

Minutes of the Ogden Valley Planning Commission Regular & Work Session Meeting August 04, 2015 in the Weber County Commission Chambers commencing at 5:00 p.m.

**Present:** Laura Warburton, Chair; John Howell, Greg Graves, Will Haymond, Kevin Parson, Stephen Waldrip, Jami Taylor

**Absent/Excused:**

**Staff Present:** Sean Wilkinson, Planning Director; Scott Mendoza, Principal Planner, Ronda Kippen, Planner; Courtlan Erickson, Legal Counsel; Kary Serrano, Secretary

***Pledge of Allegiance***

***Roll Call:***

**1. Administrative Items**

**a. New Business**

**1. SPE2015-01: Discussion and action on a conceptual sketch plan endorsement request for the Holley Farm Cluster Subdivision located at 800 N 7800 E in the AV-3 Zone (Richard and MaryAnn Holley, Applicants)**

Ronda Kippen said that the item up for discussion is a sketch plan for endorsement by the Ogden Valley Planning Commission of the Holley Farm Cluster Subdivision. The property is located off of 7800 E 800 N, and is currently used as agricultural property and there is an existing barn on the property. There is a water pond on the property the developer is in the process of digging a joint well for this subdivision. This property is part of the 77 acre parcel, is zoned AV-3, and the cluster subdivision will take in approximately 12 acres, on the proposed four residential building lots and a five acre open space parcel. They will be using a private septic system and joint culinary well, and as part of the subdivision, it will be require a joint well agreement for access to the well for maintenance, as well as easements to get the waterline to the property.

Ronda Kippen said that there is an overall conceptual plan that was submitted, and there are a few items that will need to be modified when the preliminary plan comes in. The first item will be that the word cluster needs to be in the title of the subdivision. The item that needs to be changed is they are seeking an access exception; they are seeking access for two of the lots by private right-of-way, and Lots 3 and 4 will be granted a private access exception. They will be modifying the frontage of the agricultural piece of property and then they will be doing an easement over Lot 2 and Lot 3 for the access exception on Lots 3 and 4. These are some points to be discussed with t Holley's: access, right of way, access exception if it is acceptable or not, access exception if it is feasible and desirable, the block length that currently is 2,600 feet, existing structures, lot sizes, open space, and wetlands. Staff is requesting a decision; for the Planning Commission to either approve this concept sketch plan, approve this concept sketch plan with recommendations, or deny this concept sketch plan with some findings so that the applicant can come back with something more feasible.

Commissioner Waldrip asked where the referenced 2,600 block length was located. Mrs. Kippen replied that basically it is found at about 100 South.

Commissioner Howell asked if the Fire District prefers to have a turn around. Mrs. Kippen replied that they would be required to have turnouts every 1,000 feet, so as part of the improvements that would go in for the subdivision; they would be required to do a hammerhead every 100 feet along that lane.

Commissioner Taylor said that if each lot needs to be 1.75 acres, but they also need 60% of open space, how would they rectify that? Mrs. Kippen replied that their open space would need to be 7.26 acres, which was 60%. There would need to be more acreage dedicated in addition to the 12 acres.

Chair Warburton asked staff to clarify as to why the Health Department is mandating that the lots stay where they are at. Ronda Kippen replied that on the plat there are multiple test pits. The first two tests failed; the Holley's initial design was to come in with a road that would separate the barn from the agricultural parcel; however they need to keep the barn an agricultural parcel. The Health Department wanted room on each lot for a conventional mound septic system, plus an area for an alternative septic system, and in the event the joint well failed, they need enough area for each lot to drill their own well.

Commissioner Waldrip asked on the roadway that is coming off of the highway, will that be a 30 foot right-of-way shown there? Mrs. Kippen replied that is a 33 foot egress/ingress. The private right-of-way, the improved surface can be as minimal as 12 feet depending on the number of homes but they can't serve more than five homes.

