

**CITY COUNCIL  
& PLANNING COMMISSION  
Work Meeting**

**DATE OF MEETING:** 24 March 2020

**TIME COMMENCED:** 6:01 p.m.

**LOCATION:** Electronic Meeting held on Zoom and broadcast through YouTube

**PRESENT: MAYOR:**

Jo Sjoblom

**COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

Hayley Alberts  
Blair Halverson  
Angie Petty  
Quin Soderquist  
Wayne Winsor

**PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Tim Grubb  
Taylor Walton  
Wes Johnson  
Gary Boatright  
Rob Osborne

**CITY PLANNER:**

Barry Burton

**CITY ENGINEER:**

Brandon Jones

**CITY RECORDER:**

Lisa Smith

**CITY MANAGER:**

David Larson

**DEVELOPMENT COORD:**

Kimberli Guill

**Transcriber:** Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

Mayor Sjoblom called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. She announced Governor Herbert made an executive order to allow cities to conduct public meetings electronically.

Mayor Sjoblom thanked Commissioner Boatright for the long hours and his hard work on editing the general plan narrative.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Councilman Winsor

**PRAYER:** Councilwoman Sjoblom

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

### Mixed Use

David Larson, City Manager, explained the City Council & Planning Commission created a Mixed-Use Committee to research, review, and make a recommendation on how the City should approach mixed-use as a development option. The committee met multiple times and reviewed different options, including the creation of a base zone, an overlay, development areas, and not doing anything. After much deliberation, the committee recommended that the City does not create any mixed-use zone or overlay but require a development plan and development agreement on the two properties that have already approached the City regarding mixed-use.

The committee recognized the need for a development to “pencil” for a developer and that no commercial will be built in the designated commercial areas if it’s not financially feasible. So far, developers have proposed residential elements on the commercial properties in order to make the development viable. Understanding the position of the property owner, developer, and City; the committee recommended exploring possible incentives that could allow a developer to build commercial only without a residential aspect.

David invited the committee to make any clarifications. Commissioner Walton stated he was concerned about taking out residential and felt the City might be eliminating some bargaining tools. Commissioner Osborne echoed the committee eradicated residential. Commissioner Walton wondered what type of proposals the City might receive without the residential component. Commissioner Winsor specified the City wants a development without apartments. Councilman Halverson expressed some residential would help soften the commercial. He asked if the committee is stating no residential on those two commercial properties located on the east and west end of the city. David replied affirmatively. He explained at some point someone must take the risk to build which is higher for commercial versus residential. Councilman Halverson didn’t want to limit something when it may be beneficial to the City. Councilman Winsor wasn’t sure it should be put out there that the City might consider multi-residential. He suggested encouraging other incentives for commercial. He communicated these properties are the two entrances to the City and convey the look and feel. What do apartments portray? Commissioner Walton identified possible options of townhomes, duplexes, etc. versus apartments. Councilwoman Alberts mentioned a developer could bring ideas forward which include housing.

David discussed defining the City’s position on the books, so the developer knows what the target is. He echoed a developer can always bring forward a proposal outside the scope of the zones. He commented the land use map was updated noting the land requiring a development agreement and a development plan. Councilwoman Alberts feared a developer requesting a truck stop on a large piece of property. Barry Burton, City Planner, recognized the City can amend the zones. He elaborated on customizing zones. Commissioner Osborne enjoined when a development proposal comes in for property A and property B, there needs to be a development agreement and development plan for the entire property. David verified that is correct. He also pointed out that in the committee’s recommendation mixed-use is not defined but areas are required to have a development plan and a development agreement. He indicated the City is not advertising or codifying mixed use, but if a developer proposes a mixed-use, it would be considered.

David clarified the group is okay with this recommendation as it is put on the general plan map showing the two properties cross hatched and the legend requiring a development agreement and



development plan. Barry questioned mixed-use references in the general plan narrative and David concurred the narrative needs to be amended to reflect the change.

### **General Plan Public Comments Review & Draft Revision**

David surmised the City Council and Planning Commission had reviewed the draft general plan and inquired if anyone had any further comment. Barry mentioned the graphics were duplicated and need to be fixed. Councilman Soderquist remarked on page 7 (line 175) there are 2,260 approved or proposed dwelling units, and on (line 199) the total dwelling units on vacant land is 1,042. He queried if 2,260 are proposed units and the 1,042 is estimated from everything that hasn't been proposed yet. David declared that as correct. Councilman Soderquist referenced page 10 (line 320) referencing Hill Air Force Base as being located directly south of the City and he suggested amending that to southwest.

Councilman Winsor brought up lines 276-289 concerning steep slopes. He commented it discusses the negatives of steep slopes mainly on the south bench area of the City yet when you move to Section 6 (Annexation) it promotes the development and need for municipal services of the same area. It also discusses preserving the character of the community and to isolate to foster cohesiveness. He pointed out promoting development in annexing won't foster isolation. He suggested distinguishing southern annexation from other areas since developing the south bench is contrary to other statements made in the document. He felt the property to the south on the annexation plan needs to be kept open space. David presented the Projected Land Use Map and that particular property is designated as open space.

