

Minutes of the Ogden Valley Township Planning Commission meeting held January 23, 2007, Weber County Commission Chambers, commencing at 4:30 p.m.

**Members Present:**

Louis Cooper, Chair  
Jim Banks  
Greg Graves  
Gary Allen  
Keith Rounkles  
Verl Creager  
Sharon Holmstrom

**Members Excused:**

**Staff Present:**

Jim Gentry, Director  
Kevin Hamilton, Planner  
Chris Allred, Legal Counsel  
Sherri Sillitoe, Secretary

---

**Consent Agenda Items**

- A. Conditional Use Application CUP #35-06 to revise a Home Style in Trappers Ridge PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development)
- B. Conditional Use Application CUP #34-06 for Revisions to the site plan for a Culinary Water Reservoir at approximately 2000 South in the Hawkins Creek Estates

**Regular Agenda Items**

- 1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2007
- 2. Approval of the 2007 Meeting Schedule and Member Information List
- 3. Approval of the Planning Commission Policies & Procedures
- 4. Approval of Minutes for the June 14, 2006 and September 26, 2006 meetings
- 5. Discussion -Follow up on Rock Crushing proposal at the Fairways PRUD
- 6. Conditional Use CUP #08-06 for Powder Ridge Condominiums Phase 1 Site Plan (30 Units) located at approximately 6172 Powder Ridge Road
- 7. Conditional Use CUP #36-06 for Powder Canyon Condominiums (60 Units) located at approximately 3618 Wolf Creek Drive (Intersection of Wolf Creek Drive and Moose Hollow Drive)
- 8. Zoning Petition ZP #21-06 by Darla Jones etal. to require transitional lot sizes between high density cluster subdivisions and larger residential lots
- 9. Zoning Petition ZP #10-06 by Lisa Karam to rezone property at Southwest corner of Old Snow Basin Road from CV-2 to CVR-1
- 10. Preliminary Approval for S6 Ranch Estates Subdivision (10 Lots) located at approximately 2600 E. 4000 N. in Liberty
- 11. Preliminary Approval for The Rivers Cluster Subdivision (46 Lots) located at approximately 7800 E Hwy 39
- 12. Preliminary Approval of Sundance Ridge Subdivision located at approximately 5515 East Snow Basin Road
- 13. Conditional Use CUP #19-05 located at approximately 465 N. 9000 E. (Request to Table Kelley Creek Farm PRUD Discussion until Feb 27, 2007).
- 14. Discussion on Waste Water Treatment
- 15. Planning Commission Training on May 31, 2007 and June 1, 2007
- 16. Adjourn

---

**Consent Agenda Items**

- A. **Conditional Use Application CUP #35-06 to revise a Home Style in Trappers Ridge PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development)**

\_\_\_\_\_ Staff Report:

**Finding of Fact:**

The Developer is proposing a change to the home style by adding a large wrap- around deck on The Big Horn house plan in Trappers Ridge PRUD. Since Trappers Ridge is a PRUD, there are building envelopes the home, deck and stairs off of the deck has to stay within. The area around the buildable areas are common areas and owned by the Trappers Ridge Home Owner's Association and are non-buildable areas.

**Questions to ask:** Will all structures stay within the buildable area?

**Conditions for Approval:**

- 1. A survey of the buildable area is done to show that there will be no encroachment into the common area.
- 2. This change to the home style only applies to The Big Horn Model

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends approval, subject to staff, and other agency comments.

**B. Conditional Use Application CUP #34-06 for Revisions to the site plan for a Culinary Water Reservoir at approximately 2000 South in the Hawkins Creek Estates**

Staff Report:

**Project Summary**

The petitioner constructed a 180,000 gallon culinary water reservoir to provide water for the Hawkins Creek Estates Subdivision. When the reservoir was constructed, it was found that the existing slopes were steeper than the developers engineers had represented on the site plan. Due to the error the petitioner was required to go before the hillside review board for approval for steeper finished grades than were originally approved. The petitioner also added a significant amount of additional landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of the site.

**Conformance To General Plan** Conforms: The use has been landscaped to minimize its visual impact.

**Conditions for Approval**

Requirements and recommendations of the Hillside Review Board.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval subject to staff and other agency comments and conditions.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Holmstrom moved to approve Consent Agenda Items A and B as presented. Commissioner seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Vice Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye. \_\_\_\_\_

**Regular Agenda Items**

**1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2007**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Graves nominated Louis Cooper for Chair for 2007. The nomination was seconded. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**MOTION:** Commissioner nominated Greg Graves for Vice Chair for 2007. The nomination was seconded. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**2. Approval of the 2007 Meeting Schedule and Member Information List**

Staff gave an explanation of the 2007 meeting schedule and indicated a couple of meetings were scheduled on a Wednesday due to a preceding holiday.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Graves moved to approve the 2007 Meeting Schedule and Member Information List. Commissioner Rounkles seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**3. Approval of Planning Commission Policies & Procedures**

Staff indicated the Policies and Procedures have not changed from 2006.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Rounkles moved to approve the Planning Commission Policies & Procedures. Commissioner Banks seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**4. Approval of Minutes for the June 14, 2006 and the September 26, 2006 meetings**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Banks moved approve the June 14, 2006 and the September 26, 2006 meeting minutes subject to Legal Counsel review. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**5. Discussion - Follow up on Rock Crushing proposal at the Fairways PRUD**

Staff said in October, the Planning Commission asked the developer of the Fairways PRUD to determine how much noise the rock crusher made. The sound engineer who performed the noise analysis said they conducted a noise report in October and their findings recommended moving the crusher a little more than 8 ft. The noise analysis consisted of making measurements around the perimeter of the site and off as far as they could to the south. They reviewed the measurements on October 16, 2006. Assuming what they wanted to do met the assumed standard, the measurements 130 ft. from the rock crusher, the noise is above 70 decibels continually, which is a construction noise and people in that area should be wearing hearing protection. They then went straight south 300 ft. and they are seeing 62 decibels (db.). Then they went across the fairway about 650 ft. and the number was down to 45-51 db. Technically, that would be considered an acceptable condition. The nighttime figure is 5 db. below the 55 db. and the 49-51 technically could be considered acceptable although they do not run the rock crusher all night long. They recommended that what should be done to improve the situation was to extend the wall on the crusher to the east at least 8 ft. They also recommended a three-sided enclosure with the rock crusher in the middle of it and there was no visual line of sight between the machine and any homes for at least 1,000 ft. away. Then they repeated the conditions on October 31, 2006, and basically the levels did not change. They found a big improvement at the south line of the site where they went down to 57-60 db.

