


**Q2 CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNITY** The second draft general plan emphasizes the desire to maintain the small-town charm of the city. Which of the following community elements do you feel has major impact on the city's ability to achieve these desires (select all that apply)?

Answered: 506 Skipped: 221



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Housing types (detached homes, duplexes, town homes, condos, apartments, etc)	71.74%	363
Housing density (how close homes are to each other)	83.20%	421
Architectural style and aesthetic design features of buildings (e.g. building height and materials)	44.66%	226
Amount of residential buildings	52.37%	265
Amount of commercial buildings	67.00%	339
Amount of open farmland and fields	68.97%	349
Other (please specify)	20.95%	106
Total Respondents: 506		

South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Small - Town charm left years ago	7/6/2020 1:28 PM
2	Small town charm has already been ruined.	7/6/2020 11:44 AM
3	Small town means to me single family homes with lots of open space. o apartments & crowded neighborhoods. Community events such as Country Fair Days, the trains at the park, & possibly movie night at the park.	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
4	Small town is single family homes and farmlands. No apartments & overcrowded neighborhoods. Some family oriented community activities.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
5	Single Family homes, Family Farms, parks, fields & that sort of thing	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
6	All of these will effect the city. We should only have homes 4 per acre, NO closer - No more multifamily housing.	7/2/2020 4:45 PM
7	I would like to see mostly detached single family homes with large lots (1/2 acre and larger) with as many open fields as we can maintain. I would like to see very low housing density. I would be okay with residential and/or commercial buildings at the entrances/exits of freeways/highways but NOT anywhere else within the city.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
8	height of buildings both residential and commercial.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
9	Height of buildings, both residential & commercial.	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
10	The space in the plan. Are they barracks or do they include open space? Walking paths, parks, etc.	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
11	Condos Apartments - No more; Housing Density - Ugly, too close; Amount of commercial buildings - few, negative impact; Amount of open farmland and fields - leave farmlands alone; We need to keep small town charm	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
12	No more high density housing.	7/2/2020 3:13 PM
13	No more condos, apartments; Fewer housing density; have less residential buildings; have less commercial buildings; have more open farmland and fields. All of these can have a negative or positive impact on maintaining small town charm.	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
14	High density isn't small town	7/2/2020 11:35 AM
15	farmland and fields positive.	7/2/2020 11:32 AM
16	All the ones checked would be negative. All impact in some ways - Low density - open space best.	7/2/2020 11:30 AM
17	Housing Density - Ugly Negative, Amount of Commercial Buildings - Negative, Amount of open farmland and fields - positive. They can have both negative or positive - Gray buildings could have had better design.	7/2/2020 11:22 AM
18	Some of these items can have a negative or positive impact. We need more open land & fields to maintain small town charm. We have too much commercial & high density as it is. We can get all these within a 5 minute drive of South Weber	7/2/2020 10:50 AM
19	No Dense Housing, as you have lost small - town feel	7/1/2020 3:18 PM
20	Small growth	6/30/2020 11:17 PM
21	Keep it small	6/30/2020 11:04 PM
22	Keep it simple	6/30/2020 11:00 PM
23	building too much will create congestion. We need enough open land space, and not so much industrial/commercial near the roads in and out of town.	6/30/2020 11:00 PM
24	Type of commercial businesses, locations, proximity to residential areas, school zones, school.	6/30/2020 9:21 PM
25	No more high density housing	6/30/2020 9:01 PM
26	Less commercial	6/30/2020 8:51 PM
27	We need more green in between lots!! Low density for new housing subdivisions	6/30/2020 8:30 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

28	A community where people know each other and talk to one another. In general you need a small low density community to achieve that level of interaction.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
29	Please STOP trying to develop EVERY BIT OF OPEN SPACE if you actually desire to maintain the small-town charm of our city!!	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
30	open space	6/30/2020 6:17 PM
31	More Single family homes les High density developments!	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
32	Types of businesses allowed in commercial areas (Desire less noise and light pollution)	6/30/2020 4:43 PM
33	Keep as much as we can low density residential	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
34	I would like us to stay as small as we can.	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
35	no high density housing. We have enough going in.	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
36	This is kind of a silly question. All of these have major impact on the ability to achieve any desired result.	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
37	Stop trying to develop our community into somewhere we wouldn't want to live in!	6/30/2020 12:36 PM
38	I am not in favor of any more high density housing areas. We have more than enough already.	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
39	We don't need to fill our city with townhouses, and apartments. If we are a small town, why turn it into a city?	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
40	We don't need any more multi-family apartments. We are a small town, why turn it into a city?	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
41	No connection to Layton. Get rid of the gravel pits.	6/30/2020 5:20 AM
42	The Layton connector road would destroy South Weber's small town charm. Please say no to the connector road.	6/30/2020 5:18 AM
43	The amount of traffic everyday in and out of our city.	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
44	Stop allowing zones directly next to conflicting zones without proper buffer zones	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
45	Poor distance between conflicting zones	6/30/2020 12:10 AM
46	Single Family Homes and limited condos & apartments. Lots of open space.	6/29/2020 9:17 PM
47	This should remain a single family residence city with limited businesses on the outskirts.	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
48	Detached homes on bigger lots, no more than R3 would be ideal. Just a little commercial on outskirts and no HDH	6/29/2020 4:41 PM
49	I like the open farmland/fields we currently have in South Weber.	6/29/2020 3:36 PM
50	I love the open farmland. I think we need more open space not less.	6/29/2020 3:17 PM
51	This feels like a loaded question that can be taken many ways. I feel an overload of apartment has a very big negative impact. We don't need any more appartments. We have enough. Part of the charm of South Weber is nice spaces between homes. Breathing room and such creates a nice country feel. Architectural style has always been a rule of thumb for South Weber. We didn't allow cheap looking building,,ie cinderblock etc, which has contributed to the classy look we have maintained. Open farmland is a giant contributor to our beauty, not wall to wall housing. We have beautiful hill and farms that give us a hometown feeling. We have enjoyed the maverick and a few commercial businesses but everything we really need is so close we don't need to litter our neighborhoods with business. It is might be okay or appropriate on the areas near maverick but every possible empty spot is ridiculous and given all the things we have 5 min away. We don't need much. I moved here for this country, quiet feeling.	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
52	Dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
53	To keep the small town we need to NOT add any additional High Density housing, no more apartments or townhomes. If you are trying to decrease property tax we need commercial business that bring revenue to the city. Not more residential which further increases the tax issues.	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
54	All of these have a major impact on the small town feel of this city that most of us moved here	6/29/2020 10:37 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	for. We don't want high density or apartments and hotels we want small town	
55	We need more trails, bike / walk paths, bike-friendly streets, connection to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in Layton. We do not need connection roads that would congest our roads and neighborhoods. And we need to get rid of the gravel pits. The dust from the pits seriously lowers our quality of life as South Weber residents.	6/29/2020 5:38 AM
56	This questions should read what kind of impact? Those checked have a negative impact. low density, architectural and open space have a positive impact.	6/28/2020 6:29 PM
57	We need more open spaces, country charm, any commercial buildings should have the same appherance like in park city. and no more high density housing.	6/28/2020 5:41 PM
58	This feels like a loaded question that can be taken many ways. I feel an overload of apartment has a very big negative impact. We don't need any more apartments. We have enough. Part of the charm of South Weber is nice spaces between homes. Breathing room and such creates a nice country feel. Architectural style has always been a rule of thumb for South Weber. We didn't allow cheap looking building,,,ie cinderblock and a certain amount of brick etc, which has contributed to the classy look we have maintained. Open farmland is a giant contributor to our beauty, not wall to wall housing. We have beautiful hills and farms that give us a hometown feeling. We have enjoyed the maverick and a few commercial businesses but everything we really need is so close we don't need to litter our neighborhoods with business. It is might be okay or appropriate on the areas near maverick but every possible empty spot is ridiculous and given all the things we have 5 min away. We don't need much. I moved here for this country feel, quiet feeling.	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
59	The amount of traffic through city	6/28/2020 4:48 PM
60	Roads that connect to Layton in the center of our town that was initially intended low traffic, end terminal,residential	6/28/2020 12:32 PM
61	NOT having a connection to Layton City	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
62	Would like to see South Weber stay residential as much as possible. We are not meant to be a commercial overrun commnity.	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
63	Types of businesses	6/26/2020 10:10 PM
64	Types of businesses	6/26/2020 10:08 PM
65	No road to layton! It would make south weber drive traffic go up exponentially	6/26/2020 9:20 PM
66	NO LAYTON CONNECTION	6/26/2020 9:13 PM
67	I believe it is a combinations of residential buildings, commercial and farm lands	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
68	All do	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
69	All do	6/26/2020 12:12 PM
70	If we connect our beautiful community via a road to Layton it will ruin our special little town and it's seclusion.	6/26/2020 10:54 AM
71	Seclusion from other communities. i.e No Road to Layton if we want to maintain small-town charm.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
72	No connection with Layton, I want to limit traffic in our neighborhoods.	6/26/2020 7:54 AM
73	A road that connects Layton to I-89 will not add to the charm of the city nor will high density housing. The charm of South Weber is that it is close to larger communities as well as to outdoor recreation venues. It is a quiet community, close knit and beautiful as it is.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
74	Connection to Layton on 1900 East	6/25/2020 9:01 PM
75	Connection to Layton on 1900 East	6/25/2020 8:51 PM
76	Connection to Layton on 1900 East	6/25/2020 8:43 PM
77	Connection to Layton on 1900 East	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
78	We want small town feel. Everything we need is close. We don't want to lower property' value	6/25/2020 3:37 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

79	Causing more traffic by opening connecting to Layton with a road and all the high density highway.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
80	Road(s) connections to Layton City	6/25/2020 2:04 PM
81	Our City should remain with a small town feel. This is a main reason many of us moved here. We moved to SW 30 years ago. All of these years we drove to SLC to work but elected to sell our home in SLC to move to the small town of South Weber. We do not want condos and apartments in our area. Especially in our backyards which this will be the case with the Deer Run Lofts. If we must have HD housing and commercial business, they should remain on SW Drive and limited those coming down the frontage road which is already congested and too narrow to support more activity.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
82	If we build anything it should be a junior high and we will need additions to the grade school with all the development you are considering.	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
83	There needs to be more open land. We want to keep this as small town as we can.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
84	I think that we should keep as much open land as possible. If we develop on every space then it wont be a small town anymore. It will feel like Farmington Station where we are all packed on top of each other.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
85	In moving to South Weber 30 years ago, it was the small town feel that lead us here. We both worked in SLC, but choose the SW environment knowing we would need to commute each day to work. This is the same reason we live here today.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
86	Quit building high density low income homes!! And NO more commercial! The mayors and planning commissions poor decisions have already poorly impacted this beautiful city! STOP with your poor planning and decisions made in a vacuum!	6/23/2020 8:40 PM
87	Our city is now overwhelmed with HDH. We need to focus on preserving the beautiful space we have left before it's gone forever.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
88	Future Collector Roads redesign to directly connect to South Weber Drive.	6/23/2020 6:16 PM
89	No comment	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
90	Our City just keeps getting built out.. we don't need Commercial and NO MORE HIGH DENSITY..Enough is Enough ..2700 E is going to be a mess already..As is S Weber Dr .. our city is getting ruined ..our property value will go down with all this crap that you are trying to accomplish..it's like trying to put square pegs in round holes..	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
91	Amount of high speed roads	6/23/2020 7:25 AM
92	Lower density zones show more small town charm	6/22/2020 11:09 PM
93	Other code for building structures.	6/22/2020 5:21 PM
94	This feels like a loaded question that can be taken many ways. I feel an overload of appartment has a very big negative impact. We don't need any more appartments. We have enough. Part of the charm of South Weber is nice spaces between homes. Breathing room and such creates a nice country feel. Architectural style has always been a rule of thumb for South Weber. We didn't allow cheap looking building,,,ie cinderblock etc, which has contributed to the classy look we have maintained. Open farmland is a giant contributor to our beauty, not wall to wall housing. We have beautiful hill and farms that give us a hometown feeling. We have enjoyed the maverick and a few commercial businesses but everything we really need is so close we don't need to litter our neighborhoods with business. It is might be okay or appropriate on the areas near maverick but every possible empty spot is ridiculous and given all the things we have 5 min away. We don't need much. I moved here for this country, quiet feeling. Not the Layton wall to wall feeling.	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
95	WE DON'T NEED OR WANT HUGE APARTMENTS. Houses being too close makes us feel cheap, cramped, and uncomfortable, space creates beauty.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
96	We do not need apartments blocking the view of our city or the mountains. Views increase property value. Tall apartments or buildings in the way decrease property value. I also don't need to be able to brush my neighbors teeth do to clustering a bunch of houses in one lot. Farmland also gives the homelike feel that South Weber has always had. The few commercial buildings that we have also lend to the small town aesthetic.	6/22/2020 3:40 PM


## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

97	Everything we do affects the community, i understand growth. It can be done slowly and with integrity.	6/22/2020 11:25 AM
98	Independent small businesses instead of chain stores	6/22/2020 11:12 AM
99	you should let residents decide, not the planning commitee	6/22/2020 11:11 AM
100	Another main thoroughfare on 1900 E to highway 193 in Layton would cause great detriment to the well being and quiet life of South Weber residents.	6/21/2020 11:03 AM
101	less HDH or MDH more LDH and open spaces, preserving our already existing identity and not creating change into something that cannot be undone.	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
102	I really value the amount of trees and green space along the bench and along the river. I enjoy being in the outdoors and I support the city's plans to create more trails through and making these open green spaces accessible while still preserving them.	6/18/2020 2:23 PM
103	Not only do I feel that the amount of commercial buildings has a major impact on potentially destroying the small town feel, but also the type and location of those buildings. Its crucial to really think everything through first, and I think South Weber could use an attorney that represents the residents and NOT use an attorney that represents the developer.	6/16/2020 10:24 PM
104	High density housing will continue to ruin South Weber	6/16/2020 12:36 PM
105	the items checked above negitivy impact the small town feel	6/15/2020 9:30 PM
106	No more moderate or high density!	6/15/2020 4:46 PM


Q3 The projected land use map below identifies future land use in the City. It is not the current zoning map. It is the vision and future land use plan for the City. Each color represents a different zone, which allows for different land uses (e.g. residential of varied densities, commercial, etc). When a property owner approaches the City with a development proposal that needs to rezone their property, this map acts as a guide for the Planning Commission and City Council on the vision of the City.

**QUANTITY OF EACH RESIDENTIAL ZONE** When reviewing residential zones throughout the city on the projected land use map (view larger map [HERE](#)), do you feel that the plan includes too much, just the right amount, or not enough of each zone? If desired, you can read more about our residential zones on pages 14-17 of the second draft general plan [HERE](#).

Answered: 507 Skipped: 220



## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



	TOO MUCH	JUST RIGHT	NOT ENOUGH	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Residential Very Low (A) - bright green	4.93% 25	36.09% 183	50.69% 257	8.28% 42	507
Residential Low (R-L) - pastel green	4.73% 24	36.49% 185	50.89% 258	7.89% 40	507
Residential Low Moderate (R-LM) - yellow	13.24% 67	59.09% 299	20.36% 103	7.31% 37	506
Residential Moderate (R-M) - orange	36.09% 183	50.89% 258	7.10% 36	5.92% 30	507
Residential Patio (R-P) - light brown	30.18% 153	48.32% 245	10.65% 54	10.85% 55	507
Residential Multi-Family (R-7) - dark brown	64.30% 326	26.63% 135	2.76% 14	6.31% 32	507

## Q4 Additional Comments Regarding Quantity of Residential Zones

Answered: 166 Skipped: 561

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Stop building!!	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
2	For too much high density in areas described in Superfund documents as polluted...ANY is too much.	7/6/2020 10:13 AM
3	If we want to maintain the rural charm of our city, STOP building on every single inch of property!	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
4	Preserve rural charm or our city. No more growth. Stop building everywhere.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
5	If we want to keep the small town feel, we need to quit desecrating wetlands & building apartments, townhouses, & funky intersections	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
6	No multi family housing - we have too many	7/2/2020 4:45 PM
7	I would like to see more low, very low and low moderate residential zones.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
8	As a very (old) timer in South Weber it has been hard to see (our) town (city) grow and grow. Love all the new people but hard to listen to some of these newcomers who, granted have been here 30-40 years now want to tell us open land owners who have been good stewards of said land for MANY years, what they think should be done with it. I remember knowing everyone who lived on South Weber Drive, but of course that would change. If and when we can no longer maintain our (open) land and feel a need to sell, I would hope those folks will realize that (we) more so than (some) will be a good judge of who & what we sell for. But we have a right to sell, after all, somebody SOLD to them to be here. I do realize we need zones and rules. Sorry, it just makes me a little angry to hear, "We need open spaces and yours is some that is left, so you can't subdivide!" No one in this city likes "open space" more than me! But changes come, like it or not. Sorry to have rambled on.	7/2/2020 4:30 PM
9	Quit allowing developers to decrease residential lot sizes by allowing a large "green space" within the development. I.E. keep 1/2 acre lots as 1/2 acre lots instead of allowing it to be averaged in the total acreage of a development.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
10	Keep 1/2 acre lots as 1/2 acre lots instead of allowing if to be averaged in the total average of a development.	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
11	The question of providing enough low income housing is a State mandate. People want to live here, but don't want to allow others the same privilege. Even city council has made negative remarks against apartments and the people who live there.	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
12	No more High Density, Ugly Barracks	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
13	No more apartments, barracks, condos, etc. No more high density.	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
14	Way too much commercial & business projected for our small town.	7/2/2020 10:50 AM
15	I oppose high density housing in any form, particularly increased traffic around Ray's.	7/1/2020 5:21 PM
16	No more town houses/multi units	7/1/2020 5:13 PM
17	I'd rather see more patio homes (affordable) in some of the proposed residential areas and/or houses spaced out (more land/unit)	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
18	I don't love the Ray's area being commercial, I thought we were working to put homes in there	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
19	There is a lack of low density zoning on this plan. There should be more 1 acre and 1/2 acre zones.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM
20	I think a sprinkling of R-P could be added into R-LM and R-M areas when left over acreages don't correspond well with the existing zoning. But not too much.	6/30/2020 9:21 PM
21	No more HDH or Patio Homes! All of these options are too much in our city that does not have that much space! Stop!!!	6/30/2020 9:17 PM
22	Why are you pushing so much HDH, patio homes and moderate residential! South Weber is a wonderful place and all of this ruins it!	6/30/2020 9:12 PM
23	I'm fine with the amount of residential.	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
24	Nervous about residential Multi family area on the frontage road, and how crowded it will be and	6/30/2020 9:07 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	amount of parking.	
25	We need a lot more low density, patio homes and R7.	6/30/2020 9:05 PM
26	We need to stop letting the developers decide how many houses go in... we have enough high density in south Weber we need low density housing to keep the small town charm	6/30/2020 8:30 PM
27	We currently have sufficient Residential Multi-family (R-7)-dark brown color sections on the map on both the east and west ends of South Weber with a perfect amount in the center of our town as well. the only exception are the 2 parcels along South Weber drive to the West of Highmark charter school and to the north of the resisting apartments, that might be good locations for a multi family type development.	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
28	There are a few (light and dark) brown locations that I am sure will cause issues if high density housing goes into those locations. In general 89 cannot support more traffic, and the planned changes are going to make South Weber drive more of a mess for commuting. In general our area cannot support the traffic, the change to more lanes and fewer lights is going to make the build up at the South Weber drive off ramp very dangerous. We should not be talking growth at this stage, we cannot support it.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
29	Zone out Airbnb type rentals.	6/30/2020 7:11 PM
30	I would rather see LESS projected for town-homes, condominiums, and apartments, based on the numerous army barracks style housing that can be seen from 475 East. I would rather see more patio homes or low to moderate residential areas, and we need to preserve our agricultural areas.	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
31	Our city already has enough low income housing. South Weber should be allowed to stay a bedroom community which is comprised largely of single dwelling homes. I think we have already built enough apartments and town homes and do not need anymore.	6/30/2020 6:26 PM
32	Appreciate the actions taken to increase areas of lower density by decreasing the maximum allowable density from 13 units per acre down to 7 per acre. Great work!!!	6/30/2020 5:03 PM
33	Patio homes max of 5 per acre	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
34	We shouldn't have a lot of high density housing	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
35	preserve open spaces	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
36	We need more 1 and 1/2 acre lots	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
37	Keep densities low with larger lots.	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
38	Need low density housing in residential areas	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
39	No more high density.	6/30/2020 3:21 PM
40	I would like to see the residential multi-family stop at the amount we have now. We do not need anymore we already have too much. If the land can not remain farm land (which is my preference) I would prefer to see very low or low housing in those areas.	6/30/2020 2:52 PM
41	Why isn't there more Agricultural land showing? Seems a little silly to assume in the next 20 years that all of the land will no longer be agricultural. And are we saying that people dont want agricultural places to live? Don't assume.	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
42	Just fine	6/30/2020 12:49 PM
43	The zoning of the mountain road to the water tower as recreational is idiotic!!! What are you planning for that area-- sledding slopes? I really want this changed.	6/30/2020 12:36 PM
44	I am not in favor of any more high density housing areas.	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
45	None	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
46	Our community needs more density. Density is not the problem. Poorly written city code not enforcing the look, quality, and type of higher density is the problem. Fix that, and maintain the small town feel with the density needed to draw the right commercial services to town.	6/30/2020 10:10 AM
47	The area marked moderate density, should be held to 1/4 acre lots as the smallest lot size.	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
48	1/4 acre lots should be the smallest lot size.	6/30/2020 9:23 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

