

## Pre-Application Meeting Notes for subdivision of land at 9215 E. 500 S., Huntsville, UT

We began the process of applying for a subdivision by meeting on Zoom with Scott Perkes of Weber County Planning on January 27, 2022. The meeting included Mr. Perkes, myself (Jenny Hale Pulsipher), and my parents Phillip and Barbara Hale, who are the owners of the Hale Kinderfarm at 9215 E. 500 S., from which my husband (Michael Pulsipher) and I intend to subdivide three acres for a home site.

After the meeting, I submitted an access exception petition requesting the use of my parents' current driveway to access our plat. We were assigned to work with Felix Lleverino. After review, Mr. Lleverino told me that the county would agree to our petition if we were willing to allow a public road from 500 S. to the south border of the Kinderfarm. Allowing a public road to run through the middle of the property would pose a significant safety hazard to the thirteen children living on the Kinderfarm, and my parents were not willing to accept that plan. The county then made an alternate proposal, that we allow a public road from 500 S. to our plat and then directly west to the border of the property to allow for future development of our neighbor's land. My parents were also opposed to that plan, so I withdrew my application for the access exception in February 2022.

We decided to redesign our home plat with 150 feet of frontage, allowing direct access from 500 S. to our plat. I showed the plat plan to Felix Lleverino who discussed it with the Planning Dept. They again requested that we allow a public road, either from 500 S. through the property to the south border, or from 500 S. to our plat and then directly west to the west border.

We met with Felix Lleverino and several other members of Weber County Planning Dept. on April 13 to discuss these requests. At that meeting, I pointed out the unfeasibility of running a public road to the southern border of the Kinderfarm, because the South Fork of the Ogden River runs the full width of the property and the expense of building a bridge over a shifting river bed would be significant. On examining the map, the planners also realized that 1) there were already two bridges that crossed the river within a mile, at 8600 E and 9500 E, and 2) the subdivision to the south of our property was designed in such a way that its developed lots block access to the river and the proposed public road across it.

On the county's second request, that we allow a public road running from 500 South to our house site and then directly west to the border of the property, I pointed out that the owners of the neighboring land, Thomas and Martha Leonard, are hostile to development and were planning to put a conservation easement on that land.

Given the above described circumstances, the planners acknowledged that neither of the two proposed public roads were feasible and they saw no obstacle to us proceeding to submit our subdivision application.