

Minutes of the Western Weber Planning meeting of November 12, 2019, held in the Weber County Commission chamber, 2380 Washington Blvd. Floor 1. Ogden UT at 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Bren Edwards
John Parke
Andrew Favero
Gene Atkinson
Greg Bell

Members Excused: Janette Borklund

Staff Present: Rick Grover, Planning Director; Charlie Ewert, Principle Planner/ Long Term Planner; Scott Perkes, Planner; Matt Wilson, Legal Counsel; Marta Borchert, Secretary

- Pledge of Allegiance
- Roll Call

Chair Edwards asks if there are any ex parte communication or conflicts of interest to report. There are none.

GPA2019-04: A public hearing to consider and make recommendation to the County Commission on a state mandated modification to the West Central Weber County General Plan regarding the community's plan for moderate-income housing. Staff Presenters: Charlie Ewert/Scott Perkes

Scott Perkes gives an overview of the item. Staff began by reviewing the existing General Plan and the existing housing assessment and plan to see how many components of S.B.34 were in compliance or were outstanding. Through staff's review of the County plans it was determined that the County was substantially in compliance with a lot of the requirements. S.B. 34. There was a lot of data that needed to be updated due to the age of the plans to comply with S.B. 34. Staff took the time to get updated data to get through some of those components to come up with an updated report. S.B. 34 does require that the County report annually versus biannually and that the plans be reviewed by staff annually to provide estimates and projections. Staff has prepared an updated section to the General Plan that summarizes the finding for the 2003 General Plan there is not a specific section that is set aside for moderate-income housing. The County did undertake a housing study and plan back in 2012 that is considered the General Plan's moderate-income housing plan. Staff believes that it would be a good idea to take the consolidated information and plan and amend the General Plan and use the consolidated section as a new component of the new General Plan, instead of having separate documents they would have them together. Looking through the new data that staff collected to update the plan and the projections of the plan, looking at one of the maps, due to the short time frame that staff had to collect data and run an analysis of the current and projected moderate-income needs staff was unable to collect primary data as part of the analysis. Staff pulled data from available sources and the map included some of the boundaries from where data was pulled from. Census track data was used to form new demographics on housing values for the updated plan, and there are four block routes on the map that indicate roughly where the Unincorporated Western Weber area is. Data was also pulled from the American community survey which is part of the census from the year 2013 to 2017. That data was used to represent the unincorporated Western Weber area both current and that data was used to project to 2024. There is a lot of overlap for the boundaries, and staff has done their best to eliminate as much of the overlap of data as possible. Looking at the plan itself S.B 34 requires that the County have a land use survey that component is captured on the first page of the plan. Moving forward looking at the demographics of both current and projected Western Weber the population in Western Weber is intended to grow by about 3 percent when compared to the County, the County as a whole is intended to grow at 1.3 percent to 2024. Western Weber is anticipated to outpace the Countywide growth rate in the area. There is

