

Ogden Valley Planning Commission Work Session March 6, 2018 in the County Commission Chambers Breakout Room 108 scheduled at 5:00 p.m.

Planning Commissioners Present: Chair Taylor, Stephen Waldrip, John Howell, John Lewis, Laura Warburton, Chris Hogge, Robert Wood

Planning Commissioners Absent:

Staff Present: Charlie Ewert, Principle Planner, Courtland Erickson, Legal Counsel, Kary Serrano, Secretary

Charlie Ewert apologized for Director Grover who had another obligation he was committed to. I don't intend for this meeting long and asked if everyone was okay in getting out within an hour. The response was yes. Mr. Ewert said we're going to move things around and start off with height.

WS-3: Height of Building: Modification to the definition of "Height of Building" and additional clarification regarding standards and regulations governing the height of a building and Public Utility Substation.

Charlie Ewert said this is the one that I sent out in the email today. This has a couple of small tweaks from the last time and I just wanted to run through the highlighted text. Go to the back page Line Item 194 and I think resolved all about the height.

Charlie Ewert said the next one is Line Item 181, Section b. The disguise shall be designed by a licensed architect and shall: He read through the items that were already there and the new items that were highlighted. This is my attempt to resolve the concern that we might have a fake tree at the top of the hill with no other trees around it.

There was a brief discussion with staff and the Planning Commission.

WS-1: Clusters: Modifications to the Cluster Subdivision ordinance to amend open space requirements and provide clarifications:

Charlie Ewert said just wanted to review some of the observations over the last four weeks. I met with Western Weber and a lot of this is intended to address some of their concerns. As I mentioned to you the last time, I do have concerns with clusters in the valley. Either there is a market reason why they are not happening or it's just that we are not primed up for it.

Charlie Ewert said just wanted to run through the highlighted text and I did some reorganizing and a couple of some new concepts here. Go to Section 108-3-1 Line Item 34. I restructured the Purpose and Intent and added a little bit more clarity of offer predictable support and encouragement in agricultural areas for a wide variety of long-term agricultural operations on open space parcels. I just added a new section, Line Item 102 (d) Subdivision phasing. My attempt here is to have a little bit of a time for expiration, on the cluster subdivisions that come in with a phasing plan. If they are going to go through the effort of Master Planning; and we are going to go through all the effort with verification, let's give them more time than just a standard subdivision. Within 12 months of preliminary approval vests them in density with the exception of the technical concerns that might eliminate 1 or 2 lots. It vests them in their open space plan and that's a good time to call this within 12 months, they have to record them for space. Let's just get it done otherwise you are expired and you have to start all over. After that, every successful phase after that, you get 24 months after the most recently recorded one, for a maximum of 6 years.

There was a brief discussion with staff and the Planning Commission.

Charlie Ewert said let's review Line Item 214. We are in the Open Space Plan. I put in there about amending your open space plan, you don't have to go through the whole subdivision process to do so. I also put in there, procedural requirements that says preliminary approval is final approval of your open space plan. If you come back later to amend your open space plan, and as long as it's not effected your platted recorded subdivision in any way, then you don't have to go through the plat amendment process, you just go through a simple, almost like a land use permit. There is a bunch of reorganization but not a lot of change in context. Part of the problem with the evolution of writing these things, is the changing, removing, revising, and putting them. I went back and tried to just plug that into a spot that fit better.

Charlie Ewert said on Line Item 263 (c) Open Space Development Standards and Ownership Regulations. That section gets a lot longer. What I did was pull stuff off of one of the previous section with just general configuration, because our general section was being really specific after our last meeting, so I plugged it in over here. So Line Item 264, (1) no changes there. Line Item 277

(2) just changing some references. Line Item 282, (3) Agricultural open spaces was just moved over here. Line Item 288, (3) a. we talked about how much width an open space parcel needs for a combined to turn around. Western Weber wanted to see the ability to get three turns. If you have the ability given your existing subdivision boundary to configure you lot snow way, gives your open space 450 feet width, that's what this ordinance says. If your boundaries may be configured differently, and you have less than 450 feet, we can reduce it to whatever that is. Just make your polygon easily probable.

There was a brief discussion with staff and Planning Commission.

Charlie Ewert said on Line Item 293 (b) Open Space Parcels is the same thing as before.

Charlie Ewert said on Line Item 299 if we're talking about the open space parcel of Part 4, or the sensitive land requirements of 5, these standards don't apply to them.

Charlie Ewert said on Line Items 303 and 304. I just took the list that we started making and just put it in a table. The other thing I started putting in some acreages to sum up those things, and we are talking about maximum, and read through the table.

There was a discussion with staff and Planning Commission and it was suggested not to have the maximum parcel out of the table.

Charlie Ewert said Line Item 386, this is an Estate Lot. This is the building envelope on an estate lot. The idea that I had behind the estate lot was 5.25 acres, create a building envelope, 80% of your estate lot is going to be part of the open space easement that the plat creates. The other 20% can be what you're going to do with it and you can choose. Your envelope should be closer to either the envelope of another estate lot or another actual subdivision lot. The idea there is the houses stay closer to each other. One other observation about fencing. We said don't fence it in a way that's going to corner off your five acres at a time. That was specific to Western Weber.

Charlie Ewert said Line Item 403, this section is in the preservation section. I had told you that I wanted to do something different in the preservation. Right now the ordinance requires an open space preservation easement to be recorded with the subdivision. That easement could say a whole bunch of things. They are all going to be different, and we don't prescribe how to create that easement, or what it should say. My thought on this is do exactly what we used to do with cluster subdivisions anyway. Just record an open space easement on the plat in favor of Weber County to guarantee the open space. We don't need to have complicated easements that say, this can happen this way or that way, we don't need to have those complicated things. All those clusters have stayed open before because Weber County owns that easement across those open spaces, and they can do that here.

There was a brief discussion with Staff and Planning Commission.

WS-2: PRUD: Modifications to the Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) ordinance to make a decision on a PRUD, a legislative – not administrative – action:

This was not heard.

Chair Taylor asked in the future, allowing some sort of density in the form of a transferable development right to a cluster subdivision, is that something that's possible. Mr. Ewert replied I heard from you guys the last time that you wanted to see that. It would have been here if I had more time on it. I don't know how the commission feels about it right now. I know I got a little bit resistance from Rick, but I think what he wanted to see was a little bit more of a solid conception of the Transferable Development Right. What I got from you before, let's not do TDR's, let's get the same outcome with something different.

WS4. The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Kary Serrano, Secretary;**

Weber County Planning Commission