Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Weber County Planning Commission for August 11, 2026, Weber County Commission Chambers, 2380 Washington Boulevard 1st Floor, the time of the meeting commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Weber Planning Commissioners Present: Andrew Favero (Chair), Casey Neville (Vice Chair), Cami Clontz, Kyle "KC" Lindsey, Jed McCormick, and Sara Wichern

Excused: Wayne Andreotti

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

Roll Call: Chair Favero conducted roll call and indicated Commissioner Andreotti has been excused from the meeting; all other Commissioners were present.

1. Minutes: June 2, 2026, June 9, 2026, and July 7, 2026**.**

Chair Favero recommended holding approval of the minutes to the next meeting, noting that several Commissioners had identified discrepancies requiring correction.

Vice Chair Neville moved to table approval of the minutes until the next regular meeting. Commissioner McCormick seconded the motion; all voted in favor. Commissioner Andreotti was not present when this vote was taken.

2. Legislative items:
2.1. GPA2025-03: A public hearing on a Weber County Planning Staff-driven request to amend the Weber County General Plan to include elements from the Ogden Valley General plan for areas outside of the Ogden Valley City Incorporation area. Staff Presenter: Felix Lleverino

Planning Director Grover introduced the item, noting that the Commission's role is to hold a public hearing, receive public input, and forward a recommendation to the County Commission. He reminded the Commission that the general plan is a guiding document, not an ordinance.

Planner Lleverino presented the proposal. He explained that following the incorporation of Ogden Valley City — which now encompasses Liberty, Eden, portions of Huntsville, and areas surrounding Pineview Reservoir — several areas remain under unincorporated Weber County jurisdiction. These include the Snow Basin resort area, Howard Mountain, North Fork Park, various mountain communities (Evergreen, Sourdough, Sunridge, Cassie Estates), and Ogden Canyon. Mr. Lleverino described the staff-driven process of reviewing the Ogden Valley General Plan, selecting applicable elements, and adapting the language to reflect unincorporated Weber County. Key elements proposed for inclusion encompassed historic areas of Ogden Canyon, dark sky preservation (noting the dark sky park at North Fork as the origin of the county's dark sky efforts), updated land area calculations and statistics, recreation principles, commercial village policies, transportation and mobility elements, and resource management topics including fire management, water resources, and wildlife. He noted that the maps presented gray out the now-incorporated Ogden Valley City area to reflect current jurisdictional boundaries, and that the finished product would be refined further by the county's GIS department.

Commissioner Wichern moved to open the public hearing. Vice Chair Neville seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

No members of the public came forward to comment.

Commissioner Wichern moved to close the public hearing. Vice Chair Neville seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Vice Chair Neville forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission for file number GPA2025-03 — a staff-initiated proposal to amend the Weber County General Plan to import text and maps from the Ogden Valley General Plan pertaining to lands outside the Ogden Valley City incorporation boundary, with the following findings:

1. The changes are supported by the Weber County General Plan;

2. The proposal serves as an instrument to further implement the vision, goals, and principles of the Weber County General Plan; and
3. The changes will enhance the general health and welfare of Weber County residents.

Commissioner McCormick seconded the motion. Commissioners Clontz, Lindsey, McCormick, Wichern, Vice Chair Neville, and Chair Favero voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 6-0). Commissioner Andreotti was not present when this vote was taken.

2.2 GPA2026-01 A public hearing on a proposed amendment to the unincorporated area general plan to update the future land use map, update recent growth trends, and to consolidate recent plan amendments into a single cohesive unincorporated county-wide general plan. Staff Presenter: Tammy Aydelotte and Charlie Ewert

Planning Director Grover introduced the item with the same procedural guidance as the previous item, noting this is an update to the general plan adopted a few years prior — intended to capture incremental changes rather than a wholesale overhaul.

