

Minutes of the Work Session of the Ogden Valley Planning Commission for November 19, 2024. To join the meeting, please navigate to the following weblink at <https://webercountyutah.zoom.us/j/88184457823>, the time of the meeting, commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Ogden Valley Planning Commissioners Present: Janet Wampler (Chair), Jeff Barber (Vice Chair), Jeff Burton, Bryce Froerer, David Morby, Mark Schweppe, Trevor Shuman.

Staff Present: Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner; Felix Lleverino, Planner; Tammy Aydelotte, Planner; Courtlan Erickson, Legal Counsel; Marta Borchert, Office Specialist.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**
- **Roll Call:** Chair Wampler conducted roll call and indicated Commissioner Burton was excused and Commissioner Morby was participating via electronic means. All other Commissioners were present.

1. Minutes: June 25, 2024.

Chair Wampler offered corrections to typographical and content errors for the minutes; there were no additional changes to the minutes and Chair Wampler declared them approved as amended.

Chair Wampler called for declarations of conflicts of interest or ex parte communication. Commissioner Froerer stated that the law firm that employs him has represented the applicant for CUP 2024-02 and, for that reason, he will recuse himself from discussion and action on that item.

2. Administrative Items:

2.1 CUP 2024-02 - A request for approval of a conditional use permit for the Green Hills Country Estates culinary water treatment plant, a Public Utility Substation. Staff presenter: Felix Lleverino

A staff memo from Planner Lleverino explained the applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit for a Public Utility Substation. The Green Hills Country Estates was issued a Compliance Agreement/Enforcement Order from the Utah Division of Drinking Water to design and build a treatment facility that meets the state requirements and ensures clean, safe drinking water for the Green Hills community. The 2,025 square foot facility will be built within a common area lot within the Green Hill Country Estates Cluster Subdivision common area. The 18.5-foot-tall building is a flat-roofed concrete bunker built into the side of the hill which will minimize the visual impacts.

Mr. Lleverino reviewed his staff memo and summarized staff's analysis of the application to determine conformance with the following:

- General Plan;
- Zoning guidelines;
- Conditional use standards;
- Parking and loading space, vehicle traffic and access regulations; and
- Design review requirements;

Mr. Lleverino concluded staff recommends approval of this conditional use permit application subject to the applicant meeting the following conditions of approval in addition to any conditions of the various reviewing agencies or the Ogden Valley Planning Commission:

1. Public drinking water system requirements are satisfied
2. The site, structure, and mechanical equipment shall be kept and maintained for safety and good visual appearance
3. Service and delivery vehicle parking is prohibited within the private right-of-way.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed use is allowed in the F-5 Zone and meets the appropriate site development standards.
2. The criteria for issuance of a conditional use permit have been met because mitigation of potential detrimental effects can be accomplished.

Chair Wampler invited input from the applicant.

Discussion among the Commission and staff centered on the input the applicant and the County has received from the homeowner's association (HOA) for the Green Hills Country Estates project area regarding the conditions that should be placed on this project. Applicant, Brad Rasmussen, stated that the project was pre-designed before he began working on the project as the construction manager. There is an existing well on the site, but there have been some materials found in the water that must be filtered out by a treatment plant. The site where the treatment plant will be constructed is directly adjacent to the existing well and will ultimately improve the safety of the drinking water for the residents in the area.

Chair Wampler inquired as to the number of residents the treatment plant will serve. Mr. Rasmussen stated he does not know the answer to that question.

Commissioner Morby referenced an area of the concept plan for the project and asked if there is a septic system in front of the treatment plant location. Mr. Rasmussen stated that there is a septic tank that will be used for equalization and backwashing the filters.

Chair Wampler invited public input; she stressed that public comment or public clamor should not influence the Commission's decision this type of application Administrative applications should be weighed against the County's land use ordinance to determine whether it should be approved.

There were no persons appearing to be heard.

Commissioner Barber moved to approve application 2024-02, a conditional use permit for the Green Hills Country Estates culinary water treatment plant, a Public Utility Substation, subject to all review agency requirements and conditions of approval and based upon the findings listed in the staff report. Commissioner Burton seconded the motion. Commissioners Barber, Burton, Froerer, Morby, Schweppe, Shuman, and Wampler voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 7-0).

