

**March 12, 2024 Minutes**

Minutes for Western Weber Planning Commission meeting of March 12, 2024, 2380 Washington Blvd. 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Break out Room

**Members Present:** Bren Edwards-Chair; Andrew Favero—Vice Chair, Cami Clontz, Casey Neville, Sarah Wichern, Wayne Andreotti

**Members Excused:** Jed McCormick

**Staff Present:** Rick Grover, Planning Director; Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner; Bill Cobabe; Planner III Marta Borchert, Secretary

• **Pledge of Allegiance**

• **Roll Call:**

1. **Minutes: February 13, 2024** – Minutes Approved as presented
2. **Public comments for items not on the agenda:** None
3. **Remarks from Planning Commissioners:** Planning Commissioners noted that the Field Trip was very informative.
4. **Planning Director Report:** none
5. **Remarks from Legal Counsel:** none

Adjourn to Work session

**WS1:ZMA2024-04 Gbar Rezone**

John Newhall, representing GBar, discussed a proposed 30-acre parcel at 6200 West 900 South, currently undergoing a rezone application. He aims to gather input, comments, and thoughts from the group, including the park's approach to open space requirements and culinary water service. He emphasized the importance of connectivity in trailways and pathways.

Chair Edwards inquired about the proximity of the closest connection to Little Mountain sewer line for this project. Mr. Newhall mentioned it's quite distant and that discussions with the County led to starting the process. Chair Edwards speculated about a lift station being closer to take the sewer in another direction. Ultimately, Chair Edwards confirmed that the proposal meets the requirements for the rezone.

Chair Edwards asks Charlie and Bill if they have meet the other requirements. Bill Cobabe states that they had some concerns about the block length, this is something that they have worked through with County, the have gotten to a good preliminary place. Once it is rezoned it will need to be worked more. He notes that it is right where they want it to be at this point.

Chair Edwards asks where the secondary water is coming from. John Newhall states that it is coming from Knight Irrigation. Mr. Ewert states that the secondary water needs to be pressurized.

**WS2:ZMA2023-08 Windmill rezone 2**

Mr. Ewert states that this item was removed from the agenda. Windmill #2 is Cody Wilders Project it is just north of Terakee. It has already been before the Planning Commission. They were queued up and ready for County Commission approval and then the property developer changed. Cody Wilder is still involved, but he is not calling the shots anymore. The owner that is doing Ali Farms across the street, Ali farms has been changed to Windmill #1 and this project will be Windmill #2. When they were looking at connections to the South they did not realize that staff was looking for connectivity and a street regulating plan already in the area. He adds that he is not sure if they were aware that it was granted conceptual approval. Mr. Ewert notes that they asked them to redesign but they asked them to keep outside edges larger lots and the inside will be smaller so the smaller lots won't be visible from the outside. This is one of the proposals. Now that staff is asking them to move the roads around that might change.

**March 12, 2024 Minutes****W3: Parks discussion regarding rezone donations**

Mr. Ewert states that he proposed a work session to discuss the rezone costs for developers and the contributions that the Parks District should expect from them. Mr. Ewert noted that they want to make sure they are all on the same page. He adds that County Commission has asked that whatever they decide they need to try and be consistent.

Joe Giordano and Jeff Davis are present at the meeting. Joe Giordano is the Chair of Warren West Warren Parks District. The Parks District is not affiliated with the County, but they are appointed by them. Mr. Giordano states that with the new developments in the area, the Parks District is at an Inflection point and the aim is to set a foundation for future growth. Mr. Davis states that they gone through some community engagement, there were lots of people and they got lots of good feedback. Joe Giordano explains the amount they are asking for and why, noting that developers consider it unreasonable. He emphasizes the lack of recreational spaces for unincorporated kids and states that existing parks are already full. Jeff Davis adds that if developers were looking at building, they could add amenities, but the \$7500 contribution would only cover pavilions and restrooms, not much else. They discuss the possibility of developers paying the fee instead of providing open spaces, with Jeff Davis mentioning that if they built today, they would have a surplus. However, they stress the importance of investing in parks and trail systems.

Jeff Davis mentions that they are working on transitioning the requirement into an impact fee, which would likely increase revenue. He notes that commercial partners currently contribute significantly to funding and that the fee would affect future developments differently. Joe Giordano emphasizes the need for meaningful open ground and states that they are only asking for what should have been paid. Jeff Davis adds that the fee is low compared to what it could be and highlights the calculation methods used.

They want to expand the parks systems to meet the Community needs. There is need for open space and contributions from developers. They discussed the process of arriving at a contribution figure of \$7,500 per lot from developers, considering past ordinances and community engagement. The discussion also touched on the possibility of future indoor recreation facilities and the park district's role in providing sports fields. The \$7,500 contribution is for outdoor amenities and doesn't cover building costs. They emphasized the need for developers to share in community investment, as mandated by the master plan. They want to ensure that any future developments contribute appropriately to the park district to support community needs and growth.

They went on to discuss defending park district fees to commissioners amidst pressure from developers. The concern is ensuring transparency and accountability in how these funds are utilized for community benefit, particularly through a park master plan. There was also a discussion on developer feedback and the need for balance in regulations to encourage smart growth without stifling development. The valuation of parks per resident varies based on factors like location and development costs, with considerations for fair negotiation and community investment. The aim is to find a balance that meets both community needs and developers' profitability while ensuring transparency and fairness in negotiations.

They discussed the maintenance responsibilities of trails within subdivisions and the need for clarity on who will manage them. There's a suggestion to start with a baseline fee of \$7500 for developments not incorporating these spaces into their plans. However, for those including trails, a cost breakdown based on specific locations and plans is preferable. The discussion also touches on enforcement mechanisms for trail maintenance, potential involvement of the Park District, and the challenges of homeowner compliance. Ultimately, the aim is to ensure effective trail management while balancing responsibilities between stakeholders.

Adjournment 6:30pm

Respectfully Presented,  
Marta Borchert