Principal Planner Ewert presented the item. He explained that while staff had hoped to bring draft language consolidating the Western Weber General Plan into a more cohesive unincorporated countywide document, nuances in the existing text required additional wordsmithing. That language will be presented to the Commission next month. For this hearing, he asked the Commission to focus solely on the proposed future land use map changes. Using a before-and-after slider tool, Mr. Ewert walked the Commission through the key map changes:

- **Change 1 — 7500–8300 West Corridor:** Adjustments were made to better align the general plan map with port boundaries the County had previously adopted, and to introduce an office/tech/business park buffer zone between residential areas and more intensive manufacturing or industrial uses. A crosshatch pattern was used to indicate areas suitable for either lighter industrial or office/business park development.
- **Change 2 — River Corridor West of 5100 West:** Previously shown as natural/open green (reflecting FEMA floodplain designations), this area was reconsidered in light of the Westbridge development project and landowner interest in development potential. Mr. Ewert explained that floodplain land in this area has proven feasible to remove from FEMA designation through formal processes, including elevation changes or detention improvements. The revised map shows mixed residential designations (crosshatched orange) for private lands surrounding a state-owned waterfowl management area, as well as potential vehicle-oriented commercial designations. The proposed West Weber corridor road alignment was also revised to route around the state property and follow higher, drier ground, consistent with commitments made through the Westbridge development agreement.
- **Change 3 — 1600/1800 Road Alignment:** The map was updated to show the 1800 South alignment consistently, reflecting the alignment to which the Westbridge project had been committed, rather than the previously shown 1600 alignment.
- **Change 4 — West Weber Village Area near 4700 West/900 South:** The footprint of the potential commercial area was refined to better correspond with actions taken through the street regulating plan and form-based code efforts the Commission had previously recommended. Mixed residential crosshatch designations were added at the corners of the vehicle-oriented commercial area to reflect the intended transitions.

Commissioner Clontz moved to open the public hearing. Commissioner Lindsey seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Tom McFarland (5579 South 7100 West) spoke in support of the proposal, stating that staff had engaged extensively with area landowners and that all parties he was aware of were supportive. He noted that the prior broad green designation had not accurately reflected the development potential of the land and that this update would open meaningful future options for property owners.

Pat Burns (2702 North Burns Lane) also spoke in support, noting he owns property in the area adjacent to the Black Pine MDT zone. He requested that his parcel — located near the new corridor alignment where a commercial node is planned — be added to the map changes to allow a rezone from R1-15 to a higher density designation such as R3. He indicated he had met with neighboring landowners in all four quadrants who are in agreement with the proposed change, and that a rezone application had been submitted.

Vice Chair Neville moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Wichern seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Commissioner Wichern expressed concern about designating higher density in this area before infrastructure — particularly roads

— has had an opportunity to catch up, and asked for additional context on the vision for the area. Vice Chair Neville suggested that the Burns property request and broader density questions be deferred to a future work session, consistent with how other nearby development has been handled, to allow more detailed review.

Commissioner Wichern moved to forward a positive recommendation for item GPA2026-01 — a proposed amendment to the unincorporated general plan to update the future land use map, update recent growth trends, and consolidate recent plan amendments into a single cohesive unincorporated county-wide general plan — with the findings that the proposed amendments will better support current residents by better designing future development in Weber County and will clarify the code to reflect recent changes in the county. Commissioner Lindsey seconded the motion. Commissioners Clontz, Lindsey, McCormick, Wichern, Vice Chair Neville, and Chair Favero voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 6-0). Commissioner Andreotti was not present when this vote was taken.

3. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:

There were no public comments.

4. Remarks from Planning Commissioners:

There were no additional remarks from Commissioners.

5. Planning Director Report:

Planning Director Grover invited all commissioners to attend the Utah Association of Counties or equivalent planning conference scheduled for September 9th and 10th at the Layton Conference Center. He noted that registration fees would be covered by the county and asked commissioners to respond to an upcoming email from staff indicating which day they planned to attend. Vice Chair Neville confirmed that the conference satisfies mandatory training requirements. Planning Director Grover also mentioned the Land Use Institute, typically held in October, as an additional recommended conference that brings together planners and realtors for a broad range of perspectives on land use.

6. Remarks from Legal Counsel:

There were no remarks from Legal Counsel.

Commissioner Lindsey moved to adjourn to a Work Session at 5:44 p.m. Commissioner Wichern seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

WS1: ZMA2026-01: Discussion regarding the Willow Village FB rezone and revised concept plan proposal.

