



## Staff Report to the Ogden Valley Planning Commission

Weber County Planning Division

### Synopsis

#### Application Information

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Application Request:</b> | Consideration and action on a request to amend the Edgewater Beach Resort PRUD (CUP 2003-12) site plan by rearranging several buildings, eliminating one 12-plex and one 6-plex, adding five single family dwelling units, reducing the total number of units from 166 to 153, and changing the approved landscape plan |
| <b>Agenda Date:</b>         | Tuesday, October 26, 2010   |
| <b>Applicant:</b>           | Celtic Bank   |
| <b>File Number:</b>         | CUP 2003-12   |

#### Property Information

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Approximate Address:</b>      | 6350 East Highway 39                             |
| <b>Project Area:</b>             | 13.08 Acres                                      |
| <b>Zoning:</b>                   | Commercial Valley Resort Recreation Zone (CVR-1) |
| <b>Existing Land Use:</b>        | PRUD Development                                 |
| <b>Proposed Land Use:</b>        | PRUD Development                                 |
| <b>Parcel ID:</b>                | 20-013-0017                                      |
| <b>Township, Range, Section:</b> | T6N, R1E, Section 13                             |

#### Adjacent Land Use

|               |                    |               |             |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|
| <b>North:</b> | Pineview Reservoir | <b>South:</b> | Residential |
| <b>East:</b>  | Residential        | <b>West:</b>  | Agriculture |

#### Staff Information

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Report Presenter:</b> | Sean Wilkinson<br>swilkinson@co.weber.ut.us<br>801-399-8765 |
| <b>Report Reviewer:</b>  | SW  |

### Applicable Ordinances

- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 9C (CVR-1 Zone)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 22C (Conditional Uses)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 18C (Ogden Valley Architectural, Landscape, and Screening Standards)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 22D (Planned Residential Unit Development)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 24 (Parking)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 32B (Ogden Valley Signs)
- Weber County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 39 (Ogden Valley Lighting)

### Background

The Edgewater Beach Resort PRUD was approved as a conditional use in 2003 (CUP 2003-12). Since that time, the Planning Commission and County Commission have made minor amendments to the original approval. The applicant is now requesting a major amendment to the existing approval. The Weber County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 22D) states, "Once the overall development plan showing details of buildings, structures and uses has been approved by the County Commission, after recommendations of the Planning Commission, no changes or alterations to said development plan or uses shall be made without first obtaining the approval of the Planning Commission and County Commission."

This major amendment resembles the approved site plan, but several buildings are being rearranged, one 12-plex and one 6-plex are being eliminated, five single family dwelling units are being added on the north side of the project, the overall project density is being reduced from 166 to 153, and the number of trees on the landscape plan is being reduced significantly. Each of these proposed amendments is addressed below.

**Buildings and Parking:** The following table shows the breakdown of buildings and units in the approved site plan and the amended site plan.

| Approved Site Plan   |                   | Amended Site Plan    |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 12-plex = 8          | 96 Units          | 12-plex = 7          | 84 Units          |
| 8-plex = 2           | 16 Units          | 8-plex = 2           | 16 Units          |
| 6-plex = 1           | 6 Units           | 6-plex = 0           | 0 Units           |
| 4-plex = 1           | 4 Units           | 4-plex = 1           | 4 Units           |
| Condo-tel = 1        | 44 Units          | Condo-tel = 1        | 44 Units          |
| Single Family = 0    | 0 Units           | Single Family = 5    | 5 Units           |
| Total Buildings = 13 | Total Units = 166 | Total Buildings = 17 | Total Units = 153 |

As shown by the table, one 12-plex building and one 6-plex building are being eliminated, and five single family dwelling units are being added. The 6-plex that was Building 2 on the approved site plan is being moved to where the tennis court was located and is now shown as an 8-plex. The row of 12-plex buildings (Buildings 1, 4, 7, and 13 approved site plan) on the north part of the parcel is being replaced by the five single family dwellings. One of these 12-plex buildings is being eliminated, one of the buildings is replacing an 8-plex (Building 8 approved site plan), and the other two have been moved to the south side of the road, across from the single family dwellings. The rest of the buildings are shown in the same location on both site plans.

The applicant has stated that the condominium buildings are not being redesigned and will be built according to the previously approved plans. The single family dwellings will resemble the rendering in Exhibit H. The single family dwellings are shown with a footprint of 4,500 square foot and a maximum height of 25 feet. Garage renderings for the single family dwellings have not yet been submitted, but are required.

With the reduction in density, the parking requirements have also been reduced. The Zoning Ordinance requires 1.75 spaces per unit which rounds up to 268 required parking spaces. The amended site plan shows a total of 321 spaces (161 underground, 150 open, 10 for single family dwellings) compared to 358 on the approved site plan. The amended number appears to be sufficient for residents, visitors, and commercial uses. All of the buildings have 12 underground parking spaces except for the existing 4-plex, Building 5 which is shown as a 12-plex with open parking, and the single family dwellings which will have their own garages. While the number of parking spaces is sufficient, staff recommends that the open parking spaces be specifically designated for residents or visitors on a site plan as each phase of the project progresses. Each parking space must have a minimum area of 180 square feet exclusive of any sidewalk areas.