Commissioner Waldrip asked if the road would be extended to the east to serve additional property, or has this not been discussed? Mrs. Kippen replied that is what is being discussed tonight; whether this commission thinks there will be additional development needed to the east, or whether they should steer away from a wider private right-of-way access, so there won't be any problems with properties abutting the new road. Director Wilkinson replied that in this case, there are some pro's and some con's. There is a large area of land that could be developed to the east, but a large portion of that land is marginal at best. Wetlands are not good for development. This happens to be in the middle where a road should go through according to the block length, but the question is do they really anticipate much development?

Richard Holley, applicant, 1287 N 7000 E, Huntsville, said that it was their desire to subdivide four lots for their children on their property. He doesn't anticipate developing the other property; they plan to put that in a conservation easement on the remainder of the property so they can continue to farm it and have his four children live there. They met with the Fire Marshal that was given the information of what was required. They understand that there would be a pullout on the main road going from 7800 east back to the barn. He required a 10 foot by 40 foot pull out on the road, and the stubs off Lots 3 and 4, they gave us options of a Y, a hammerhead, or a cul-de-sac. They decided a hammerhead that would continue Lot 4, and the boundary of Lots 3 and 4, because it's wide open space and there is nothing encumbering a large turnaround, and the two homes on Lots 3 and 4 would access themselves. His children liked it because they have large trailers and would be able to pull in and turn around. In the beginning, he had envisioned much smaller lots because his children didn't want larger lots because it encumbered them by farming the open space that they didn't want to take care of. It was his understanding from the Health Department that, he needed to be willing to designate a huge area to replace the joint with four individual wells if the joint well failed, but it didn't make sense to him because to replace one well would cost them \$60,000 versus adding four new wells at a cost of \$200,000. In reference to that well, they have purchased from Weber Basin, 32 acre feet of water, the pond would irrigate the open space, and the other part would be for the homes. They are in good standing with the state as far as the well; they have plenty of shares designated to each lot with a well agreement. The Fire Marshal laid out the requirements needed to start improving the road and having it certified by an engineer and hold the 75,000 pounds. They have some work to do to finish the water system. They have to create frontage; the portion in front of Lot 2, the length of that entire road to where it reaches Lot 3, would be deeded to Lot 2. Then it would revert over all the back to Lot 4, then the frontage and the road would be dedicated to lots 3 and 4 to create frontage for those two lots. It would be part of the access exception that they are requesting.

Commissioner Waldrip asked the applicant if he was aware of the 1,300 foot road requirement. Mr. Holley replied that he met with staff and discussed the property on the south. There is an easement for the future, and staff suggested going further north to avoid opening that up to having future development crossing through their property. They have chosen to have a private right-of-way because they don't want any development further back to the east of their property. They did have the Army Corps of Engineers come to their property and they didn't see any problems other than with the drainage ditch that runs to the north of the road. It's not an irrigation ditch, but is drainage from surrounding properties.

Commissioner Howell asked how deep they had to go from their well before they got good water. Mr. Holley replied that they drilled down to 275 feet because they wanted to have ample water and that is when they applied for a pond permit to irrigate a portion of that land. He is not sure the distinction between good well drinking water and pond water.

Commissioner Waldrip referred to the wetlands delineation, when the Army Corp of Engineers came to the property, did they delineated both Lots 1 and 2 as wetlands? Mr. Holley replied that he was not aware of this. Mrs. Kippen said this is in the County GIS Map as wetlands delineation, but staff has not verified it. Commissioner Grave said most likely that came from an aerial photo.

