

Coalville City Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Held On
March 15, 2021
Virtual

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Chair Linda Vernon called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. This was a virtual meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair: Linda Vernon
Commissioners:
Tim Bristow, Jeff White,
Tonja Hanson

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| CITY STAFF PRESENT: | PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE: |
| Don Sargent, Consultant | Jim Boyden, Margarita Richins, |
| Paul Taylor, Engineer/Community Development | Margarita, Martina Nelson, Camellia |
| Sheldon Smith, City Attorney | Robbins, Dave Boyden, Louise |
| Zane DeWeese, Public Works Director | Willoughby, Jack Walkenhorst, Eric |
| Nachele Sargent, City Recorder | Langvardt |

Item 1 – Roll Call:

A quorum was present.

Item 2 – Pledge of Allegiance:

Chair Linda Vernon led the Commissioners, Staff, and Public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 3 – Continued Review And Discussion Of The Parks, Trails, And Open Space Code Amendments:

Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit A) and reviewed the redlined language and mapping changes with the Commissioners. The Staff and Commissioners discussed the revisions including:

- Adding a trail or sidewalk continuing from the Cemetery along Chalk Creek Road to connect to the Chalk Creek Estates Subdivision and a future link across Chalk Creek to Border Station Road.
- Continue the trail through the annexed Wright property to the City limits for a future link to Chalk Creek Road.
- Reviewed the three proposed trail type sketches. If adopted, the current Construction Specifications and General Plan would need to be revised to show the new trail classifications. The Master Plan should have the trail classifications

1 identified on the map with language stating the final determination would be
2 through the development process.

- 3 • 8-4-080, B, #1 – Suggestion of adding language to the “significant natural features”
4 such as Chalk Creek, Weber River, etc. The Planning Commissioner’s will forward
5 their suggestions to Don.
- 6 • 8-4-080, B, #2 – Adding the trail design classifications.

7
8 The Planning Commission decided to review the map and forward their classification
9 suggestions to Don and schedule a work session and public hearing for the next meeting.
10 Don stated he would email the trail sketch classifications and the map to the
11 Commissioner’s for continued review.

12
13 **Item 4 – Review And Discussion Of The Initial Update Amendments To The Development**
14 **Code Use Table And Definitions:**

15
16 Don Sargent referred to the Use Table and Definitions (Exhibit B) and stated one benefit of
17 the chart was you could see everything at a glance for each Zone. He suggested starting
18 the review with one Zone, like the Agricultural Zone, and go through them one at a time or
19 they could start on page one and go page by page. They may need to take out some uses
20 or add in some uses and the uses would need to correspond with the revisions to the
21 definitions. Chair Linda Vernon stated this would not be a fast process and would take
22 several work sessions. She questioned where the resort type information should be listed
23 or if another Zone needed to be created. Don stated the resort type uses would be listed
24 under Recreational Facilities or Uses. He stated right now the definition was the use list
25 and that needed to be reversed. The definition needed to describe what the uses meant
26 and they needed to be listed in the use table associated with that zone district. Don stated
27 the idea would be to group types of uses associated with a type of activity instead of
28 having a catch-all list. He stated he would get some examples from other municipalities to
29 give them some ideas for consideration. The Planning Commission decided to review the
30 Use list by zones and would start with the Agricultural Zone.

31
32 **Item 5 – Review And Discussion Of The Proposed Wohali Phase I Final Subdivision Plat**
33 **and MPD Development Agreement:**

34
35 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit C) and stated the overall MPD and Phase I
36 of the Wohali plan was approved in December 2020 and this review was for the Final plan
37 for Phase I. He stated going forward, the entire project would need to be consistent with
38 the Findings, Conclusions, and Conditions with the Phase I Preliminary approval. Don
39 stated the project consisted of 1,664 acres, 125 residential lots, 303 nightly rental resort
40 units, and an overall mixed use Master Plan, which included density bonuses to get to the
41 125 lots, deed restricted open space, residential lots, resort rental units, resort amenities,
42 and recreational support facilities and uses. There was around 1,172 acres of open space
43 which was around 70% of the property associated with the density bonus and the overall

1 project design and layout that was approved as part of the MPD. The Development
2 Agreement was also submitted for the overall project. He stated the purpose of the
3 Development Agreement was to memorialize the MPD approval and to structure the
4 project in a way that ensured the City was protected with respect to what was approved
5 with the MPD. It also protected the Developers so they would know what their
6 entitlements were and that they were secure going forward. This was a long-term project,
7 contemplated to take up to 20 years for build out, so it was important to have very clear
8 language in place that anyone could look at and be able to understand how this project
9 needed to be reviewed going forward when subsequent phases and planning came before
10 the City. Don stated that Wohali was only going to plat 26 lots for this first part of the Final
11 plan.