Chair Cooper said he envisions that if they enclose the crusher on three sides and have something they could pull into, it could buffer the noise. A solid wall or something like a freeway noise barrier wall would or should absorb the sound. The cement blocks are designed to do the same thing with the blankets.

Commissioner Rounkles said by using the blankets, they should not have the sound revert. The sound engineer said they had the same noise with or without the blankets. Truck traffic tends to dominate that problem.

Commissioner Holmstrom said in their discussion, they said not only would they do what they could do to alleviate the noise, but that they would move the crusher from phase to phase. The sound engineer said you could park the crusher in front of a wall and the sound would jump back. Typically, if you can get the crusher 3-400 ft. away from residential property lines, the noise should meet ordinance requirements.

Mike Nelson was asked by the petitioner to outline his proposal. The buyers are a part of the process. The rock crusher is a mobile apparatus and will be moved to each phase. They have limited the hours of operation to 9:00-3:00 or 9:00-4:00 and it is not running every day. They shut down during the lunch hour. They also visited several of the home owners surrounding the rock crusher.

Commissioner Holmstrom said when they have their ordinance meeting they should talk about using this as a conditional use and put parameters using the research that Mr. Nelson did in their ordinance drafting deliberations. Mr. Nelson said they provided a report to staff of the research that was done.

Staff said this item is on the agenda as a discussion only item. No action will be taken. Chair Cooper said this process is already going on. They need an ordinance in place so staff can review projects such as this to see if a petitioner is in compliance.

Commissioner Graves said the decibel chart is hard to understand. He appreciates the developer's hard work. Commissioner Rounkles said they made effort on their own to help mitigate noise. Commissioner Graves agreed that the developers made a good faith effort.

**6. Conditional Use CUP #08-06 for Powder Ridge Condominiums Phase 1 Site Plan (30 Units) located at**

**approximately 6172 Powder Ridge Road**

Staff presented the following report:

The applicant is requesting conditional use and site plan approval for Powder Ridge Condominiums Phase 1 (30 Units) located at approximately 6172 Powder Ridge Road. The project lies in a Forest Residential (FR-3) Zone, which lists Time Share Building and Group Dwelling as a conditional use. The units in this project were originally approved in 1988 and amended in 2003. This proposal will move the location of the units-which were started but have been removed-to a new area close by.

This project was originally presented to the Planning Commission on September 5, 2006. It was tabled at that meeting due to insufficient sewer and water hookups being available. Since that time 30 sewer and water hookups have been paid for and will be provided by Powder Mountain Water and Sewer.

Weber County Zoning Ordinance States "The purpose and intent of Conditional Uses is to allow in certain areas, compatible integration of such uses as special exceptions but which are related to the permitted uses of the zone, but which may be suitable and desirable only in certain locations in that particular zone due to conditions and circumstances peculiar to that location and/or only if such uses as designed, laid out and constructed on the proposed site in a particular manner."

Weber County Zoning Ordinance further states: **22C-5. Basis for Issuance of Conditional Use Permit.** The Planning Commission shall not authorize a Conditional Use Permit unless evidence is presented to established:

1. That the proposed use of the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community, and
2. That such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case and the conditions imposed, be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons nor injurious to property or improvements in the community, but will be compatible with and complimentary to the existing surrounding uses, buildings and structures when considering traffic generation, parking, building design and location, landscaping and signs, and
3. That the proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this Ordinance for such use, and
4. That the proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and governing principles and land use of the General Plan for Weber County
5. That the proposed use will not lead to the deterioration of the environment or ecology of the general area, nor will produce conditions or emit pollutants of such a type or of such a quantity so as to detrimentally effect, to any appreciable degree, public and private properties including the operation of existing uses thereon, in the immediate vicinity of the community or area as a whole.

The exterior architectural design and color scheme for the building conform to the requirements in chapter **18C** of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance. The building will consist of brown vertical cement board siding, heavy wood fascias and window divisions, ledge stone pillars and columns, and a tin colored metal roof. The windows will have a blue-green tinted glaze. (Please see the renderings included with the packet). The landscaped area combined with open space containing natural vegetation includes about 56% of the total area for this project. This meets the criteria for the FR-3 Zone and chapter 18-C of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance.

A new underground parking lot with 50 stalls will be built as part of this project. Additional stalls are also provided above ground. The proposed number of stalls does meet the requirement for 1.75 stalls per dwelling unit. A hammerhead turnaround is proposed at the entrance to the underground parking area, which is a variance from current ordinances. This design must be approved by the Weber Fire District and the Planning Commission must give a favorable recommendation to the County Commission for approval. The Weber Fire District will also require a NFPA 13 Fire Sprinkler System as well as fire hydrants to be installed.

**Questions to Ask:** Where will snow be stored?

**Conditions for Approval:**

1. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Engineers Office.
2. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Health Department.
3. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Building Inspector.
4. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber Fire District.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends approval subject to staff and other agency comments and recommendations.

Weber County Zoning Ordinance states: "The Planning Commission may deny or permit a Conditional Use to be located within any zone in which the particular Conditional Use is permitted by the use regulations of that zone. In authorizing any Conditional Use, **the Planning Commission shall impose such requirements and conditions necessary for the protection of adjacent properties and the public welfare.**" Any variance from the Weber County Zoning Ordinance will require a petition, and granting of a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

The Planning Commission can approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit subject to staff and other agency comments.

The Planning Commission can deny the proposed application.

The Planning Commission can table this item if additional information is needed

The decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the County Commission by filing such appeal within 15 days after the date of the decision of the Planning Commission.

Staff said there have been new renderings submitted.

Commissioner Holmstrom asked if the fire department could actually get up that road? Staff replied that apparently they can.