49	I would like to see more neighborhoods of single family dwellings instead of more apartments and townhouses. It seems we have a good amount of those. Perhaps some neighborhoods of smaller, starter homes would be helpful to our city. Not everyone can afford a big expensive home, but doesn't want to live in a townhouse either.	6/30/2020 8:13 AM
50	I have some concerns about having a long term RV camping ground in our city.	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
51	If there are no currently approved developments on some of the current R-7 areas then move them back to at least Patio (R-P).	6/29/2020 10:59 PM
52	The lofts community off the frontage road is too crowded with insufficient parking and will cause more frontage road congestion.	6/29/2020 10:22 PM
53	Let's zone everything low moderate to very low and keep our community as small as possible!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
54	Preferably larger lots and less dense development	6/29/2020 9:17 PM
55	We do not want any more residential multi-family in the city	6/29/2020 9:08 PM
56	There are a few areas where the zoning doesn't reflect existing housing density. For example, the lots next to the train park are built more densely than what they are zoned for.	6/29/2020 9:06 PM
57	Do not take away from the community we have. The residents of SW have been clear on this issue for years	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
58	Well, I'm colored blind, so it's very hard to distinguish some of the colors...Thus the reason for "Just Right"!!!!	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
59	High density housing should only be allowed on the perimeter of South Weber, if at all.	6/29/2020 4:43 PM
60	Detached homes, no more than three to an acre would be ideal. Yes the cost of these homes would run up but that's the price one has to pay to live in a good neighborhood	6/29/2020 4:41 PM
61	I am still opposed to the Loft housing development, the rest seem ok	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
62	I think we need to finish the current projects before starting any more	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
63	If we want to keep the small town feel and charm of the city then we need to stop pushing for so much commercial development and high density housing!	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
64	I do not agree with high rise R7 Buildings	6/29/2020 3:04 PM
65	Do not agree with high rise R7 Buildings	6/29/2020 2:30 PM
66	Feels like a good overall mix.	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
67	way to much residential of all types. Not enoughGreen for sure. I don't want every inch of our city filled	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
68	Dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
69	Please don't allow anymore high density housing in our city.	6/29/2020 12:25 PM
70	I do not want any more high density housing in our city.	6/29/2020 12:20 PM
71	We do not need to keep adding in houses packed on top of each other. We already have an apartment complex and 2 townhouse developments. That is already too much. If you continue to build homes they need to be homes with land requirements. The west end used to have a 1 acre requirement go back to that preserve the city.	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
72	South Weber is growing and I understand any city would. But I would ask the Counsel to keep in mind what the citizens want. We don't need more high density, no more apartments, no more townhouses and no more houses on top of each other. If you are going to build go back to the required 1 acre a lot you had on the west end forever. The appeal of South Weber is that it's small and a little higher priced so not just anyone can live here. Many people have left their parents homes here saved up just so they can afford to move back to the quiet protected city. That is the charm of it. Adding more apartments and townhouses takes away from the charm of south weber.	6/29/2020 10:37 AM
73	less houses and more open land	6/29/2020 9:56 AM
74	No more HD please	6/28/2020 6:29 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

75	No more high density housing.	6/28/2020 5:41 PM
76	I feel you just want to load up our beautiful green areas, natural habitat and put up houses to make us look like Layton and every other over built area. I want South weber to be the small town it is known for and desired.	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
77	No more HDH including close together patio homes.	6/28/2020 5:09 PM
78	The more high density housing, the more traffic, more road repairs, more water usage, fuller schools. High density housing needs to stop coming into South Weber. Houses are fine if they are big lots with plenty of space between.	6/28/2020 4:18 PM
79	-	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
80	It would help maintain the small-town feel of South Weber if we don't fill up every currently open space with high-density housing	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
81	Those with open land left in the city should be given the same opportunities to develop their land as the very first developer in the city. They should not be penalized for keeping their land open for this long.	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
82	I don't agree with the commercial zoning on the corner is South Weber Dr and 1550 E. I think that would be residential property	6/27/2020 5:21 PM
83	I want to keep the small town feel. Packing more houses into small spaces violates the spirit of that concept. I don't want South Weber to become an Ogden/Layton neighborhood.	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
84	Need to maintain agricultural, and open spacing as much as possible.	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
85	No more townhomes/condos/apartments .	6/26/2020 9:13 PM
86	If this city continues to grow like this we will need more emergency egress routes out of the city. I'm not opposed to growth but we need to plan for transportation needs.	6/26/2020 9:05 PM
87	No more multi family housing.	6/26/2020 7:22 PM
88	I understand that South Weber has a limit for growth like any other communities. Let's allow this growth to facilitate a family friendly community, not high density housing that tends to decrease property values, increase crime, etc.	6/26/2020 2:42 PM
89	Need patio homes in all areas of south weber and all future housing needs larger lots (1/2 acre) we have enough smaller lots	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
90	Too much Multi Family around my property. I will be surrounded if the Lofts build and also across the street from me.	6/26/2020 1:59 PM
91	none	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
92	none	6/26/2020 11:56 AM
93	If you put too many houses, townhomes or apartment complexes you take away the "small town" feel. Do minimum acre lots to spread people out....ie. .50 acres	6/26/2020 11:33 AM
94	"Maintain the Small-Town Charm" means keeping us small. Thus the lower density housing zoning will support this versus the higher density housing will thwart this. Additionally, the more lower density housing we put in versus higher density housing the more everyones property value stays strong.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
95	Because of South Weber's unique traffic issues (i.e. limited ingress and egress) the number of residential dwellings should be limited so that total development will not overwhelm our roads and compromise the safety or diminish the quality of life (daily commute) of it's residents. This opinion is in addition to the desire to preserve the rural nature of our community. We have enough high-density housing - we need no more. In fact, more two acre lots would go along way toward maintaining the character of South Weber.	6/25/2020 11:28 PM
96	Layton an Ogden, two neighboring cities have plenty of high density housing. We do not need to make this small land city like these two cities. For one, we don't have the land or roads, traffic lights or police department to handle more high density housing. Northridge High is the most transient high school in Davis County district as it is. South Weber is one of the only stable family communities as a whole that feeds this high school.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

97	We need larger lots. Developers squeeze every millimeter of land to the line for the most lots out of a piece of land. This is totally contrary to a small town country living area.	6/25/2020 10:27 PM
98	No Further Comments	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
99	Too many options keep it simple with larger lots	6/25/2020 7:52 PM
100	Keep it how it is.	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
101	We won't ever be a big city, save the charm and don't try to build population by adding all of the High density housing. we moved here years ago because of the home town feel, let's not lose that.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
102	We are against additional R7 housing. Our goal should be to keep open farms and single family housing with some building restriction, such as at least a 2 car garage	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
103	no additional comments	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
104	No multi unit housing	6/25/2020 8:49 AM
105	To have a small farm town feel there should be more, very low density areas.	6/24/2020 11:09 PM
106	Lower density is desired to maintain as much rural atmosphere as possible. Accommodating developers and assuring profitability of new developments is not the responsibility of the city.	6/24/2020 7:27 PM
107	You are jamming too much of the multi family units on the 89 access road.	6/24/2020 7:10 PM
108	None	6/24/2020 6:23 PM
109	We need more zones for agriculture and open space	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
110	We don't need anymore apartments.	6/24/2020 4:43 PM
111	I think that alot of the residential zoning needs to be more open space or zoned for agriculture.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
112	No comment.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
113	none	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
114	I thought we had elected other options for outside funding rather than adding HD housing? We live near the Frontage road on Deer Run Drive. The Frontage road is very narrow and currently cannot support the traffic. We should not be adding R-7 to this area, especially near residential houses that have been here for many years. That is not why we moved here. Many citizens of South Weber walk this road each day. More traffic and driveways will only add to this problem. With the construction of 89, this area will feel more congested especially if a sound wall is ever installed. The road has a slope that is hazardous in the winter months and the wind freeze the water on the road. We are against HD housing. We have enough. We are still hoping the Deer Run Lofts are not built adding 73 families in our backyard. Not why we live here.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
115	Every other city values agricultural. Ours in this plan is completely taken out even against the land owners wishes.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
116	There is to much of Residential Low being removed for the current plan,	6/23/2020 6:16 PM
117	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
118	We don't need anymore high density areas. What about our buses and schools? My kids can't ride the bus and we are 1.5 miles away.	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
119	No comment	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
120	I'd like to see more open space instead of wall to wall build out.. The corner of 2700 E ,8200 S would make a great place for a community garden as would other places in town .. that could add charm and delight to that piece of property...	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
121	I think the yellow zones on the west end should be Low Res (light green).	6/22/2020 11:09 PM
122	I think it looks ok as is. I don't know enough about city planning to know what is/isn't ok. I know we cannot go back to less housing. I like the small town feel here in South Weber and would like it to stay somewhat of a small town feel as much as possible.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM
123	Multi-family attracts crime and traffic.	6/22/2020 9:49 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

124	Rather than add more people, which increases congestion on our roads & in our schools - Why not improve the lives of those who already live in South Weber? Adding more recreation land? More parks? A better rec center? A community pool? Biking or jogging trails? A splash pad? Our family always has to travel outside of South Weber to do these things. We want a destination community!	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
125	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
126	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
127	No comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM
128	I do not want to see more apartment complexes	6/22/2020 5:21 PM
129	We need to maintain our beauty not fill it to the brim	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
130	The City doesn't need anymore high-densisty housing, we need open space and to maintain or increase farmland, Reduce the number of parks, and park funding(unless its for the sole purpose of maintaining natural landscapes such as wetlands or natural resources such as the hills that follow along our city or wetlands that are on currant private property(only time wetlands and the remaining natural areas should not be sold for development) even the current farm lands should remain farm land, we don't need increased traffic, or abusing eminent domain to build roads on peoples land. eminent domain should never be used within this city. and natural wetlands should be expanded and maintained.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
131	The more housing units added will lower the small town aesthetic. South Weber is a great city and I believe personally that that is because of how quaint it appears. The more high density housing or buildings added will literally decrease likability of the city. I don't want it to end up looking like a slum.	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
132	No	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
133	If the true purpose is to keep South Weber a nice place to live adding apartments, townhouses and condos will not help us achieve that goal.	6/22/2020 11:25 AM
134	Need more low residential zones	6/22/2020 11:10 AM
135	No more HDH	6/22/2020 11:06 AM
136	Need to keep the farm land. Need commercial to help keep taxes low. We pay the highest in surrounding cities	6/22/2020 6:54 AM
137	We have enough multi density and need more low density	6/21/2020 8:28 PM
138	We have enough high density and moderate density. We need more low density	6/21/2020 8:08 PM
139	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
140	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
141	Quit building Multi family. you are destroying the city.	6/20/2020 11:33 AM
142	How will living in a commercial zone affect me in the long run?	6/19/2020 11:27 PM
143	I would like to see more options for larger plots of land in homes. These aren't offered and there are many people who would be interested in homesteading right here to keep more open spaces and maintain the more relaxed country feel	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
144	I feel like the beauty of South Weber is in the preserving of the open lands of along its edges on the south bluff and along the Weber River on the north side of the freeway. Within the town though, I think more thought and planning should go into areas that could be beautifully and very intentionally master planned into high-quality mixed single and multi-family developments that provide unique amenities to the community. I do not believe that space between homes and preserving low density community spaces is the right direction. More and more, I am seeing other communities attracting the best of the population of Utah and beyond with higher density communities that offer more common space that is engineered to provide amenities that have high value to the community: i.e. more trails, more creatively designed and controlled waterways, more parks, more space that can be collectively maintained and enjoyed by more of the community. I see families like mine focusing more energy and time on spending quality time with their children in the form of physical activity, hands-on outdoor scholastic learning, developing skills and talents for both hobbies and essential living, and socializing respectfully	6/18/2020 2:23 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

with other kids and neighbors. There is a growing impetus in the lessening of value and importance on maintaining a large private yard. I see homes in South Weber that have been a part of town for several decades and they are rundown and look dumpy! I feel like that is a shame from both the public's and the landowner's point-of-view. I see my community aging in place without the ability to backfill and attract a younger generation of talented and successful contributing citizens. Multi-family has a stigma in South Weber as equating to poor people and I resoundingly disagree with that. It COULD mean a lower-income resident, but it could also be done in such a way that the value, style, and amenitization of the multi-family developments attract higher income residents than who already live in town. I think the mindset of multi-family needs to be shifted in such a way that the city sees it as a way to positively amenitize its community more putting in certain a la carte multi-family requirements in its zoning such as a certain percentage of their development is dedicated as public park, open lands, or mixed-use commercial. Increase the density percentage requirement of amenitization of these developments on a sliding scale, stop calling R-7 "high-density", and allow for density to increase based on how much amenitization is created to the community. Our community wants to preserve the openness and value of it all, but without educating the community and steering the development criteria and value of creating more higher density areas of town, we as a community will ultimately lose its charm and value in place. We are already dying on the vine with no real commercial tax base income and that will never ever fully develop without attracting more population, more client base, more demand. The cost of living on these huge lots we have in town are going to continue to get heavier and heavier on the backs of the citizens themselves and the amenities the city is currently providing will not grow but wither and die. We need more of the town zoned at a higher density and to allow creative development to add value to our neighborhoods while lessening the burden of the cost of living in our charming community. How do we do this? Examine the fringes of the moderate density zones of our community where either new development could still happen or redevelopment is highly potential and rezone with either a new mixed-use zoning or R-7. The portion of the city sandwiched zoned as A between the T-1 zone, I-84, and R-M zones northwest of the gravel pit would be a prime location for mixed-use or R-7 or higher. The whole strip of mostly undeveloped land between I-84 and South Weber Drive where Old Fort Rd would connect to 6650 S should all be zoned to mixed-use and or R-7 as a buffer between the R-LM and R-M zones and the freeway I-84. This helps keep density and its intrinsic increased traffic on the fringes of the lower density communities while also creating more commercial demand for businesses that would like to bring their locations to the city thus strengthening our incredibly non-existent commercial tax base. The A zoned area on the north side of I-84 should be C-H. Our town could use every bit of real estate around these fringe areas of town that sees the higher volumes of transient traffic. I also think the land right behind the elementary school should be zoned R-7. This would fit with walkability and access for children that would be in that neighborhood and it would be a buffer between the institutional zoning and R-M the next lower residential zone.


145	I really would like to see more single family homes pushed in this city!! Let's focus on quality, not quantity!!	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
146	If we are moderate residential, what happens to our livestock on properties over 1/2 acre? There are a lot of horse properties in amongst the zone. When we go to sell, the property needs to be intact as people search for large animal properties. Country feel??? How does changing R'LM to MR keep the country feel!	6/17/2020 7:18 PM
147	no comments	6/17/2020 2:37 PM
148	The amount of recreational zones within the residential zones is deceiving. I don't consider a retention area to be the same as a recreational or park type area	6/16/2020 10:24 PM
149	Save the farmlands and rural feel of South Weber. Stop building town homes and apartments. I want to see fields with horses and cows, not a concrete jungle filled with town homes, apartments and additional commercial properties.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
150	I emphasize to have the right balance of Residential Zones to continue our small hometown feel to our South Weber community -- avoid over-crowding and congestion.	6/16/2020 6:02 PM
151	Re-zone yellow and orange residential low moderate and moderate to residential VERY LOW density. Open space and housing density must be planned for, and continuously fought for! There will always be increasingly high pressure demands by developers to add more, and more, and more residential dwellings until every single occupy-able foot is stuffed full. You as the city council and planning commission are like the "Little Dutch Boy" holding back the flood. Please do NOT relent. Plan for open space!	6/16/2020 5:51 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


152	overcrowded city	6/16/2020 4:00 PM
153	Too many cookie cutter town homes going up. Your destroying every ounce of land to smash something on it.	6/16/2020 12:40 PM
154	The commercial highway zones are unacceptable. Too close to residential areas. This will greatly diminish quality of life.	6/16/2020 12:36 PM
155	None	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
156	It's perfect how it is currently	6/16/2020 9:23 AM
157	Too many low density areas. The majority of Today's home owners want smaller lots. Large lots end up being ran down and not taken care of bringing down all our home values.	6/15/2020 10:56 PM
158	Please assure we continue to use low to medium density housing. Say no to commercial property that does not fit with South Weber.	6/15/2020 8:03 PM
159	N/a	6/15/2020 7:47 PM
160	We need to stop building homes of any kind.	6/15/2020 6:35 PM
161	Stop trying to pimp out all of south Weber's land!	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
162	Layout of residential zones seem good where their at, would avoid slam town homes, condos apartments in, would take away from that small town feel	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
163	We already have so many multi-family residential areas. I don't think we need any more. Particularly on the battlefield land.	6/15/2020 4:08 PM
164	no more HDH	6/15/2020 2:14 PM
165	Nonr	6/15/2020 12:22 PM
166	The Institutional Zone is too far east. Adding a school zone to gravel pits might be interesting.	6/15/2020 12:20 PM

# Q5 LOCATION OF RESIDENTIAL ZONES Do you agree or disagree with the location and placement of the residential zones on the projected land use map?