12

13 Eric Langvardt stated he appreciated all the work that Don Sargent and Sheldon Smith had
14 put in on the Development Agreement. He stated the application was pretty straight
15 forward and he and Jim Boyden would be happy to answer any questions the Planning
16 Commission may have.

17

18 Don Sargent stated the process did require additional public hearings with the Planning
19 Commission and City Council, but there wouldn't be any further negotiations. He stated
20 the negotiations were completed with the MPD approval and the public hearings would be
21 to allow any comments about meeting the intent, findings, and conclusions of approval.
22 Sheldon Smith agreed and stated the Planning Commission should review the information
23 and give their questions and input to make sure the plan was consistent with what the
24 approval was. He stated they had worked hard on the Development Agreement to make
25 sure the City's interests were protected. The Commissioners discussed the information
26 including:

27

28 • Conditions of Approval #7 – Question and clarification of how the surrounding and
29 adjacent parcels could be included in the MPD. Don Sargent: If another property
30 were proposed to be included within the project, it would require a process. It
31 depended on what that property would entail. Was it going to provide additional
32 density, open space? Was it a trail access? It depended on the level of density. If
33 density changed, then it would be essentially the same process we went through
34 with the overall MPD with public hearings with the Planning Commission and the
35 City Council. This project would stand alone as it was proposed. If a parcel were
36 coming in at some point in the future, for whatever reason, we'd look at that as a
37 separate application.

38

39 • Conditions of Approval #9 – Where were the setbacks being determined from. Don
40 Sargent: In the approval of the agreement, which was now specified in the
41 Development Agreement, there are some exhibits that show those types of
42 development configurations and the associated setbacks that were represented
43 during the agreement. There were some exceptions with the village core being in a
44 clustered format. This was listed as part of the conditions, that those would be
45 addressed in the Development Agreement and this was where configurations were

1 listed that were contemplated. The five, ten, and twelve foot listings were part of
2 the village core. The residential would maintain regular setbacks. Eric Langvardt:
3 Initially we had even more restrictive setbacks that would be implemented. They
4 wouldn't be platted, but would be restricted as a building pad that the design
5 committee would review. The smaller setbacks were geared toward the village
6 core portion.

- 7 • Conditions of Approval #10 – Clarification that “non-residential setbacks would not
8 be required” was referring to the commercial and rental units. Don Sargent: Yes,
9 that was correct.
- 10 • Development Agreement 4.4.2 – Questions and clarification of what the 300 feet
11 means. Don Sargent: The last paragraph clarifies that question. “In no case shall
12 the allowed maximum density be exceeded, but if the parcel abuts the perimeter,
13 the density cannot be increased in that area, unless it is least 300 feet away from
14 the perimeter of the property”. The idea of that paragraph is to maintain a
15 distance, a buffer distance, so anybody that was relying on the approvals, anything
16 new that came in at least, would have that 300-foot perimeter buffer. Eric
17 Langvardt: Basically, if we added 20 acres just North of our property, but it's
18 contiguous and we wanted to roll that into the MPD, which your current ordinance
19 allows, we would have one density unit that would be tied to those 20 acres at the
20 one unit per 20, we could take that and put it into the project, but we would have
21 to be at least 300 feet away from our property line or any neighboring properties to
22 do that or it would kick it into a major amendment process. We wouldn't be
23 increasing any density. It would be the base density of the parcel that was added.
24 We'd have to put it in the core of our project basically or we would have to get a
25 major amendment if we wanted to put it, say 30 feet away. Don Sargent: It would
26 be the protection line, buffer for an adjacent property line.
- 27 • Development Agreement 4.4.5 – Clarification of what the buffer is referring to. Don
28 Sargent: This was just an infrastructure and roadway efficiency provision. Jim
29 Boyden: If our Northern boundary were already developed and it had a network of
30 streets and infrastructure, when it came time for us to develop our property that
31 abutted that portion, our property would need to line up with and match the
32 infrastructure of the abutting property, so that it was cohesive and made sense, so
33 that you could transition from one project to the other without hitting dead ends
34 and roads that go to nowhere.
- 35 • Verified a crash gate was for emergency responders and could be pushed open as
36 needed.
- 37 • Verified once this Final plat of Phase I, these 26 lots, was approved and recorded, it
38 met the requirement of having to be completed within three years.