Staff said the developer has a plan for snow removal and staff explained that plan.

The developer was asked if there has been any thought as this project grows to put a fire truck at the site? The developer said the overall masterplan of Powder Mountain will require several fire engines up there over time. The overall masterplan will probably be submitted to Weber County within the next six months.

The developer explained the materials they will use for the buildings and facade. They may possibly use veneer because the cost is getting to be the same as lead stone. The fireplaces are between units.

Commissioner Holmstrom said the new changes are a definite improvement.

Commissioner Rounkles asked the developer if the old Powder Ridge building will be demolished, and the petitioner replied yes. The new development is on a vacant site. Staff said there were existing foundations of proposed condos that were never built, but the foundations have been removed. The condos that people use will stay. Commissioner Banks asked the distance between the old development and the new and staff replied that is approximately 50 ft.

No further public comment was made.

Staff stated that approval of the conditional use permit constitutes approval of the phasing, although they will have to come back for the subdivision plat for the condos.

Commissioner Rounkles asked if the roof material or the windows be shiny? The developer said that they are not using reflective glass, but they may get a subtle reflection. The roof material is a metal tin-type replication with a matte finish that will be painted. In answer to a question by Commissioner Graves, the developer said they will use brown or subtle gray vertical cement board, not orange.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Holmstrom moved to approve Conditional Use Permit CUP #08-06 for Powder Ridge Condominiums Phase 1 Site Plan (30 Units) located at approximately 6172 Powder Ridge Road subject to staff and other agency recommendations. Commissioner Banks seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**12. Preliminary Approval of Sundance Ridge Subdivision located at approximately 5515 East Snow Basin Road**

Staff said there has been a challenge regarding notices that were sent out on the Sundance Ridge development. The Conditional Use Permit application for the water tank does not appear on the agenda.

Chris Allred, Legal Counsel, said the notice language listed that the conditional use permit was on the agenda tonight, not preliminary approval for the Sundance Ridge Subdivision. Apparently, property owners have some concern with that notice.

Russ Maughan said the issue was not that the subdivision was not noticed, it was that the notice did not state it was for preliminary approval of Sundance Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Allred clarified that the concern is that some of the surrounding property owners may not have understood what was on the agenda.

Mr. Maughan said that he is a neighbor and had two neighbors call him concerned about the notice as well. They did not understand it was on the agenda for preliminary approval.

Commissioner Holmstrom said they are proposing to hear a request on a night that was set aside for ordinance review. Staff said they would like to discuss the special meeting at the end of the agenda. Chair Cooper agreed.

Commissioner Graves said he believes the notice mistake is a sufficient reason to table this item.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Graves moved to table Preliminary Approval of Sundance Ridge Subdivision located at approximately 5515 East Snow Basin Road. Commissioner Banks seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**7. Conditional Use CUP #36-06 for Powder Canyon Condominiums (60 Units) located at approximately 3618 Wolf Creek Drive (Intersection of Wolf Creek Drive and Moose Hollow Drive)**

Staff presented the following report:

The petitioner is proposing a 60 unit Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD), consisting of 6 buildings with 10 units in each building. A Planned Residential Unit Development is a development in which the regulations of the zone, in which the development is situated, are waived to allow flexibility and initiative in site, building design and location in accordance with an approved plan and imposed general requirements.

Total acres for the development are 7.76 with 6.63 acres lying within an FR-3 Zone and 1.13 acres lying in an O-1 Zone. Approximately 4.65 acres will be set aside as common space. The development is located at approximately 3618 Wolf Creek Drive, the intersection of Wolf Creek Drive and Moose Hollow Drive.

An area of 148,500 square feet for the 6 condos and clubhouse is required. An additional 500 square feet for each of the 60 lockout sleeping rooms (nightly rentals) is required. The total required area is 4.09 acres which is met with the 5.23 acres in the FR-3 Zone that is not a road. Almost 30 percent of the total acreage will be landscaped with materials and plants that conform to Chapter 18C of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance.

The architectural design and color scheme for the building conforms to the requirements in Chapter 18C of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance. The condos will be constructed of an asphalt and bronze metal roof with a wainscot of stone. Siding on the condos will be hardy board with the gables being copper and bronze. The timber post and trim will be cedar and windows will be constructed of aluminum clad. Construction materials for the club house are similar to the condos except for the roofing which will be constructed of a corrugated metal. The Design Review Ordinance and Ogden Valley Architectural, Landscape and Screening Design Standards do apply to this project and have been satisfied due to adequate site layout, parking, landscaping and the fact the proposed building materials are predominately natural, muted earth tone colors. Outdoor lighting fixtures and structures have been shown and do comply with the Ogden Valley Lighting Ordinance. The proposed buildings will be less than 35 feet in height.

For the 60 building units, 105 stalls are required with an additional 8 for the clubhouse. As Chapter 24-3 of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance states, the lockout sleeping rooms require one space per two bed capacity, requiring an additional 30 stalls. The total stalls required are 143 which Powder Canyon meets with 147 (60 are lower level parking and 87 are outside).

Culinary water will be provided by Wolf Creek Water Company, secondary water will be provided by Wolf Creek Water Conservancy and wastewater will be handled by Wolf Creek Sewer Improvement District.

A financial guarantee will be required for all improvements including landscaping and the clubhouse. The approval of this CUP acts as a preliminary approval for this subdivision.

Weber County Zoning Ordinance States "The purpose and intent of Conditional Uses is to allow in certain areas, compatible integration of such uses as special exceptions but which are related to the permitted uses of the zone, but which may be suitable and desirable only in certain locations in that particular zone due to conditions and circumstances peculiar to that location and/or only if such uses as designed, laid out and constructed on the proposed site in a particular manner."

Weber County Zoning Ordinance further states: 22C-5. Basis for Issuance of Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission shall not authorize a Conditional Use Permit unless evidence is presented to establish:

- That the proposed use of the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community, and
- That such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case and the conditions imposed, be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons nor injurious to property or improvements in the community, but will be compatible with and complimentary to the existing surrounding uses, buildings and structures when considering traffic generation, parking, building design and location, landscaping and signs, and

- That the proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this Ordinance for such use, and
- That the proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and governing principles and land use of the General Plan for Weber County, and
- That the proposed use will not lead to the deterioration of the environment or ecology of the general area, nor will produce conditions or emit pollutants of such a type or of such a quantity so as to detrimentally effect, to any appreciable degree, public and private properties including the operation of existing uses thereon, in the immediate vicinity of the community or area as a whole.