a couple of trends as far as household size is concerned, in Western Weber, it is anticipated that the average household will decrease slightly from 3.06 to 2.92. The County as a whole will see a slight increase from 2.96. to 3.05. Concerning the racial composition, the Western Weber area is comprised of primarily Caucasian individuals at 94 percent and a small amount of Hispanics/Latino and a trace amount of other races. Looking at the age distribution this is interesting because they saw a large growth in the number of individuals of 60 years and greater and as their growth rates increase there is a very flat growth across the younger generation for the individuals from 0-40 there is a very flat and in some cases a negative growth rate for the individuals which would lend to the idea of that a lot of the population growing in place and getting older and becoming empty nesters, the kids move out or more wealthy individuals move in and perhaps don't have or perhaps do have children. Looking at housing they did anticipate that housing stock would grow at the same pace as the population. Looking at owner-occupied housing the growth rates were flat. He notes that looking at the tables the growth rates are a bit more exaggerated for the rental units. This is indicative of the new moderate-income households moving into town or looking for rentals. Comparing the 2017 median income market value of 183,100 to the Unincorporated West Central 302,000 dollars there is a 40 percent difference. Generally speaking houses and land values are more expensive in Western Weber. This can be attributed to the size of the land available in the Western Weber area. Looking at income S.B. 34 requires that the moderate-income housing plan looks at the area median income for the County as a whole in 2017. The area had an area median income as a whole 62,036 dollars. Looking at the Western Weber area there is an AMI of 85,051 that is a little over a 20,000 dollar difference between the County as a whole and Western Weber. Looking at housing affordability what is generally perceived as being affordable is housing at households income or housing at costs that don't exceed 20 percent of a household's income generally speaking this is viewed as being affordable and looking at the Countywide average median income of 62,036 dollars and taking 80 percent of that amount. 49,629 dollars would be the target for moderate-income housing. 28 percent of the monthly housing budget would equate to 1158 dollars a month and a family should not exceed that amount, they would want to have affordable housing and they will need to keep their purchase price at or below 242,500 dollars to keep their mortgage at an affordable rate. Looking at renting in Western Weber 15 percent of the population is renting, looking at vacant units there were about 135 vacant units but none of those were listed as rentals which lend to the idea that all of the rental units in the area are occupied. Looking at renting and affordability for renters something is interesting in the trends. In 2017, 312 of 417 households that were in rental units they were paying at or below 28 percent of their income for rent. 312 of the 417 had affordable housing in 2017. 75 percent of the renters had affordable housing in 2017 and projecting out to 2024 the rent increase from 1096 dollars to 1456 dollars per month but the number of households pays that were at or below 28 percent of their income for housing to be 603 of 723 households that is 83 percent of household projected to have affordable housing. Looking at the increase in rent the question of why it is becoming more affordable to rent, looking at a few more indicators such as the renter-occupied income, the income if it continues on the linear projection to 2024 their income would be increasing almost 20 percent. Looking at the growth of the cost of rent it was increasing at 24.7 percent. People who are anticipated to continue renting are earning more than they used to and are outpacing the cost of rent slightly. The percentage of households that can rent at an affordable rate is increasing. Looking at the data they can see some trends of more of the households that are moving into rentals and prefer to purchase housing but because of the growth in the housing values, they might be descending to rent. Some more wealthy people are renting in the future.

For individuals who own in West Central Weber the property value is growing 23 percent. The Weber County property value is growing by 17 percent. The Countywide AMI shows a growth of 6 percent. If incomes are growing at 6 percent in 2024 and property value between 17 percent and 23 percent it is easy to see how the affordability gap is growing. In calculating the estimated supply and the Assessor's office provided data concerning the housing units and their property values and in running the data there were 201 housing units which represented 70 percent of the total housing units in Western Weber which represented the benchmark for affordable housing or the 80 percent of AMI. Looking at the need they saw that there were 1123 moderate-income households in Western Weber, there is currently a deficit there of 922 housing units. Projected out to 2024 there will 1613 households that will be at or below the 80 percent of AMI by 2024. That is a growth of 490 households between now and 2024 in the Western Weber area that needs housing. Comparing that to Weber County as a whole Weber County has 31,821 moderate-income households in 2017, projected out to 2024 which would grow by 1739 households to 33,560 households. Comparing the number of households in 2024 as compared to the County as a whole it would be associated with the Western Weber area. There is a couple of takeaways and summaries of the findings some trends are looking at the data and some of the numbers. Concerning the household size and Weber shrink slightly the population is aging in the 60+ group and shrinking in the 0-40 years. There will be an increase in the 2 person households which may be empty nesters or wealthy individuals. The owner-occupied housing values are outpacing the AMI at a

steep rate the AMI is growing at 6 percent and the housing value is growing at 27 percent that is a big delta as they grow apart. The growing number of renting households has higher incomes as compared to 2017 projecting that out to 2024 it can be seen that more wealthy households are going to be renting. That could be because the current housing values are pushing households into rentals who would otherwise wish to purchase but can't make that jump. Looking beyond some of the updated data and the trends staff looked to see what some of the barriers to affordability were. Existing zoning in the West Weber area of one dwelling unit per acre or greater is one of the larger issues concerning affordability. This is a component of housing costs. The larger the land the less affordable it is. This one of the biggest barriers that was foreseen. Looking at the goals principles and implementation, staff pulled the goals, principles, and implementation of the 2012 housing assessment and plan and left them in the updated plan. He notes that they also added some goals from the Ogden Valley moderate-income housing plan for consideration as they were recently reviewed and vetted by the Ogden Valley Planning Commission. There is one goal that is new and has not been in a plan to date, this is beginning on line 348. It is implementation 2.1.2 this was an idea that could help to increase affordability in the Western Weber area. This is regarding the incorporation of residential dwelling units within the village or commercial centers, this would entail mixed-use development on the upper levels retail of commercial uses. This would shrink the footprint of what is required to develop housing and would help affordability. It would also allow the moderate-income households to be closer to amenities and services that come about through commercial development.