2.2 CUP 2023-07: Consideration and action on a request for a conditional use permit for an agritourism operation located at 4661 Creek View Drive, Eden. Staff Presenter: Tammy Aydelotte

A staff memo from Planner Aydelotte explained the applicant is requesting approval of an agritourism operation in the FV-3 zone. This application was received under the previous agritourism ordinance and is therefore bound by the ordinance previously in place before it was amended in December 2023. The applicant's property, at 4.61 acres, falls under the "market garden agricultural operation" which includes an agriculturally productive property consisting of three acres or more but fewer than five acres. The applicant grows produce on the property, in gardens and greenhouses. The proposal includes a glamping cabin, which is a permitted use under a market garden designation of the agritourism operation. Currently, the applicant proposes the following uses under agritourism: *Community Garden/Community supported agriculture, U-pick operation, glamping cabin.*

Ms. Aydelotte reviewed her staff memo and summarized staff's analysis of the application to determine conformance with the following:

- General Plan;
- Zoning guidelines;
- Conditional use standards;
- Standards relating to safety for persons and property;
- Standards relating to infrastructure, amenities, and services;
- Standards relating to environmental;
- Standards relating to the current qualities and characteristics of the surrounding area and compliance with the intent of the General Plan; and
- Input from review agencies.

Ms. Aydelotte highlighted some confusion in the County's land use code (LUC) regarding permitted and conditional uses in the FV-3 zone, as well as the definition of a 'lot of record'; staff believes that the subject property is a lot of record that meets the minimum zoning requirements for the zone. However, if the determination is made that the subject property is not a lot of record,

the acreage would need to be twice the minimum acreage requirements for the FV-3 zone. Staff has not applied the double acreage requirement to this property because the subdivision in which the property is located has been recorded with the County and the property is a lot of record. The uses requested by the applicant are considered permitted uses, but the third use of 'glamping' does not meet the minimum development standards under the agritourism ordinance.

Ms. Aydelotte concluded the Planning Division recommends approval of file# CUP 2023-02. This recommendation is subject to all review agency requirements and the following conditions:

1. The proposed glamping (existing structure) cabin not be approved as part of this application as it doesn't meet the minimum development standards (setbacks).
2. A business license shall be obtained through Weber County.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. This recommendation is based upon the proposed glamping cabin not meeting minimum setbacks as outlined in Weber County LUC 108-21-6-(a)(5). The proposed use conforms to the Ogden Valley General Plan.
2. The proposed use will not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare.
3. The proposed use complies with applicable County ordinances.
4. The proposed use will not deteriorate the environment or create an unsightly improvement so as to negatively impact surrounding properties and uses.

Commissioner Schweppe referenced the statement that the glamping use does not meet setback requirements of 120 feet from the perimeter of the property, and 250 feet from the closest building. Ms. Aydelotte stated those are minimum setbacks if the applicant is able to install a screen that is at least six-feet tall along the majority of the boundary between the glamping use and the adjacent home. He has indicated he can provide a 100-foot setback from the perimeter of the property and just 228 feet from the nearest structure. This led to continued discussion and review of the development standards Planning staff has applied to the application; Ms. Aydelotte referenced the section of the staff report that provides a brief description of why each of the uses that have previously been requested by the applicant are not allowed.

Chair Wampler invited input from the applicant.

Applicant Jason Fuller stated that he would like to include the glamping use and he does not consider that to the same as a typical short-term rental (STR) use. He feels the glamping use is appropriate and fits with the surrounding uses. He provided an analysis of other types of uses that provide for over-night stays and compared the setbacks for those uses with the setbacks for glamping. He provided photographs taken from several different angles and locations on his property to illustrate the privacy of the area where the glamping use would be located; landscape design of the property will provide proper screening and will actually enhance the beauty and value of other properties in the area. He also discussed the history of the application process for this project, which has involved the purchase of additional water for the property and designing the tiny house/glamping cabin for the property. He received some guidance from a Planning employee who later left his employment with the County, and he later began working with Ms. Aydelotte and learned of some issues with his proposal. He is not sure if the delays imposed on his application are intentional, but he is concerned about the current situation and the status of his application. He stressed that he is not applying for approval of an STR; the glamping would be open to no more than two people per tent unit and he will always be located on-site to monitor activity at the property. Chair Wampler clarified that Mr. Fuller has applied for a glamping CUP. Mr. Fuller stated that is correct, but he would consider the use to a 'farm stay' rather than a STR or glamping.