**Conformance to General Plan:**

Powder Canyon conforms to the General Plan by meeting the requirements for an approved PRUD and the FR-3 Zone. The proposal also conforms to the General Plan's Goals & Objectives by promoting the preservation of open space and designing a building that uses materials compatible with the Valley's rural character.

**Conditions for Approval:**

1. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Engineers Office.
2. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Fire District.
3. Requirements of Wolf Creek Water and Sewer District.
4. Requirements and recommendations of Utah Department of Transportation.
5. Resolution of issues listed above.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends approval subject to staff and other agency comments and recommendations and issues listed above. Conditional Use Permit approvals/denials are appealable to the County Commission within 15 days of the Planning Commission decision.

Commissioner Banks asked if there was any way they could preserve the apple tree that is on the site.

Commissioner Holmstrom said she thought a minimum of 10 acres was required for such a development. She asked if staff had an idea of how much acreage is FR-3, FV-3, etc. over the entire valley floor? Staff said it is a condo development not necessarily a PRUD. The recreation study they have been working on for almost two years. They determined at total build-out there would be 15,000 units. A PRUD gives them the flexibility for some smaller lots. By building their proposal in the FR-3 Zone, they are only at half of the allowed density. The FV-3 Zone allows one unit per three acres. The large part of the valley floor is FV-3 and AV-3, not FR-3 zoning.

Commissioner Holmstrom asked if this proposal part of the Wolf Creek masterplan density count? Staff replied yes, it is part of their overall density.

In answer to a question by Commissioner Graves, staff said water availability is a State question. Under the current lagoon system, they are not sure of the build-out capacity. Wolf Creek has taxing ability and this should not be a problem.

Commissioner Holmstrom asked about the road repair improvements. Commissioner Banks said the road has already been repaired and they are haling dirt out to prevent more damage.

Mike Nelson said by putting underground parking, 60% of the project is dedicated to open space. In answer to a question by Commissioner Rounkles, Mr. Nelson said they have a plan for a pretty extensive drainage system. There is a drainage swall to the right. The geotechnical report made some suggestions regarding having some additional drainage and they will follow that recommendation. They will also tie into the overall trail system. Commissioner Rounkles said he believes that is an important thing and should be done to get people off of the road.

Michelle Hill, 3615 Wolf Creek Drive, said when they bought their condo two years ago, they bought it for the view. This new development will totally block their view. She objects to adding more buildings in this area. They have moose that walk along their condo and river banks. Her second concern was that more condos in the area will overburden their power supply. Their power fails at least once or twice a month. Her third concern is with the roads and infrastructure. With increased building, they will lose the atmosphere in the valley.

Chair Cooper said that is the Planning Commission's call with trying to create ordinances to protect. Blocking of views is a tough issue that they try to address. If they start to have power outages, what could the power company do if it serves all of Utah? Letters are sent to the power company and all other utility companies notifying them of proposed subdivisions. Sometimes they reply and sometimes they do not. Utah Power is concerned about the growth in the valley. Commissioner Allen said to his knowledge all the power comes down the canyon on the one line.

No further public comment was made.

Commissioner Holmstrom said she would really like to discuss P.R.U.D.'s in the future and address some ways they allow them with less rather than more units and more open space. However, the density is coming out of the overall approved density for Wolf Creek.

Commissioner Graves said the proposal is half of what is allowed in the present zone.

Commissioner Rounkles asked if the road coming into Moose Hollow is adequate with the proposed increased density. Should the County Engineer look at a pull-out deceleration road? Staff said the County Engineer does review potential and proposed roads. A brief discussion followed regarding roads at this time.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Allen moved to approve Conditional Use CUP #36-06 for Powder Canyon Condominiums (60 Units) located at approximately 3618 Wolf Creek Drive (Intersection of Wolf Creek Drive and Moose Hollow Drive) subject to staff and other agency requirements and recommendations. Commissioner Rounkles seconded the motion. A vote was taken Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**8. Zoning Petition ZP #21-06 by Darla Jones etal. to require transitional lot sizes between high density cluster subdivisions and larger residential lots**

Staff presented the following report:

**Findings of Fact:**

The petitioners are requesting that Chapter 22B (Cluster Subdivisions Special Provisions) be amended to require transitional lot sizes between high density cluster subdivisions and larger residential lots (see attached petitione'rs letter).

**Conformance to General Plan:**

Both general plans recognize a need to preserve open space and preserve the rural character of unincorporated areas of the county. The change will help preserve the rural feel of larger lots.

**Other Issues to Consider:**

Will buffer requirements create unuseable strips of land between the clustered lots and adjoining properties.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider adding buffering requirements between smaller lots in cluster subdivisions and larger existing residential lots between one and five acres. Buffering should not be required between lots in a cluster subdivision and parcels greater than five acres as the five-acre parcel could itself be divided into a cluster subdivision.

Chair Cooper said it does not seem to him where this would be a problem. The intent is just for when they are abutting other lots. If they had a cluster subdivision, they could come within 100 ft. or so from the property line, if they have open space, and it would not be a big deal. Staff said there was only one case in the County where this was a problem in a cluster development, but it was when a lot was against a much larger lot. Usually developers place the open space against the neighboring property line. Chair Cooper asked staff to come back to them with comments at another meeting. Staff said the GEM committee has also made some comments that should be helpful.

Commissioner Allen said the buffering word is a big word. Commissioner Holmstrom said it would be good to have the language in place. Commissioner Rounkles said he believes the word "larger" should be defined. Commissioner Graves said staff will come back with a suggested number.

Steve Clarke, Eden Planning Committee, said in the draft recreation resort ordinance, they have looked at the case where there was a ski resort next to high density recreation property. It was agreed to by the stakeholder's committee that it should be adjacent to the zone the property abuts. That rationale seems to fit here. The Eden Planning Committee looked at it, although he is not officially representing them, they felt it should be addressed by ordinance and that buffer language should be addressed in the ordinance.