Commissioner Andreotti asks where the numbers for the 80 percent came from. Mr. Perkes states that in the County the average median income area 62,036 this information comes from the census and the American Community Survey it is 2013-2017. The ACS uses 2010 but it projects to 2017. He notes that there should be an updated census in 2020. It is an area median income for the County. Looking at 80 percent of that number that is where the 49,629. Commissioner Bell asks if the 49,629 is projected from the American Community Survey that was done before 2013. Mr. Ewert states that the American Community Survey is based on the 2010 census. Commissioner Bell states that if the data was based on the 2010 census the data is not necessarily reflective it is a projection. Mr. Ewert notes that we will know for sure when the 2020 census data is out. Mr. Perkes agrees that there is some limitation with the data and the margins of error especially when you start to project out that many years.

Mr. Perkes states that S.B 34 speaks to the County providing moderate-income housing for individuals at the Countywide AMI 80 percent of the Countywide AMI

Commissioner Parke states that there is no commercial in the Western Weber. Commissioner Bell states that there might not be at the same lot of commercial areas in Western Weber be there are some commercial zones. He notes that he sees value in adding that so that when commercial areas grow the applicants would have to comply with that.

Commissioner Andreotti states that he is ok with this, it has a lot to do with trends.

Mr. Ewert state that under state law adopting this would be an adoption of an element of the General Plan. It would be a component of the General Plan.

Commissioner Atkinson asks concerning Terakee Village Blanch's proposal would help meet the recommendations and projections. Mr. Ewert states that it could. Looking at moderate-income housing one of big affordability issues is the amount of land that is required in the zoning. Looking at smaller parcels in developments such as a PRUD or a cluster subdivision, this would be looking at lowering the amount of money that is going to go into the land. He asks if the homes will be affordable to the 80 percent AMI probably not. Looking at the existing cluster subdivision projects that are out there, most of them are well above the 100 percent AMI. He notes that the Terakee Village may not be meet the recommendation but it might be more affordable than one dwelling unit every acre. He notes that part of the value would be the assisted living facilities. This would be considered a residential facility. The smaller the land is the more affordable it is going to be. Commissioner Favero states that it is important to look into the future and not just base it on what is being built now and look at the potential growth. Commissioner Atkinson asks how to get closer. Mr. Ewert states that counting every affordable housing unit and the aggregate number and the median household value it would help with that. He states that it might not be a huge jump toward getting to the 80 percent. Chair Edwards asks if PRUD's would help the County get closer than the clusters. Commissioner Bell states that he agrees a lot of the clusters have not broken ground. The proposal talks about modifying the cluster subdivision code to allow for these types of lots. He adds that they could be incentivizing higher density. Mr. Ewert states that they are working on the PRUD ordinance, which still has not been adopted. In that code, there

was a provision that would offer 10 percent additional bonus density free of cost as long as that 10 percent additional is developed in affordable housing or deed restriction or it would be reserved for small condos or townhomes which would sell for a more affordable rate. Commissioner Bell states that he agrees with Mr. Ewert the existing cluster the way that it has been implemented would not help promote moderate-income housing at all.

Commissioner Atkinson states that it seems to him that looking at the information present it seems that there is less of a gap. Mr. Ewert notes that currently in the unincorporated area 201 affordable housing residential units are valued the 80 percent AMI or less it is affordable to those households. There is a need for 1121. There is a high demand right now for affordable housing. Commissioner Bell states the point is to incentivize it when the development comes in. He notes that if there is an incentive for ADU's to get registered it would possibly double the number of moderate-income housing. Mr. Ewert notes that a lot of the basement apartments are perfectly lawful and unfortunately according to the code they have to get a conditional use permit, it should be taken out of the code and allow for detached ADU. He adds that having the owners come to the office and report is not an easy task.