Answered: 503 Skipped: 224



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Residential Very Low (A) - bright green	4.97% 25	61.03% 307	5.96% 30	11.53% 58	16.50% 83	503
Residential Low (R-L) - pastel green	4.37% 22	60.44% 304	7.75% 39	11.33% 57	16.10% 81	503
Residential Low Moderate (R-LM) - yellow	3.18% 16	58.85% 296	10.14% 51	11.13% 56	16.70% 84	503
Residential Moderate (R-M) - orange	2.19% 11	52.39% 263	14.34% 72	14.34% 72	16.73% 84	502
Residential Patio (R-P) - light brown	2.39% 12	47.32% 238	12.92% 65	19.09% 96	18.29% 92	503
Residential Multi-Family (R-7) - dark brown	3.38% 17	27.04% 136	17.69% 89	36.98% 186	14.91% 75	503

## Q6 Additional Comments Regarding the Location and Placement of Residential Zones

Answered: 155 Skipped: 572

South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not enough (A) & (R-L). Too much yellow & orange. West South Weber North of South Weber Drive keep more green. South of School (SW Elementary) green.	7/6/2020 3:13 PM
2	Again STOP BUILDING!!	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
3	More green less yellow & orange	7/6/2020 1:28 PM
4	More light green, not as much yellow & orange.	7/6/2020 11:44 AM
5	The city's increased density radically increase human exposures to pollution in the west end of our valley.	7/6/2020 10:13 AM
6	We need to encourage & keep our farmland & agricultural land instead of throwing in houses everywhere.	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
7	Keep agricultural land use. No more multifamily zones or housing developments.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
8	More farmland & open spaces, we don't need more businesses & town houses.	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
9	We do not need more multifamily or moderate housing if anything we need to move to green!	7/2/2020 4:45 PM
10	(A): I would like to see more (R-L): I believe all areas that are yellow/orange in the far west aspect of our city should be more green/light green.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
11	1. Much prefer residential moderate (r-m) orange west of 1100 E to be changed to (R-LM) yellow. 2. Town houses/ apartments don't go with the "rural" feel. Personally feel no need for them in South Weber.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
12	1. Much prefer Residential Moderate R-M orange west of 1100 E to be changed to R-LM yellow. 2. No more townhouses/apartments!!!	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
13	Land owners should have their right to develop their land to the needs of all not just the rich and facebook famous.	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
14	Need more (A) Need more (R-LM) Need Less (R-M) Need more but spaced further apart (R-P) Need Less (R-7) No dense housing in single home areas. Put it next to the apartment complex	7/1/2020 3:18 PM
15	No 3 story town homes in South Weber. The land across from the city offices looks like it will be zoned commercial. Do not suddenly change it to allow for 3 story town homes. Any town homes built must be required to put up a fence in the back.	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
16	Keep Multi Family Residential as is now. No more added	7/1/2020 11:42 AM
17	I feel like the city needs HDH, however the placement needs to be more thoughtfully done. For example, placing HDH next to MDH or LDH needs to be thought out better.	6/30/2020 11:34 PM
18	none	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
19	Nilson Homes property east of Canyon Meadows Park: R-M rather than R-P. Some homes have already been built. Keep remaining proposed lots (as shown on vehicle transportation maps 2A, 2B, and 2C) on Cook Drive & circle R-M.	6/30/2020 10:40 PM
20	The center of the city in the already developed areas should be 1/2 acre lots.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM
21	I'm sure there are areas in town that could easily accomodate less dense housing zones, particularly those with limited street access or nicer views.	6/30/2020 9:21 PM
22	Leave some agriculture in our city! Do some bigger lots!	6/30/2020 9:17 PM
23	I disagree because I would like to see more low density and agricultural zoning.	6/30/2020 9:14 PM
24	We already have more than enough townhomes and apartments. I DO NOT like the R-7 already being added to the commercial lot behind Maverik. That lot has not been re zoned yet and should not.	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
25	R-7 I don't like that location	6/30/2020 9:07 PM
26	I've heard my wife talk recently about a trend that's developing in real estate called "Resuburbanization - it's a trend that's developing due to all of the covid-19 craziness that shows people/buyers want MORE space between thier neighbors and they don't want to be	6/30/2020 8:47 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

right next to each other and stacked on top of each other. We are a small community with charm and character and space that needs to be protected and preserved because people will come looking for what we have to offer and will be willing to pay to live in a city where there is space and we'll planned communities and it's not going to be high density housing complexes and apartments that draw them to South Weber!

27	We do not have enough residential low (A) or (R-L) or (R-LM) and too much has been identified as Residential R-M.	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
28	Why does it have to be in clumps? Can it be mixed?	6/30/2020 8:17 PM
29	In general there seems to be a lack of foresight in the locations. Granted it has grown that way in many cases but we have industrial close to low density, we have high density and commercial right together and that feels problematic. I think there should be significant thought in trying to work some issues with the proposed changes.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
30	This is a difficult question to answer, because it doesn't specify future development versus existing development	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
31	Lofts were the worst decision ever made! taking prime Single family home spaces	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
32	There should be more of a buffer	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
33	place Low density housing where the open space is by Rays old store.	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
34	The density is too high in most of the city	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
35	Would like to see more lower densities (green and yellow).	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
36	Rays property needs to be residential.	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
37	I do not agree with the placement because I would like to see more land for very low, low and moderate low and less for moderate and no more multi-family housing.	6/30/2020 2:52 PM
38	If the very low residential includes trailer parks we don't need them in our city.	6/30/2020 2:50 PM
39	Again, I find this a poorly written question and really doesn't allow for a good discussion or feel for appropriate responses.	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
40	Too much residential	6/30/2020 1:17 PM
41	Just fine	6/30/2020 12:49 PM
42	I disagree with the placement of high density housing developments on the frontage road and also think that the yellow that has well-documented history of contamination by the base should stay as bright green! Why have future lawsuits?	6/30/2020 12:36 PM
43	I am opposed to HDH near the Maverik and also in the Ray's property on SW drive.	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
44	None	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
45	Large portions of R-M need to be rezoned as R-7. Especially along the freeway and highway corridors. R-7 is better suited for being a buffer against those thoroughfares and they keep the higher collector traffic out of the middle of town.	6/30/2020 10:10 AM
46	We need to remember to have a place for parks, even small ones, in Residential Zones.	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
47	I feel that the moderate housing is correct, I just feel that making the lot sizes smaller than 1/4 acre is a mistake.	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
48	If I'm reading the map correctly, it appears there aren't more plans for residential multi-family dwellings other than what we have now. That is good in my opinion. It looks like there are plans to add a good deal of patio homes in lower South Weber. I guess my question would be, will they be available for young families as well as say the 55+ age?	6/30/2020 8:13 AM
49	I don't feel like we need anymore condos or townhouses. Why do we want to make our small town into a city?	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
50	Spread Low moderate and moderate residential throughout city with remaining property as they can compliment one another.	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
51	You might want some Low Density (light green) areas in the Low Moderate (yellow) areas. The	6/29/2020 10:59 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

section of R-7 behind the care center on the western end of town seems out of place, unless it will be more care center. We have enough R-7 at that end of town.

52	I would prefer that the area shown as recreational "Green" by street 1900 remain open land.	6/29/2020 10:37 PM
53	dark green at top of 1900 should not be recreational, but remain natural open land for nature and wildlife	6/29/2020 10:37 PM
54	I disagree with the lofts community on the east end of S. Weber, there is no significant commercial value there and no benefit to South Weber - but will cause traffic problems.	6/29/2020 10:22 PM
55	Take the Patio and Multi Family off the map! We have plenty of them already!!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
56	We do not want Residential multi-family or commercial in the middle of the city!	6/29/2020 9:08 PM
57	I prefer single family units to multi-family units. Townhouses and apartment buildings change the feel and value of adjacent neighborhoods.	6/29/2020 9:06 PM
58	multi residential or high residential should not be a fixture in SW	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
59	See my answer in #4...	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
60	Remove the R7 zone that is north of 7800 S. and west of 2700 E.	6/29/2020 6:13 PM
61	Commercial establishments should only be permitted on the edges of South Weber. The former Ivan Ray property should NOT be zoned commercial.	6/29/2020 4:43 PM
62	I disagree not because of the location, but because I don't want the HDH style homes	6/29/2020 4:41 PM
63	again disagree with the Lofts project	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
64	We do not need multi family dwellings here or at least not anymore	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
65	I strongly disagree with the Residential Multi-family (R-7) that is located just north of 7800 S. and west of 2700 E. With the potential of The Lofts being constructed to the south, residents on 7800 S. don't want to be sandwiched in between two high density units. I believe this area would blend better with the surrounding neighborhood if it was R-L or R-M.	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
66	Do not agree with multi family R7 without adequate parking	6/29/2020 3:04 PM
67	Do not agree with Multi family R7 without adequate parking.	6/29/2020 2:30 PM
68	NA	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
69	again not enough agricultural green space to much residential and way to much commercial	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
70	Dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
71	Please don't allow anymore high density housing in our city.	6/29/2020 12:25 PM
72	I do not want anymore high density housing in our city.	6/29/2020 12:20 PM
73	I don't feel like HDH should be mixed in with LDH/MDH. We need to keep them seperate. I do not support "The Lofts" with also trying to mix HDH with commercial businesses.	6/29/2020 11:58 AM
74	Reconsider the amount of R-M, R-P, R-7 we have in the city. We do not need to keep adding these types of homes. We moved to South Weber to get away from the big city feel.	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
75	As stated above we are trying to put too many "affordable" options in south weber and pack-in the townhouses and apartments and houses with no yards.	6/29/2020 10:37 AM
76	no apartments	6/29/2020 9:56 AM
77	We have enough low income housing.	6/28/2020 7:52 PM
78	I think most of the yellow, low-moderate, should be residential moderate, orange.	6/28/2020 6:21 PM
79	There already getting to be to many houses and people. The small town feeling is getting lost as well as the safety.	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
80	The density is already too high. Additional neighborhoods of moderate or high density will ruin our small town we have today	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
81	we dont need anymore high density housing	6/28/2020 5:41 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

82	The only one that I could understand if the small amount of patio. The rest is overkill at best...	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
83	If we can have bigger lots on the west end of town this reduces stress on our families and infrastructure.	6/28/2020 5:09 PM
84	-	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
85	There is too much multi family housing.	6/28/2020 2:00 PM
86	I strongly disagree with the R-7 proposed behind the nursing home on South Weber Drive and 475 E.	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
87	It seems out of balance that all of the residential moderate is in the east end of the city. Why can't the west end have moderate?	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
88	High Density Housing should be kept out of the inner city if at all.	6/27/2020 11:25 AM
89	High Density Zones should not be placed in the inner city.	6/27/2020 11:24 AM
90	I marked disagree because I want it as sparse as possible.	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
91	Prefer the old Rays store land to be residential.	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
92	I like having single family homes in the area one you add too many townhomes/apartments it takes away any charm.	6/26/2020 9:20 PM
93	Allowing a large multi-family zone on an already busy street near the east end of South Weber will be a safety issues to the children in the neighborhood as well as add to the congestion from traffic going to Maverik and Highmark Charter School.	6/26/2020 2:42 PM
94	Need patio homes in all areas of south weber and all future housing needs larger lots (1/2 acre) we have enough smaller lots Also need more commercial recreation in places where it show residential low density	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
95	Too much Multi Family around my property.	6/26/2020 1:59 PM
96	none	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
97	n	6/26/2020 11:56 AM
98	Replace large portion of R-M with with R-A or R-L. Significantly reduce R-P and illuminate completely R-7.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
99	The land that formerly housed Ray's market should be Moderate Density.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
100	Needs to be More green west of 89. More yellow could be East of 89.	6/25/2020 10:27 PM
101	No More Multi-Family (R-7), not needed.	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
102	No comment at this time	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
103	Seignate Rays Market property for moderate residential.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
104	Designate former property owned by Ivan Ray as Residential Moderate...nothing less.	6/25/2020 2:04 PM
105	Strongly disagree with new R7 located near the Maverik. The Frontage road is too narrow to support the current traffic flow. It is very slick in the winter months due to the wind. The Maverik has increased to congested feel. Now adding a car wash, it cannot support HD housing. We need a current traffic study in this area especially looking at the weekend traffic flow. If the Lofts are built, this will be a neighborhood nightmare. Lots residents appear to be walkers in addition to children walking to Highmark. We believe we can be a great community by not adding HD housing especially in established residential neighborhoods.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
106	Property near the Hillside is too polluted for residential—— health hazard! No more high density or multi family residence	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
107	Too much high density in only certain parts of the city, especially on the west side frontage road!	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
108	Much of the Low Residential is east of 89. We need more in the undeveloped land in the center.	6/25/2020 8:21 AM
109	If I don't agree with the quantity of particular zones, I'm not sure how happy I can be with the	6/24/2020 7:27 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


	location of those zones.	
110	None	6/24/2020 6:23 PM
111	There is too much commercial and the residential area are too close. We need more open space.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
112	There is way to much Multi Family and patio home areas. We can't keep a small town feel if we have to put so many people in here.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
113	No comment.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
114	none	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
115	Strongly disagree with the new proposed R7 by the Maverik. The Frontage road is already congested. Has a recent study been performed in this area since the Maverik was built? If not, this should be done as the Frontage road cannot support the traffic, cars and walking that has already been approved (Maverik, car wash, and potentially the Lofts). No more HD housing.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
116	I strongly disagree with the proposed maps. The city is being ruined with low density high income housing! I can't even back out of my dads driveway without being worried someone is going to run me over!	6/23/2020 8:40 PM
117	Residential Multi-Family Are oddly place in the city. To much Residential Low area are being removed.	6/23/2020 6:16 PM
118	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
119	We don't need the traffic and population increase.	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
120	No comment	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
121	The Residential Patio is located, where it will greatly affect the traffic and safety of the frontage road	6/23/2020 10:28 AM
122	Against development in plume area..it's diseased.. potential lawsuits...NO HIGH DENSITY	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
123	I don't have enough knowledge to know what the best plan is here. I am in support of keeping SWC a small town feel.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM
124	See previous comment	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
125	Adding multi-family homes to an already crowded neighborhood is a terrible idea. We need more GREEN space!! What is wrong with our current zoning? Why are we so eager to change everything?	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
126	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
127	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
128	No Comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM
129	Way to many residential zones. I feel its being shoved down our throats	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
130	the placement is only bad becasuse it is changing current green areas and very low denisty to yellow brown or orange. very low density should be priority and should not be changed to anything lower at any time.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
131	Increasing population will not increase quality of living.	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
132	no	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
133	Our family owns one of the undeveloped farms in the city, we won't sell as long as orange is on the plan. Must be yellow to green.	6/22/2020 11:25 AM
134	NO More HDH	6/22/2020 11:06 AM
135	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
136	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
137	Keep low density housing everywhere.	6/20/2020 11:33 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


138	these are hard to tell where they are not already developed areas. I would highly request that we slow development while we try to work through some things. There is NO RUSH to get open spaces developed.	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
139	R-M Density zoning should not belong up against the I-84. This should be R-7 which will create much more common space for the community to use and a taller sound and visual barrier between the freeway and the lower density neighborhoods. It also keeps the collector road that will be going in through that area more free and clear of driveway entrances and exits with them being consolidated with multi-family developments. I think the gravel pit should be cross-hatched for potential mixed-use in the event it is sold. There is so much potential with that piece of land that could benefit the whole city: new schools to handle the growing kid population, retail, commercial, single and multi-family development, parks, trails, etc.	6/18/2020 2:23 PM
140	I think the R-7 should only be used in areas where we need building to transition from commercial to residential. Not put R-7 where there can still be single family homes!	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
141	Not enough very low and low, and too much moderate, patio and multi-family residential.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
142	I emphasize to have the right balance of Residential Zone locations to continue our small hometown feel to our South Weber community -- avoid over-crowding and congestion.	6/16/2020 6:02 PM
143	Keep the highest density housing closest to freeway on and off ramps to keep traffic within the heart of the city as low as possible.	6/16/2020 5:51 PM
144	I feel it's best to keep the high density housing on the outside of the city, near the freeway on ramps is good... It helps keep the masses of all those buildings hopefully going to the freeway and toll bridge rather than coming thru the city.	6/16/2020 5:08 PM
145	none	6/16/2020 4:00 PM
146	Just because there's land there doesn't mean you need to develop it. Go ruin someone else's town.	6/16/2020 12:40 PM
147	We need to keep South Weber small, stop the building already leave it as it is ,,	6/16/2020 10:58 AM
148	None	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
149	They are spaced nicely currently on the dark brown multi family which is what gets the most push back from citizens. We shouldn't add any more because that will overrun certain areas.	6/16/2020 9:23 AM
150	We don't need any more high density than what we already have	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
151	Again, no apartments, condos, townhomes (have enough of). Housing going on seems fine.	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
152	There are so many patio home developments going in...do we really need that many?	6/15/2020 4:08 PM
153	no more HDH	6/15/2020 2:14 PM
154	None	6/15/2020 12:22 PM
155	The general plan needs a specific explanation of each zone. Two pages representing setbacks, height limits, acreage, and style. More color and pictures.	6/15/2020 12:20 PM

**Q7 QUANTITY OF EACH COMMERCIAL ZONE** When reviewing the commercial zones throughout the city on the projected land use map (view larger map [HERE](#)), do you feel that the plan includes too much, not enough, or just right amount of each zone? If desired, you can read more about our commercial zones on pages 17-18 of the second draft general plan [HERE](#).

