



## Ogden City Corporation Request for Proposal

### Single Family Home Development – 605 N Jackson Ave

**Q & A - 10/10/25**

---

#### **STATEMENT OF CLARIFICATION:**

*We would like to emphasize that the current entitlement state of this project is only preliminary plat approval. All final approvals, design, engineering, verification of setbacks, buildable footprints, easement dimensions etc. are to be completed by the developer and civil engineering team as they work through the approval process.*

*As stated in the pre-bid meeting, the proposal should be kept at a high level. The preliminary plat is a reference document, and the final design and engineering may need to be modified to ensure buildability. Ogden City encourages developers to submit proposals that best reflect their ability to develop the land, understanding that some of the information is limited and that further detail will be provided and determined as it becomes available throughout the review/approval process.*

1. When is it expected that the developer will take ownership of the property? Does this happen right after the RFP process or is there an option for the developer to get it entitled before taking ownership?

*The developer should include in their proposal when they would propose to take ownership of the property. The estimated entitlement schedule along with the time of taking ownership should be clear in the overall project schedule.*

*After successfully being awarded the RFP the city will proceed with a development agreement that outlines the terms of the project including details on the property transfer, purchase price and scope of the work detailed in the RFP and developers' proposal.*

2. It appears that it will be the developer's responsibility to pipe the canal, correct?

*Yes. The developer will need to pipe and cover the canal in conjunction with the development.*

3. Regarding Lot 10 and the maintenance of the detention basin area – this is a tough one. We have seen this same scenario play out in other cities/subdivisions where it is the homeowner's sole responsibility to maintain the basin and has seldom worked out the way it was intended to. We've found that, in scenarios like this, a small HOA fee is the best way to ensure areas like these are maintained well thus mitigating future problems. But if the city isn't open to an HOA, we are open to other ideas.

- a. Additionally, I assume the property taxes for Lot 10 would reflect the additional acreage? Would the homeowner be able to utilize the area in any capacity? If so, what restrictions would be in place? Could I get more details on the specs the city would like to see in that detention basin?

*CLARIFICATION: Recent feedback from Ogden City Engineering would have Ogden City as the owner of the detention area parcel ownership and it would be maintained through the public services department. The developer would still be responsible for the construction, improvement installation and landscaping, etc.*

*The preference would be to not have an HOA as part of this development.*

*No additional details regarding the detention basin are available at this time.*

- 4. We are concerned about the lot size/shape of lots 5, 8, and 9 in regard to buildability and general homeowner experience.
  - a. Lot 5 for its irregular shape on the corner, and the ability to maintain setbacks. Would the lot line between 4 and 5 be considered the rear or side?
  - b. Lots 8 and 9, due to the Irrigation Easement running through about half the depth of those lots. Would the setbacks change in this scenario where the easement affects the buildable area on these lots?
  - c. After discussing with our team, we feel that consolidating some lots would provide the best living experience for future homeowners, but perhaps you can shed some light on how you would approach building on these lots?
  - d. Just thinking out loud here now... what if Lot 10 was shrunk a bit by adjusting the northern lot line to the south and place a tot lot there with some benches and maybe a covered picnic table or two? Lots 8 and 9 could then split the difference in the increased lot area, helping with buildability, and the low HOA fee would become more palatable for the residents. Thoughts?

*PLEASE REFER TO PREVIOUS STATEMENT OF CLARIFICATION*

- 5. I read in one of the RFP documents that there were some Lot Width concerns in the cul-de-sacs (perhaps due to scale issues which was mentioned).
  - a. Which lot lines would you expect to be adjusted to maintain a 50' lot width? Seems like Lot 15 might be tight, and, logically, the east end of the line between 14 and 15 could be pivoted to the north, such that the line runs parallel to the line between 13 and 14.

*PLEASE REFER TO PREVIOUS STATEMENT OF CLARIFICATION*

- 6. Would it be possible to obtain the plat CAD file for our team to more easily make adjustments?

*Sorry - no, the CAD file is not available at this time.*

7. Are any allowances possible for garages to come past the porch on challenging shaped lots?

*We would encourage developers to make sure every effort to set garages back. However, we understand some challenging shaped lots may require creative layouts and having the garages setback may not be an option. This would typically be looked at as an exception for difficult to plot lots and any extension past the garage should be minimal and the architectural emphasis should not be the garage.*