Director Wilkinson said that there was an access to the south coming out to 7800 E. when Bison Creek was proposed so the property that borders the Holley property is not landlocked. If the access exception were to be approved, it's not going to stop development to the other property; they have access from Highway 39 and from 7800 E. In the code for an access exception to be approved, it states, *"the landowner of record or authorized representative shall agree to pay a proportionate amount of the cost associated with developing a street. If at any time in the future the county deems it necessary to have the landowner replace the private right-of-way or easement with the street that would serve as a required access to additional lots."* If there is a real

need in the future for a road to be developed, the county would work with the Holley’s, and they would be required to pay their proportionate share of the property that they have fronting on that street. It’s an agreement in the future. Commissioner Graves said that in order for that to kick in, there has to be a trigger such as adding a lot that will cause their private access to turn into a road. Director Wilkinson replied that is correct or the county could just say they need it and then they would work with the Holley’s to get a road there.

Ronda Kippen said the code states, *“that a private right-of-way or access easement shall have a minimum width of 16 feet and a maximum width of 50 feet”* that’s the standards for the road turn outs. The travel surface can go down to 12 feet, but the dedicated width has to be 14 feet. It further states, *“that the improved travel surface of the private right-of-way or access easement shall be a minimum of 12 feet, if the access serves fewer than five dwellings, and a minimum of 20 feet at the access serves five or more dwellings.”*

**MOTION:** Commissioner Parson moved for approval of SPE2015-01 with no recommendations needed for the request of the Holley Farms Cluster Subdivision for the endorsement of the sketch plan site located at 800 N 7800 E, in the AV-3 Zone. Commissioner Graves seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Waldrip asked if they needed to note the nonconforming road issue in the motion. Director Wilkinson replied that the applicant has submitted an access exception application, and what staff wanted from the commission is for them to say they like it the way it is. From what was heard today, based on the sketch plan showing the access exception, they are okay with that.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken with Commissioner’s Parson, Howell, Graves, Haymond, Taylor, Waldrip, and Chair Warburton voting aye. Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

- 2. **Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:** None
- 3. **Remarks from Planning Commissioners:** None
- 4. **Planning Director Report:** None
- 5. **Remarks from Legal Counsel:** None
- 6. **Adjourn to Convene to a Work Session**

**WS1. DISCUSSION: Regarding Agri-Tourism operating in cluster subdivision open space**

Scott Mendoza referred to the Discussion/Question worksheet. Staff has had some discussions related to the current Agri-tourism Ordinance. When they created the Weber County Agri-Tourism Code; they basically said that Agri-Tourism is allowed in any zone where it’s listed as a use; that’s the AV-3, FV-3, and the F-5 Zones in the Ogden Valley. In those three zones someone can participate or come to this commission for approval of a conditional use permit for Agri-Tourism. These farms were categorized as small, medium, and large farms; and the small farm was categorized as three to five acres. In the Ogden Valley in the AV-3, FV-3, and the F-5 Zones, they can do Agri Tourism, as long as it’s not in a cluster subdivision, and on the common area or open space parcel. In the definition provided where it states, *“Agri-tourism businesses are permitted conditionally in designated zones, excepting those areas within residential subdivisions that are dedicated for the purpose of open space or common area”* is the exception. They could do it in all those zones except for a cluster subdivision open space. The discussion for tonight is if they would like to change that definition in a way that would allow Agri-Tourism in the cluster subdivision open space. Would it be appropriate to have Agri Tourism going on in that open space parcel, whether it’s dedicated as common area or possibly a private owned agricultural space parcel?

Chair Warburton asked for the sake of Commissioner Taylor, to further define cluster subdivision, or what this might look like. Mr. Mendoza said that this was solely about cluster subdivision, and the best way to describe that, is a large piece of property, where typically it would be divided into three acre lots, that front on a privately or dedicated road, a basic standard subdivision is what they would call it most of the time. A cluster subdivision in the Ogden Valley has to have a minimum of 60% of the overall area reserved as open space or common area. The lots can be reduced in size; if there is a sewer system in place they can go down to 6,000 sq. ft., when there is a large piece of property with smaller lots clustered most of the time in one area to reduce infrastructure costs and the rest of the property is open space, sometimes dedicated as common area, and sometimes dedicated as privately owned open space.