Answered: 504 Skipped: 223



## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



	TOO MUCH	JUST RIGHT	NOT ENOUGH	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Commercial (C) - dark red	41.67% 210	44.64% 225	8.33% 42	5.36% 27	504
Highway-Commercial (C-H) - bright red	41.27% 208	45.83% 231	5.95% 30	6.94% 35	504
Light Industrial (L-I) - bright blue	28.57% 144	57.74% 291	3.17% 16	10.52% 53	504
Transitional Light Industrial (T-I) - pink	24.80% 125	57.54% 290	3.37% 17	14.29% 72	504
Commercial Recreation (C-R) - light blue	25.00% 126	51.98% 262	11.90% 60	11.11% 56	504

## Q8 Additional Comments Regarding Quantity of Commercial Zones

Answered: 176 Skipped: 551

South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We have enough commercial	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
2	We need to keep the area above the canal as open space for wildlife. If we allow recreational uses the possibilities of garbage getting into the canal & yards increases, as well as fire danger & crime.	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
3	Keep area above the canal as is. I enjoy the wildlife. If recreational use is approved, there will be more trash	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
4	Putting commercial & recreational things in the (C-R) areas is a desecration of wildlife habitat, a danger to family homes below those areas due to the sensitive topography of the land.	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
5	(C): None by the city hall (old Rays) (C-H): The area by 475 - No apartments - Hotels.	7/2/2020 4:45 PM
6	(C): I would NOT want to see commercial land in the center of our city. (C-H): I believe the area zoned by 475 is too large. I would also love to limit the light pollution and noise for what goes in this area. (T-I): I think this is too close to the homes listed very low density. It would decrease the value of these homes.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
7	Be very careful on what is allowed at I84/475 E interchange area. It is very close to existing homes and new residential developments.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
8	Very concerned 475 E/I84!! Devalues existing homes, traffic & congestion, crime. Probably 0 profitable & could be vacated & an eyesore for years to come at entrance to community.	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
9	Change the gravel pit back to light blue recreational. Use the vision of previous city council members. Weber Canyon gateway to the mountain recreation	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
10	Station Park Feel	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
11	Adding commercial depends on what is added. Small town feel. Akin to Station Park	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
12	small town feel for commercial	7/2/2020 11:35 AM
13	More small businesses - not corporations so we can get more revenue	7/1/2020 5:26 PM
14	The gravel pit etc - are not the kind of commercial we want - small mom & pop business is what we need - a few!	7/1/2020 5:13 PM
15	I hope the west gravel pit area could still include recreational possibilities	7/1/2020 4:42 PM
16	(C) - Here goes your small town feel Please be careful with future decisions made. Our green spaces are disappearing faster than I have ever seen.	7/1/2020 3:18 PM
17	Be cautious in what is allowed in each commercial zone. Especially in the middle of South Weber on South Weber Dr. A small town grocery store (i.e. Valley Market) would be nice on South Weber Dr. near the school or at the 84 interchange (Trader Joe's) car wash by Maverik (small).	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
18	My concern is the huge amount of land on the west side of the city that can be zoomed into several things. The vast majority of that land is unstable hillside and used to fall into areas that had heavy restrictions due to HAFB runway. The area needs to have a plan instead of being vastly open to so many things. The West end has a huge portion that is still natural ground. Let's not just let anything come in and develop it- we will lose our beauty and keep ending up with huge ugly white buildings that have no landscaping except their soccer fields.	6/30/2020 11:58 PM
19	No commercial in the center of our city	6/30/2020 11:37 PM
20	Center of city should not have commercial and commercial should not be bordering low density zone	6/30/2020 11:37 PM
21	none	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
22	no commercial in middle of city	6/30/2020 10:42 PM
23	No commercial in the middle of the city.	6/30/2020 10:37 PM
24	The commercial recreation zone is being too broadly applied, especially to zones with easements. We need to leave undeveloped space in our city.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

25	Current commercial zoning is okay except for area including City Building, former Ray's location & lot immediately to the west of it. Also the land of east of Hwy 89. Should be NO commercial or industrial zoning immediately adjacent to any type of residential.	6/30/2020 9:21 PM
26	Another terrible job on this plan!!	6/30/2020 9:17 PM
27	I don't think the dark red commercial belongs next to low density agriculture. There needs to be zoning by degrees.	6/30/2020 9:14 PM
28	The zones along south weber drive should be commercial NOT highway commercial. That would allow for more service oriented businesses and even churches. HC is too restricted. All of the zones and the approved uses are stupid and need to be changed so that zones mean something.	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
29	Way too much! We do not want a city overrun with commercial zones! Be smart and protect what we have!	6/30/2020 9:05 PM
30	Keep commercial to the east and west ends, close to hwy 84 and hwy 89 entrances for greater chances for success.	6/30/2020 8:47 PM
31	The area on 475 would be a nice place for more recreation...something like an Aquatic Center, similar to Clearfield	6/30/2020 8:31 PM
32	Keep the zoning for what it is we don't need any mixed use.	6/30/2020 8:30 PM
33	No commercial in the center of our city ... It's not sustainable. Commercial development needs to be keep to the east and west ends of the city that provide quick and easy highway access that will improve the chances for success with commercial type businesses due to exposure to residents both in and outside if the city limits. Also, better definitions are needed and a rewrite of our code for commercial zones to ensure that what the city allows fits within the vision if the current residents of South Weber.	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
34	The gravel pit takes up a large portion of the Red, I am not sure that is an issue. It does look rather big for our little city, but I think that is deceptive.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
35	I really don't think we should be putting more commercial business by the Town Hall. That land should either be VERY LOW density or should be made into a park or something that is beneficial to all residents (like a public pool).	6/30/2020 7:02 PM
36	I don't like the idea of a commercial development on the site of the old Ray's store/gas station. Children walk to school, and there are existing homes adjacent to this property that would be negatively affected.	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
37	I don't think we have a need for commercial properties in the middle of our city. I don't mind it in the areas close to the highway or interstate.	6/30/2020 6:26 PM
38	The plan needs a better explanation of what commercial recreation is.	6/30/2020 6:10 PM
39	Concentrate commercial around highway's But keep out of residential areas!	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
40	There is too much commercial	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
41	put spaces between housing and any commercial.	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
42	Change the recreation zone to a no development zone	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
43	Too much commercial. Commercial recreation should stay open house.	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
44	Commercial area in the middle of town by the city offices DOES NOT need to expand. The area is already to busy with speeding and people parking on the street d/t the town homes. DO NOT allow the commercial area.	6/30/2020 3:34 PM
45	On commercial more space needed when close to residential. Noise, traffic concerns for residents.	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
46	Commercial property should only be along the highway and exits. RAYS AREA ACROSS FROM THE CITY OFFICE BUILDING SHOULD NOT BE COMMERCIAL OR HIGH DENSITY AREA. VERY VERY VERY LOW DENSITY ONLY	6/30/2020 3:21 PM
47	I do not want to see any commercial within the city. I am okay with a few highway commercial areas that are on the borders of the city, but please none near housing and in the middle of the	6/30/2020 2:52 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	city.	
48	If commercial (dark red) means apartments they should not be in the middle of the city, they would adversely effect traffic through our neighborhoods traveling to and from school.	6/30/2020 2:50 PM
49	Its insulting to put everything not in a residential zone into recreational zone. Keep it open and Agricultural. The Gravel Pit should not be commercial until a development agreement can be put in place to protect the citizens form something bad. Keep the leverage with this property within the hands of the city. Read the Parsons agreement concerning potential. DO NOT CHASE THE TAX DOLLAR. It never works out well for small towns. Eye rolling emoji	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
50	Just fine.	6/30/2020 12:49 PM
51	I am not in favor of commercial in the heart of the city at the Ray's site.	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
52	None	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
53	More C and C-H need to be introduced to the city along more R-7 zoning along the perimeters of the city. Maintain the town's core while making the edges more robust.	6/30/2020 10:10 AM
54	The commercial Zone on the East end of South Weber Dr. will cause undue congestion on a highly traveled thoroughfare.	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
55	We are very close to a large metropolitan area, we don't need to have every convenience within the city.	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
56	I do not think the area around what is known as Ray's store and current city hall should be zoned commercial. It should be residential in my opinion.	6/30/2020 8:13 AM
57	I don't feel like we should put more commercial businesses on the east end of South Weber Dr. at the west end of the gravel pit. It is hard to see around that curve in the road and having commercial businesses there could lead to accidents if people are pulling in and out onto South Weber Dr.	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
58	Please do not give up our only Prime Commercial spaces off highway exits to housing so developers can make a quick return off homes but we will forever have lost the very limited commercial space we have remaining in high traffic areas.	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
59	No commercial in center of city.	6/30/2020 12:10 AM
60	No commercial in city center	6/29/2020 11:36 PM
61	I hope you realize that there is no definition of what these zones mean in the General Plan. They are only included in the end of the "long" survey. So the answers you get for this question from only the "short" survey people could be meaningless - and possibly some, if not many, of the long survey people.	6/29/2020 10:59 PM
62	Take the city property and the Ray's property in the center of town out of the commercial zones!! It should be low residential! Also, it doesn't make sense to have commercial to the west of the gravel pit. If they want to draw people into town for commercial, it should be close to the exits!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
63	Commercial in the middle of the city across from city hall and around 2100 E doesn't make much sense. That should be changed to residential. I am also concerned with the light industrial. We need to make sure that this is not a issue with traffic and noise as well as strict building height requirements to not impede views. I am also concerned with the commercial recreation on the south hillside. This would destroy our beautiful little town's views if buildings are allowed to be built here.	6/29/2020 9:17 PM
64	Disagree with Commercial (C) Dark Red Zoning on South Weber Drive just past 2160 E.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM
65	Strongly disagree with the commercial C dark red zoning on south Weber drive just past 2160 E.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM
66	See my answer in #4...	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
67	City has all the commercial it needs. We are ruining the reason people moved here by adding more commercial.	6/29/2020 6:13 PM
68	Commercial establishments should only be permitted on the edges of South Weber.	6/29/2020 4:43 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

69	Again, the idea is not to commercialize it too much. Right now the amount of commercial is acceptable and traffic that brings is also acceptable.	6/29/2020 4:41 PM
70	no comment	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
71	I do not think we need any commercial in the center of town, and what are you doing with the homes in the center of town that have future commercial slated for that property?	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
72	It is in my opinion that what we have currently in the city for any type of commercial is enough. There is no need for any other type of commercial businesses in the city. Anything we need is a stones throw away in any direction.	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
73	No commercial within the city.	6/29/2020 3:36 PM
74	We have plenty of commercial already. No commercial within the city and no more near 89.	6/29/2020 3:17 PM
75	NA	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
76	When you say commercial recreational then it is too much for businessess. It shouldn't be blanket changed in my opinion until current owners decide to sell. At that time prospective buyers can go to city with owners to request zoning changes. That way it can be done as we go. Not lock us into a stuffed to the gills with people and businesses city.	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
77	I don't think it makes sense to have the commercial right in the center of town. Rays valley service area makes more sense to be residential.	6/29/2020 1:28 PM
78	Dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
79	No Need for Commercial Recreational, North of I84.	6/29/2020 12:25 PM
80	The pit should not be turned into a high commercial zone	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
81	There is not any commercial recreation on this property aside from one of the sand pits. Why are we turning the second one to commercial, seems odd we would do that. By changing this it would take away the option of a lake like always promised wouldn't it? I understand we need more commercial in our city but we need to be very careful of where and how we place it.	6/29/2020 10:37 AM
82	do not move the landfill to our city	6/29/2020 9:56 AM
83	commercial should be near freeway	6/29/2020 8:33 AM
84	I would like to see more recreation land, not an RV park.	6/28/2020 6:34 PM
85	I'd like to see more of the trails developed that are outlined. I'd also like to see our recreational land not turned into an RV park.	6/28/2020 6:30 PM
86	Any commercial should be small town, no large stores, no storage sheds, - feel of Station Park or Park City	6/28/2020 6:29 PM
87	More walking trails and biking trails needed	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
88	The definition of commercial recreation is poorly defined to understand real intent.	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
89	Dont let high density housing into our commercial zones.	6/28/2020 5:41 PM
90	I think Commercial needs to stay by marverick area. Im totally not in agreement of industrial being right next to residential. I also don't think we need commercial in the s curve...seems pretty random even for the city building. Why do we need a new building. absolutely no to the red in the gravel pit. Once it is commercial any amount of anything could come and we would be bound. I think it needs to remain natural resource. If someone came in that had a wonderful idea that the community agreed with then they can then rezone.	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
91	We have great options all around us, don't inundate us with commercial and make what does come beneficial to the residents as well as fit our lifestyle.	6/28/2020 5:09 PM
92	We cannot keep a small town with minimal traffic with this commercial development.	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
93	We really have way too many large dump trucks, etc traveling our roads. It's a huge safety concern & wear & tear on our roads.	6/28/2020 1:02 PM
94	Commercial recreation is nonsense. Leave it as open space.	6/28/2020 12:32 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

95	I disagree with changing the zoning of existing houses to commercial--areas around Rays and the existing city office building, and the area north of South Weber Drive and 2100 E where there are existing houses. I disagree with the pink T-1 area where there are existing houses, as well. I STRONGLY disagree with putting commercial recreation on the southern slope of South Weber, where there is the + overlay from HAFB. These are sensitive lands, including a steep, unstable slope with possible contaminants from HAFB. This should remain open, untouched land, as it is also home to many wildlife in the area.	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
96	From a safety standpoint and traffic standpoint the light industrial, which is mostly construction companies, should not be in our city.	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
97	Please no commercial in the center of the city	6/28/2020 10:33 AM
98	The Ray's property across from the city office should be low density housing. We don't need businesses or apartments there.	6/27/2020 9:05 PM
99	Adding more of the above commercial zoning takes away from the small town feel.	6/27/2020 9:04 PM
100	No commercial in the center of our city.. I think we have plenty anyway where they are currently	6/27/2020 7:48 PM
101	Should probably eliminate Ray's property as commercial and move to residential moderate.	6/27/2020 5:52 PM
102	No commercial in the center of the city. It belongs on the outskirts.	6/27/2020 4:49 PM
103	I know there must be some commercial, but I want it limited to the current locations.	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
104	I think we need to make it easier for business to come to South Weber. I understand that many people want to keep business out and leave this a "bed room" community but that is going to get more expensive as time goes on. We need to build more of a commercial tax base.	6/26/2020 9:05 PM
105	no commercial in the center of the city	6/26/2020 7:09 PM
106	All areas along a highway 89, interstate 84, and South Weber dr, should remain commercial with no residential mix in the commercial area.	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
107	No commercial on the "Rays" property.	6/26/2020 1:18 PM
108	none	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
109	If I would have known that a field near my home would be turned into commercial...I probably wouldn't have built where I did. The whole point was to still feel "country" and "small". Very disappointing to see.	6/26/2020 11:33 AM
110	South Weber is a residential community. The type of commercial we would want has already been provided by surrounding communities and they would have to reason to want to develop in South Weber. most of the types of commercial that would want to come to South Weber bring nothing good for our small town-feel. What commercial zoning we do have should be more on the outskirts and boarders. ZERO Commercial should be anywhere in the center of our city or by existing neighborhoods! The property across from city hall should NEVER be commercial, but rather residential. The more commercial we have in the middle, the more traffic that comes to that commercial and puts wear and tear on our infrastructure with no compensation for that wear and tear.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
111	In keeping with the city's stated goals of maintaining the rural character of South Weber, special care should be taken to encourage small businesses, family-owned enterprises and NON-Franchise businesses. We only live 2 miles from every chain store in America! We do not need another Maverick or another Target or another Cabelas or another Olive Garden or Super 8 in South Weber!! Encourage small businesses and unique retail establishments that provide locally needed services.	6/25/2020 11:28 PM
112	Because we don't support many government services in our city, we do not need more commercial zones. They are as fine as is.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
113	Commercial recreation just right as long as the Hill Air Force Base restrictions of no building stays in place.	6/25/2020 8:43 PM
114	Commercial Recreation just right as long as the Hill Air Force Base restriction of no building remains in place.	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
115	less commercial is better. can travel just a few miles to get what is need.	6/25/2020 7:45 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

116	I would like to see the area around City Hall and Ray's store eventually returned to residential and move City Hall to another commercial zone area.	6/25/2020 6:10 PM
117	We have enough commercial	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
118	We like where they are placed but don't want to add more than we presently have designated.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
119	No HD housing.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
120	No development in plume areas. No need for commercial! Everything we need is 2.7 miles away. And we don't have any area that could be commercial without encroaching on residential homes	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
121	It doesn't really seem that there is a solid plan for the city and how it should grow. Most of the businesses that have been allowed to open, I have never frequented and have no interest in. Certainly don't want them "in my back yard".	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
122	Ok	6/25/2020 8:49 AM
123	The city offices show as commercial but the city garage is residential. The city property probably should be all one type. Plus I am all for moving the city garage, possibly to across from the offices.	6/25/2020 8:21 AM
124	Keep any new building away from the gravel pit. It is not a nice area for housing.	6/24/2020 11:09 PM
125	There doesn't appear to be that much commercial space zoned for the city. Will this be enough of a tax base to support us in the future once we're built out?	6/24/2020 8:19 PM
126	You are jamming TOO much commercial property on the 89 frontage road. The road is not big enough To handle all the traffic. Too many bright lights have been allowed. It is right next to houses and the light pollution is TOO MUCH. Think of all residents. Not just near city hall or the D. Horton development.	6/24/2020 7:10 PM
127	None	6/24/2020 6:23 PM
128	There needs to be more buffer between commercial and residential areas.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
129	Geneva & Staker need to control the dust	6/24/2020 4:43 PM
130	There needs to be more of a buffer zone between commercial & residential areas.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
131	No comment.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
132	none	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
133	No commercial property in the land across from the current South Weber city hall.	6/24/2020 10:15 AM
134	It appears many South Weber residents do not mind traveling to Layton or Ogden for shopping and other needs. We moved to South Weber for the small town environment and want it to remain that way.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
135	I don't like the commercial in middle of town. Would prefer it be on the outskirts.	6/23/2020 8:29 PM
136	We need to value the peoples property values who have saved their whole lives to live where they do. Commercial will devalue their property and their lifestyle.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
137	Why is the "Pole Farm" be coming Highway-Commercial when the city went to great lengths and expense to accommodate their request in 2001 prior to the Olympics?	6/23/2020 6:16 PM
138	Rezone Old Rays property to Single family Residential	6/23/2020 3:26 PM
139	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
140	No comment	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
141	Once begun, we cant take back developments, to keep SW , SW we must proceed with caution on Commercial Development.	6/23/2020 10:28 AM
142	Again no development where Plumes are ..	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
143	Realistically we need commercial to help provide taxes for our city. I think it looks great in that all commercial property is kept to the outskirts of our city near the exits/entrances.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


144	None	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
145	Please limit the quantity of commercial zones. Lets keep South Weber unique. If we really want to identify as the "gateway to Northern Utah recreation", let's keep commercial to the minimum.	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
146	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
147	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
148	No comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM
149	I like keeping the commercial businesses within specific areas, such as the Maverik and other businesses on the very East end. I am fine with that little complex staying constant. I don't want to see other areas designated throughout the city as commercial areas.	6/22/2020 5:21 PM
150	I don't think light industrial should be right next to residential. If I could pick the business it might be different. The Highway commercial is way to much because of the pit. The whole pit needs to stay exactly where it is. If something came in that was great they can try to change zoning. Changing it to commercial locks us in.	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
151	We do not need to expand in any way on more commercial land, in any way even for recreational.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
152	Why move the city building it's fine where it is. We don't need anymore changes that will just cost our city pointless expenditures and traffic and crime. The latter of which NO ONE WANTS	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
153	no	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
154	Commercial should be at the exits of 89 and 84. Commercial in the middle of the city wont work	6/21/2020 8:08 PM
155	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
156	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
157	I'm opposed to commercial zoning that brings in an unlimited amount of traffic from outside residents.	6/21/2020 11:03 AM
158	Eventually, we will probably need more commercial businesses as a tax base.	6/20/2020 11:51 AM
159	There is plenty the way they have it.	6/20/2020 11:33 AM
160	I am concerned about what types of commercial might go in the area off of Adams Ave. I like that the commercial is kept to the area by Hwy 89 now, leaving the rest of the city with more of a small town feel.	6/19/2020 3:05 PM
161	we should NOT be trying to label any of our "slopes" as any sort of anything. There is instability and high risks to safety of citizens for anything to be built on the slopes. I highly disagree that MID CITY should be used as commercial.. everything surrounding is a neighborhood! Kids walk home from school etc. Commercial will not do well in the center of town.	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
162	Area in central SW zoned commercial does not fit with where commercial (highway commercial) is and will be benefiting our city. The fact that the location has tried numerous times in the past to be viable as a commercial location and failed is also good indicator that it should be rezoned residential and allow western and eastern ends of town to be the commercial locations we build upon.	6/18/2020 2:13 PM
163	Take commercial off of the city office building and Rays property!	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
164	We need to maintain more open space	6/17/2020 7:05 PM
165	Halt the commercial growth in South Weber. I'll drive to South Ogden or Layton if I need a Walmart.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
166	Unfortunately your predecessors blew it when they allowed the gravel pits. Go back and look at Google Earth timeline feature to view aerial maps of beautiful South Weber BEFORE the pits. What an ugly waste. We do NOT need more commercial in South Weber. Leverage what is already here, including, if possible, the repurposing of the gravel pits. We have plenty of extremely easy access to all commerical services we need within a 10-minute drive in 3 directions: Grocery, hardware, auto service, etc in Layton, South Ogden, and Riverdale. For what reason do we need more commercial other than as a business tax base? Herriman got greedy for that, and destroyed their once-fair area. Don't be Herriman.	6/16/2020 5:51 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


167	That RV park is a huge mistake	6/16/2020 12:40 PM
168	Commercial highway zone should not be close to residential areas. This will ruin the community and any peacefulness left in the west end of South Weber.	6/16/2020 12:36 PM
169	None	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
170	The only logical commercial and industrial areas are going to be by Highway 89 and on top of the hill where the new road will connect to Layton.	6/15/2020 10:56 PM
171	n/a	6/15/2020 7:47 PM
172	Commercial is awful to consider by the old Rays building! Children WALK HOME ON THIS STREET AND SIDEWALK why would we endanger them with commercial traffic?!	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
173	Building up like the strip mall seems well suited for our area, Nice sit down restaurant be nice.	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
174	Please keep our commercial on the west end commercial and dont put and more hdh down there.	6/15/2020 2:14 PM
175	No	6/15/2020 12:22 PM
176	N/A	6/15/2020 12:20 PM

# Q9 LOCATION OF COMMERCIAL ZONES Do you agree or disagree with the location and placement of the commercial zones on the projected land use map?

