

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Western Weber Planning Commission for April 15, 2025, Weber County Commission Chambers, 2380 Washington Boulevard 1st Floor, the time of the meeting, commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Western Weber Planning Commissioners Present: Andrew Favero (Chair), Casey Neville (Vice Chair), Wayne Andreotti, Cami Jo Clontz, Jed McCormick, Bren Edwards, Sara Wichern

Staff Present: Rick Grover, Planning Director; Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner; Felix Lleverino, Planner; Liam Keogh, Legal Counsel; Tiffany Snider, Office Specialist.

Roll Call: Chair Favero conducted roll call and indicated all Commissioners were present.

WS1: Discussion with Weber Basin Water Conservancy District regarding water availability for future development in the Western Weber planning area.

Chair Favero invited the representatives of Weber Basin Water Conservancy District to introduce themselves; Scott Paxman, General Manager and CEO and John Perry, Assistant General Manager introduced themselves to the Commission. The group engaged in discussion about the amount of water available to the Western Weber planning area; this included reference of various water sources for the area and the impact that recent drought conditions and the current levels of the Great Salt Lake have had on water availability for the area; conservation standards; residential versus agricultural water needs; and the ability of the District to support the projected population of 48,000 for the Western Weber planning area at buildout.

Chair Favero recessed the meeting for five minutes.

The group wondered if it would be appropriate to accept input from the applicant for the Westbridge Meadows development, Jeff Meads, given that the availability of water was a main discussion point during the March 11, 2025 meeting when the application was discussed by the Commission. Principal Planner Ewert noted that the applicant has indicated a willingness to xeriscape within the project area, with the exception of the public park spaces if there is enough water to supply it. Even the parks areas would be limited to turf that is necessary for specific recreation activities. He also noted there is a rumor circulating that the County requires pressurized secondary water, but that is not correct. The County has an ordinance that states that if the culinary water provider requires a pressurized secondary water system, the County will support those providers. Commissioner Edwards stated the Taylor-West Weber Water District does require a pressurized secondary water system and based on the conversation with Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, that is the direction that all water providers should be moving in. He noted the County ordinance formerly required secondary water until the County 'passed the buck' to the water providers to enforce and police secondary water systems. This led to high-level philosophical discussion and debate among the group about the appropriateness of current water ordinances and regulations; and population growth projections and what should happen when the water supply is exhausted.

Jeff Meads then addressed water models and development standards influenced by the availability of water.

The group concluded to hold a follow-up meeting with Weber Basin Water Conservancy District and other stakeholders that need to be involved in continued discussion of water availability.

WS2: Follow-up discussion of a rezone and associated development agreement for the Westbridge Meadows development, a master planned community that will rezone approximately 1400 acres of property located within the area south of the Union Pacific Railroad between the Weber River and 7500 West. The zone(s) being proposed include a Master Planned Development Overlay Zone (MPDOZ), and a variety of Single-Family Dwelling (R1), Two-Family Dwelling (R2), and Multi-Family Dwelling (R3) zones, as well as the Form-Based Zone (FB (mixed uses)) and the open space zone (O-1).

Principal Planner Ewert stated this application was tabled during the March 11 meeting to provide time for additional discussion regarding water availability as well as buffers/setbacks between the project area and other land uses in the vicinity of the project area.

Chair Favero invited Legal Counsel Keogh to provide the Commission with guidance regarding a development agreement for the proposed project. Mr. Keogh stated that if the County is going to use a development agreement to provide flexibility or exceptions to

certain elements of the land use code, State Statute requires review of the development agreement by the Planning Commission. He has gotten the impression that the Planning Commission has the expectation that the development agreement must be fully negotiated, executed, and finalized as part of their action and recommendation to the County Commission. He stated that is not the case; the Planning Commission should review the development agreement, but the fact that the development agreement is not in its final form should not be the basis of delaying action on the application or recommending denial of the application to the County Commission. There will be many matters in the development agreement that will not be finalized until a point in the future. The Commission discussed the elements of a development agreement that they should be focusing on at this time, such as density and a contribution from the developer for the parks district and asked if an additional review of the development would be required if those elements change after the Planning Commission makes their recommendation. Planning Director Grover stated the County Commission can determine if changes to the development agreement are significant enough to warrant the matter being referred back to the Planning Commission for further consideration and a new recommendation.

The group then engaged in discussion with Mr. Meads about his efforts to secure water for the project area, as well as phasing and platting of the project based upon water availability; negotiations between the developer and the Ogden Bay Waterfowl Management Area (WMA) regarding appropriate setbacks and buffering; the need for the Planning Commission to see a map identifying all properties included in the rezone request, including a conceptual layout that identifies future roads, infrastructure improvements, and amenities; a desire for 1800 South to be extended through the project area; approval of any development that would set a problematic precedent; and avoiding encroachment into the floodplain along the Weber River. Mr. Ewert indicated that he will continue to work with the applicants to adjust their application and development agreement responsive to the feedback provided by the Planning Commission, and the amended application will be included on the agenda for the next business meeting for continued discussion and a possible recommendation to the County Commission.

The work session adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Brown

Weber County Planning Commission