While the amended site plan has the effect of reducing the overall density and surface parking, it also increases the number of buildings from 13 to 17. The Planning Commission needs to determine if the reduction in density and parking offsets the increase in the number of buildings. In staff's opinion, the location and height limit of the new single family dwellings is a better design than the 12-plex buildings that are on the approved site plan. Any potential negative impacts are reduced because the single family dwellings have a smaller footprint and are 10 feet shorter than the 12-plexes.

**Phasing Plan:** A new phasing plan (See Exhibit C) has been submitted for this project. The first phase includes the existing 4-plex building and the west entry area. The second phase consists of the five single family dwellings and includes the road from the end of Phase 1 to the round-about. The rest of the Phases are shown on Exhibit C. When these phases are subdivided, this Phasing plan must be followed unless it is amended at a future date.

**Landscaping and Amenities:** The approved landscaping plan shows 367 trees compared to 159 trees on the amended site plan, which is a difference of 208. The landscape designer eliminated the trees to retain and improve the views to the reservoir and Snowbasin. The Planning Commission should compare both landscape plans and make a recommendation on the overall number of trees. If views to the reservoir are to be protected, it may make be beneficial to reduce the number of trees along the north property boundary and incorporate these trees back into the development. Another landscaping concern is on the amount of turf grass. The Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 18-C) allows a maximum of 50% of the landscaped area to be turf grass. The approved site plan showed an area of 26% turf grass, but the amended site plan appears to have more than 50%. This issue could be addressed by adding more areas of wildflower and natural grass mixes. The landscape plan needs to show an underground irrigation system for the landscaped areas. The pathway system has not changed from the approved site plan and must be built accordingly.

The amenities plan for this project is also proposed to change. The approved plan showed a tennis court, a pavilion with barbecue grills, a volley ball court, a playground, and a swimming pool. The amended site plan has eliminated the tennis court and the pavilion with barbecue grills. The volleyball court and playground are shown as part of Phase 9, and the pool is shown in Phase 12 with the condo-tel. A 20 foot wide beach access easement is located between Buildings 13 and 14 in Phase 2. The Planning Commission needs to determine if the amenities are sufficient or if the approved plan amenities should be retained. The Planning Commission should also determine if the amenities should be built earlier in the phasing plan. Any signage or lighting for the project also needs to be addressed with this amendment or the approved signage and lighting designs will remain in place.

**Roads, Utilities, etc.:** The roads in this development will remain at 24 feet wide, and all of the requirements of the Weber County Engineering Division and Weber Fire District must be followed. The review letter from the Fire District states that the roads must be 26 feet wide, but in speaking with Fire Marshall Ted Black, the 24 foot wide roads which were previously approved will be allowed. The second entrance on the northwest corner of the parcel must be extended to meet the existing gravel County road. This entrance will no longer be used only as an emergency access, and no gate will be allowed. The utility and drainage plans are being reviewed by the Weber County Engineering Division and their requirements must be complied with.

### Summary of Planning Commission Considerations

- Do any of the proposed amendments have potential negative or detrimental effects that have not been considered?
- Do the single family dwelling units fit with the rest of the PRUD?
- Where will the single family dwelling garages be located (designs are still required)?
- Do the reductions in density and parking offset the increased number of buildings?
- Should the parking breakdown between residents and visitors be shown on this plan, or in future phase approvals?
- Is the Phasing plan appropriate?
- Is the reduction in the number of trees on the landscape plan appropriate?
- Is the reduction in the number of amenities appropriate? Should the amenities be built in earlier phases of the project?
- Is this new PRUD design better than the previously approved design?
- Does the Planning Commission have other questions that have not been addressed?

### Conformance to the General Plan

The existing site plan was approved in conformance with the Ogden Valley General Plan in 2003. These amendments reduce the overall density numbers for Ogden Valley and reduce the height and mass of the buildings located closest to the reservoir.

### Conditions of Approval

- Requirements of the Weber County Engineering Division
- Requirements of the Weber County Health Department
- Requirements of the Weber Fire District
- All previous conditions of approval from CUP 2003-12 which are applicable remain in place

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the County Commission, if adequate answers are provided to the questions listed under "Summary of Planning Commission Considerations." If adequate answers are not provided, staff recommends tabling this item to allow the applicant time to provide adequate answers to the Planning Commission's questions.

### Exhibits

- A. Existing approved site plan
- B. Amended site plan
- C. Phasing plan
- D. Existing approved landscape plan
- E. Amended landscape plan
- F. Applicant's request statement
- G. Renderings of approved condominium buildings
- H. Renderings and footprint of new single family dwellings

Map 1

