

# **SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**DATE OF MEETING:** 8 December 2022

**TIME COMMENCED:** 6:00 p.m.

**LOCATION:** South Weber City Office at 1600 East South Weber Drive, South Weber, UT

**PRESENT:**

**COMMISSIONERS:**

**Gary Boatright  
Jeremy Davis  
Julie Losee  
Marty McFadden  
Taylor Walton (excused)**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE DIRECTOR:** Trevor Cahoon

**DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR:** Kimberli Guill

**Minutes:** Michelle Clark

---

**ATTENDEES:** Paul Sturm and Michael Grant

**Commissioner Davis called the meeting to order, welcomed those in attendance, and excused Commissioner Walton.**

**1. Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Boatright

**2. Public Comment:** Please respectfully follow these guidelines.

- Individuals may speak once for 3 minutes or less: Do not remark from the audience. State your name & city and direct comments to the entire Commission (Commission will not respond).

**Paul Sturm, of South Weber City, identified amendments to agenda item #6 including a request for definitions in the Land Use Matrix.**

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**3. Consent Agenda**

- 10 November 2022

**Commissioner Losee moved to approve the consent agenda as amended. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.**

**4. Updated Final Plat w/Phasing for Petersen Farms PUD (25 Lot Plat) (Combined R-L, R-LM & R-7 zoning) 13.06 acres located at approx. 6950 S 475 E by Applicant: Timothy Grubb:** Community Services Director Trevor Cahoon explained a Final Plat has already been considered for this development; however, the developer wishes to amend the plat to include phasing for the project. The overall development is being platted in 2 phases. Considering the cost of construction, both phases are being requested to be approved at the same time.

Commissioner Losee questioned the timing of construction and what may happen if the property remains a field. It was the consensus of the other Planning Commission members that wasn't a concern.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to recommend approval to the City Council of Petersen Farms PUD Final Plat for Petersen Farms PUD (25 Lot Plat) (Combined R-L, R-LM & R-7 zoning) 13.06 acres located at approximately 6950 S. 475 E. Commissioner McFadden seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.**

**Commissioner Losee moved to open the public hearing on South Weber City's Development, Design & Construction Standards. Commissioner McFadden seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.**

**\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING \*\*\*\*\***

**5. Public Hearing & Action on South Weber City's Development, Design & Construction Standards:**

**Dana Shuler of Jones & Associates** reported it has been five years since the city's design and construction standards has been updated.

A brief overview of changes is listed below:

**Section 1 – General**

- 1.03 More clearly defined meaning of Title / Chapter and specified current Code information.
- 1.04 Added acronym for Utah Administrative Code

**Section 2 – Development Standards**

- 2.02 Added requirement for Developer to be responsible for materials and construction testing.
- 2.04 Geotechnical Investigation. This is a new section that was added to specify the minimum requirements for what needs to be addressed in a geotechnical report.

**Section 3 – Design Standards**

- 3.03 Updates to pipe requirements to meet State Code.
- 3.04 Updates to requirements for water line crosses to comply with Division of Drinking Water requirements.
- 3.05 Street/Road Design requirements updated to clarify design specifications.
- 3.06 Storm Drain and Drainage Design updated to meet State requirements.

**Section 4 – Construction Standards**

- 4.01 Updated Contractor licensing requirements to follow State Code (previous version specified license types).
- 4.03 Construction Testing. This section has been updated to include requirements for both development projects and city projects.

**Section 5 – Technical Specifications.**

No Changes.

**Section 6 – Standard Drawings, Plans, and Details**

See revisions to Drawings.

**Appendix A – Storm Drain and Drainage Design Standards**

- Updates to all storm drain and drainage standards to comply with the updated State Code requirements of an 80th percentile retention instead of the previous 90th percentile retention.
- Addition of Exhibit 3 - Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs).

**Appendix B – Geotechnical Report**

This is a new Appendix that defines the minimum requirements of all geotechnical investigation reports.

**Appendix C – Modifications and Additions to Manual of Standard Specifications**

- 32 12 05 M Bituminous Concrete (Modified). This adds two minor clarifications to the new spec approved and adopted by APWA in April 2022.
- 32 16 13 M Driveway, Sidewalk, Curb, Gutter (Modified). Added requirement for expansion joints where new curb and gutter adjoins existing.
- 32 92 00 M Turf and Grass (Modified). Added requirement to submit seed mix if an alternate mix from the approved provided list is being proposed.
- 33 05 12 Conductive Tracer Wire for Pipe Installation. This is a newly added specification.
- 33 11 00 M Water Distribution and Transmission (Modified). Added requirement to follow Utah Administrative Code for Drinking Water.