Commissioner Schweppe asked if there is an existing cabin on the property. Mr. Fuller answered yes; he relocated a shed to the property that he has converted to a cabin. It meets building codes, but an engineer has recommended that he install footings under the building, and he intends to do that in the next year.

Chair Wampler asked Mr. Fuller if he currently operates a community supported agriculture (CSA) use on the property, to which Mr. Fuller answered yes. Chair Wampler asked if one element of the application is that customers of the CSA would pick-up their vegetables from the subject property. Mr. Fuller answered yes; he has previously delivered vegetable purchases, but as his business grows it will be more efficient to have customers come to his property for pick-up. He would create a defined pick-up timeframe to restrict business traffic to a specific time of day/day of week. Chair Wampler inquired as the maximum number of customers the business could serve based upon his current operations. Mr. Fuller stated that he could expand his offerings significantly, which would also result in a significant increase in his customer base. Chair Wampler stated she is looking for a projection of customers in order to determine the impacts the business could have on the area. Mr. Fuller stated that he does not

want to grow beyond 20 to 25 customers that would pick up products each week. Chris Fuller approached and added she has never had more than four or five people at the property at one time to pick up product; it is 'silly' to think that selling vegetables from the little farm will have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Commissioner Burton referenced a handout that Mr. Fuller provided to each Commissioner prior to the start of tonight's meeting; the handout proposes that the bed and breakfast (B&B) farm retreat and agricultural research education center (AREC) be allowed to have reduced setback requirements. He asked Mr. Fuller if he is suggesting the required setbacks for the use, he desires to pursue are too restrictive and that the other uses allow for a reduced setback and that is why he is pursuing those now. Mr. Fuller stated that was not his intent, but it is odd to him that a more intense use, such as a B&B or AREC have lower setbacks than a glamping use. This led to high level discussion of the differences between several types of overnight stay uses listed in the County's LUC, after which Commissioner Burton asked if the shed that will be used as a cabin can be moved to another location on the property in order for it to meet minimum setback requirements. Mr. Fuller stated that may be an option, but it would be very expensive.

Chair Wampler invited public input; she stressed that public comment or public clamor should not influence the Commission's decision this type of application Administrative applications should be weighed against the County's land use ordinance to determine whether it should be approved.

Carolyn Robertson stated she lives at 3448 Fuller Drive. She noted Ms. Aydelotte was very helpful in her explanation of the lot of record issue for the subject property. She added that in the past, Mr. Fuller has included the Eden Hills Subdivision as an entrance point to his operation; traffic entering and exiting Mr. Fuller's property would also cross the power corridor line, but they do not have a permit for that. She stated that there was previously a tree farm around Mr. Fuller's property, and it served as a nice buffer between the Fuller property and adjacent properties, but most of those trees have been removed and the buffer is much less dense. She has also performed her own measurement of the setbacks in the event the glamping cabin were relocated to another area, and the minimum setback requirement still would not be satisfied.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard.

Commissioner Burton addressed Ms. Aydelotte; he inquired as to what Planning staff's recommendation would be if this application were evaluated according to the current agri-tourism ordinance. Ms. Aydelotte stated she has not performed a review of the application using the current ordinance because the current ordinance is not applicable. She suspects the property does not meet the minimum acreage requirement for the current agri-tourism ordinance. She noted that staff's responsibility when evaluating a conditional use application is to determine if the application meets the ordinance; any recommendation from staff is based upon that evaluation.

Commissioner Burton addressed Legal Counsel Erickson; he noted Mr. Fuller has suggested the Planning Commission has some latitude in providing an exception to any setback requirement and he asked if that is correct. Mr. Erickson stated that would only be correct is such an exception were provided for in the ordinance. If the ordinance does not provide any flexibility, the Planning Commission does not have the discretion to waive or adjust the setback requirements. Mr. Fuller stated that the handout he provided to the Planning Commission provides a code citation for the ordinance that his property is grandfathered under; it states the Planning Commission has the ability to waive one or more of the requirements of the ordinance under certain circumstances. Mr. Erickson took a moment to review the ordinance language cited by Mr. Fuller.