Answered: 503 Skipped: 224



## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Commercial (C) - dark red	3.78% 19	42.94% 216	17.89% 90	26.04% 131	9.34% 47	503
Highway-Commercial (C-H) - bright red	3.98% 20	51.49% 259	16.10% 81	16.90% 85	11.53% 58	503
Light Industrial (L-I) - bright blue	3.58% 18	55.07% 277	9.94% 50	13.52% 68	17.89% 90	503
Transitional Light Industrial (T-I) - pink	2.98% 15	55.27% 278	8.95% 45	12.92% 65	19.88% 100	503
Commercial Recreation (C-R) - light blue	4.77% 24	50.70% 255	10.14% 51	16.90% 85	17.50% 88	503

## Q10 Additional Comments Regarding the Location and Placement of Commercial Zones

Answered: 167 Skipped: 560

South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	C-R outside of city boundaries need to be removed. While it may be in the , it has not been annexed yet. Maybe the property owner and county have other things in mind.	7/6/2020 3:13 PM
2	No more commercial	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
3	C-R west end South Weber south of canal contaminated property	7/6/2020 1:28 PM
4	Contamination on West end	7/6/2020 11:44 AM
5	Do mixed use - no hotel, no daycare, no RV parks.	7/6/2020 10:06 AM
6	We don't need more commercial land uses.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
7	Maybe we could make some of the commercial areas in between South Weber Drive & I84 fishing areas or wetlands.	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
8	The center of our city should be homes not town houses.	7/2/2020 5:03 PM
9	No commercial in the middle of town.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
10	Even though I see the potential for good commercial development at I84/475 E interchange, I would rather see residential. Living in the immediate area I worry about the increased traffic and all the other problems that come with it. I t will probably develop enough to require a traffic light also.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
11	Increased traffic & bringing in people off the highway so close to residential of 475 E & I84 will be extremely problematic!! So close to Riverdale there is no incentive for people to stop here anyway. Crime & traffic & congestion - very against it. Hotel at 89 & 84 is not profitable; why would 475 E be any different?!	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
12	If we cannot get commercial developers then take it out of highway commercial and we will put in residential multi-family.	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
13	No commercial - across from City Office	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
14	No apartments on commercial in dark red zone except city office.	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
15	Same as above	7/1/2020 3:18 PM
16	Again, be careful what is put in those zones.	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
17	Again, the West End Hillside can not be a free for all.	6/30/2020 11:58 PM
18	I don't like the location of the commercial zoning of what used to be Ray's, I think it would be better as residential , as I used to live in the townhouses by there and it would be a better location for houses.	6/30/2020 11:55 PM
19	No commercial in the center of our city	6/30/2020 11:37 PM
20	In regards to the dark red commercial zones I strongly disagree with their placement. There should not be residential so close to those areas. Those that live nearby could have property values potentially go down, it could bring unwanted traffic to residential neighborhoods and is an eye-sore to those that live nearby as well. As for the highway commercial zone, I really only disagree with the area zoned down by the Old Maple Farms community. My reasoning is the same: because having highway commercial so near residential properties should not happen for the above mentioned reasons.	6/30/2020 11:34 PM
21	I thought we didn't want to have commercial in the town center ie, Ray's	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
22	no commercial in center of city	6/30/2020 10:42 PM
23	No commercial in the middle of the city.	6/30/2020 10:37 PM
24	The commercial in the center of the city is spot zoning and should not exist. It is not only poor planning but will negatively impact the neighborhood. Those zones should match the existing zones surrounding the property.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM
25	With the exception of the area including City Building, former Ray's location & lot immediately to the west of it. Also the land of east of Hwy 89. Should be NO commercial or industrial zoning immediately adjacent to any type of residential.	6/30/2020 9:21 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

26	I don't agree with commercial in the center of the city due to the added traffic.	6/30/2020 9:14 PM
27	Again, the location of the HC along South Weber Drive and even up 2100 is ridiculous. This should be C at the very least. We want the entrance to our city to be a robust business section which complements each other and contributes to our tax base. If it doesnt give us tax income, then it should require conditional use so we dont fill up with them	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
28	Terrible plan.	6/30/2020 9:05 PM
29	Commercial in the center if our city is not supportable, change the zones in the center of the city from commercial to low density	6/30/2020 8:47 PM
30	Commercial in the pit - do not support - should be commercial recreational with a review/ potential rewrite of that zone to ensure what is permitted fits in with citizens vision for the city.	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
31	Roads do not seem to match with the designations in many areas. Commercial Recreational seems like a lie. I think we need significantly better descriptions on that and the plans for those areas. It feels like a way to hide things. I would like more of a distinction to be made, and more clarity on the plans in those locations.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
32	See my comments on #8 regarding the space around town hall.	6/30/2020 7:02 PM
33	There would need to be more information on the type of business / commercial development that will be considered before I feel comfortable agreeing with the placements	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
34	We have too much area zoned for commercial usage. We need to eliminate or reduce the amount of commercial zones in the middle of our city.	6/30/2020 6:26 PM
35	I don't like the commercial zone between 7400s and 7550s.	6/30/2020 5:35 PM
36	From the general plan: "Care should be given to any commercial development adjacent to a residential...area. A buffer between the two land uses which reduces the negative impacts of the commercial development is strongly encouraged." With the proposed zoning changes, I see a need for more "buffer" on the land bordering my neighborhood: The south shoulder of So. Weber Drive, running west from Highmark Charter School to South Weber Storage (near 2100 S). While I agree that the east end of town, generally, is best for commercial development, bringing it right to the backyards of us living there is too close. Commercial zoning on that piece of land (as named above) would be highly intrusive to residents here, adding noise, light pollution, and people congestion. It may also be in the interest of Highmark school to not be surrounded by businesses on both sides. High density housing would also bring too much light and people. I'd greatly appreciate more residential/commercial buffer by zoning this small piece of land (named above) as something of a more rural nature, such as Recreational, Institutional, or Open Land. More storage sheds would even be okay, but I see restaurants and highly-trafficked businesses as greatly changing the neighborhood in a negative way. Thank you.	6/30/2020 4:43 PM
37	There is too much recreation and industrial	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
38	South Weber town center put no commercial. It can be on the west of town.	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
39	There should not be any commercial in the middle of the city. The zoning should match what is around it.	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
40	Too much commercial.	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
41	AGAIN, the area across from the city offices SHOULD NOT BE COMMERCIAL. The town has out grown the area and the commercial properties should be consolidated to decrease residential traffic not increase it. The area has people parking on the street with not enough parking for town home residents. VERY VERY disappointing that this area is even considered to be commercial when the city development for businesses as outgrown the area and should be located by the highway exits,	6/30/2020 3:34 PM
42	Rays property and in that area should be residential.	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
43	NO COMMERCIAL AREA IN THE MIDDLE OF TOWN I.E. RAYS AREA ACROSS FROM THE CITY OFFICES. THE AREA HAS TO MUCH TRAFFIC, SPEEDING AND NOT ENOUGH PARKING ALREADY WITH THE TOWN HOMES.	6/30/2020 3:21 PM
44	I do not want to see the property across from the city hall become commercial and if city hall is ever moved I would not like that to be commercial either.	6/30/2020 2:52 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

45	If commercial (dark red) means apartments they should not be in the middle of the city, they would adversely effect traffic through our neighborhoods traveling to and from school.	6/30/2020 2:50 PM
46	I do not like this question. Location and placement? This isn't an art project. The map needs more shades of Green and Violets. The map should be reflective of location, best use, needs and wants of the city, reflective of the land owners wants and needs.	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
47	Too Much Commercial land	6/30/2020 1:17 PM
48	I am strongly opposed to commercial in the Ray's store area! This is not appropriate in the heart of our city.	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
49	Non	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
50	We are very close to large cities that provide most services. Why do we need to incorporate every service within the city?	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
51	I understand that there is a request to put in an RV park on the side of the freeway at the West end of town, but how are you designating the East side gravel pit as a recreational area?	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
52	Again the area around Ray's store and city hall should not be zoned commercial. Also the small area on the east side of hwy 89 is questionable.	6/30/2020 8:13 AM
53	No additional comments.	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
54	No commercial in center of city, Commercial right off highways makes sense. How will commercial fit in gravel pit area. This would be a prime space for a unique City Boardwalk/Ski village around top edge of pits, with high adventure recreation area down inside the pits.	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
55	I don't think the Commercial zone in the middle of the city (by city hall) is a correct designation. Maybe it was commercial, but it would seem limited that any business would want to locate in the middle of the city.	6/29/2020 10:59 PM
56	I would favor changing the commercial land near the City Offices to single family housing. The location does not work for commercial purposes and would now be intrusive.	6/29/2020 10:22 PM
57	Change the city office location and the rays property to low residential!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
58	All of the industrial areas should have height restrictions/ after hours noise restrictions	6/29/2020 9:29 PM
59	None	6/29/2020 9:06 PM
60	I don't necessarily disagree or agree with the commercial locations (dark red). It will just mostly depend on what is placed there and how well it will represent our city. Especially where a few of the areas are so close to homes.	6/29/2020 8:55 PM
61	Small business are fine but not industrial or recreational commercial	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
62	Strongly Disagree with placement of Commercial Zone just past 2160 E on South Weber Drive.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM
63	Strongly disagree with placement of Commercial Zone just past 2160 E on South Weber Drive.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM
64	Again, see my answer in #4...	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
65	I'd be in favor of more peripherally located businesses to support our city and get rid of the pit	6/29/2020 6:57 PM
66	Remove all commercial zones that are not currently being occupied by current businesses.	6/29/2020 6:13 PM
67	n/a	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
68	Again no commercial in the center of town	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
69	Maintain commercial zones only where there is an established business (i.e. Maverik, Gravel Pits, Sure Steel, etc) Remove all other commercial areas.	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
70	No commercial within the city. I enjoy and love the open farmland in these zones.	6/29/2020 3:17 PM
71	NA	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
72	I don't want overload of commercial. Everything can be gotten outside of our city leaving it pristine and beautiful	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
73	The commercial area in the center of town (Rays) doesn't make sense to be commercial	6/29/2020 1:28 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	anymore. Should be residential.	
74	dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
75	No Need for Commercial Recreational, North of I84.	6/29/2020 12:25 PM
76	I feel like our city has not been a very good neighbor to our uintah friends by approving an RV park that will negatively impact both cities. Shame on us for allowing this scar on our city.	6/29/2020 12:20 PM
77	There should be no commercial (dark red) at the "S curve" along South Weber Dr. It is too close to residential and would cost the neighboring homes their value. Same as "Ray's" across from City Hall. Do not like it. (At least with the commercial zoning next to Highmark it's not in the homes' backyards...it's down a steep hill.) I also strongly disagree with all of the highway commercial (bright red) within city limits. We need to get rid of the sand pits and create a better environment for South Weber residents. The wind is inevitable, the sand is not. The Staker Parsons should never have been allowed to be here and needs to be done away with at the soonest opportunity. It is an eye sore and a deterrent for future (and existing) home buyers. It costs the beauty of our neighborhoods and homes!! Also, the park and ride is a perfect location and something much needed. Is there a way to put some money there and beautify it at all?? It is also an eye sore!	6/29/2020 11:58 AM
78	The pit is a huge concern on what we plan to go there in the future. Need to consider what rezoning this will bring in.	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
79	More recreational commercial should be considered.	6/29/2020 10:37 AM
80	I don't think the Rays property should be commercial. It's right in the middle of the city surrounded by residential property. My kids ride their bikes to school and I don't want them to have to worry about dealing with more traffic passing that area.	6/28/2020 6:34 PM
81	Keep commercial at east and west not middle of town	6/28/2020 6:29 PM
82	If I understand recreational commercial more needs to be added	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
83	The area across from the city building should be low or moderate housing.	6/28/2020 5:41 PM
84	Bright blue is way to close to residential. No thank you to having all the hillsides turning into commercial recreational. I don't want anything to take over our slopes that are so beautiful and homes to many types of natural animals and environment . Many deer, fox, many birds of prey and other natural animals enjoy their homes up there. We watch them almost every night and enjoy their sounds at night. I don't want to have the beauty destroyed by trails and domesticated animals and the scar it will put on the beautiful environment	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
85	No one who lives near the on/off ramp of 89 wants to live in the middle of 50 businesses. The traffic is already becoming a nightmare with Maverik and the businesses across to the North.	6/28/2020 4:29 PM
86	Again, the traffic is building and the small town feel does not mix.	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
87	Commercial does not make much sense in the center of our bedroom community. Make it 475 or off of 89. As a real estate investor, hidden commercial access is a non-starter.	6/28/2020 12:32 PM
88	I strongly disagree that there should be a commercial zone in the middle of the city among residential neighborhoods. I strongly disagree with zoning the west gravel pit as commercial highway. A better use of this land would be commercial recreation.	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
89	NA	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
90	Please no commercial in the center of the city	6/28/2020 10:33 AM
91	The Ray's property across from the city office should be low density housing. We don't need businesses or apartments there.	6/27/2020 9:05 PM
92	Rays property across from the city hall should be low density housing. I do not want nonlocal traffic driving through South Weber. If high density housing is built in that location, it will increase the traffic and make walking, riding bikes, and jogging along South Weber drive unsafe. I would like to see the commercial property only on the east side of South Weber by 89. Please keep the west side of South Weber more small town feel.	6/27/2020 9:04 PM
93	no commercial in the center of the city	6/27/2020 7:48 PM
94	As noted, change the Ray's commercial zoning to residential moderate	6/27/2020 5:52 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

95	The center of our city is not a good location for commercial. South Weber drive cannot support the traffic in that area.	6/27/2020 4:49 PM
96	I do not like the Commercial by Ray's old store. I like the commercial at the edge of the city not in the middle. Houses would be better there.	6/27/2020 3:48 PM
97	See earlier comments.	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
98	Commercial at Rays and around that needs to be residential, not high density. Do not agree with multi story commercial. Please consider homes close to commercial, safety.	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
99	no commercial in the center of the city	6/26/2020 7:09 PM
100	Need more commercial	6/26/2020 5:02 PM
101	There is a need for more commercial (Dark Red) space	6/26/2020 5:02 PM
102	We need to capitalize on everything that can be commercial recreation, this does not mean turn the gravel pits into lakes!!!!!! that is a very bad idea	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
103	My only concern about the Commercial zones is the congested traffic it will cause by Maverik.	6/26/2020 1:59 PM
104	none	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
105	no	6/26/2020 12:12 PM
106	I was unable to open a bigger map so I am unsure of location. I like where Maverick is and I wouldn't mind having a small commercial base on the other side of town but not excessively. You should focus on something the kids can do but still have the city profit.	6/26/2020 11:33 AM
107	Overall Too much commercial zoning (Small town-feel, right?) All the commercial zoning (Dark Red) protrudes too deep inside the city boundaries, and the property across from city hall needs to be residential. Commercial Highway goes too far into the city, and is too close to existing neighborhoods. Commercial recreational is too vast. If Commercial Institutional allows for drug, alcohol or behavioral recovery etc. they bring nothing but problems for the community and should never be brought into our small-town feel. Let the surrounding big kid cities provide. I'll gladly pay them to take care of me or my family members with these issues rather than bring them into our community.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
108	Care should be taken whenever approvals are given for putting in a neighborhood-changing eyesore like the La Roca facility. When proposed development bumps right up against an existing home(s), as much care should be taken to preserve the property rights/values of an existing resident as is taken in facilitating the developer! That was NOT done with La Roca. That atrocious building was erected before anyone knew what was happening!! And it has negatively impacted that neighborhood! There are plenty of other places that a gigantic, industrial, metal-monstrosity could be erected without ruining property values. I want to go on record as being very strongly opposed to having that facility in our neighborhood. SO much could be said about that whole issue which has never been adequately explained or resolved for the community. Shame on South Weber City Council for that debacle!!!!	6/25/2020 11:28 PM
109	We do not need commercial within the city. The red zone commercial on the west end is plenty and it is highway commercial. I actually would like to see more recreational on this end of town instead of as commercial as is zoned, especially with the zone of the commercial property within a mile in Uintah. That will bring in a lot of outside traffic, which again this is what residents who moved to South Weber in the first place wanted to avoid.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
110	Highway Commercial west of the Charter School concerns me due to the safety of kids walking to and from school and homes behind this area.	6/25/2020 8:43 PM
111	Highway Commercial west of the Charter School concerns me due to safety of kids walking to and from school and homes directly behind it.	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
112	Same as last comment	6/25/2020 6:10 PM
113	The HWY commercial property will create a huge danger zone for traffic if developed in between the frontage rd and hwy 89 south of south weber dr.	6/25/2020 6:03 PM
114	No mixed use anywhere. We can't handle traffic	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
115	I am strongly disagreeing with more than has been presently started.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

116	I do not think we need more commercial locations. It is a quick drive to Ogden, Layton, Riverdale. The draft plan states adding locally needed good and services should be encouraged. Perhaps adding a hair salon, or small business such as the Physical Therapy or insurance office does not create high volume of traffic. However, our main commercial feed should be along SW Drive which is much wider than the frontage road and close to the 89 or 84 exit without bringing traffic in residential neighborhoods.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
117	No development in plume areas!	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
118	Commercial enterprises seem targeted mostly in the west area of the city again. This affects those who live nearby considerably and disproportionately.	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
119	See comment above	6/25/2020 8:21 AM
120	We need more public recreation lands with trails.	6/24/2020 11:09 PM
121	Do you want to support ALL the needs of the city on the 89 frontage road? It seems like you are willing to ruin the homes All along the frontage road by jamming in too much! What about along highway 84?	6/24/2020 7:10 PM
122	None	6/24/2020 6:23 PM
123	Too much highway commercial. There needs to be more buffer between zones.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
124	The commercial zones aren't sufficiently buffered from homes or schools. There needs to be Way less commercial and highway commercial too.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
125	No comment.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
126	none	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
127	No commercial in use property on the land across from the current South Weber City Hall.	6/24/2020 10:15 AM
128	No HD housing by the Maverik or old Ray's store. If HD housing is elected by the majority of our citizens through this survey, it should be established on South Weber Drive where the road might be able to support the additional traffic flow. If we establish HD housing, we should study the schools to see if they can support this. Is it time to build a Jr High in our area? The light blue areas on the future plan are too early to make an informed decision.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
129	Once again you are getting rid of the small town charm we have always been known for!!	6/23/2020 8:40 PM
130	Like I said earlier. Would prefer to see commercial on the outskirts of town and not in middle of town.	6/23/2020 8:29 PM
131	Way too much commercial for a city our size. I strongly suggest that we don't shove in more bang for our buck. Control city spending and let the citizens enjoy our lifestyles.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
132	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
133	No comment	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
134	We need a jr high put in ..our children have to go to sunset which is quite a drive..it's foolish and not safe.. NO MIXED USE AT ALL	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
135	We need more recreational locations. This will bring in people to enjoy open land, spend money in a hotel or food, fun, etc	6/23/2020 7:25 AM
136	Commercial Recreation areas should be agriculture	6/22/2020 11:09 PM
137	The location looks great on the outskirts of town.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM
138	I do not think there should be commercial across the street from the current city building (where the old Rays store is). That should be residential.	6/22/2020 10:54 PM
139	None	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
140	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
141	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
142	No comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM
143	I do not want to see our slopes developed into anything but it's natural beauty with the wildlife	6/22/2020 4:02 PM


## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

that we watch almost every day and hear the fox calling at night. Take away that beauty and take away the reason we live here. And if this area is being considered for trails I strongly disagree. I walk 10 miles every day 7 days a week, without fail. I dont need money spent on trails to make me healthy. Healthy people are not created by trails. Wanting to be healthy come from inside your own head. All that would do is fill our beautiful landscape with people and their trash and an expensive proposition. This disturbs the our natural resourses.