**Appendix D – South Weber City Public Works Standard Drawings**

New Sheet No.	Original Sheet No.	Updates/Modifications
All Drawing Sheets		Updated individual sheets with the new standards border, updated all drawings sheet page links per the updated sheet naming convention.
Cover	CS-01	Updated signature blocks, updated sheet naming convention (Renaming the drawing sheets allows for simpler future revisions and updates).

R1	CS-02	Updated the irrigation system note on the lot lateral configuration detail, removed tree notes and references.
R2	CS-03	Renamed the South Bench Drive cross sections to Collector Roadways, and updated the street cross section dimensions.
R3		New Detail Sheet - Added the private roadway street cross sections per the City Ordinance.
R4	CS-04	Moved the street sign details to Sheet R9, updated the APWA reference numbers on the survey monument detail.
R5	CS-05	Adjusted drawing sheet to be Drive Approach specific, moved defective concrete detail to Sheet R10, moved asphalt patch plan to Sheet R11.
R6	CS-06	Adjusted drawing sheet to Be ADA Ramp specific, moved concrete related details (sidewalk, curb, etc.) to Sheet R10.
R7	CS-07	Renumbered drawing sheet, no additional changes.
R8		New Detail Sheet - Added the private roadway cul-de-sac and hammerhead turnaround details to the City Standards.
R9		Created a Street Sign specific detail Sheet, added the private road plate detail, updated street sign pole dimensions and notes.
R10		Created a Concrete specific detail Sheet, moved concrete related details to this sheet, updated the concrete collar notes.
R11		Created a Trench Section and Asphalt Patch specific drawing sheet, moved specific details shown to this drawing sheet, updated patch plan dimensions.
R12	CS-05A	Renumbered drawing sheet, no additional changes.
CW1	CS-08	Updated the water later service part numbers, pipe specifications, and added general Note 6 to the drawing sheet.
CW2	CS-09	Updated pipe specifications, added valve collar detail and updated concrete collar notes, and updated Flexi-Flag note.
CW3	CS-10	Renumbered drawing sheet, no additional changes.
CW4	CS-11	Updated the large water meter station to the Octave Meter and components, updated pipe specifications, updated vault dimensions.
CW5	CS-12	Updated pipe specifications.
CW6	CS-13	Moved the Trench Section detail to Sheet R11, updated various notes, added the "Alpha" restraint system as an approved option.
CW7		New Detail Sheet - Added the (RP) Reduced Pressure Backflow Assembly details for commercial irrigation connections to the Culinary Water System.
SS1	CS-14	Renumbered drawing sheet, no additional changes.
SS2	CS-15	Added Sampling Manhole Detail, Moved Concrete Collar Detail to Sheet R10
SD1	CS-16	Updated the catch basin details to reflect current construction methods for installation.
SD2	CS-17	Renumbered drawing sheet, no additional changes.
SD3	CS-18	Updated storm drain manhole notes.
SD4	CS-19	Updated basin slope at the outlet structure.
SD5	CS-20	Updated basin slope at the outlet structure.
G1	CS-21	Updated the fence post table (depth of posts).
G2		New Detail Sheet - Added "Water Wise" examples and references to the City Code.
SL1-SL3	CS-22	New Detail Sheets - Added the current City Standard Streetlight details and installation practices to the City Standards.
SL4	CS-22	Added the RMP (Rocky Mountain Power) connection detail to the City Standards as part of the streetlight detail sheets.
LID1	CS-23	Updated LID (Low Impact Development) information [er the State of Utah Low Impact Development Guide, Added additional LID examples to the drawing sheet.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to close the public hearing on South Weber City’s Development, Design & Construction Standards. Commissioner Losee seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.**

**\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED \*\*\*\*\***

**Commissioner McFadden moved to recommend approval to the City Council on the South Weber City’s Development, Design & Construction Standards. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**6. Discussion on Residential Multi-family (R-7) Zoning Code Updates w/R-5 Overlay**

Trevor Cahoon explained the City Council when approving the Final Plat for the South Weber Gateway project, instructed the Code Committee to consider zoning text amendments to facilitate the development in amending the approved final plat to allow for a townhome development for individual ownership. The items that were brought forward by City Staff as areas that prohibited this type of development included the following:

- The exclusion of provisions surrounding zero lot line developments.
- The absence of a dwelling, townhome definition within the code.
- The inclusion of setback provisions that oriented buildings based on lot configuration and not on orientation of the buildings toward a right-of-way.