Commissioner Barber asked Mr. Fuller if his property qualifies for the Farmland Assessment Act. Mr. Fuller stated he is working with someone who has dealt with the Farmland Assessment Act to determine if his property would qualify for assistance. He noted he does not qualify for greenbelt tax reduction status.

Mr. Erickson then stated that LUC 108-21-6 states "the uses listed below are subject to additional standards beyond any provided within other codes and one or more of the additional standards may be waived by the Planning Commission upon finding that either a proposed use proposes no detrimental effects to neighboring properties due to unique circumstances or it can be mitigated to an acceptable level due to the imposition of other or appropriate site specific conditions that justify the use". He concluded the Commission does appear to have some flexibility to offer an exception if they make one of the two findings listed in the ordinance text. Mr. Fuller stated that his glamping use would be for couples only and he would not tolerate noise, traffic, or light that would be a nuisance to adjacent properties.

The Commission engaged in philosophical discussion and debate of the intent of the setback requirements included in the ordinance and whether the perceived impacts of reduced setbacks could be mitigated. Commissioner Burton stated he is comfortable considering a reduction of the setback requirements so long as it is possible to establish conditions that can appropriately mitigate the potential negative impacts; however, he felt it appropriate to table any action on the application until staff has time to perform an analysis of the additional information presented tonight and assist the Planning Commission on crafting conditions that would mitigate the detrimental effects. Planning Director Grover indicated staff can provide optional conditions that may provide reasonable mitigation, but the Planning Commission is ultimately responsible for determining final conditions of approval.

Commissioner Shuman stated that his discomfort comes from the fact that this application does not comply with the current version of the agri-tourism ordinance. Commissioner Burton agreed but noted that the setback requirements included in the previous version of the agri-tourism ordinance are arbitrary and not based upon any scientific factors.

Commissioner Barber moved to deny application CUP 2023-07, a conditional use permit for an agritourism operation located at 4661 Creek View Drive, Eden, based upon the following findings:

- After well over a year, the applicant has totally ignored the primary premise of the agri-tourism ordinance, which is to comply with the farmland assessment act; and
- The location is inside of a fairly dense subdivision, and he has seen and heard of traffic coming to and from the property that will ultimately create a public safety issue for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Shuman seconded the motion.

Commissioner Burton stated that staff has explained that the farmland assessment act does not apply to this property because it is in the FV-3 zone rather than an agricultural zone. Ms. Aydelotte clarified the ordinance is not clear as to how to apply the farmland assessment act in a forest zone. Commissioner Burton given the lack of clear direction in the ordinance, the Planning Commission is charged with considering the application in a light that is most favorable to the applicant. Ms. Aydelotte stated that is correct. Mr. Erickson stated that the State Code indicates that if a land use regulation does not plainly restrict a land use application, the land use authority shall interpret and apply the land use regulation to favor the applicant. In this case, relative to the farmland assessment act, he is of the opinion that that there is some ambiguity as Ms. Aydelotte has expressed. Commissioner Barber stated the LUC indicates that all agri-tourism activities shall be complimentary to the primary agricultural use, and it also carries on to discuss the farmland assessment act. He stated that it is his interpretation that all agri-tourism operations must comply with the farmland assessment act. Mr. Erickson stated that is a valid interpretation, but due to the ambiguity in the ordinance, other interpretations have also been made and it is ultimately up to the Planning Commission to make their own interpretation. Commissioner Barber stated his motion stands based upon the findings he communicated.

Commissioner Burton stated that he does not believe there is significant density around the subject property that would be impacted by a slight increase in traffic associated with the proposed use. He also does not believe current traffic levels are significant to warrant concerns regarding public safety and it is likely that the Halloween trick-or-treating traffic is higher than the traffic generated by the agricultural operation. He agreed with Mr. Erickson's interpretation of the ordinance regarding the ambiguity of the requirement to comply with the farmland assessment act. For these reasons, he would prefer to table the application rather than deny it.

Commissioners Barber and Burton debated current traffic levels as well as the potential increase to traffic as a result of approval of this application;

Chair Wampler called for a vote on the motion to deny the application. Commissioners Barber and Shuman voted aye.. Commissioners Burton, Froerer, Morby, Schweppe, and Wampler voted nay. (Motion failed on a vote of 5-2).