Scott Mendoza said the things that they will get into if they were to consider allowing Agri Tourism in a cluster subdivision open space, what the impacts would be. How would that impact the neighbors with small lots right next to a farm, if they were to allow Agri Tourism in an open space parcel in a cluster subdivision? If that were in place today, would the neighbors that bought into the cluster subdivision, feel that they were noticed appropriately, even though they were aware of the fact that Agri Tourism could go on in that open space behind them? If they were to consider allowing Agri Tourism in a cluster subdivision open space, the neighbors would receive as much notice as anybody else on any other property across the valley. Somebody that is not in a cluster subdivision, but are near a farm, Agri Tourism can occur on that farm. When they are thinking about impacts, the impacts could be throughout the valley, and the reason they have been comfortable allowing Agri Tourism at all, is because they did the best they could when they created that ordinance section, to mitigate as much as they could with anticipated impacts. There are buffer standards, screening standards, hours of operation standards; and even though this is a conditional use, they can assign conditions to regulate the hours of operation, that standard is already in the code.

Commissioner Parson asked if there is a cluster subdivision, is there anything in place for someone in the subdivision to have the ability to agree or disagree on that, and if they approved it, then would it be a Homeowner's Association? Commissioner Warburton replied think of how many times they have had to tell people that they can't make a decision based on their HOA. It's either allowed or not allowed. Mr. Mendoza said in private agreements like CC&R's; they could restrict and limit the uses on an open space parcel. Privately, they could restrict, even though the county were to agree and say yes, Agri Tourism is okay in a cluster subdivision open space, the land owners can go a step further, and they can say no, that is not something they see in their cluster subdivision code.

Commissioner Howell said on a cluster subdivision that is less than three acres, the problems that people would have, is what is listed for special occasions; including weddings, family reunions, special events, harvest festivals, and music events. Mr. Mendoza replied that they may not; but what they may like is that if Agri-Tourism is allowed, it could be a second source of income to support and sustain a genuine farm. What they anticipate seeing in the future are projects coming to this commission that are parts of an operating farm. Farms that are operating today and family has an interest in keeping that farm, and continuing to operate it.

Scott Mendoza said as part of the discussion when they were creating this code, they were under the impression that cluster, smaller lots, had more people, and the impact might be great. For right now, let's not allow it in cluster subdivisions, because there may be impacts to the neighbors, and the other reason was creating competition. Why would they want to allow another Agri Tourism operation on a piece of property where the county has already been able to go and check that off as being dedicated open space? Cluster Subdivisions allow someone to divide in a way that also allows an open space preservation tool.

Commissioner Waldrip said right now for example the Holley Farm 12 acres in a standard subdivision; they could come in and get a four lot, three acre per lot subdivision. In those three acre lots, they would have the ability to do Agri Tourism activities within those three acre lots by current code. So what they are saying is now, they have 1.75 acre lots plus some open space, and the only difference, is that the open space becomes the site for the potential Agri Tourism, rather than having four individual lots have the ability within the 12 acre parcel to have. Rather than having 4 three acre lots with the ability to do Agri Tourism, now they have one space, with the potential to have Agri Tourism on it, but the Agri Tourism use would be governed by one of two things. If the open space is owned by an HOA, the HOA would control whether or not that's used for Agri Tourism. If it's owned by a single owner or a dedicated owner that's dedicated it to open space, that would be solely in the judgment of that owner, that that space would be used for Agri Tourism. Mr. Mendoza said except that when a new property owner comes to you for approval for a cluster subdivision; staff will have to present to this Planning Commission an open space preservation plan. That plan to have Agri Tourism; that plan and eventually that easement, will go on that property should include Agri Tourism as one of the continuing uses.