Darla Jones said she is proposing this amendment and representing her other neighbors who helped pay to submit the ordinance amendment application. Ms. Jones prepared a statement summarized as follows:

They will have eight homes along their one-acre fence line. The atmosphere is being completely destroyed. Realtors have told her the value of her home will drop tremendously. Her lot will have the high risk of being flooded with eight homes on her fence line. She lives in Taylor and she has invested her entire life to live where she lives. She respects that a developer needs to make money and can build on it, but they have been there for years.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Graves moved to direct staff to amend the cluster subdivision to create an ordinance to require transitional lot sizes or some sort of buffer between high density cluster subdivisions and larger residential lots. Commissioner Holmstrom seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

9. **Zoning Petition ZP #10-06 by Lisa Karam to rezone property at Southwest corner of Old Snow Basin Road from CV-2 to CVR-1**

Staff presented the following report:

**Findings of Fact:**

The petitioner is requesting that 3.22 acres located on the southwest corner of the Old Snowbasin Road be rezoned from Commercial Valley CV-2 to Commercial Valley Resort Recreation CVR-1. The concept development plan will remain the same as the one approved when the property was zoned to CV-2 (see attached drawings). The change will be in allowed uses. Instead of the truncated CV-2 uses previously approved, the property owner would be allowed to request approval for any of the uses listed in the CVR-1 zone. For example, they would no longer be able to have a legal office, hotel or motel units, but they would be able to mix condominium rental apartments in with the commercial uses.

**Conformance to General Plan:**

The general plan set a goal to enhance quality recreational opportunities and lists an objective to identify recreational assets, facilities

and activities in the valley and determine which facilities might be expanded to meet increased recreation demand and plan for such expansion. The changes in zoning will take the property from a general commercial zone and place it in a recreation zone focused on providing service to those coming to the valley to recreate. It will not conflict with the general plans' goal of maintaining the valley's rural atmosphere and rural lifestyle as the change will not increase the intensity over what is currently allowed and the site is surrounded by a high density condominium development on the north and one acre and smaller suburban residential lots on the south.

---

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends approval because the proposed zoning change conforms to the general plan. The property owner should also be made aware that any proposed use will need to conform the concept development plan and will require site plan or conditional use approval and must meet the requirement of all other county ordinances applicable to this type of development.

They have an architectural style for the development and a detailed plan will have to be approved at a later date. There has never been an approved site plan, only an approved concept plan with proposed hotel units and therefore, a site plan will need to be submitted. The developer is asking for a downzoning so the units can be sold as condo-tel units.

Commissioner Holmstrom said she was not on the East Huntsville Planning Commission, but she understood the commercial site plan that was approved had a time limit and if not developed within that time frame, it would revert to its prior zoning. Staff said the County Commission, if they choose when they approve a rezone, they can approve a zoning development agreement. Ms. Karam has until July of this year. Typically, if nothing has happened in the area, they will extend that time.

Commissioner Holmstrom said by rezoning, would the developer have another two years? Staff said that would be the County Commission's decision. A zoning development agreement states that the County Commission "may" revert the zoning back to its prior zone, it does not state "shall" revert back. Commissioner Holmstrom said they may get the zoning approved, but the conditional use permit and/or site plan may not be approved. Staff said that is correct.

Commissioner Holmstrom said she has heard some comments that the height if you are looking up from a view corridor or the agricultural preservation farm just below it, could be a problem if allowed over 25 ft. Staff said the height is not an issue at this time. The question before them is the hotel vs. condotel or should they rezone the property, which is actually a downzoning?

Chair Cooper asked if it is any more conducive to have a condo-tel and what are the ramifications? It seems a condo-tel lends itself to being a community where someone could live in the unit, whereas hotels are transient in nature.

In answer to a question by Commissioner Allen, staff said the Chalets to the south of this proposal are zoned FV-3 on one-acre lots, but received approval prior to the general plan zoning. There are condos directly to the north as well.

Lisa Karam, 1173 Innsbrook Drive, said her residence overlooks this parcel which was zoned CV-2 in 2001. She began the latest process in April 2005, and waited 8 months for the ordinance to be revised to allow condo-tels in the CV-1 Zone, and she submitted this rezone request in August 2006. If approved, it will allow them to utilize the condo-tels and still have the ability to provide the associated services needed on their side of the valley. There is no change in the conceptual design. She understands that if there were changes to that design, that she would have to bring the plan back before the Planning Commission.

Staff again stated that this is a downzoning proposal, wherein they are taking away some of the uses, but are adding the "condo-tel designation. The clubhouse across the street next to the road was approved at 25 ft. and the buildings further back were allowed to have a 35 ft. height. Commissioner Holmstrom voiced her concern about the building height and spoke her intention of requiring the same for this proposal. Staff said the property is further back than the land trust parcel was.

Frank Cumberland said if a person who owns the land assumes the risk and is willing to follow the rules that apply, he supports that request. He referred to his submittal letter. The pretty architectural renderings are clearly incidental. If everything does not follow the rules, he will object in the future.

Rich Koski, Ogden Convention Visitors Bureau, said he is representing Shelliece Stokes who was unable to attend this meeting. Ms. Stokes expressed her support for the zoning change and looks forward to the development. Commissioner Holmstrom asked Mr. Koski if it is customary for the Visitors Bureau to support individual developments. Mr. Koski said he does not know what has happened in the past, he is only representing Ms. Stokes at this meeting.

Steve Clarke spoke for this project, but questioned what happens to the density of the project is rezoned? Does the density carry across in a rezone? Staff replied that in this case, yes, the concept approval was for 70 hotel rooms, and the proposal with the rezone is 60-70 condo-tel units, which is a reduced density. Commissioner Holmstrom said she assumes they would have lock-out rooms, which actually increases density. Staff said with the lock out sleeping rooms, it is still below the maximum density that would be allowed. The lock out room would not be considered a dwelling unit because there is no kitchen, they are not counted as part of the density.