Commissioner Burton moved to table application CUP 2023-07, a conditional use permit for an agritourism operation located at 4661 Creek View Drive, Eden, directing Planning staff to further research the potential detrimental effects that would occur if the setbacks were waived or reduced as provided for in section 108-21-6 of the LUC. Commissioner Froerer seconded the motion. Commissioners Burton, Morby, and Schweppe voted aye. Commissioners Barber, Froerer, Shuman, and Wampler voted nay. (Motion failed on a vote of 3-4).

Commissioner Shuman moved to approve application CUP 2023-07, a conditional use permit for an agritourism operation located at 4661 Creek View Drive, Eden, based on the review agency requirement and findings, and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Commissioner Schweppe seconded the motion. Commissioners Barber, Burton, Froerer, Morby, Shuman, Schweppe, and Wampler voted aye. (Motion carried on a vote of 7-0).

3. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:

There were no public comments.

4. Remarks from Planning Commissioners:

Chair Wampler stated that when she listened to the June 25 meeting in order to make corrections to the minutes that had been submitted for approval, she was reminded of the lengthy discussion between the Planning Commission and Principal Planner Ewert about the complications of the form-based zone. There was both verbal and written public comment submitted that evening, as well as comment from Commissioners regarding the problems with the zone. There was interest in limiting the form-based zone, and even pausing application of the zone for a time until the concerns can be addressed. At that time, a specific request was made for Mr. Ewert to convey those concerns to the County Commissioner and report back to the Planning Commission. She asked what the outcome of that discussion was. Planning Director Grover stated the County Commissioner requested to delay discussion of that matter until after the vote on the incorporation of the Ogden Valley was completed. He is willing to raise that issue with the County Commission again. Chair Wampler stated she would appreciate that; it will take a year for incorporation to be finalized, and the County will still be considering land use applications during that time, and she feels that the concerns regarding the form-based zone must be addressed.

Commissioner Burton asked if there are areas in the County currently under the jurisdiction of the Ogden Valley Planning Commission that are not included in the boundaries of the area to be incorporated as a city. Mr. Grover answered yes; the snow basin and powder mountain areas are not included in the area to be incorporated. Commissioner Burton asked if that means the Planning Commission will continue to exist after the new city is created. Mr. Grover stated that is a possibility, but Commissioners would need to reside in the unincorporated areas rather than an area that will be included in the incorporation.

Chair Wampler asked if there has been any movement on the Cowboy Partners or CW Basin developments that were discussed in recent meetings. Mr. Grover answered no.

5. Planning Director Report:

Planning Director Grover stated he has asked for a briefing from the Legal Division of the County regarding the process of proceeding with the incorporation of area in the Ogden Valley. When he receives that information, he will provide it to the Planning Commission.

6. Remarks from Legal Counsel

Courtlan Erikson stated the County will continue to have jurisdiction over unincorporated areas of the Ogden Valley and business in those areas will proceed as usual. There was a brief discussion among the Commission and Mr. Erickson regarding any legal precedents relating to any land use action taken by a legislative body following an incorporation election.

Chair Wampler briefly noted that another item she was reminded of when listening to the June 25 meeting was that any item that is tabled by the Planning Commission that is not placed back on an agenda within two months can be taken up by the County Commission; that is something for staff and the Planning Commission to keep in mind.

The meeting adjourned to a work session at 6:44 p.m.

WS1: Discussion regarding a development agreement proposal for future phases (Phases 2-22) of the Gateway Estates Subdivision. Applicant Representative: Matt Lowe

Principal Planner Ewert stated that the applicant is seeking to proceed with phasing of the Gateway Estates Subdivision, and they are seeking approval from the County for their phasing plan; currently, the land use code indicates that failure to plat the next

phase of a project within a certain period of time following completion of the previous phase, the preliminary plat approval is revoked. The applicant is seeking a development agreement that vests them under the current laws and gives them the opportunity to continue to plat future phases even if the next phase is not platted within six months or a year of the completion of the previous phase. Any such contract requires consideration of the Planning Commission and the County Commission, and this could involve some negotiation of certain dedications or amenities to be provided by the applicant. One thing staff has thought of is the need for improved pathways and trails in the Ogden Valley and perhaps the County could require a donation or fee in-lieu for those types of improvements in exchange for granting a development agreement.