Commissioner Waldrip said so even prior superseding CC&R's, conditions, covenants, or private agreements in the easement that is recorded against that property, they need to have Open Space Agri Tourism in that open space dedication. Mr. Mendoza replied yes, there would be a list of uses that would be able to continue to be used on that property. Common in a conservation easement where they would list the uses that would be able to continue, Agri Tourism would need to be one of those which would enable the HOA or an individual to come to them for approval for Agri Tourism.

Chair Warburton said who would be willing to move forward with it being retroactive? Courtlan Erickson, Legal Counsel said the only way an existing cluster subdivision could have Agri Tourism as a use today, assuming that this gets passed retroactive to everything that is out there, the only way that happens is if in the easement it specifically states Agri Tourism as a permitted use or it has language or any approved use per code in the easement.

Scott Mendoza said they would have to carefully read that easement, and they would most likely come back, say a cluster subdivision was approved three years ago, this wasn't something to consider then, it wasn't part of their open space plan. Several years ago they didn't have to encumber the lots with an easement, and maybe after 2006 they did, either way the easements or the open space preservation that has been put in place, there is language that states approved open space uses, and that language is on the dedication plat. With that said, staff would bring the Planning Commission the subdivision because that wasn't something that was presented originally, he didn't think an approval of a conditional use with an application, would meet that approval. They would have to come in with a subdivision and that open space request, and if they are comfortable approving the open space plan, which could include that, then they would bring in the conditional use.

Chair Warburton asked if they want to put those conditions on that process. Mr. Mendoza replied that they do not have a choice; the dedication is what it is. Commissioner Waldrip said the county has to comply with the dedication.

Chair Warburton said as she understood staff to say, there is wording in every dedication that whatever is approved by the county is allowed. Mr. Mendoza replied it depends on how that is interpreted, that dedicated language approved for open space purposes. Is that approval at subdivision time or is that approval at conditional use time. Courtlan Erickson said that his initial thought was approved for open space purposes; he would expect that to be not frozen in time when that was created expect it to be at anytime in the future if it was approved for open space, it would be allowed there.

Chair Warburton said if she was a disgruntled resident that wanted to sue the county, and said that she bought her house on the approved uses, she would not have bought the house in this subdivision, if she had known this was going to be approved, what would the rebuttal be for that? There are all kinds of things that are approved after the fact; there are things that could affect people, and land use is not stagnant. Courtland Erickson replied that he would have to look into that; laws change all the time, and that's a broad open ended language and not specific.

Commissioner Parson asked what the cost would be for them to rededicate the plat. Director Wilkinson replied that it would require a plat amendment at the cost of at least \$525. Commissioner Waldrip indicated that engineering fees would also be added to that cost. Also, who would write that amendment? Commissioner Graves said that it would be basically a language change and not much else. Mr. Mendoza replied that he didn't think it would be an actual plat amendment; it's just going to require an approval and that could be a separate process. On the dedicated plats they use standard language and it just talks about an approved open space focus. The file is where they would find easements and if someone comes in and they granted the county an easement, and guaranteed the county that it would only be used for uses A, B, and C, but they wanted to change that, they would come in and request an amended easement.

Chair Warburton said it looks like staff has some homework, to see about protecting people that already live there, and see what is required to change the easement.

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Graves said that he is not in favor of applying the use retroactively. He struggles for the person who comes into the cluster subdivision, because they are able to take advantage of that open space and then suddenly or after a period of time someone comes in and drastically changes the nature of that open space.

Chair Warburton said it's been her dream to have open space that has the covered light area; people move in and have their own areas but go down there to ride. Commissioner Graves said that would be use that would disappear. If it were dedicated common area for a park area or a meadow, that's what he enjoyed looking at. Then they build because that was part of the what was approved, and suddenly now there is going to be all these activities like the Farmer's Market, a corn maze, etc. he would be very irritated with that. He does not feel that it's fair to retroactively impose on somebody. If they can do it in the future, then people buying in realize this is a possibility, but people already settle in a place and they didn't know that was going to happen. Mr. Mendoza said that they could take baby steps and start out slowly going forward from today, and then if there is a request in the future, they will come back and tackle this. Chair Warburton asked Commissioner Graves if he was okay with that, so they will do it but not retroactively. Commissioner Howell and Commissioner Waldrip agreed with Commissioner Graves.