Commissioner Allen asked if they have a definition of a hotel vs. a condo-tel. Staff replied yes. Commissioner Holmstrom said the parking would have to change with the lock-out sleeping rooms.

Sharon Zini, 6618 Via Cortina, said here only concern is if they have rules in the valley, when are they going to enforce them instead of making exceptions? This resort will give them a nice benefit of services on their side of the valley.

Ron Gleason said with the lock-out rooms they are creating more density which is against the general plan's intent.

Steven Roberts said he believes they need more condo-tels and support for resorts. If there was no underlying density and under 70 units density, that is the opposite of what happened in Wolf Creek. This would be a great TDR, but he questions where the density could be transferred from. He asked how many density units were allowed before it was zoned to CV-2. Commissioner Holmstrom said Mr. Roberts paid out of his density pool for his condo-tel. Mr. Roberts said they have been talking about this for many months about transfer of development rights, and believes they should transfer the density from the valley floor where they want to create more open space. The lock-out room is not sold to a separate person.

Staff said their commercial zones do not have underlying density. There is a potential for more units with a hotel plan. Chair Cooper said maybe that is arbitrary and capricious and is a legal question. Staff said they could build a hotel and not use any of their density numbers. Commissioner Allen said the definition states "...as accessory to a recreation resort." Staff said that issue was discussed several years ago and it was determined the entire Ogden Valley is considered a resort.

Chair Cooper asked if the issue is because it is in a commercial zone that it is treated differently? Staff said if they are going to look at underlying zoning. They could build 60-70 hotel rooms, which is their density as approved in their concept development plan. Commissioner Allen said he is concerned about the density and that it could grow.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Allen moved to table Zoning Petition ZP #10-06 by Lisa Karam to rezone property at Southwest corner of Old Snow Basin Road from CV-2 to CVR-1 until they get better information as to what the impact would be to the valley overall, specifically what happens to the density with this proposal and related it as to how a TDR might affect this type of proposal and why it becomes important to count density units. Commissioner Banks seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

10. **Preliminary Approval for S6 Ranch Estates Subdivision (10 Lots) located at approximately 2600 E. 4000 N. in Liberty**

Staff presented the following report:

The petitioner is requesting preliminary approval for S6 Ranch Estates Subdivision (10 lots) located at approximately 2600 East 4000 North in Liberty. The subdivision contains 52.71 acres and lies in both AV-3 and FV-3 Zones which both require a minimum lot area of three acres and a minimum lot width of 150 feet. Nine of the lots are approximately 3 acres in size and Lot 7 is approximately 16 acres due to steep slopes covering much of its area. A 75x100 building envelope is shown on the plat.

Culinary water will be provided by the Liberty Pipeline Company. A secondary water system will need to be approved by the Weber County Engineer's office. Wastewater will be handled by individual septic tanks which have been approved by the County Health Department.

New roads will be built as a part of this subdivision and all roads must meet the requirements of the Weber County Engineers Office. The road into the subdivision travels approximately 1,881 feet before being broken up by a stub road to the south. It then continues another approximately 553 feet before terminating in a cul-de-sac. Chapter 2-2-D of the Weber County Subdivision Ordinance states "Minor terminal streets (cul-de-sacs) proposed in the subdivision of foothill or mountainous lands where topography dictates or limits the options in road design to a considerable extent, the Planning Commission will establish a maximum length based upon each individual situation. As a guide for design, a maximum length of 2,000 feet to the beginning of the turnaround is established." The cul-de-sac will be required to have a diameter of 110 ft. A four-foot gravel pathway will be provided on one site of the main road and a deferral for curb, gutter, and sidewalk will also be required.

**Conformance to General Plan:**

This subdivision conforms to the General Plan by meeting the requirements for the AV-3 and FV-3 Zones in which it is located.

**Conditions for Approval:**

1. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Engineers Office.
2. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Health Department.
3. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber Fire District.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends preliminary approval subject to staff and other agency requirements and recommendations.

Commissioner Rounkles asked staff if Lot 7 is an estate lot, and staff replied no, it is not a cluster subdivision. Lot 7 is just a larger lot with steep slopes which doesn't count toward the buildable area of that lot.

David Parkinson, speaking on behalf of his Mother-In-Law, Karen Smith, said she and her husband purchased the property approximately ten years ago from Susan White. After this purchase, her husband passed away. Their intent is to subdivide the land. The pond has been in existence for 25-30 years, but has not been used for a number of years because it leaks. One neighbor to the south, Bill Brookes, has expressed his intention to use the pond as he has one ditch right. However, there is question as to whether he has a valid right to that water because it has not been used for some time. In answer to a comment by Commissioner Allen, Mr. Parkinson said the well easement was given to Liberty Water when they intended to drill a well on their property. However, Liberty Water drilled their well on another location.

Commissioner Banks asked Mr. Parkinson if he is aware of the new State rule for new subdivisions are 40 lbs. of pressure. He is not sure he can deliver the required pressure with normal useage or fire protection for the proposed four lots up there. Mr. Parkinson said when they gave Liberty Water the rights to drill the well and the water reservoir, and at that time they agreed to deliver water to their acreage in return, possibly a water storage tank could be built there. He realizes there are some issues that they need to address and work out. Commissioner Banks said the water would have to come back through the system.

Bob Rigby, a liberty resident said they purchased the property with the intent to build sooner or later. He would like more than the one-acre piece he is living on now. He approves of the proposal.

John Brooke said his family owns 50 acres south of the Smith piece, and they purchased it with the intention of keeping it as a working farm. He is not speaking against the development concept, but is speaking against the preliminary approval because they believe it is deficient in several areas and may in effect create them to redraw the proposal. He further explained that they will use the detention pond to receive the required pressure up through the upper fields. They have been working on their plan for 1 1/2 years. The problem they have is their detention right rolls through three lots. Mr. Brooke indicated that this preliminary plan does not address secondary water or where the pipelines and risers will be put in. He is speaking on behalf of the owner of the Liberty Ranch Subdivision. This development plan does not address their existing water right. They believe it is in the general best interest to move the stub road to the east. It would shorten the distance of Spring Creek Road. Their property is in greenbelt to make sure it stays agricultural land. They ask that the petitioner go back to his engineer and address their issues of concern.