Chair Edwards opens a public hearing. There are no public comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Bell moves recommended that the Weber County Commission adopt the legislative amendment to the West Central Weber County and add the West Central moderate housing plan as an addendum to the General Plan. This recommendation is based on the findings that it has to be compliant with S.B. 34, and that it is in the interest of health safety and welfare of the public. Commissioner Parke seconds. Motion carries (5-0).

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: none

3. Remarks from Planning Commissioners: none

4. Planning Director Report: Mr. Ewert thanks the Planning Commissioners for their attention to detail on the issues discussed. He also wants to give a big kudos to Scott Perkes.

5. Remarks from Legal Counsel: none

6. Adjourn to Work Session: 5:47 pm

WS1: Review and discussion regarding street connectivity ordinance. Staff Presenter: Charlie Ewert

Tim Sullivan from Township and Range states that there are four elements to street connectivity. The first one is to connect the streets. A grid of streets is the most connected type of network. It doesn't have to be a grid but where the intersections and the dots are connected to the most number of links where the arrows are. There is also the network scales, the networks should be compact with blocks that are human scale and have connections every so often and don't go too long between the connections. They will connect specifically to community destinations like parks and schools and churches. He states that it is important remember to stay connected for all users, not just vehicles, but also pedestrians, bicyclists, truck, and equestrians. He states that they also talked about why connected streets are important, there is a variety of benefits and details that have gone into it is better for all types of mobility, such as, automobility and transit mobility, pedestrian mobility, and bike mobility. It is great for emergency services. It is better for safety it reduces the crash rates. It is better for the economy. It creates more value in neighborhoods and cities. He states last time they discussed what the tools are that help creates a connected street network. On one hand, there is the policy, and on the second there are changes in the code and the ordinances. There are capital projects, this where they go out and build connected street networks. In areas that are still growing like Western Weber, these are the best ways to go about it. He states that they want to avoid having to come back and make costly capital projects in the public sector if a disconnected network is built. It is much better to have developers create a more connected network, to begin with. He states that they can use policy to influence code changes. The intent of the draft policy has to do with two things it is to create a simple set of requirements for the developers for new developments and part of the community-wide connected street networks. It is not just that the development that is being built is connected, it's part of the bigger connected network that in 20 or 30 years you can't tell where one subdivision ends and another begins and it is all part of the big connected public network. He notes that they will also want to achieve the flexible requirement and that they do not want to be too rigid in how they are proscribing the requirements. There are about five different key areas. The first one is connectivity, this is making sure that the streets are in the intersections are connected enough the requirement is a minimum of 1.6. A perfect grid is 2.0, so it is not requiring a perfect grid the ratio of the links which are the blue pieces. The link is