As the Code Committee reviewed the R-7 zone, it became clear that the ordinance was written with parameters in a similar fashion to a single-family zone thus making it difficult to plan a multi-family development. The reason that these inconsistencies were not noticed in other developments lies in the fact that other projects utilized the Planned Unit Development conditional use section of the city code. The South Weber Gateway was the first project to follow development guidelines strictly under the R-7 zoning code.

As conversation progressed within the Code Committee other areas of concern toward multi-family developments were discussed in relation to the R-7 code and future development. While it is still a desire to limit the use of this zone, the Code Committee discussed various housing types that would be more appealing to future development other than traditional townhome, high-rise, or garden style apartments. Through the conversation the committee identified the main issue with multi-family housing is the visual appeal and congruence of form with surrounding single-family units already established within the area. To answer these concerns two concepts were discussed, type of housing unit and design standards.

In the case of design standards, the State of Utah has limited the city’s ability to impose design standards upon single-family developments. It does not prohibit a city from imposing design standards on multi-family units. Therefore, if South Weber City wishes to pursue developing a design standard for multi-family housing this is a possibility. Townhomes are the outlier within

this context because although there is more than one unit within the building, state code does identify these units as single-family attached developments. Within the state code there is a provision to allow a city to impose a design standard on single family developments if the code allows for a density incentive utilizing an overlay zone. This would mean that if the city were to allow a developer to have more density than a zone would typically allow, the city would be able to impose design standards for the development.

With this line of thinking, if the city were to seek for particular multi-family or single family units by offering more density, the city would be able to dictate the form of the units themselves. The Code Committee then discussed the possibility of reducing the allowed density within the R-7 zone to 5 units an acre and offering an incentive of 7 units and acre, which would allow the city to have better control on the type of development found within the city.

For example, including smaller single-family housing complexes such as cottage courts. In these types of development, the city would offer a higher density for the creation of single-family homes with smaller lots on a shared court. Some items to discuss would be how many units an acre the city would want to encourage and the style of development.

Mansion style apartments or condos was another housing concept that was attractive to the Code Committee. Allowing a building to look like a large single-family home, but housing 4-7 units within the home. So that appearance would be single family while providing more variety and density of housing.

While the idea is new and needs more work to determine the viability of the incentive, the prospect of this update with an eye toward the Moderate-Income Housing Updates becomes an idea that can provide a better development and use of land within the future. Further discussion on whether it is viable to reduce the R-7 zone's density further and offer the now current density as an incentive would provide the desired outcome would be important for the Planning Commission to discuss.

At this stage it has become necessary to get the feedback from the Planning Commission on the potential changes the R-7 zone and receive their recommendations on what to include in the draft ordinance. The following table breaks down the changes proposed by the Code Committee for the Planning Commission review.

After a discussion in Planning Commission on September 15, the commission gave the following directions to staff to update the code in the following ways:

- Update the definitions as recommended
- Allow townhouses as a permitted use
- Maintain density at 7 units an acre, but explore in a future update overlay zones
- Establish a minimum lot area and minimum lot width
- Utilize sections for zero lot lines and setback orientation for share common space as recommended
- Alter front setback lines to 25 feet to accommodate for large vehicles
- Include diagrams to demonstrate setback requirements

Staff has made updates based on the recommendations from the Planning Commission. The only exception is including a minimum lot area. Staff would recommend that having a minimum lot width would be sufficient to dictate design aesthetic and would allow for more flexibility of design than restricting a minimum lot area. This is something the Planning Commission could recommend be included back in the ordinance.

The Planning Commission met on October 13 to discuss the draft ordinance and make their recommendation to City Council. In a 3-0 discussion by the Planning Commissioners present a recommendation was made to approve the drafted changes to the Residential Multi-family zone and recommend the City Council begin the process in the creation of overlay zones to address design standards in accordance with Utah State code.