**WS2. TRAINING: Planning Commission – Rules of Order Training**

Director Wilkinson reviewed the rules of order with the board members.

**Page 2: B: Conduct of members of the Commission:**

**1. Addressing Members:** Director Wilkinson said that all of the members have good conduct, but sometimes they are addressed by their first name to the public. As commissioners he asked that they please address each by Commissioner or Mr. or Mrs. so that it has a more formal appearance. They don't have a problem with attendance, and staff appreciates when they call and let Kary or Sherri know when they cannot attend a meeting.

**4. Conflict of Interest:** Director Wilkinson said if they have conflict of interest, typically it's going to be because they have a direct or substantial financial interest in the proposal or for some reason they feel they cannot be impartial. If either of those are the case, they do have a conflict and they will need to recuse themselves from the meeting for an item while its being heard, and they will have to leave the Commission Chambers while that item is being discussed and voted on. For example, Commission Waldrip is developing a subdivision right now in the Ogden Valley and when that comes back before the Planning Commission, he will need to recuse himself. Chair Warburton asked if he would be emailing them when that gets on the agenda. Director Wilkinson said in his case, because he is the applicant, he does not have to recuse himself from the meeting. He comes down, and sits with the audience, and acts as the public. It's also possible for the members of the Planning Commission if they so choose, to give public comment. If they choose to do that, they give up their spot on the Planning Commission for the item. They come down and sit with the audience, give their comment, and then they will have to leave the room until the item has been heard and voted on. On Administrative Items, don't speak with people. On Legislative Items, there is more discretion there. If someone approaches them or they have a conversation, they need to disclose it in the public meeting. On conflict of interests, the Planning Commission will vote as to whether they feel there is a conflict of interest. On Gifts and Favors, they should not take gifts and favors from people. In some special circumstances, no pecuniary gifts having a value of less than \$50 or an award publically presented with recognition of public service can be accepted. Political Activities as members of the Planning Commission they are not restricted; however, please refrain from bringing the politics to the meeting.

**C. Meetings:** Director Wilkinson said on occasion staff can call special meetings at the discretion of the Chair as they have in the past for Powder Mountain and Snow Basin. For larger projects that require more work, staff has called for a special meeting; typically they will not, they will use the work sessions and the regular meetings to address all of their items. The length of their meetings, 8:30 p.m. is when they will finish the item presently being considered, and all remaining items will be heard on the next agenda. If they are close, and there is another item, they can suspend that rule. As a general rule, he likes that time frame as it helps move things along.

**D. Order of Business:** Director Wilkinson said they have seen how this works; the chair introduces an item, staff gives a presentation, and then the applicant gives their presentation. The member, are welcome to ask questions of staff for the applicant at any time, then it's open for public comment. They are welcome to ask questions of anyone during the public comment, and that is typically when the questions should be asked. Once the public comment closes, it's time to make a motion, and then the members discuss that motion. Chair Warburton said once the motion has been made, it can be amended; they just need a motion on the table in order to discuss. Director Wilkinson said that one other item, the Open Meeting Statement that just needs to go away.