anything between intersections and that includes a cul da sac. The nodes are intersections or dead ends. Looking at the graph he presented he states that it is not a perfect grid by any means. There are 3-way intersection and cul de sacs but there are also a lot of 4-way intersections, so it scores a 1.65. he adds that these are the kinds of networks that they would be able to build. It is a pretty connected network, but it is not too onerous for the developer to have to create anything but a grid. He shows the Planning Commissioners a few different examples of 1.6 grids. He states that there will be some variation, it's going to be nothing but a grid. It does require developments to be more connected. He adds that this is the connectivity index. Chair Edwards asks what is the purpose of the cul da sacs. Mr. Sullivan asks what the purposes are from whose perspective. Chair Edwards points out the ones he means and notes that they can get the same number of lots with the cul da sac. Mr. Sullivan states that some people like the cul da sac lifestyle. He notes that with that type of depth of block some lots are a little bit deeper, There are a lot of different ways to do it. Mr. Ewert states this configuration might be the concern that was mentioned. He notes that a lot of the time cul da sac are seen because of the rights of exclusivity those lots can be sold for a premium. Sometimes in an odd configuration to give frontage to meet the minimum requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Sullivan agrees and states that the example shown is to show some of the variations in configurations. He states that the next thing would be the block lengths. Block length take care of the network scale. It ensures that the block length isn't too long and that there is not too much space between the streets. Looking at some of the examples of developments within Western Weber County there does tend to be some long blocks. He states that what they are proposing is a required maximum block length. Which would be 13.20 he notes that this is long, it is a quarter-mile. He asks that they think about from a pedestrian's standpoint how long it would take to go all the way around the block. He states that they need to be sensitive to the concept, the block length is 8 times the average lot width. For the average block length, there would 8 lots in a block. He states that developers can still build plenty of lots within a block, but it is all scaled to how big the lots are. He states that it is a range within parameters. He notes that cul da sacs are allowed within this, they are however naturally limited due to the connectivity index. He states that they can't have too many of them otherwise they won't score high enough and there are some other requirements they can't be too long. Long cul da sacs reduce connectivity. He states that what they are proposing is similar to the block length where the maximum cul da sac length would be 3 times the average lot width. There would also be a requirement for a pedestrian path through the end of each cul da sac so that it would not reduce pedestrian connectivity by having cul da sacs. They want to make sure there is also an external connection to other developments around it, he notes that for small projects it is really important. There is going to be a requirement for stub streets, these are streets that extend out to an area that might be developed in the future. He notes that they are extending the grid that they created with block lengths into the next area. The next area would be required to pick up those streets so that the grid becomes seamless. There might be some places where there is a major street, possibly a UDOT corridor where it accesses a management agreement prevents access at the frequency that the code requires it and active transportation can be substituted. He asks the applicant can demonstrate adherence to the requirements. They would have a connectivity plan, it graphically shows how the project meets the requirements. He states that exceptions are really important. In a situation where the topography makes things too steep have connections next to development or inside of it. It could be an existing development that does not have a connection. Commissioner Favero asks how this fits into a cluster subdivision where there is going to be a block of open space. Mr. Ewert states that this would be one of the exceptions. He notes that the Planning Director can require those connections somewhere else to compensate for the difference. They would try and implement something like this. Chair Edwards states that they could ask for a trail to make that connection. Mr. Ewert states that through the cluster code they would require a trail to navigate the open space area. If it is a traditional subdivision it doesn't have those kinds of requirements. If they are backing into an open space area there is a trail stub that goes into the open space area. Mr. Sullivan states that instead of it being a grid they could substitute a trail. The current cluster code states go around the outside don't go through. Commissioner Parke asks at what point in the process are they going to require the connectivity plan? Mr. Ewert states that it is in the very beginning. This would be done with preliminary they would need to submit the connectivity plan along with all their survey data. He adds that before it comes to the Planning Commission there shouldn't be a question of connectivity. Chair Edwards asks why they would allow the private streets to increase by 25 percent in block length. Mr. Sullivan states that streets must be private to count towards a block length in connectivity index requirements. It makes it more difficult to do private streets they need public streets to be spaced at least 800 ft. To make private streets feasible they came up with an increase of 25 percent. Mr. Ewert states that this gives the ability to push the limits of the block length because there will already be streets that connect in. If they are looking at the 400 ft. maximum if there are one public intersection 400 ft. from the next one down they won't be a private street there. He adds that if they are ok with private street they could allow that to go out to 25 percent. Commissioner Parke states that the question is are they ok with public streets. Chair Edwards states that he believes that the whole section should go away. Commissioner Parke agrees. Mr. Sullivan states that they can strike that whole area. Commissioner Favero states that he is

not sure it should get wiped out, there should be some flexibility there. Mr. Ewert states that if the section is removed it would not remove the flexibility it would need to meet the normal code. The public block lengths would have to be the same if they wanted to connect to a private street. Commissioner Favero asks how this would affect the flag lots. Mr. Ewert states that they have already said they do not want to allow flag lots in the Western Weber. He notes that he is not sure how the County Commission is going to feel about that. He states that as far as flag lots go if they are allowed it is going to be a matter of getting access to the property in the back.