144	there do not to be any more commercial zones, any any places.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
145	We DO NOT need a road cutting through peoples land they have given over do to Eminent Domain for Transitional Light Industrial !	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
146	no	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
147	The Old Rays Property Should not be commercial or HDH	6/22/2020 11:06 AM
148	Commercial at exits 89 and 84	6/21/2020 8:08 PM
149	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
150	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
151	keep it by 89 and 84	6/20/2020 11:33 AM
152	no commercial properties in the center of the town. Keep at ends instead	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
153	I think the commercial zone in the middle of town where Rays used to be should be changed to R-M. That appears to be a spot zoning. I feel that city hall should move to the outskirts of town near other commercial applications.	6/18/2020 2:23 PM
154	I would like to see commercial to be taken off the map for the center of town! We don't need to try to invite people to travel through our city to get to the limited commercial there! It has been proven that it's hard to make things work there in the last 15 years. Let's leave the commercial at the ends of town where it is easy to access from the freeway and hwy 89 and go right back out!	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
155	The land across the street from the City Offices needs to be homes rather than commercial. This is an eye soar right now.	6/17/2020 7:18 PM
156	we don't want commercial in the middle of the town.	6/17/2020 2:37 PM
157	The placement is somewhat acceptable, but there is far too much commercial.	6/16/2020 10:24 PM
158	We're good with the amount of commercial we have now. We don't need more. The gravel pits should be turned into a lake for additional recreation opportunities. That would make our city really special. The Maverik store would greatly profit.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
159	Get ALL of the heavy commercial out of the neighborhoods and middle of the city. If commercial must be had, locate them near the outskirts and freeway entrances/exits.	6/16/2020 5:51 PM
160	Find another town to dig up	6/16/2020 12:40 PM
161	The commercial center off 475 E will take away from the country feel that is out here. The roadway is extremely small and will bring a ton more traffic through this area.	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
162	475 east, I don't want businesses going in there. we have enough traffic already. Houses would be ok, but not commercial.	6/15/2020 7:05 PM
163	No commercial at rays property. Not ideal location and kids walk home from school right there	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
164	Commercial seems fine just what you allow that goes in it that will cause the stir.	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
165	The battlefield should be zoned as residential, not commercial. It's far too close to the neighborhoods, especially for a hotel.	6/15/2020 4:08 PM
166	None	6/15/2020 12:22 PM
167	NA	6/15/2020 12:20 PM

### Q11 The following 3 maps show different options for the future road network on the west side of the city. Which road network configuration do you prefer?


Answered: 487 Skipped: 240



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
 <p>2A - Limited driveway access collector as frontage road that turns south and connects to South Weber Drive. East Old Fort Road intersects with collector. Canyon Drive dead ends east of intersection. <a href="#">Link to view larger map</a></p>	36.14% 176
 <p>2B - Limited driveway access collector as frontage road with roundabouts and connects straight to neighborhood East Old Fort Road. Collector turns off final roundabout to the south and connects with South Weber Drive. Canyon Drive continues after intersection. <a href="#">Link to view larger map</a></p>	38.40% 187
 <p>2C - Combined A and B. Limited driveway access collector as frontage that turns and connects to South Weber Drive. East Old Fort Road intersects with collector. Canyon Drive continues after intersection. <a href="#">Link to view larger map</a></p>	25.46% 124
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>487</b>

# Q12 Connection to Layton off 1900 East. Which road option do you prefer?

Answered: 504 Skipped: 223



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
 2D - Connection to Layton via future paved local road off 1900 East. <a href="#">Link to view larger map</a>	15.48% 78
 2E - No connection to Layton. Leave road in current condition as dirt access road to water tank only. <a href="#">Link to view larger map</a>	84.52% 426
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>504</b>

## Q13 Additional Comments Regarding Vehicle Transportation

Answered: 270 Skipped: 457

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I don't like any of the options on question 11. Was unable to submit online due to question 11. What other options has the city looked at? Why are you forced to choose an option that the city wants. There has to be other options. This is a poorly written question. Needs to be revoked and on another survey.	7/6/2020 3:13 PM
2	NO ROAD!! This is stupid. we don't need a road!! Also the fact that I couldn't submit my survey online because I'm not going to be FORCED to choose a road option is RIDICULOUS!!	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
3	I don't agree with the options. No new roads intersection 11	7/6/2020 1:28 PM
4	I don't like any of the connections.	7/6/2020 11:44 AM
5	I've seen what unstable conditions on hills can do. Two of my friends lost houses & the road near my childhood home became unstable and created problems for quite some time. It had to be rebuilt. Don't do it, please!	7/6/2020 11:33 AM
6	ONLY	7/6/2020 11:16 AM
7	1. No road to Layton 2. No collector roads. Nothing within city requiring higher than residential speeds (25 - 35 mph)	7/6/2020 10:13 AM
8	We DO NOT need a connection to Layton. This is a wildlife area. It needs to remain as open space with NO public access because it is a high fire danger area & slide/erosion area.	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
9	No connection to Layton. This is a wildlife area. It needs to remain open space with zero public access because of fire danger and the cedar bench slide area.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
10	Feb. 20. 2005 - Landslide took out a barn Feb 28,2014 - Mud slide forces evacuation of 4 families April 23, 2006 - Mud slide destroyed a home & injured a 4 year old little girl. If those aren't 3 good reasons to quit messing around on fault areas, then you must not have children at home.	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
11	No South Bench Drive! Any new roads need to be max speed of 25 MPH. We can do emergency exits to 84 and 89 - we do not need HAFB traffic! Wayne has some good ideas.	7/2/2020 4:45 PM
12	No connection to Layton please! I work on Hill AFB and I DO NOT want this connection.	7/2/2020 4:39 PM
13	Remove East end of 7800 S from being a collector road.	7/2/2020 4:25 PM
14	Add traffic circles to 2C in some location as 2b or Old Fort Road	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
15	No connection.	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
16	Ref #12: This road connector to Layton will damage the communities & homes appeal to all owners on 1900 & the scenic areas that harbor wildlife & wetlands.	7/2/2020 3:55 PM
17	I think it should be possible as an emergency exit. If it remains dirt, but could connect in an emergency. Did you see the traffic back up out of Saratoga Springs in their emergency evacuation?	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
18	#11 - Nothing that connects to South Weber Drive. This is a total waste of everyone's time. Earlier survey said no road to Layton - nothing changed. That it's even on the survey says the mayor listens to no one but herself.	7/2/2020 3:36 PM
19	No connection to Layton. Ever	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
20	Bad deal for South Weber. Unstable Hill	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
21	No connection to Layton.	7/2/2020 11:35 AM
22	No Layton Connection	7/2/2020 11:32 AM
23	Unsafe - Expensive for citizens.	7/2/2020 11:30 AM
24	No connection - not safe or good for South Weber	7/2/2020 11:22 AM
25	No Layton Connection	7/2/2020 11:04 AM
26	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON!!! Costs too much, hill instability, brings too much outside traffic to our neighborhoods, snow will be an issue on this road. This will cause more traffic	7/2/2020 10:53 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

going through our entire city as a shortcut. Causing wear on all of our roads and costing the city taxpayers even more!

27	for question 11 my answer is NO collector road. We don't need a huge road running through our city. Residential road is fine. The beginning of this road is way too wide and should never have happened.	7/2/2020 10:50 AM
28	No roads connecting us to other cities other than the ones we have! We have 7 roads out now - no more traffic - no more funds spent on new roads. Fix the ones we have - no more dead-ends.	7/1/2020 5:26 PM
29	I live on Canyon Dr. and would prefer my street NOT become a through street.	7/1/2020 5:21 PM
30	Q11: "Canyon Drive dead ends" Ridiculous! - some planning? 2E/ Is this why the transportation tax was levied on citizens?	7/1/2020 5:13 PM
31	Homeowners along 1900 E will not be able to get out of their driveways! Residents already speed up & down 1900 E, people driving through will just make it worse. Plus the park activities already congest the roadway and is unsafe due to traffic.	7/1/2020 5:03 PM
32	I feel very strongly about having a connection to East Layton - Yes please! For safety's sake, we need another way in and out of the city.	7/1/2020 4:42 PM
33	A connector road off of 1900 would be a nightmare for those residents.	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
34	I am absolutely opposed to an additional road to Layton to benefit Layton Development - this totally degrades South Weber's small city charm.	7/1/2020 11:48 AM
35	The city wishes to maintain "small city charm" yet will open neighborhoods to through-traffic of any sort. Who will reimburse property owners lost home value? How will taxes increase to pay for & maintain an expensive road? A through way, through residential, family homes to an industrial park makes no sense. The disruption, noise & danger of large vehicles will ruin people's living peace in their own homes.	7/1/2020 11:42 AM
36	I only choose one on question 11 because it was required. I do like the limited driveway access but ending up on a random spot on South Weber Drive doesn't make sense. Is a traffic light going to be put there in the middle of homes so that people can access South Weber Drive.	6/30/2020 11:58 PM
37	I'm Really against a connection to Layton on 1900. Leave it to the State if they ever want to build a regional connection, as that is what this would become if it were implemented	6/30/2020 11:55 PM
38	I really like the roundabouts and love the idea of the collector road not having to go through neighborhoods. I support the road to Layton if we can accomplish something like that as well.	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
39	Although we would love quicker access to Layton, a road going right through our neighborhood, bringing in lots of traffic will make it very unsafe for our children to play. Our children also walk across that street to get to the church. Some kids walk to school, or ride their bikes to school going down 1900 E. Wasn't there another way into Layton that was discussed? Choose an area to put a road that will not funnel into a neighborhood. Why not have another access onto Highway 89 further up, or a frontage road going along side Highway 89 on either the East or the West side. Also, the more stop lights you put in South Weber, the slower the mobility out of South Weber.	6/30/2020 11:00 PM
40	There are no other access roads shown in our General Plan. Not only should this remain an access road but it should then be completely removed from our plan. Comments on the General plan text should be included to explain the citizen involvement that took place with survey results illustrating why it is being removed from the plan.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM
41	I would be extremely unhappy if the 1900 road goes into Layton	6/30/2020 9:35 PM
42	There is no need for a road to connect South Weber to Layton. All that would happen from a road like that is massively increased traffic, pollution, noise, accidents, crime, stress on our services and citizens, and increased costs to everyone but those that use the road itself. Leaving the road as it is or performing , minimal upgrades to turn it into an emergency evacuation route is ALL that is needed. NO LINK TO LAYTON!	6/30/2020 9:21 PM
43	The west end option should have a None of The Above!! Very poor planning and infringing on the rights of the citizens who live there and love where they live!!	6/30/2020 9:17 PM
44	I think this connection would cause a lot of problems especially where we live and I don't see	6/30/2020 9:15 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	any upsides for it.	
45	Strongly no connection to Layton. With all the development going in with the 500 acre East Gate business park South Weber will just become a cut through.	6/30/2020 9:14 PM
46	I disagree with all of the above maps. Please do not try to ruin peoples ways of lives with your terrible planning. South Weber has had terrible planning for years! NO roads line up and now you're planning on ruining the West End and the good people on Canyon Drive! Stop the nonsense!	6/30/2020 9:12 PM
47	BIG NO on access to Layton. It will ruin our city. I understand growth, but this will be detrimental to South Weber	6/30/2020 9:11 PM
48	Question 11 is wrong and should be invalid!! There is no case where a road should go through there. It would be dangerous to connect there and would require property being condemned. IF this road was ever needed and IF the owners wanted to sell it, we could make an amendment to the general plan. It should not even be in here but you force us to chose. The connection to Layton should have died when we voted against it before.	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
49	I hate the above maps. My vote is none of the above, but unfortunately there was not an option for this! Once again, when it involved someones property you should involve them in the choice!	6/30/2020 9:05 PM
50	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON	6/30/2020 9:01 PM
51	I do not want the road to Layton	6/30/2020 9:00 PM
52	No connection to LAYTON - from unstable hill slopes to contamination that we do not need to be disturbing - take it off the general plan!	6/30/2020 8:47 PM
53	I am FIRMLY against a road to Layton	6/30/2020 8:31 PM
54	We do not need collector roads we can have nice residential roads that connect to different subdivisions. We don't need round about a people can barely figure out how to work the sweeping T on 475 E and 6650 S. IT IS NOT SOUTH WEBER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ALLEVIATE TRAFFIC OFF OF 89!!!! We are not a pass through town!	6/30/2020 8:30 PM
55	Connect to Layton via existing frontage road.	6/30/2020 8:20 PM
56	I can not stress this enough - NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON!! shut it down!	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
57	It needs to be paved, but gated for emergency use only so that in an event of a disaster we can get out in passenger vehicles.	6/30/2020 7:11 PM
58	There are too many geological issues with the land that the proposed road would be built on. Currently, with it being a limited access for the water tank, there isn't a lot of traffic disturbing the land and causing major geological issues such as land slides.	6/30/2020 7:02 PM
59	Keep this road as a dirt road. DO NOT BUILD SOUTH BENCH DRIVE!! It is too expensive. It will bring too much outside traffic to and through our city. It will not be safe to start excavating contaminated soil from Hill Air Force Base!!	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
60	I am absolutely opposed to a paved connection to Layton. We need a CERT emergency plan in place with designated people who have a key or combination to unlock the gate to our current "dirt" maintenance road that connects to Layton. This would reduce the cost and provide an emergency egress out of our city if needed.	6/30/2020 6:26 PM
61	Just bought a home on 1900 and in no way want road to go through to Layton. With grandchildren visiting to dangerous having all that traffic on 1900. and being a long time resident of south weber knowing the history of the hills and land to the south that being very unstable it is not in the best interest of South Weber or its residents to put a connector road on this land. Plus all the other negative it brings with it. NO NO NO TO ROAD	6/30/2020 6:17 PM
62	Really don't like the idea of making 1900 connect all the way through to Layton.	6/30/2020 5:35 PM
63	Please do not approve the road connection option to Layton. I see kids biking, people jogging, (including myself and my kids) etc. on that road all the time and with a connection road built there I believe it will drastically change the small town feel of that neighborhood. People already tend to go a little faster than necessary on that road, and with a connection road, you will see a greater flow of traffic, speeding violations and potential pedestrian accidents.	6/30/2020 5:17 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

64	Not seeing value in a Layton connector road, either for hazard evacuation or economics. If the city pursues this for an evacuation route, need to show how this route effectively reduces the risk for a credible hazard -- haven't seen this yet.	6/30/2020 5:03 PM
65	Why do we not have a bike lane on plan for South Weber drive ! It is so narrow and currently so dangerous for bikes! or restrict bikes to roads other than South weber Drive.	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
66	I don't like any of the choices. I chose the ones I thought would have the least impact	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
67	Please see The SWC General Plan Update 2020 Lines 658-663 concerning 1900 E. acknowledges that 1900 E. is considered a serious safety hazard at the bluff near 7550 S. Why would anyone want to increase traffic in an SWC acknowledged safety hazard area.	6/30/2020 4:25 PM
68	My vote is NO Layton connection.	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
69	No Connection to Layton!	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
70	NO NEW CONNECTION TO LAYTON. 89 works and is being expanded. A different connection is a waste of money. The beauty of South Weber is the small town feel close to the city. Layton connection DESTROYS that and ruins the value of the community.	6/30/2020 3:34 PM
71	I have a strong opinion on this. It is a NOOOOO!!!	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
72	NO NEED FOR LAYTON CONNECTION. 89 WORKS	6/30/2020 3:21 PM
73	Do not want a connection to Layton through 1900 east.	6/30/2020 2:52 PM
74	I prefer no connection to Layton. A connection would open up us to a large increase in cross county traffic especially during rush hours with traffic being routed via Google and Waze.	6/30/2020 2:50 PM
75	I choose NONE OF THE ABOVE! WHY MUST I CHOOSE ONE? Take this road off the map. The city does not have any other "access roads" showing on the map. This gives a false representation of the roads purpose or status.	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
76	Remove the East end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/30/2020 2:31 PM
77	NUMBER 11. MY VOTE IS FOR NONE OF THE THREE. NO ROAD. YOUR POORLY PREPARED SURVEY SHOULD HAVE AN OPTION FOR NO ROAD.	6/30/2020 1:34 PM
78	I don't know why we're doing this again. We already told you we don't want it.	6/30/2020 1:17 PM
79	If a road to Layton needs to happen I would prefer to complete the frontage road.	6/30/2020 12:49 PM
80	Way too much traffic would be brought in for the road! We bought here BECAUSE it was quiet not because it would become a thoroughfare. How would you like it if I did that right next to YOUR house?	6/30/2020 12:36 PM
81	Very strongly opposed to a connection to Layton!! When I see Highway 89 backed up, I definitely do not want to see half that mess diverted through the middle of our little city. No connection!!	6/30/2020 11:48 AM
82	Non	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
83	There has been much discussion about another route to leave the city, but this extension will bring many more people who will use it as a shortcut during rush hour, to bypass Hwy 89. We do not need a second route into Layton, and the traffic that it would cause would be terrible. This is a really BAD idea.	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
84	Much has been said about residents using this route if installed, but more traffic will be from people using this route to short cut around traffic on Hwy 89. Every night when the rush hour happens, we could expect a solid line of cars coming down 1900 E. to bypass Hwy 89. This is a VERY BAD idea.	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
85	We need an alternative route in and out of south Weber besides 89 and 84	6/30/2020 8:43 AM
86	I vote no to the connection to Layton.	6/30/2020 5:20 AM
87	Please, no connection to Layton. It would decrease the quality of our lives and decrease the values of our property.	6/30/2020 5:18 AM
88	I think that connecting to Layton off of 1900 East would be very detrimental to our city for so	6/30/2020 3:02 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

many reasons. To bring more traffic to 1900 and to South Weber Drive would not be a good idea at all. We already have too much traffic on South Weber Drive as it is. It's dangerous for our children and it will devalue homes on these roads even more than they have already been devalued because of the current traffic. I have lived at 1900 and South Weber Dr. for almost 39 years and have seen the small-town charm of the city change every year due to the amount of traffic we have on this road. I cannot even sit on my front porch with family or friends and have a decent conversation because of the noise from cars and large trucks going by. I raised three children here and they were always safe but no more. I could have easily lost two of my grandchildren who both tried to run into the street onto South Weber Drive recently. People drive on this road at 40, 50, and 60 miles/hr. My mail box is across the street from my house for the convenience of the mail carrier so in order to pick up my mail, I have to run very quickly in order to not be hit by passing cars. If this road to Layton is put in, the traffic could be as much as 7,000 additional cars on South Weber Dr. every day. Just last week I watched approx. 30 semi-trucks full of dirt drive past my house every day for three days. I then spent a day cleaning up the dirt caused by these trucks as South Weber only cleans South Weber Dr. and its curbs every once and awhile. How many more semis will be driving through our neighborhoods if we end up connecting to Layton near a very large industrial park which is slotted to be built at the top of the hill near Hill Air Force and near this new proposed access road off of 1900? If this access is put in to Layton City, I will get to look forward to having a street light in front of my home where upon, I will have the joy of having a string of cars stopped in front of my house waiting for the light to change. Why do we need more traffic on our streets? It makes no sense if we really do care about having small-town charm here in South Weber.