The Commission engaged in high level discussion with Mr. Ewert and Matt Lowe regarding the concept of a development agreement to regulate phasing of the project and the protections Mr. Lowe is seeking through the development agreement. Mr. Lowe stressed his biggest concern is being vested under current land use laws given the level of uncertainty regarding development in the County; he is not asking for any zoning commitments or changes to density of the property. The Commission concluded they are comfortable with a development agreement that only addresses phasing of the project; however, they wanted to include a mechanism in the agreement that would indicate the agreement would be terminated if the land were sold to another owner. Mr. Ewert stated he will work with Mr. Lowe to negotiate an agreement that can be presented to the Commission in draft form in a future work session meeting.

WS2: Discussion concerning 66.51 Acres on Powder Mountain Road, Ogden Canyon, Weber County, UT. Applicant Representative: Samuel Orme

Chair Wampler referenced a memo included in the meeting packet regarding 66.51 acres of property on Powder Mountain Road, 47 acres of which are at a grade of 37 percent or grader and are undevelopable. The memo writer, Stephen McCutchan, did an excellent job of addressing the complications with the property and identifying development options. Chair Wampler facilitated a discussion among the Commission and Planning staff regarding the information included in the memo. Areas of concern include allowing nine driveways to access Powder Mountain Road, which is fairly steep and often slippery in the winter months and the maximum number of dwelling units that are currently entitled for the area. Chair Wampler concluded it would be best to table continued discussion of this matter until a time that the applicant or an applicant's representative can attend a meeting with the Commission.

WS3: Discussion regarding a proposed development agreement (by means of a master planned development overlay zone) and development/concept plan amendment for the Bridges development at approximately 4930 Fairways Drive. Applicant: The Bridges Holding Company LLC. Applicant representative: Eric Householder

Principal Planner Ewert explained a legislative action on this application is tentatively scheduled for the Commission's next business meeting. Chair Wampler stated that she would appreciate receiving information on these types of agenda items in advance of the meeting so that the Commission can perform their own research in preparation for a discussion of the matter. She indicated she sent an email to Planning staff asking for documentation regarding this proposal and did not receive a response. Mr. Ewert stated he did not have the information last week and he provided it once he received it; tonight's meeting is a work session, and this is an opportunity to discuss the applicant's proposal. He stated this is a request to amend the development agreement and concept plan for the Bridges project; he and the applicant representative, Eric Householder, summarized the proposed amendments and discussed the potential implications of each. There was a focus on open spaces/trails; community amenities; ingress/egress points throughout the project; development rights and actions taken in the past to move density points to this project area.

Chair Wampler stated she would like to have additional time to review the information that has been presented tonight, and for another work session to be held before this application is moved forward to a public hearing and possible legislative action. Commissioner Shuman agreed and stated that it is important for the Commission to have a clear understanding of their authority to reject any of the changes proposed by the developer. Chair Wampler agreed.

Commissioners expressed concern regarding staff's communication of this proposal to the Commission; Commissioner Shuman indicated the perception is that staff is 'ramming this proposal down the community's throat' without providing all options available to the Commission. Mr. Ewert argued he is providing the Commission with guidance regarding the rights the applicant has and the Commission's inability to deviate from previous agreements and from the County's land use code (LUC). He stated his job is to protect his employer, not the Planning Commission or the public; he is simply providing the Commission with information about legal action the applicant could take based upon certain decisions to deviate from previously approved agreements.

Chair Wampler restated her concern about the timeline of this proposal; she is not comfortable proceeding to a public hearing and action on the proposal without sufficient time to carefully review the amendments to the development agreement and the concept plan. Mr. Ewert stated he does not have a choice to change the timeline for the application; if the County Commission wants to change the timeline, they have the authority to do so, and he is willing to approach Planning Director Grover to see if he can request an adjustment from the County Commission. Chair Wampler asked if the applicant can change the timeline, to which Mr. Ewert answered yes. Mr. Householder indicated he is willing to meet with Commissioners or the public in an open house type of meeting to try to address concerns or questions about this matter. This idea was discussed briefly, but no decision was made regarding whether the applicant would host a public forum regarding the proposal.

The work session adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Brown

Weber County Planning Commission