Applicant representative Selvoy Fillerup and applicant Roger Heslop presented the latest revised concept plan for the Willow Village form-based rezone. Mr. Fillerup acknowledged that the current layout as drawn does not yet pencil out financially for the applicant and that the purpose of the work session was to identify which design elements were most important to the Commission so adjustments could be targeted accordingly. Mr. Fillerup presented the revised layout, highlighting several improvements over prior versions: the street layout has been adjusted to align with an approved subdivision to the north across the canal; units are oriented to face outward toward public streets with rear-load garages; and the building mix has been reduced from 7- and 8-plexes to 6-plexes or fewer, consistent with the updated form-based code. He noted one area of conflict in the northwest corner, where the street regulating plan calls for single-family lots that do not fit the parcel geometry well, and suggested addressing that transition through the development agreement. He indicated the overall layout is substantially consistent with the intent of the form-based code, particularly as it relates to the public realm. The revised unit count was reported at approximately 201 units, slightly under the maximum of 208 permitted by the density calculations for the affected acreage. Mr. Heslop spoke candidly about the financial challenges of the project. He noted that despite this being his least expensive land on a per-unit basis among his active projects statewide, the current design results in a projected loss of approximately $250,000. He attributed this to an accumulation of cost pressures: single-fronted roads that do not generate units on both sides, significant impact fees (including water secondary and parks dedication), and the rear-load configuration, which reduces per-unit market value by approximately $10,000. He emphasized that no single factor is responsible, but that the aggregate makes the project unviable as currently drawn.

A substantive discussion followed regarding parking, density, and design. Commissioner Wichern raised concern that with 20-foot-wide garage bays (standard for townhomes in the current market) and no driveways on several units, overflow parking for residents and guests would be inadequate, particularly as most households would likely include two working adults and therefore two vehicles. She also questioned whether the 20-unit-per-acre designation in the mixed-use zone was realistic without apartment-style construction, noting that spreading that density across townhomes results in too little open space and parking. Mr. Heslop acknowledged the parking concern and noted that based on experience at comparable projects, approximately one visitor stall per four units has worked well, but the current plan is closer to one per five. He also confirmed that there is no current market for apartment buildings in this location and that demand would more likely follow the construction of the planned bypass road.

The discussion turned to whether the project should revert to a lower-density single-family zone (R1-50), which would simplify street connectivity but would not achieve the general plan's commercial support density goals or conform to the recently approved future land use map. Mr. Heslop and Mr. Ewert both acknowledged the tension: any design changes that make the project financially viable tend to conflict with either the street regulating plan or the general plan map, while conforming designs are not financially viable for the developer.

Vice Chair Neville suggested that allowing front-facing garages on the eastern public street — specifically to eliminate a private internal road, push units back, and create larger driveways — could improve both parking and financial feasibility. Commissioner Wichern was open to that approach, and Mr. Ewert noted it could be accommodated through the development agreement even if it deviates from the standard form-based code requirement.

The Commission also discussed the relationship of this project to the adjacent parcel previously designated as open space under an expired PRUD. Mr. Ewert noted that while there is no formal conservation easement in place, the density on the neighboring parcel was granted with an expectation of open space on this property, and that obligation remains a matter for legal resolution. He suggested that if the form-based code is applied to this project, it should also be applied to the developed neighboring parcels to avoid non-conformity issues.

Mr. Heslop also raised the possibility of receiving impact fee credits in exchange for constructing road improvements along 900 South toward 4700 West, rather than paying fees directly. Principal Planner Ewert indicated that staff had been considering a similar approach for other projects on 3600 West, and that this model — where the developer installs improvements in advance rather than paying fees into a pool — could work well here and benefit other uses along the corridor, including a nearby school.

At the conclusion of discussion, the Commission directed the applicant to return with two alternative concept plans for a future work session prior to a public hearing:

- **Plan A:** A refined version of the current rear-load layout, with modifications to increase parking and open space (potentially by removing a small number of units), and with a proposal for how impact fee credits could be structured to offset road improvement costs.
- **Plan B:** An alternative layout allowing front-facing garages along the eastern public street, eliminating the private internal road, and similarly addressing parking and impact fee considerations.

The Commission confirmed that retaining rear-load orientation for the majority of units and ensuring adequate parking remain priorities, while acknowledging that some flexibility in how the form-based code is applied — through the development agreement — is available. The applicant indicated the revised plans could be ready within approximately one week.

The Work Session adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassie Brown

Weber County Planning Commission