89	No connection to Layton!!!!	6/30/2020 2:56 AM
90	Many firmly against Layton Connection still support locked gate Emergency egress onto I-84 (1-2 locations) and Hwy 89 (add a locked gate at old Hwy 89 entrance at 8200 S).	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
91	NO road to Layton!	6/29/2020 11:49 PM
92	Against the road to Layton!!!!	6/29/2020 11:46 PM
93	A connection to Layton will be a nightmare for the residents of our city! Unwanted traffic, more traffic more crime, speeding on 1900 is already bad, can't imagine what it would be like with a connection to Layton.	6/29/2020 11:26 PM
94	A Connection to Layton is not what I envision for South Weber. It will bring a lot of unwanted traffic in the neighborhoods and a lot of other negative side effects. Don't want it, hope it never goes through!	6/29/2020 11:20 PM
95	Strongly disagree that there should be a connection to Layton. There's not one positive outcome in my mind with a road to Layton!!!	6/29/2020 11:12 PM
96	The Layton connection road is too expensive, too steep and creates potential risks for land slides, accidents, auto-pedestrian collisions and would be a very busy through way.	6/29/2020 10:22 PM
97	NO connection to Layton on that steep road!!	6/29/2020 9:59 PM
98	NO LAYTON CONNECTION NOW OR EVER!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
99	Can we please add some speed bumps to major/minor collector roads that go through neighborhoods with young children? People speed.	6/29/2020 9:06 PM
100	I do not approve of any access to 1900E. The added traffic through SW is not desirable. The hillside is unstable and will be a money pit for residents. This is a vanity project which will cost irreparable harm to value of people's homes along 1900. This has also been voted down before. It is also inappropriate this survey requires you to select a preferred map when clearly the majority of residents do not want the hillside developed and a major road brought through the middle of the community.	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
101	Please do not build connection to Layton, thank you.	6/29/2020 8:02 PM
102	No connection to Layton is necessary. Highway 89 and I-84 are close enough. It doesn't make sense to turn 1900 into a bypass road with more traffic for the sake of saving a few minutes.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM
103	No connection should be put in to Layton on 1900 and it should remain a dirt paved road. It doesn't make sense to change 1900 into a heavy traffic road as it is a quiet residential area and is not worth saving a few minutes.	6/29/2020 7:52 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

104	Remove the East end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
105	Remove the east end of 7800 south as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 7:30 PM
106	Remove the east end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 7:12 PM
107	Remove the east end of 7800 south as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 6:13 PM
108	I strongly oppose extending the road past the Posse Grounds further east. South Weber does NOT need a road to Layton. If it is not geologically feasible, why is it even being considered?	6/29/2020 4:43 PM
109	No connection to Layton please. No thoroughfare. If it bothers people then open another exit into US 89S at south end of 2700 E. At least they can get to the base quick enough. Won't help their return trip.	6/29/2020 4:41 PM
110	I do not want to see an increase in our property taxes again. the last increase of 99 percent was enough	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
111	I do not think we need anymore access to south weber we need to leave it as it is. It is hard enough to get on and off south weber dr now I could not imagine with more traffice	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
112	Remove the east end of 7800 south as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
113	No connection road to Layton!!	6/29/2020 3:36 PM
114	I do not want a connection road to Layton.	6/29/2020 3:17 PM
115	not in favor of city development of these roads at this time. only at expense of future developer	6/29/2020 3:04 PM
116	I feel that the first part of this is a trick question and I am not in favor of city development of these roads at this time and only at expense of future developer.	6/29/2020 2:30 PM
117	Another connection in/out of the City is VITAL.	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
118	Please do not put in a road to Layton. It will bring too much traffic and make the roads in my neighborhood more dangerous. This potential connection road to Layton has no benefit to the city of south Weber and its citizens.	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
119	Holy Cow We already told you that we don't want this connection. How many times will you ask. Like a child wanting something and goes back and forth from parent to parent until they get their way. We are adults. My understanding is that some people came to our officials and said they were wanting the connection but didn't do the survey. That is irresponsible on their part. If I hear another word about the silent majority being all in favor of the connection you are wrong. That silent majority will probably be on both sides but thinking that they all are for the road is ridiculous. We , that spoke, said "no". My experience on the many people that I spoke to almost all of them that did not take the survey were afraid to go against the people they cared for in high places.	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
120	Dumb ass survey. Number 11 does not have a "no road" option. I against any road under Number 11.	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
121	I do not want a connection to Layton. This will not be safe for the residents and children of South Weber. I do not want to pay for it to be built and maintained. Please take it off the general plan.	6/29/2020 12:25 PM
122	I live one culdesac off of 1900. My kids use 1900 E all the time to ride bikes, walk to friends' houses, and use skateboards. This will not be safe. I have driven down mutton hollow which would be a similar street to what is being proposed. Residential on both sides. 25 miles per hour. It also slopes downhill. I have found it extremely difficult to maintain 25 miles per hour while driving down mutton hollow. I actually had to put forth great effort. Please take this. connection off the general plan.	6/29/2020 12:20 PM
123	Is there an option where a road can be made and used in an evacuation instance? Where certain people would hold keys and unlock the gate for people to have an additional access in the unfortunate need for evacuation. This would be something I would consider.	6/29/2020 11:58 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

124	make it a toll road	6/29/2020 11:34 AM
125	Part of the appeal of South Weber is the small town feels. The dead end roads and that you have to take a few extra minutes to get to layton or south ogden but it keeps other people out of our city. We do not need a road to layton we have 2 Highway 89 and the freeway. We do not need more traffic in the middle of our city to clog up our roads this will not bring us more revenue but will bring us more accidents, more crime and more speeding on our roads. More traffic jams more people we don't want this.	6/29/2020 11:28 AM
126	The point of South Weber is that is off the path. We knew moving here that we would have to spend 5 extra minutes to get out but it was worth the inconvenience to raise our kids in a small town. We DO NOT need a road to Layton to allow other people to come into our town and use our roads and endanger our children and residents. We have enough trouble with outsiders in ONE AirBNB and you want to invite 7k more people to speed through our cities and bring NO Benefit to residence. Not to mention the dangers of messing with that hill and the chemicals, the speeding that already happens on 1900 and SWD. We Do not need a road to Layton. The cons outweighs the benefits. Yes we had a fire but EVERYONE got out just fine we also had a tornado and everyone got out fine the road brings more harm to residents. Do not add a Highway, Do not add a Road to nowhere, DO NOT add a road to Layton and do not bring MORE danger to 1900. We moved here because it IS NOT Riverdale, Layton, Ogden, Kaysville, Bountiful. If I wanted to live in those cities I would. We picked South Weber because it was the small town feel and off the beaten path a great "bubble" to raise our children. If I wanted a busy city I would have moved to Layton.	6/29/2020 10:37 AM
127	do not put in a connection road to Layton	6/29/2020 9:56 AM
128	It would seem prudent to have another point of egress from So. Weber to Layton without having to go on Hwy 89.	6/29/2020 8:24 AM
129	The connection to Layton would decrease our quality of life. It would bring increased noise and air pollution, wear and tear on our roads, safety hazards, and congest our city, and decrease the value of our properties. This has to be a land developer's idea. SW City should be for the residents, not the people trying to make money at any cost. Please do not connect Layton to South Weber via paved connector road. This would be tragic.	6/29/2020 5:38 AM
130	DO NOT LIKE ONLY OF THE CHOICES FOR QUESTION 11.	6/29/2020 1:10 AM
131	NO ROADS to Layton!!!!	6/28/2020 8:41 PM
132	I strongly disagree with a road to Layton using 1900 E. We don't need extra traffic or crime in our small town. My kids ride bikes on 1900E, let's keep our kids safe and not bring thousands of extra cars to our small road. I don't mind driving the 7 extra minutes to get to Layton, that's why I live here. Country feel but close enough to the city. Let's keep it that way.	6/28/2020 6:34 PM
133	Strongly disagree with any roads being constructed to access Layton. If I wanted easy access to Layton, I would move to Layton. Keep the South Weber small town atmosphere.	6/28/2020 6:30 PM
134	Any direct road to Layton will not be safe and will ruin the small town. Too much traffic is also dangerous. As proven, the hillside is not safe and will cost the city too much for upkeep. Will decrease SW property value.,	6/28/2020 6:29 PM
135	Strongly DONOT WANT A ROAD CONNECTING TO Layton	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
136	Never ever make a connector to Layton, it would ruin our city!	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
137	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON NOW OR EVER	6/28/2020 5:41 PM
138	Absolutely NO NO NO NO. I am so annoyed that this is even being brought up again. We already overwhelmingly said "NO" How many times do we need to say it!!! The "Silent Majority" doesn't mean they are on the city side of this issue. In my opinion, If anything people are afraid to speak out against the Major, which is sad in itself, because she is personally loved. But at a certain point you must stand for what you feel is right. We do not want everyones traffic from laytons new industrial area.. or any of them...We do not want to be a short cut..no Thankyou. No Thankyou to any of Hill Field AFB Traffic Holy Cow, No! We are Military People and we know exactly what Hill traffic could mean....No No No As far as any of the new roads proposed. I feel that there should have been an option to say no to them instead of picking one. Why can't we make those decisions if it come to that. Not go ahead and cut through our citizens properties through emanate domain. I understand needing to get to neighborhoods but It sure seems like we are getting to them just fine now. I don't see any traffic jams anywhere now. The	6/28/2020 5:33 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

only place i see traffic jams is at High Mark because I have walked past it for several years in the mornings. Even that is totally manageable. As far as the scare treatment the city tries to promote about being locked into South Weber with no escape that is just ridiculous. I was in the middle of the fire situation and we were very controlled and fine. if worst came to worse a simple opening of a fence on a dirt road is available in an emergency. Simply trying to just scare people is irresponsible and unfair and I feel dishonest. I've lived here for 30 + years. 28 years ago maybe 89 had its challenges but it couldn't be safer and with the dedicated lane to South Weber it couldn't be easier to get in an out of South Weber. Round abouts are a waste of money. We aren't that busy

139	These roads are disastrous ideas and will ruin the lives of many who have built their homes here.	6/28/2020 5:17 PM
140	No road to Layton.	6/28/2020 5:17 PM
141	No connection to Layton, worst idea ever!	6/28/2020 5:09 PM
142	7800 South should NOT be a collector road considered in the future with a connection to View Drive. Not every street in South Weber needs to connect. View Drive and Peachwood residents already have access to South Weber drive in multiple directions and connecting to 7800 S will ruin one of the older and more established streets in South Weber.	6/28/2020 4:29 PM
143	Remove the west end of 7800 South as being a future collector road. I live on that street and I DO NOT want more traffic coming through. There's no need for it.	6/28/2020 4:18 PM
144	Remove the east end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
145	Remove the East end of 7800 south as being a future collector road and do not connect to view dr.	6/28/2020 2:00 PM
146	Absolutely NO road connecting to Layton ever	6/28/2020 1:02 PM
147	There is no way the hill above 1900 or 1900 itself could accommodate the amount of traffic that will find this road. It will destroy the environment as 89 has our east side.	6/28/2020 12:32 PM
148	In the general plan draft it states: "619 It is important that major transportation routes through South Weber are protected 620 from unnecessary traffic motion." This should be taken into consideration when considering an access road to Layton. This will increase unnecessary traffic in the whole city as people use that road to commute THROUGH the city. This connection will never remain a "paved local road", but become a major commuter road by people seeking to avoid the traffic on highway 89. There will be many people using this road who do not live in our city, bringing all sorts of safety and crime problems that come with having people who don't live in the city commute through the city. This should NOT be an option and should be taken OUT of the general plan entirely. Additionally it should be taken off of Layton's general plan and the Wasatch Front plan. Furthermore, the general plan states: "659 1900 East Street is an extremely important collector road. It has a serious safety hazard 660 at approximately 7550 South. Here it traverses a steep bluff which reduces sight 661 distance at the intersection with 7600 South and encourages traffic to speed as cars 662 travel north down the hill. It should be a priority to evaluate the possibility to mitigate 663 this safety hazard." This should also be strongly taken into consideration, considering you want to bring thousands of commuters through the city ON THIS DANGEROUS ROAD! Also, ample consideration should be given to the costs that this would bring to the city in building, maintaining, and making/keeping this road safe. Consideration of the contaminants found on/in the hillside should also be taken. This is not a safe or wise plan.	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
149	Frontage road is the best plan from I84 to SW Dr. No road to Layton in any way shape or form!	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
150	Leave dirt road beyond 1900 E as access to tank and emergency egress as needed.	6/28/2020 10:33 AM
151	This 1900 connection is a terrible idea and a waste of our communities resources not too mention the strain it would put on a already busy street. We do not need to give Layton and Riverdale a thruway and most the people that live here don't mind the extra few minutes. One of the best set ups for any residential area is eliminating thru opportunities to protect its residents. Put the money into the trails and let us keep driving a extra few minutes when we want to go to Layton.	6/28/2020 9:53 AM
152	2A looks like it would be the best to protect children walking to school from the DR Horton neighborhood. The round-about option doesn't look like it would deter cars from speeding	6/27/2020 9:05 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

through the DR Horton neighborhood. 2B is a bad idea. We don't need a connection to Layton via 1900 E. I think it would for sure be used by non south weber residents and bring unnecessary traffic through our city.

153	2A would keep the children in the DR Horton subdivision more safe while they walk to and from school and play outside. We do not want a high volume of traffic coming through the neighborhood. The roundabouts in option 2B would be an expense that wouldn't stop cars from driving fast and going into the DR Horton subdivision. Option 2E keeps the small town charm of South Weber. It protects our city from high levels of traffic driving through to get home or shopping in Roy, Riverdale, Washing Terrace, Ogden, and South Ogden. We have lots of children in South Weber it would be devastating if anything happened (kidnapping, auto/pedestrian accident, sexual abuse) to them because more people are driving through our town and seeing all the children out playing. Please only build an emergency exit dirt road and keep our citizens of all ages safe!	6/27/2020 9:04 PM
154	Make dirt road emergency fire road with breakaway lock/keypad.	6/27/2020 5:52 PM
155	For safety purposes I like the idea of a road to Layton. a small country road	6/27/2020 3:48 PM
156	<p>First of all, thank you for your community service. It can be a thankless and difficult job at times and carries with it, some sleepless nights, as well as dis-pleased citizens, and many differing points of views. As city representatives you are responsible to listen many points of view, study the issues and then create the "master/general" plan for our city's future. I appreciate the challenges you have. I would like to make some comments for you all to consider, specifically regarding the transportation plan. I know there has been a lot of public input against "South Bench Drive" and how it relates to the general plan. I just offer some other things to consider. Almost 20 years ago, there was a process called Envision Utah 2020, where state planners collected public input on what our state should look like by the year 2020, which planned in detail a master transportation plan. This included the Legacy highway, East-West corridors between I-15 and the future Legacy North, Antelope drive improvements, 2000 West in Davis County and many others. We now have their history and lessons-learned to review and apply to our "Envision South Weber 2040" to consider. As we plan for our city's future, we can learn from Envision Utah 2020. We know most of the Davis and Weber County transportation projects, such as Legacy, Antelope drive improvements, 2000 West in Davis County, Highway 89 and many others have proven to be very expensive and often later than needed. The delays and/or lack of planning for the future has increased the cost of their development extremely. There is much history showing the cost to expand/widen roads, tear out existing homes and move utilities often costs more than 80% of the total cost of the roads. If we plan for such a road, we can determine the most logical location, plan for and improve utilities along the best route, have developers share it the cost as we progress along it's route, apply for grants, have other agencies share in the costs, etc. Transportation studies do show increased traffic as population increases. For example, Highway 89 was becoming a challenge even prior to the current 3-year construction. Even with improvements, it will continue to be and adventure. Alternatives will be vital under normal conditions. We know it is logical non-South Weber folks are most of the traffic, however, we "South Weberites" also need to get to and from our homes to work, shopping and wherever we go. All the planned development by the East gate of HAFB will be employment for our citizens also. A few minutes of saved time for many of our citizens could result. The road going up the slope does require additional engineering and design work. Planning and research will be required. We need to keep options open and plan accordingly. One possibility would see if the State would consider making it a state highway, as is South Weber Drive. Safety, maintenance and snow-removal will require consideration. Another consideration for continuing to include the South Bench Drive as an option, including the possibility of using the 1900 East connection is emergency services. With any kind of complication on Highway 89, I-84 or even South Weber Drive, other options are very important to consider. Fire experts will demonstrate the importance of what just 3-5 minutes of delay means on responding to a fire. Medical experts can explain the difference just a couple of minutes mean on responding to a medical emergency. This consideration may sound a little dramatic, but it is a real factor to be considered. We all hope there will be no major disaster, but we must consider the possibility. Another consideration is environmental issues. Consider the additional 5-10 minutes of automobile engines running each day while the take the more roundabout routes of Riverdale Road or highway 89 to HAFB or North Layton and multiply it by several thousand each day. Environmentalists could calculate the effects on our air quality. There are arguments for and against each one of these considerations. Several considerations could qualify for grants and government assistance to fund our future transportation plans. I know some of these plans effect some of our citizens much more than others, but, when</p>	6/27/2020 11:48 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

looking into the future, reviewing potential options are key to this process. Thank you for your time and consideration

157	This road should be a toll road for non-residence and free for residence of South Weber. No access for large trucks.	6/27/2020 11:25 AM
158	The connection to Layton should be a toll road for non residents and free to use for all South Weber residents. No access for large trucks.	6/27/2020 11:24 AM
159	I do NOT favor the road. If people are in a hurry to get to Layton, they should move there! Plenty of packed neighborhoods for them to move to!	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
160	If 1900 to Layton is not an option city needs to find another north south option	6/26/2020 10:43 PM
161	I am adamant about NOT having connection to Layton on 1900 E. or any other area. South Weber is small and does not need to be a drive through town!!! Please respect our opinion. Thank you...	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
162	It's WRONG that we were required to choose one of only three options in Question #11. I didn't want to choose any options in Question #11, because I don't believe we need anything but the frontage road, or Old Fort Road. All of these options require more development than seems necessary until and unless that farmland is sold and developed.	6/26/2020 10:10 PM
163	It's WRONG that we were required to choose one of only three options in Question #11. I didn't want to choose any options in Question #11, because I don't believe we need anything but the frontage road, or old fort road. All of these options require more development than seems necessary until and unless that farmland is sold and developed.	6/26/2020 10:08 PM
164	The Layton connection is the scariest part of this entire proposal. I believe the entire city would suffer from too much traffic in the morning and evening. I would move because I would be a couple houses away from the busiest street. I moved here for th light local traffic that would change South Weber into a through city and I don't want to be in a city like that	6/26/2020 9:20 PM
165	I really like the location of 2a except don't like the roundabouts. It doesn't make sense to put them on a frontage road with the only option to go south and East (the freeway is to the north). 2d is an absolute necessity. We need another way in and out of the city for emergency egress and I don't see anywhere else it would be possible. If this city continues to grow, we will need to do this sooner or later and it will cost much more later. We need it now.	6/26/2020 9:05 PM
166	NO NO	6/26/2020 6:37 PM
167	No limited driveway access, just better design of subdivisions, need to add connection from 725 East to South Weber drive, get rid of roundabouts on residential roads, clean up the mess at 6650 and 475 and make that a round about. (what a waste of engineering fees and poor design) Replace traffic light with a roundabout on South Weber drive and frontage road, (it would have to be designed to accommodate the larger trucks and trailers, which is possible). Too many people pull off on frontage road going east in front of east bound traffic that have the right of way, it could help to remove South Weber electric sign that blocks the clear vision triangle and put a sign no left hand turns on red light. With growth which will come creates more traffic get smart on designs Get that south bound connection from 1900 east to Layton done immediately. We get to go north on Adams avenue and we have always had Hyw 89 and Riverdale for east and west, let's be smart and allowed to a south bound access. South Bench road over the hill to Layton was a very bad idea, there was no clear property owner that wanted that road on their property or development. Yet South Weber continue ignores a road that is already there going south. we have the 60 foot right of way (its legal) yet because of former city councils decided to only grade it to 30 feet, wish South Weber could really show how wide 60 feet is. You can always do rolled curbs and no sidewalks. If safety is your concern get rid of another mess that another council created on Peachwood Way and 7570, talk about blind corners in both directions. I guess we have made mistakes, let quit making more, get smart and quick letting a very small minority tell you what to do and do the wishes of the silent majority they are the ones that elected you.	6/26/2020 2:26 PM
168	I hardly ever use this exit (I-84 to SWD) so I don't feel it should be my decision. Those that live closer and use it should have that right to say what they want. Also i want removed the east end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do NOT connect to View Drive. I along with neighbors would find this to be a disaster to this small street and already have way too much traffic coming from the Daniel Drive road that now comes from peachwood dr.	6/26/2020 1:59 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