In a discussion item with the City Council on October 25, the council expressed a desire for the Planning Commission to have a more in-depth discussion on the reduction of density within the R-7 zone to 5 units per acre and the creation of draft ordinance for an overlay zone to grant bonus density of up to 2 units and the implementation of design standards. The council feels the exploration of creating an overlay zone now would be pertinent to protect the interests of the city in facilitating development standards for projects in South Weber.

The two main questions the council would like answered are: What should be included or covered within an overlay zone? What are the design standards that need to be established within the zoning overlay? This is an initial discussion with the Planning Commission on what the creation of an overlay zone will look like and what design standards would be subject to review.

Commissioner Losee understands this is a draft document but pointed out there are spelling mistakes and typos. Commissioner Boatright expressed he has no issues with the updates and feels it is reflective of what the Planning Commission discussed. Commissioner McFadden and Davis agreed.

## 7. Planning Commission 2023 Goals

The following items were listed as potential items to focus efforts on in 2023:

- Review water and how to tie the general plan and land use development to water usage.
- Dust mitigation and what the city's standards include when the number of pollutants in the air is violated by some of the land uses in the community.
- Architectural standards review.
- Staker Parsons gravel pit and possibilities for this property after it is no longer a gravel pit.
- Definition of commercial recreation zone and what are we using it for.
- Open land zone for an urban forest interface. This would include making sure wildfires can't jump into other areas of our city in those open land areas.
- Reviewing the sensitive land areas and how to provide standards in city codes and what is the appetite to develop on a hillside.
- Trails and active transportation.

Commissioner Boatright acknowledged water usage is important to focus on. Commissioner McFadden agreed. Commissioner Boatright isn't sure how much the Planning Commission can do about the dust mitigation. Commissioner Losee suggested focusing on sensitive land areas.

Commissioner Davis queried who directs the Code Committee. Commissioner Boatright replied that the Planning Commission gives suggestions to the City Council. He pointed out in the joint meeting with the City Council and Planning Commission they did discuss the possibility of the Chairperson and Co-Chairperson serving on the Code Committee. Commissioner Losee asked how many hours is required. Trevor replied that the Planning Commission receives a stipend and hours are not tracked.

**PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

**Trevor Cahoon:** reported the city received feedback from the State regarding South Weber City’s Moderate Income Housing Plan. The overall review was positive; however, the State is concerned about Section B’s infrastructure and implementation plan. They requested dates to be included. They also requested the plan be included in the master plan and not a separate document.

**ADJOURN:** Commissioner Boatright moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 6:44 p.m. Commissioner Losee seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and McFadden voted aye. The motion carried.

**APPROVED:** Jeremy Davis 1/12/23 **Date**  
**Chairperson: Jeremy Davis**

Michelle Clark  
**Transcriber: Michelle Clark**

**Attest:** Kimberli Guill  
**Development Coordinator: Kimberli Guill**

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission  
for 08Dec22 Meeting  
by Paul A. Sturm**

**Public Comments and Questions  
Agenda Item #6 -Packet Page 141 of 151**

**6. Discussion on Residential Multi-family (R-7) Zoning Code Updates w/R-5 Overlay**

**ACTION**

Discussion on the Residential Multi-family (R-7) zone amendments.

**ORDINANCE REVIEW**

In the November Planning Commission meeting the Planning Commission discussed the creation of an overlay zone to help encourage quality construction. Throughout the conversation the Commission discussed what things they would like to regulate and require to allow for increased density. Based upon that discussion Staff has drafted an ordinance for a Strategic Growth Overlay zone and made amendments to all areas of the code that reference to the R7 zone to now say R5.

**4-8-3: DEFINITIONS:**

RESIDENTIAL AREA, RESIDENTIAL ZONE:	Any area of the city with a zoning designation of Agricultural (A), Residential Low Density (R-L), Residential Low-Moderate Density (R-LM), Residential Moderate Density (R-M), Residential Patio (R-P), Residential Multi-Family Seven (R-5) under title 10 of this code and the abutting public streets and public premises.
--	--

Should Residential Multi-Family **Seven** (R-5) be shown as Residential Multi-Family **Five** (R-5) as shown elsewhere in this document.

**10-1-10A: LAND USE MATRIX**

Zones	C	C H	C R	LI	TI	N R	A	R L	R L M	R M	R P	R 5
Accessory Building	P	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Accessory Use	P	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Please define the first row in the table as Zones.  
Please define "P" and "C" in the table.