39

40 Don reviewed the exhibits with the Commissioners, Staff, and Public. He stated they were
41 on the link on the website. He stated Staff didn't have any other comments for this Phase I
42 plan other than the engineering review unless something came up from the
43 Commissioner's or public comments that had been missed. Eric Langvardt explained there

1 were a combination of things for determining only doing 26 lots at this time. He stated
2 taxing, demand, and the market played a part. He stated the next Phase would be the
3 village core and they wanted the diversity of having a mixed use. He stated they were
4 currently designing the resort units, but they weren't sure yet how many they would be
5 proposing for the next Phase. Don Sargent stated the three-year provision was intended to
6 make sure the project was actively moving forward and the phasing was occurring based
7 on the approvals. He stated they would have a substantial investment with the
8 infrastructure with Phase I which usually meant it was in the Developer's best interest to
9 keep moving along with the additional phases.

10
11 The Planning Commission decided to do a work session and a public hearing at the next
12 meeting for the Wohali project along with a work session and public hearing for the Parks,
13 Trails, and Open Space. They decided to wait until May for the Use List and Definitions, but
14 agreed to start reviewing it and giving their comments to Don.

15
16 **Item 6 – Consultant Updates:**

17
18 Don Sargent stated the City Council held the public hearing for the ALJ program. They
19 accepted the Planning Commissions comments and would be continuing the public hearing
20 at their next meeting.

21
22 Paul Taylor stated there was a public hearing at the City Council meeting for the FEMA
23 ordinance and the Council voted to not alter the proposed language because they didn't
24 want to have the any issues or possibility of voiding the flood insurance program. He
25 stated that was the recommendation from the National Flood Insurance Program. Chair
26 Linda Vernon questioned if they had added the language to have the person that made the
27 changes liable for any issues they caused. Sheldon Smith stated they felt trying to add
28 some of that language in and making changes would have more implication to City liability.

29
30 Chair Linda Vernon inquired if anything was happening with the Allen Hollow property.
31 Don Sargent stated he had mentioned to the City Council that someone had contacted him
32 about researching the potential of doing a project with the Allen Hollow property. He
33 stated no other comments had come up and that was a non-issue at this point.

34
35 Don Sargent stated the City had received criticism that materials weren't available on the
36 website and he wanted to make sure everyone knew copies of the materials would be
37 made available as soon as the information was submitted to the Planning Commission or
38 City Council and anyone interested could contact the City Hall for a copy of the Staff report
39 at any time.

40
41 **Item 7 – Planning Commission Updates:**

42
43 Commissioner Tonja Hanson questioned if the Planning Commission vacancy was still open.
44 Don Sargent stated the Mayor and Council put the appointment on hold at the last Council

1 meeting, but now had received three letters of interest for consideration and planned to
2 appoint them at the next meeting.

3

4 **Item 8 – Review And Possible Approval Of Minutes:**

5

6 The Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the February 16, 2021 meeting.

7

8 **A motion was made by Commissioner Jeff White to approve the minutes of February 16,**
9 **2021 as written. Commissioner Tim Bristow seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion**
10 **Carried.**

11

12 **Item 9 – Adjournment:**

13

14 **A motion was made by Commissioner Tonja Hanson to adjourn the meeting.**
15 **Commissioner Jeff White seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion Carried.**

16

17 The meeting adjourned at 7:38 P.M.

18

19

20

21

Chair Linda Vernon

22

23

24 Attest:

25

26

27 _____
Nachele D. Sargent, City Recorder