Commissioner Walton requested future sidewalks along South Weber Drive be shown on the Active Transportation Map. Brandon Jones, City Engineer, agreed adding future sidewalks in the areas where South Weber Drive doesn't currently have it would be appropriate. Commissioner Walton identified specific areas of concern. Brandon will double check sidewalks on that map.

Commissioner Osborne wondered what the City is trying to achieve with the annexation plan. David described the gray area remaining open space all the way up to the flat. Barry elaborated the City has more control if the property is identified in the City's annexation plan and explained the annexation is initiated by the property owner. Councilwoman Alberts asked about rezones and agreed by identifying the property on the City's annexation plan it allows for more City control. Commissioner Boatright remarked it needs to be stated in the narrative that the City plans on keeping it as open space. Barry clarified there is a portion on the east bench that is developable. Commissioner Walton conveyed if both cities include this property in their annexation plan, the property owner would most likely go with the city where they can make the most money. Barry explained state statute provides a boundary commission and in the case of annexation dispute, particularly an overlap between cities, either entity can protest the annexation as well as any tax entity such as the school district. Commissioner Johnson revealed landowners who have already stated they want to keep their property open space. He had misgivings about the stability of the hillside if that property is developed. Councilman Soderquist conceded it is hard to put one definition on all properties. He suggested the possibility of breaking it into sections. Barry discussed the areas that Layton City can't service. He requested the City put in the most likely scenario for the Capital Facilities Plan. David expressed if we don't plan for any use and some future decision allows use up there, then when the developer needs to put in infrastructure, there is no way to recoup cost in impact fees.

Councilman Halverson discussed the Projected Land Use Map. He identified a couple of areas that have been identified Commercial Recreation. Barry reported the back portion of Kastle Rock property is in Riverdale City. He suggested taking this portion out of industrial and put it into some other use. He was aware at one time Layne Kap had plans for a small industrial park all the way to the freeway. Commissioner Walton recited there is a compatible use study being conducted with Hill Air Force Base and surrounding cities, including South Weber.

Councilwoman Alberts asked how possible high density is calculated in the CFP. Brandon stated from a capacity standpoint it would be good to plan for higher density, but it is difficult to guess actual numbers. Councilwoman Alberts questioned the new population calculations. David clarified the numbers now match the developable land map. Brandon explained it is better to overestimate the population. Commissioner Walton related the Governor's Office of Economic Adjustment numbers project a much higher build-out population for South Weber. Commissioner Boatright expressed the City has provided a good estimate and the 2020 Census will change things. He reiterated this is just a plan and any future council could change it.


Commissioner Walton asked about high winds and possible guidelines. Commissioner Boatright submitted the general plan is not the place for specifications. Brandon proclaimed it is in the city building codes.

Councilman Winsor discussed line 369 to 403 concerning Hill Air Force Base Environmental Impact and wanted more definitive explanations. He queried how accurate Map 5 is? Councilwoman Petty mentioned there are areas identified as contaminated but questioned if it the City's responsibility to define. Commissioner Boatright discussed line 400 and recalled when he bought his home, he was aware of these sensitive and possibly contaminated areas. Councilwoman Alberts canvassed the review process for contaminated areas. David replied there is a development process with geotechnical study requirements. Brandon explained the section in the code for sensitive lands and stated it does not specifically outline required tests, but this section could be strengthened. He expressed the City can require testing on a any piece of property. Councilman Halverson suggested increasing the testing requirements. He does think mitigation systems work. He proposed the general plan is worded well enough. Councilwoman Alberts suggested further conversation at another time concerning this item to make sure the City is protecting the residents. Councilman Halverson discussed the radius outside the plume maps and questioned how far out it should go. Councilman Soderquist communicated these plumes are created from sample testing from years ago. Councilman Halverson relayed these plume maps were updated eight or nine months ago. Commissioner Osborne asked who is responsible to agree to these plume maps, and how can the City encourage coordination. Councilwoman Petty wanted to make this a priority and address concerns. Mayor Sjoblom suggested having the committee meet again.

Councilwoman Alberts wanted to make sure an email from a resident was double checked. David was assigned that duty. David explained the timeline for the general plan and using these recommendations the maps and narrative will be finalized. The survey will be reviewed by randomly selected volunteers from the community using the survey instrument. The survey will then be emailed to the City Council and Planning Commission for feedback. He pointed out in the past the city has discussed holding public open houses, but under the current circumstances that cannot take place. However, the survey will go out during the month of April with the public comment period being closed the end of April. There will be an electronic version of the survey

as well as paper copy. Another joint work session will be held between the City Council and Planning Commission which is planned for May 12th. Public comment will be reviewed at that time. Ultimately, the Planning Commission will have a final review and officially recommend the plan to the City Council. The City Council will have the final adoption of the general plan.

**ADJOURNED:** Councilman Winsor moved to adjourn the Council Meeting at 8:08 p.m. Councilwoman Petty seconded the motion. Council Members Alberts, Halverson, Petty, Soderquist, and Winsor voted aye. The motion carried.

**APPROVED:**  \_\_\_\_\_ Date Apr 14, 2020  
Mayor: Jo Sjoblom

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Transcriber: Michelle Clark

**Attest:**  \_\_\_\_\_  
City Recorder: Lisa Smith