Mr. Sullivan states that one of the issues that occurs is what to do when there are a puzzle of properties being developed at different times. A lot of the time it is challenging to get it all to meet up together and for all the developments to meet up into a connected network. He states that they are proposing a multi-connectivity planning process that Weber County can use. There would be a collaboration with 2 or more property owners with the County to come up with a long-term plan and an agreement not necessarily concerning what every single street is going to look like, but where the connection is. It will also show all the obstacles such as canals. The idea is that it would be a small connectivity plan and there might be an idea for a small density bonus for participating in the program. Mr. Ewert states that they would be working with all of the willing property owners. This will incentive people to work together. Commissioner Bell asks why this can't be part of a General Plan. Why can't they go back to the General Plan and go back to the section lines? Wouldn't that create the section lines? Mr. Ewert states that the section line is a mile apart. Commissioner Favero states that they are looking at smaller frontages. Chair Edwards states that the section lines are roads now. Commissioner Favero states that it should be that way, but there have been some issues. Mr. Sullivan states that the first three things discussed could help this issue, but it might not solve every problem. Mr. Ewert states that concerning Commissioner Bell's question it can be added to the General Plan. Commissioner Bell states that the only thing they have to incentivize is to add more density to every code there is. He states that by the time they have incorporated all these things there is going to be 2000 sq. ft. lots. He understands the need for density, but they need to be reasonable. He states that he is leaning more towards saying that it is mandatory. He asks how they can make it mandatory without incentivizing them. It is just part of how they have to do it. Mr. Ewert states that one of the challenges incentive zoning and performance zoning there has to be a political environment where they can make things restrictive. Right now they are looking at increasing the municipal services tax for the Unincorporated area of Weber County. Part of that is the need for secondary water and possibly increasing it an extra quarter above what they were thinking. They could give an incentive for xeriscaping or ask for an adequate amount of water. He states that they need to boost whatever they are imposing, to the incentive, this is the challenge. The restriction that is in place currently how can they be made softer, and how can they incentivize the landowner other than giving them an extra lot. Commissioner Favero asks at what point they start overreaching the people's property rights. He states that this is something that he values and everyone in the room values. Mr. Ewert states that it would be nice to be able to compel it to be a mandatory requirement. He adds that if they do this no one is going to want to talk to their neighbors. Mr. Sullivan states that it probably isn't required in every circumstance. It is for specific situations, if a property owner sees an issue they can go to the County. It's hard to require that. Mr. Ewert states that looking at a small area connectivity plan as opposed to a General Plan. He states that they will look at the specific areas and how they connect through the General Plan. The section lines and the quarter section lines will be drawn out on a map, everything in between will be up to the developer. They will need to meet a connectivity index if they work with their neighbor to have the acreage connected all together to create a master planning process to get a couple more lots. If they can find an incentive that isn't money based. Commissioner Bell states that that is the only thing they have as an incentive. As long as the overarching General Plan is the section lines and the quarter section lines and stay as true to that as possible. He adds that there is not going to be connectivity unless it is mandated. Mr. Ewert states that the connectivity index and the stub streets are going to be the key. The stub street is going to create a lot of connectivity between the two projects. Commissioner Favero states that it will also include the agreements between the landowners, this might incentivize it. Commissioner Bell states that some people have stated there is no way they are selling to development and then there is another extreme there are people who want to do it but didn't know how to make it work. Commissioner Favero states that concerning the people who don't want to sell what is going to change that is one generation. He adds that even if they don't have an intention to develop at least there is an opportunity to make that connection just in case. Commissioner Bell states that it is a really good idea but he wants to see how it will play out practically. Mr. Ewert states that they could do small area planning. Whether it be connectivity planning or otherwise on the block scale it can be done through the General Planning process and they can create an ordinance. He states that they will want to work with the landowner but it will be the County imposing it.

Mr. Ewert asks what they think about the policy from what they have heard. Commissioner Bell states that he likes the idea of making it cohesive. Everyone knows it will eventually be built out and they could end up with some terrible subdivisions. He adds that this could allow the owners to do something feasible with their lot in a fluid way.

Commissioner Andreotti states that in 20 years it's not going to be the same. What they need to do is come up with a set of rules. Those lots are 401ks for some people.

Commissioner Atkinson states that he is personally supportive of it.

Adjournment: 6:37 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Marta Borchert