knight said the concern from our team would be the addition of traffic on 1300 without a light. Preston Mobius said, taking into consideration the city stance, the access for Phase 3 would be maintained as a private approach. UDOT discussions said they would like to see a forty (40) foot right of way and then have the street tapper down as it enters the community. Matt Robert said the traffic study is for Phases 1 and 2. Preston Mobius clarified that they would complete another traffic study including Phase 3 as a memo to the original traffic study. Matt Robertson would like to see the updated traffic study for the recommendation of access

to Washington since all of the traffic would be feeding up to the goofy access point at 1300 North where turn lanes are not long. He would like to see the updated study before making a final recommendation. He is still in favor of accessing Washington to give another access point. Preston Mobius said he cannot speak for the Baileys, but a right in and right out is a concern for them financially. Making a median right in right out would also create Canfield as a right in right out. All agreed this was up to UDOT to decide the outcome of this connection.

Sarah Wichern said the city was not anticipating this type of density without some amenities added to the parcel like what was suggested before with a park amenity. A lot more discussion is required in order to receive approval. Preston Mobius said the goal is to figure out if the access would be required or not and talk with UDOT. This would allow them to complete more upfront work instead of changing the concept a bunch of times.

Grover Wilhelmsen asked if there would be a potential light at 1300 or not. Preston Mobius said he believed the access would be further to the north. The discussion led to the parking on 1300 North causing traffic flow issues. Grover Wilhelmsen said with the residents and the current construction worker parking on both sides of 1300 North the traffic coming through the area is becoming hazardous. The traffic will increase as more people move in. Preston Mobius said there is no street parking on private drives. The committee discussed parking in the subdivision and the potential of painting the curbs red.

Jennie Knight said the committee is curious about what the traffic study would show. The committee is leaning towards another access point. Preston Mobius said determining this access point will dictate the site layout and how his team moves forward.

Sarah Wichern asked what was to be considered as open space for Phase 3. The concept says twenty (20) acres of open space. Preston Mobius replied this includes a highlighted amenity area which has not been determined as of yet. Also, everything between the townhouses, minus the cell phone tower, limited common area, and amenities area. There will be a sidewalk for connectivity. Sarah Wichern said the numbers show 2.4 acres for the site with the amenity area only showing .27 acres. Preston Mobius said his engineer most likely is accounting for anything green. He explained the limited areas as the driveway and rear setback. No lot foot print is included in this calculation. Limited common areas are excluded.

Matt Robertson stated this phase does not have the same rights as the other phases with the density. Phases 1 and 2 were calculated with several acres of open space. Sarah Wichern said the city will most likely be looking closer to parking since the other area does not have adequate parking, especially since the two (2) car garages only fit one car. This area will require more parking. Preston Mobius said he will talk with the current homeowners about not having enough parking within the garages. Sarah Wichern discussed things she would be considering with the parking for the future phase like a wider garage and approach.

Preston Mobius explained there is a power easement between the phases. They are talking about moving the underground power line for the cell tower into Dixon Creek's existing power infrastructure. Before doing so, they need to know if this will be possible. Right now, they are looking at maintaining the current underground power line as it is. In Phase 1, they had a gas line they had to relocate. In Phase 3, there is an underground power line they will need to relocate. They are working with Rocky Mountain Power who has a ten (10) foot easement around the cell

tower.

Grover Wilhelmsen asked what the developer could do to add more parking for residential visitations and help elevate the current parking problems. Preston Mobius said with Phase 1 and Phase 2, the parking is existing. With Phase 3, they do not have the current total, but it is more than the other phases. His team has talked about a pedestrian pathway to the north connecting to the open area and commercial space but have not come up with a solution to drive traffic without the use of a car.

Jennie Knight said the next steps are the city engineer is available to talk with traffic engineer if the developer desires, complete a new traffic study, follow up with UDOT, and come back to Project Management with new information.

2. **Discussion to grant final plat approval for Dixon Creek Phase 2A located at approximately 1243 N Washington Blvd.** – Preston Mobius

Jennie Knight said Preliminary Plat approval for Phase 2B was granted last night. The city has already received the county survey for this phase as well. Preston Mobius said there were a couple of changes made through the review with the county, but the county surveyor did sign off on them. There were no other comments from the committee to address.

Preston Mobius asked about the process for Phase 2B. Jennie Knight replied when the LOMAR through FEMA is worked out and reordered with them, then Phase 2B would go back through the same approval process after the buildings are replaced on the plat as an amendment.