Chair Cooper asked if there is any reason staff sees why they would not want to give preliminary approval to this subdivision based upon the comments made by Mr. Brooke? Staff said any approval should be subject to agency review. Staff will take a look at the easements before it comes back for final approval. Commissioner Banks asked if they can use the pond for that easement? Staff said if there are significant changes to the layout, etc., staff would bring it back to the Planning Commission for preliminary approval. It seems like he is putting in several feet of frontage that would benefit Liberty Ranches.

Commissioner Holmstrom said there are problems with the lot alignments. Commissioner Graves said all they have to do is maintain access to that water which is something that can be worked out. It is not up to the Planning Commission on how that is worked out.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Graves moved that Preliminary Approval is given for S6 Ranch Estates Subdivision (10 Lots) located at approximately 2600 E. 4000 N. in Liberty subject to all of staff and other agency comments and working out the water rights and easements so that no one is denied legal rights to water. Commissioner Rounkles seconded the motion. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**11. Preliminary Approval for The Rivers Cluster Subdivision (46 Lots) located at approximately 7800 E Hwy 39**

Staff presented the following report:

The petitioner is requesting preliminary approval for The Rivers Cluster Subdivision (46 lots) located at approximately 7800 East 800 Hwy 39. The property is currently zoned Residential (RE-20) and Shoreline (S-1). The RE-20 portion of the property was zoned such at the time zoning went into effect in the Ogden Valley in 1961. The reason for the RE-20 zone at that time was to make lot sizes similar to those in Huntsville, since this was thought to be an area for natural expansion of the Huntsville Boundary.

Five of the lots will be located in the S-1 Zone, which currently does not have provisions for cluster subdivisions. These lots will meet the requirements for the S-1 Zone by having at least five acres and 300 feet of frontage. The other 41 lots will be in the RE-20 zone which does have provisions for cluster subdivisions. The RE-20 Zone requires at least 30% of the subdivision to be preserved as permanent open space and does not allow for any bonus density. However, lot sizes in this subdivision can be reduced to a minimum of 10,000 square feet with a sewer connection, and frontage requirements are reduced to 80 feet. Lots will range from approximately 11,000 sq. ft. to 24,000 square feet in area. The reason for clustering the lots in this subdivision is to help preserve the wetlands on the property.

Approximately 10.82 acres of open space will be provided within the subdivision. The open space will have a private park with a 900 sq. ft. covered pavilion and a small parking area with thirteen stalls. The area will be landscaped with trees, shrubs, and native grasses. A small mailbox area for subdivision residents will also be provided and served by the parking area as will a public trail system that runs throughout much of the open space and connects to roads in the subdivision and public lands to the west. Ogden Valley Pathways suggests that "shared roadway paths or side paths be planned along the private roads in the subdivision to provide a safe lane for residents to access the pathways in the open space."

New roads will be built as part of this subdivision and all roads must meet the requirements of the Weber County Engineers Office. The property currently has four access points but only two will be used as part of this subdivision. The north entrance road into the subdivision will require a 60 foot right of way but all other rights of way will be reduced to 50 feet. The petitioner is requesting a variance to allow an island to be placed near both of the subdivision entrances. Each island will contain a subdivision monument sign, a guard house (see renderings provided), and landscaped areas. No renderings for the monument signs have been provided. An agreement relieving Weber County of any liability or maintenance for the islands will be required. Rolled curb will be installed throughout the subdivision but pathways will take the place of sidewalk. The petitioner has had preliminary discussions with the Utah Department of Transportation and a letter from UDOT will be required for final approval.

Waste water treatment will be provided by a package treatment facility that is being proposed as part of the Bison Creek development. This system will initially serve Bison Creek, The Rivers, and Old Trappers Ranch subdivisions with capacity to expand to serve other developments. Final approval will not be given until a financial guarantee is in place and recorded as part of the Bison Creek subdivision. Along the same lines, Eden Water Works is proposing to expand their waterlines to serve the same three developments and others in the future. Eden Water Works has provided a feasibility letter to provide water for this subdivision but a final commitment letter from Eden Water Works will be required prior to final approval. The Weber Fire District is requiring 12 new fire hydrants.

A wetland delineation on the property has been completed by BIO-WEST Inc. and has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers for review. Approximately 8.94 acres within the project boundaries were identified as wetlands. An approval letter as well as any associated permits from the Army Corps of Engineers will be required for final approval. Flood plains affect Lots 42-46 and buildable areas for these lots may need to be identified on the plat. A geotechnical report recommended that no basements be allowed for homes in this subdivision.

**Conformance to General Plan:**

This subdivision conforms to the General Plan by:

1. Meeting the requirements for the RE-20 and S-1 Zones.
2. Meeting the requirements for Chapter 22B of the Weber County Zoning Ordinance.
3. Meeting the objectives of the General Plan Section 3.01 to "Identify and promote the preservation of open space" and "Establish mechanisms to preserve open space in the Valley" and Section 10.02 to "Provide incentives for developers to preserve open space and cluster development."

**Questions to ask:**

1. How will flood plain impact the buildable area for lots 42-46? Should building envelopes be shown?
2. How will wetlands impact the buildable area of lots 8, 24, and 26? Should building envelopes be shown?
3. Because of the wetlands and flood plain, should there be a requirement that the lowest habitable floor be 1 ft. above the crown of the road?

**Conditions for Approval:**

1. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber County Engineers Office
2. Requirements and recommendations of the Utah Department of Transportation
3. Requirements and recommendations of the Weber Fire District
4. Requirements of Eden Water Works Company
5. Financial guarantee and approval for sewer package treatment plant
6. Requirements and recommendations of the Army Corps of Engineers

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends preliminary approval, subject to staff and other agency comments and recommendations. These recommendations need to include the variance to the road standards. Staff is also recommending that rolled curb/gutter be installed.

Staff said they will also need the dimensions of the signs. Staff said with this "urban" type development, they sent a notice to Huntsville Town over 90 days ago to see if they were interested in annexing this property if it was within their annexation policy declaration, but they have not responded.