**F. Procedure – Motions:**

**1. Making of Motions:** Director Wilkinson read the following: *"Upon review of the full public record on a request and due deliberation among the members of the Planning Commission, any Planning Commissioner, except for the Chair, may make a motion; however, any Planning Commissioner may second a motion and that includes the Chair. The motion shall include not only the direction of the motion, but shall also include the recitation of specific findings of fact supporting the motion. A second shall be required for each motion citing compatible findings. Other members of the Commission may support the motion adding compatible findings. A motion shall die in the absence of a second. Discussion of the motion should not take place until it has been seconded and the Chair has stated the motion and called for discussion."* Commissioner Warburton said that as a commission they have not been good at that, and as a Chair she should be calling for that, and she will give better attention to that. Commissioner Parson said do they say, "I would like to make a motion on CUP 2015-35." Commissioner Graves said that's perfect then he adds whatever conditions that are recommended usually as found in the staff report. Director Wilkinson said that in some cases, they have seemed to just adopt staff findings, and that is fine; if they don't feel they have anything to add, they can adopt

those things that are listed, and those are sufficient. Typically, there will be a staff’s recommendation section; staff recommends approval based on the following and here are the reasons why. There are also conditions of approval section; where they say on the condition or upon the following reasons. They want to make sure that the motion has a base. Commissioner Warburton said they can still make an amendment afterwards and the person making the motion can withdraw their motion and have a second motion made. Director Wilkinson said the motion must be germane; it has to relate to the subject. A motion to deny is where a motion to deny has been defeated; a member of the Commission shall make another motion to dispose of the issue. If the motion fails, then they make another motion. Substitute Motions, he has not seen this one happen, but believes that some motions need to be rewritten. Substitute motions are basically where they are striking out an entire section or paragraph of the main motion, and inserting a different section or paragraph in its place. Amendments are more complicated than friendly amendments because they actually require a motion and a second then they have to take action on that motion, amendment are then voted on the original motion, and it gets all complicated. Chair Warburton said that the friendly amendment seems to work for them. Director Wilkinson said that friendly amendments can be done without a formal motion, with unanimous consent of the members present; typically such motions are appropriate for clean-up items or an issue discussed but inadvertently neglected by the maker of the motion.

**H. Procedure for Debate:** Director Wilkinson read the following, *“No member of the Commission shall interrupt or question another Commissioner without obtaining the Commissioner’s consent. To obtain such consent, the Chair shall be addressed requesting to interrupt or ask a question; e.g. “Chair (name) I would like to ask Commissioner (name) a question or make a comment.” The Commissioner speaking has the discretion to allow an interruption.”* Director Wilkinson said that this Planning Commission does not interrupt each other. Chair Warburton replied that she agreed.

**I. Procedure for Voting:** Director Wilkinson said regarding Roll Call on Final Passage, they do not do a roll call vote, that was changed to a voice vote, so they just need to change the heading on this section.

**2. Minute Approvals:** Director Wilkinson read the following, *“The Chair shall ask the Commission if they have had the opportunity to read the minutes and if there are any additions or corrections. Upon hearing from the Commission, the Chair shall declare the minutes approved either as presented or amended.”* No motion is necessary to approve the minutes and the minutes can be declared approved once the Chair has asked for comment from the Commission.

**3. Voting or Changing Vote:** Director Wilkinson said that they can change their vote before the decision is announced, not after.

**5. Commission Members Required to Vote:** Director Wilkinson said that everyone is required to vote. They cannot abstain from a vote. If they have the conflict of interest, or in some cases if they come in late during a discussion they can choose to abstain from voting because they feel they have lack of information.

**K. Amendment:** Director Wilkinson read the following, *“The Rules of Order may be amended at any meeting of the Commission held after not less than fourteen days written notice of the proposal to amend the Rules, upon a majority vote of all the members of the Commission. Adopted Rules of Order may be amended at any regular meeting by a vote of the majority of the entire membership, or if the amendment was submitted in writing at the previous meeting, then they may be amended by a two-thirds vote of those voting, a quorum being present.”* Director Wilkins asked the members to review the Rules of Order and then they can discuss them in a future meeting. Chair Warburton asked if it has always been like that, because they revised the rules in the first meeting of the year. Director Wilkinson replied that is correct but they can amend throughout the year as well.

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kary Serrano, Secretary;  
Weber County Planning Commission