Matt Robertson clarified that Phase 2B will be a separate plat with building parcels listed as B1 and B2. The common space stays the same and is labeled as B3. Matt Robertson said since preliminary approval was given last night, and there are no changes to the phase, then final can be granted. Staff to issue final approval letter.

Jennie Knight said a new mylar will be required for Phase 2B. She clarified that the signatures for the LLC and county should be obtained first. That way when the mylar is turned into the city the only signatures left are those pertaining to the city.

Matt Robertson verified the addressing was completed. Preston Mobius confirmed lot addressing was completed at the beginning of the subdivision approval process. Lot numbers and addresses for this phase have stayed the same. Matt Robertson asked the developer to submit the plans to the city once more for a quick review before printing the mylar.

3. **Continuing Projects.**

Jennie Knight said one item staff wanted to go over with the committee and receive feedback on is the city's public noticing process. Jack Fogal said he had someone inquire if our public notice met the legal requirements. In response to this, he reviewed the state code, UCA §63G-30-102 regarding public notice requirements and UCA §10.20 regarding land use noticing. Overall, with the review, the city does meet the legal requirements for public noticing. With his review, he did discover some suggestions from other municipalities he feels will be a benefit to our process.

These suggestions are as follows;

- Three jurisdictions identify the Weber County Parcel numbers. The law says general address, but he feels by adding the parcel number as well as the address would be helpful for clarity and beneficial.
- Approximately 70% provide the current zone and proposed zone that the parcel would be changed to. Right now, the current public notice calls out the parcel and references where to find more information on the city website and state website. He feels this would be a benefit to add.
- Two provided the approximate acreage of the proposal and one provided a map. When we do our mailing, we do provide a map, but the letter is not posted on the state website.

He reviewed the three neighboring cities as examples of their public noticing for the committee to review. According to UCA §63G-30-101, the notice should show the title, the code we are doing it under, provides an approximate address, invites residents to make comments, says where they can make the comments, even provides an email address for those comments, phone number, and lists the state and city websites.

Harrisville City's current public notice format complies with statutory requirements. However, the addition of some of these items could enhance public understanding and transparency. Staff seek directions from the committee regarding whether any of the enhancements identified should be incorporated into future public hearing notices. The enhancements are;

- Provide an address and parcel number
- Separate notices individually
- Add the current zone and proposed zone
- Post a map of the area on the city website

Tyler Seaman asked what the exact compliant was. Jack Fogal replied it was that the city's current noticing was not providing enough information to the residents. Tyler Seaman asked if this was because the notice did not provide the information or because the resident did not know where to go to find it. Jack Fogal replied, a little of both. In the end, the question is, has the city broken the notice down enough for the average person to understand. Tyler Seaman asked what the current steps are to putting out a notice to the public. Jack Fogal replied the city is required to post on the city website, the state website, and three posting locations which are the city offices, the cabin posting box, and the posting box on 2150 North. The residents can come in and obtain a copy of the notice and any materials pertaining to it. The city is no longer required to post signs. The packet with the materials is also available on the state and city websites. For instance, the notice displayed is in reference to an MDA which is far too much to post in a posting box. To handle this, the bottom of the notice draws the attention of the reader to where they can locate the information as already stated.

Jennie Knight said to Jack's credit he still sends out notices to the surrounding property owners. Jack Fogal said the requirement states effected entities. We are no longer required to do notices. The old state code required notices for real property owners 300 feet surrounding the property. We do this including all the utility providers and surrounding cities. Jennie Knight added we still are sending out notices to those who are most effected. We stopped posting properties because we were finding our signs would get trash. The areas were the signs were posted and the information

area on the sign would become destroyed with the elements to the point no one could read it. We can still put a sign on the property which states to go to the city website. Jack Fogal added we would need to get permission to do this.

Sarah Wichern added the suggestion from the county is to have the developers responsible for posting a sign on the property. They have the time and resources to do this. Jennie Knight added other cities have been suggesting this as well. This is a conflict the city council has been discussing too.

Gover Wilhelmsen said he liked the information broken out in bullet points. This would draw attention to the information when asked his opinion. Jennie Knight said let us move forward with the recommendations to make the notice easier to read by adding the map and bullet points.

The discussion ended with the requirements to post a sign on the property and what legal perimeters would be required to require a developer to do this.

Meeting adjourned at 9:44 a.m.