Commissioner Holmstrom said this land could not be developed without the Bison Creek receiving its sewage. Staff said they are not sure that is true as waste management is not their area of expertise. Commissioner Allen asked if this could be a stand-alone development without the sewage treatment plant? Staff said this is not an issue.

Jamie Gull, a partner in the development company, said they are not taking the Planning Commission's concerns lightly. In regard to density, they have redesigned the plan nine times. They have had aerial photography done and had a traffic survey and a geotechnical report done. They new there was high water there and they are satisfied that there will be no basements there. Their results concur with Bio-West's recommendations. Recognizing FEMA has already established floodplain maps, they went over and above the requirement by having a water flow study done and will provide that information to the Planning Commission at the time of final approval. They are reaching the point now that they need to have preliminary approval in order to obtain financing to get the sewer system available.

Chair Cooper said they are limited to what the sewer treatment plant can serve. He believes the best thing that can be done to water quality in Ogden Valley is a treatment package plant, but you have to have willing developers. A lot of money is needed to be spent to determine the best location for a sewer treatment plant.

Commissioner Holmstrom said the problem is this particular plan sits in the middle of a wetland. She would like to explore it with the County Commission. Discussion followed regarding this issue.

Chair Cooper said a lot of the work was done in October not in the spring when they could look at potential water problems.

Commissioner Rounkles said he would like additional time to review this proposal. Obviously, their study will look at the highest water flows in the time period spanning a number of years which include high water years.

Clarke Wangsgard, 7505 E. 600 S., said his family owned this property for five generations. They milked cows. In the past everyone had fences in Huntsville, but over the years the fences disappeared, and their cows occasionally would wander onto another's property. The road put in there in 1952 is a huge road. There was a lot of water on the property in the past, but he used it to raise cows and help crops to grow. If the petitioner follows the rules, he should be able to develop. He is in favor of this development.

Ron Gault, a member of the Huntsville Town Council, said he did not know about this proposal, but did receive the letter staff mentioned. Huntsville is not interested in annexing which is why they did not respond. The reason they are not interested was it was a beautiful piece of rural property that sits around the Town of Huntsville. It does not fit in their masterplan. They do not have a zone that matches the RE-20 zoning. They do not want to take the risk of being sued if the property floods.

Ron Gleason said he agrees of doing planning first before the package plants move forward. It will take some time but he believes it is important to move forward. It is a development company and they do not live there on a daily basis. Until they understand all of the ramifications, he believes this item should be tabled. They need to find out if and when Bison Creek's sewer treatment plan will be built.

Steve Clarke said he recognizes the developer has spent money to get to this point. On one of the property boundaries they are showing very small lots right next to homes built on larger lots. They believe the issue of having a buffer should be looked at.

Commissioner Holmstrom said they love the idea of such systems, although they know they are not fail safe, but they need to know what would happen if they do fail. They need to know more about the body politic procedure. From their point of view as planners, they are all frustrated by the process. They need to know from the County Commission how it will work. A Planning Commission should make decisions to help protect the County from liabilities. They have several things before them that are similar to the problems in Mountain Green. She realizes this developer has a tremendous amount of integrity and has provided over and above things required at the time of preliminary approval, but she would like to have this item tabled for one month to clarify their position. She would like to know what is desired by the County Commission.

Chair Cooper said Brian Cowan from the Health Department previously told them that if a property was within 300 ft. of a sewer system, they are required to hook up to that sewer. This is another reason that this

has to be looked at. Are there also conflicts with other agencies or laws? He agrees with the County Commission that if they did not have a problem with it, they would not have had to ask the GEM Committee to review it.

Commissioner Graves said just the fact that they have not had sufficient time to review it is justification enough to table the issue. This could change the future of the Ogden Valley.

Staff said when the County Commission approves a body politic, they understand and want and desire that location. The County Commission has the authority to plan in Weber County.

In answer to a comment by Commissioner Allen, Chris Allred said the body politic issue is not a new issue for the County Commission. They have looked into hookup fees, etc. They have thought about it and have adopted some procedures.

Commissioner Holmstrom said they are not saying the County Commission has not put knowledge and thought into it. They are saying the Planning Commission does not have the knowledge that the County Commission has. She would like to have the Planning Commission meet with the County Commission to discuss this issue. Staff said they will approach the Chair of the Commission to get his opinion. Commissioner Holmstrom said if they had a workshop it would be enlightening for the County Commission.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Holmstrom moved to table Preliminary Approval for The Rivers Cluster Subdivision (46 Lots) located at approximately 7800 E Hwy 39 for one month and that during that time they will seek some sort of workshop with the County Commission whereby they can become better informed on wastewater facility issues. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion and said it is the infrastructure of the system being put in place. A vote was taken and Chair Cooper said the motion carried with all members present voting aye.

**13. Conditional Use CUP #19-05 located at approximately 465 N. 9000 E. (Request to Table Kelley Creek Farm PRUD Discussion until Feb 27, 2007).**

Staff said they have agreed a one lot subdivision could be done to build one home at this time. Staff said they believe Brent Dickens does not have a valid PRUD application.

Mr. and Mrs. Dickens showed a presentation of their property and dog show operation at this time.

**14. Discussion on Waste Water Treatment**

This item was talked about during the Rivers Subdivision Agenda Item. Commissioner Holmstrom said it does not do them any good to have Bison Creek on their agenda until they have a meeting with the County Commission.

**15. Planning Commission Training on May 31, 2007 and June 1, 2007**

Staff indicated that it has been two years since the last training and for County insurance purposes, the Planning Commission members are required to receive training. All members, with the exception of Commissioner Allen, are required to attend the May 31, 2007 and June 1, 2007 training at the Utah Local Governments Trust Building in North Salt Lake. There is a registration cost associated with the training so the members will need to let staff know by the end of April if they are able to attend.

Staff said a special meeting will be held on February 12 at 5:30 p.m. to review and discuss ordinances. Chair Cooper asked if staff can give them a time line when they will see the Sensitive Lands ordinance. Commissioner Banks said he will not be able to attend the February 27, 2007 meeting.

There Being No Further Business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sherri L Sillitoe, Secretary  
Weber County Planning Commission