169	A Layton connection would be devastating to our community. Many children are required to walk down 1900 to get to SW Elementary. Too steep. Too many driveways on 1900. Too much traffic. Too high a price to pay for convenience.	6/26/2020 1:18 PM
170	none	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
171	No connection to Layton!	6/26/2020 12:12 PM
172	no connection to Layton	6/26/2020 11:56 AM
173	This should not be on the survey again. We have made it clear we do not want this road	6/26/2020 11:12 AM
174	We should never put a road connection to Layton.	6/26/2020 10:54 AM
175	The fact that this connection to Layton is still on this survey is a testament that some in our city office and some of our elected didn't value the opinions of the citizens who did the last survey. Rationalize all you want, but to ignore 65% of your respondents is just wrong. We will never need a road to Layton and if we ever connect us to Layton you have destroyed our small town feel, divided the city in half, and have destroyed the lives of those who live along that road. Regarding the other roads and potential neighborhoods: The more we can keep subdivisions separated from other subdivision, and only connect them to connectors (South Weber Drive etc) The more secluded and secure each subdivision can stay. THAT is Small-Town feel and Charm!	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
176	We have voted numerous time to not have the connectors to Layton. This needs to stop.	6/26/2020 7:54 AM
177	It is true that South Weber needs another way out in case of emergency. However, it will be nearly impossible to make a connection through South Weber to Layton in a way that will not turn into a thoroughfare for folks who just want a speedway shortcut. The solution to this could be this (dirt road to the water tank) limited use road that could be gated and available in case of an emergency.	6/25/2020 11:28 PM
178	It'd be great to have our frontage road, east of hwy 89 connect to Layton. Not nearly as many homes would be impacted.	6/25/2020 10:54 PM
179	'It is important to plan for future roads to ensure connectivity throughout the city'.... Says who? We don't want to be connected to Layton City. The residents who moved here, and are attracted to this area including myself like the small town feel of South Weber. If I wanted to be connected to Layton, I would have moved there. I haven't talked to one person who wants this road. I am quite upset that this is even on the table. Besides that, South Weber can't even maintain the roads we have. They are horrible! They haven't been resurfaced in years. I feel like I am riding a roller coaster whenever I drive on 8150 South because of the bumps, divots and hills. This brings me to my next comment. We pay plenty in taxes. Where is this money going? Our city is not being improved. Adding a major connection to Layton is not going to improve anything that is already here. Maybe the cities vision for the future is to improve what we already have. Paint the fence so to speak. It needs it, without a new road. That will not make South Weber Charming. It will make it comparable to Washington Terrace.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
180	There is absolutely no good reason to have a connection from South Weber to Layton.	6/25/2020 10:27 PM
181	Absolutely no connection to Layton. This road would cause irreversible damage to our city. This would encourage commuters bypassing 89 into our city streets and placing burdens on all our neighborhood streets. This is a terrible location for a road with all the houses facing 1900. Every street along 1900 and Deer Run would take the burden of this traffic. This will negatively impact South Weber.	6/25/2020 9:01 PM
182	Against a connection to Layton. This is a terrible location for a road with all the houses along this path. The frontage road on the east side of 89 needs to connect to 193 long before this road is discussed.	6/25/2020 8:51 PM
183	Absolutely against a connection to Layton. 100's of families and their homes would be at risk of crime, speeding, noise, safety and loss of property values. All roads connected to 1900 would be at risk.	6/25/2020 8:43 PM
184	Absolutely 100% no connection! Risks outweigh the benefits to the citizens of this community, especially those who live along 1900 East and surrounding side streets.	6/25/2020 8:30 PM
185	No connection to Layton. The hill isn't stable and continuing to try and try to get the collector road pushed and 1900 after the first survey is a waste of money.	6/25/2020 7:49 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

186	#11- there is no need for this "frontage road". This is horrible planning. This will connect right into a school zone. There is no noise barrier against 84 and on top of that you want to put a frontage road. That's awful. This is only going to pt the school kids in more danger while crossing South Weber Drive. The traffic is going to be backed up into the neighborhood. This stems from the awful sweating "t" that everyone is already upset about. It's not safe. Now you want to take that road and extend it, ruining our farmlands and agriculture, just to run it through a quiet neighborhood and then pop it out at the elementary school zone. I don't agree with any of the options listed. I DO NOT agree with ANY OF THE OPTIONS listed. However it won't let me finish the survey without picking one options. Very sly way to get your votes I guess. #12 again there is no need for this connection road on 1300. This is being more traffic through our otherwise quiet neighborhoods. This is not a safe road as is, so let's add a connection and more traffic? That makes no sense. I feel like the we, the people of South Weber, have voiced our opinion about this connection road and no one is listening. No connection.	6/25/2020 6:07 PM
187	We do not want to connect to Layton! Too much traffic, kids catch the bus on that road! That is an absolute no brainer!	6/25/2020 3:42 PM
188	No connection from Ogden to Layton through South Weber. !!!!!!!!!!!!!!! We can't afford to maintain it.	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
189	Please do not connect us. It will increase traffic and take more the feeling you are saying you want to preserve.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
190	Do not connect to Layton!	6/25/2020 2:04 PM
191	Question #11, please disregard my answer 2C. I do not live in the area and have no knowledge of needed traffic flow. This should have hard a NO OPINION option. Question #12, we are strongly against the road to Layton mainly due to all the issues documented in the General Plan Update. The south/southwest slopes with very high risk of landslides. Stripping the land will increase erosion and flooding. Development will reduce the community overall quality of life. toxic waste in the soil. Cost 2 to 4 million, who is paying for this? Proposal that even large trucks could use the road? Even Legacy Highway did not allow large trucks until recently and the community was very unhappy. Very bad idea for safety reasons. I do use the Adams Toll road and feel it is well established. I have no issue paying \$1 when I need another driving option. As mentioned I drove to SLC daily for 30 years. There were several traffic and environmental issues (tornado, bad storms) shutdowns in SLC. It did not matter how many traffic patterns offered, everyone was just stuck to wait out the issue. I do not see adding this road will solve any issue. We have seen no value for the cost only negative impact. Would we really put safety, which is well documented, and current property owners at risk to save 5 minutes in our day? I would not. We do need a well documented evacuation plan and training in our town. To us, this should be high on our priority list.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
192	NO drive-thru roads,highways, or commercial roads connecting us to Layton andOgden!	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
193	Connection to Layton road proposal has too many concerns about safety associated with it.	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
194	Keep traffic flow low	6/25/2020 8:49 AM
195	I am against a connection with Layton through the city. A frontage road on highway 89 would be preferred and acceptable.	6/25/2020 8:21 AM
196	Remove the east end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/24/2020 11:51 PM
197	We need a connection to Layton. I was very disappointed the original South Bench drive location was shut down. The 1900 E. connection isn't nearly as good of a location for the connection, but it is better than nothing. If we don't get this connection on our master plan, we won't be able to get federal or state grants to help pay for it. It is very short-sighted of our city officials to cave to a small but loud community activist group that's goal is to isolate South Weber and ultimately hurt our cities health.	6/24/2020 8:19 PM
198	NO COLLECTION TO LAYTON. This has been asked and answered. My grandchildren keep asking the same question until they get what they want, but that doesn't make it right. On collector roads, it is not the responsibility of the city to develop roads for future development or to accommodate new development. Developers should bear cost of the road necessary to accommodate their development and the impact their development may create in the future.	6/24/2020 7:27 PM
199	None	6/24/2020 6:23 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

200	1900 E. should NOT connect! I chose the 2B map because I had to choose one. But I don't like it either.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
201	Please never suggest this connection to Layton. We don't need anymore traffic.	6/24/2020 4:43 PM
202	I don't want 1900 E to be connected to layton. There would be way too much traffic coming from Layton. There are alot of kids that ride bikes or skateboards down 1900. It's not safe to put any more traffic there. It's also too high of a grade. I understand the need to plan for roads by Old Fort Road. I think that this needs to be reworked though. I chose that option because there wasn't any other option to choose.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
203	I don't desire to have this as a connector to Layton and a paved road, as this will immensely increase the traffic through South Weber, which will cause a drain on our road maintenance and safety of our community.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
204	none	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
205	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON!!!!	6/24/2020 10:15 AM
206	I do not live on the west end of South Weber so I wished I could have skipped question 11. As far as the connection to Layton, this should be NO. Many studies and information has been provided that this has serious hazard issues such as land slides, soil contamination, grade of the hill, cost (2 to 4 million \$\$). No even Legacy Highway allows large trucks but yet that is part of the City proposal? Why? Again, I have lived here 30 years and see no need for this road based on the hazard issues. This should be shut down. Who plans to pay for this? We do need a good evacuation plan or study for an organized evacuation plan. The cost of this road, tangible and intangible, are not cost effective to this City.	6/24/2020 9:30 AM
207	Please, take the road to Layton off the general plan...this would be horrible for South Weber!!	6/23/2020 9:09 PM
208	All of these go thru people's land! Poor communication poor design poor everything! I figure if people want CHANGE so bad And are wanting that city feeling then please move. Don't change what generations have tried protecting!	6/23/2020 8:40 PM
209	I can't stress enough how much I think a connection to Layton is a terrible idea!!	6/23/2020 8:29 PM
210	I think there should be a none of the above option. The other silent majority is sick to death of worrying about roads ruining their lands and lifestyles.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
211	No Connection to Layton!!	6/23/2020 3:26 PM
212	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
213	We bought our home 3 houses away from 1900 for a reason, our kids are safe. If i have traffic going down that road they are not safe. Not to mention all of the kids that have to walk to school from this road because we can't get bus passes.	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
214	I do not want the connection into Layton. It only increases our taxes and traffic into South Weber with no benefits to and residents of South Weber. I am strongly against this connection.	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
215	Absolutely NO on Layton Connection to 1900 E	6/23/2020 10:28 AM
216	No connection to Layton	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
217	I do not support the road at all to Layton. This must not happen. I live only about 7 houses away from 1900 E and do not want a busy road near our home. This is why we chose to live where we do now. Please do not build this road.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM
218	Very opposed to this agenda	6/22/2020 10:36 PM
219	We do not need any more access to Layton. Safety is not as big a concern as is being promoted.	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
220	My intent was to select the option that does NOT create a public road to Layton. I fail to see how that benefits current South Weber taxpayers.	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
221	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
222	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
223	No comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

224	Strongly against a connection to Layton! Listen to the people who elected you!	6/22/2020 6:47 PM
225	No connection. This is a ridiculous idea ignoring the fact that this will totally change our city negatively. I DONT want a drive through I DONT want the extra traffic. I DONT want any amount of Hill AFB cutting through our city. I don't want traffic from all the industrial things going on on top of our hills. I am baffled/irritated that this is even on this survey. Apparently when we said we didn't want it on the last survey you didn't listen. I am disappointed in political leaders thinking they know more than their citizens. We are a very intelligent group of people here in South Weber that have moved here for a reason. Maybe listen to the people that bother to take part in what happens here, not the people that don't bother to.... ....then complain. Are we going to continue doing these surveys until the city officials get the answer they want. Please listen. Please don't talk about the silent majority. The silent majority is a term or dead people that can not speak any more. And if you use this as an excuse that majority is likely to be is both sides of the issue., just lazy or to old ...they will be far from only on just your side.	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
226	We do not need connections to layton our city road functons just fine. And we should not be stealing peoples property to build any of these roads in the first place, and this questions is only designed to get what you want out of our answers. stop scewing data for your own intrest. There should be a choice to not cut into these properties at all in any way shape or form and I would have chosen that one. Also the worst Idea I have ever heard for the citizens is adding a connection to layton and a gate to hill air force base.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
227	If you want your residents to give honest feedback don't configure your questions to get the results YOU want. I would've chosen the option for NO roads cutting through peoples property	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
228	no	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
229	We cannot afford nor do we want a connection to Layton.	6/22/2020 11:25 AM
230	NO NO NO to the road to layton	6/22/2020 11:11 AM
231	Strongly disagree with Layton connection primarily due to strong safety concerns. Also cost concerns moving forward. I feel strongly enough about this project that I would say that the position of our local government personnel will affect my vote in the future.	6/22/2020 11:10 AM
232	No connection to layton now or ever. There should be no roads or development on that Hill.	6/22/2020 11:06 AM
233	No connection to Layton. Too expensive and dangerous in the winter.	6/21/2020 9:18 PM
234	Strongly oppose this.	6/21/2020 9:01 PM
235	No connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:48 PM
236	I don't want a connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:42 PM
237	There Shouldn't be a connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:28 PM
238	No Connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:08 PM
239	NO connection additional connection between Layton and Ogden. What we have is more than sufficient!	6/21/2020 6:30 PM
240	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
241	If the purpose of the road is for safety, I'm not sure why we need to spend the money on a paved road when a dirt road will work fine in the event of an emergency. This road will have a negative impact on the small-town feel of the community.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
242	I would like a non motorized public access from 1900 to Layton on dirt road for hiking and biking.	6/21/2020 10:22 AM
243	Putting a main access to Layton on 1900 would be dangerous to our community with GPSs routing everyone (including delivery trucks and semi trucks going to and from the industrial park and HAFB as well as all Employees) - routing thru the quiet little neighborhood w children and pets playing, walking and going to school)! Just an insane idea. The road up over the hill can be gated off and only accessed in case of a. Emergency.	6/20/2020 11:28 PM
244	This road would be expensive and unnecessary. If we need another access for safety, why wouldn't we just build a gravel access on the south end of 2500 East with a gate. It could be 50 feet long and connect to 89 in case of an emergency. Otherwise it would remain locked.	6/20/2020 11:51 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


245	1900 East connection is the worst idea and thing ever for this city. I will Protest and fight such a terrible thing.	6/20/2020 11:33 AM
246	We need many more roads and routes for the safety of the community.	6/20/2020 5:59 AM
247	Highly in favor of 1900 E connection to Layton, especially with the growing traffic and congestion on Hwy 89.	6/19/2020 10:36 PM
248	Do not put a road link to Layton. We do not want the traffic, the noise, the danger of that hill, the speeding, the pollution, the expense. South Weber is a small community we choose to live in, we do not want to have the traffic of Layton, if we did we would live there.	6/19/2020 7:02 PM
249	I don't really see the value in having a connection to Layton here; other than if there is an emergency, it gives people one more point of egress.	6/19/2020 3:05 PM
250	we should not be even considering a road to layton. There are too many issues to consider. HAFB east gate industrial park??? I don't want to be a road connection to something similar to clearfield's job corps! That would be awful. We can't even take care of our existing roads for snow removal yet we would add another??? NO! I ask that you consider the exorbitant cost to citizens and the ramifications of such a DRASTIC change to our identity. I say NO	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
251	Design standards need to be implemented that strictly limit the use of this road to minimize traffic impacts to residents along, and near 1900 East. Namely; weight limits, limit total number of axles on vehicles and trailers, reduce speeds, reduced roadway width, incorporated walking path and/or bicycle lane. Placing it on the general plan does not commit the City to construction, rather it preserves future flexibility to the City and it's residents. Additional recommendation would be to work with Layton City to explore options that a connection would not be made to the any street network associated with the East Gate RDA and the designation of any road connecting from Layton into South Weber would only be designated as a collector.	6/17/2020 10:44 PM
252	I absolutely DO NOT WANT A CONNECTION TO LAYTON!! We do not need to build on a contaminated, unstable hill and invite additional traffic to our city! Keep the traffic near the on/off ramps of I-84 and Hwy 89 and let the rest of us live in peace!! There is no reason to open us up to everything that road will bring with it!!	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
253	If we need to evacuate, the 1900 E water tank road could be used as an emergency egress. It doesn't need to be a residential road. Give the gate key to a public official and finish the dirt road to Layton's proposed road. Why spend the millions for a road that will be severely impacted by geological events. The road will drain the budget throughout the years due to the geological upkeep (landslides, water seepage, scarp collapses, etc.)	6/17/2020 7:18 PM
254	I recently moved to south weber because we liked the small town feeling and being out of the way. People who move here and live here, I believe, mostly have the same opinion and do not want extra traffic coming through our neighborhoods.	6/17/2020 7:52 AM
255	I don't understand why we are revisiting the idea of a connecting road to Layton. The people have spoken and the mayor doesn't care. This is a dangerous plan and it has been pointed out over, and over, and over again as to why that is. It doesn't need to keep reappearing on the general plan. TAKE IT OFF!! Listen to majority who have expressed legitimate concerns!	6/16/2020 10:24 PM
256	No road to Layton from South Weber! It's bad enough that Hwy 89 is in gridlock every afternoon. We DO NOT need that in the middle of our city.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
257	The city seems to like adding more housing without ever planning more roads to handle all the traffic. I don't understand why anyone who lives here is so anti business and new roads. We can't just be a city of houses with no services and no jobs and only one road in and out of the city.	6/16/2020 5:55 PM
258	There is no need for a connector road to Layton, and certainly not one that warrants the exorbitant expense. The natural geography surrounding South Weber is a major contributing factor to the "isolated" small-town feel that we cherish. Breaking through that geography will destroy that setting and make us just another neighborhood of Layton.	6/16/2020 5:51 PM
259	As a cancer survivor I don't want any work done on hills or any more slides	6/16/2020 4:25 PM
260	No on 1900 east	6/16/2020 4:00 PM
261	No Layton Connection	6/16/2020 3:04 PM
262	We have expressed multiple times about you putting in a road on 1800 East, if you want to fight	6/16/2020 12:40 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


	about it then so be it but you won't win.	
263	None	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
264	The 1900 E extension (paving the dirt road) is a bad idea for so many reasons, top among them is cost, now and future, maintenance, hillside stability (or lack thereof). Opposed entirely.	6/16/2020 8:36 AM
265	Layton connection is a must.	6/15/2020 10:56 PM
266	A connection to Layton is unnecessary due to the close proximity of HWY 89.	6/15/2020 7:47 PM
267	Roads should be for local connectivity and NOT regional connectivity. Don't destroy south Weber to benefit other cities at our obvious detriment!	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
268	DO NOT LINK ROAD TO LAYTON!!! To much traffic, to many taxes, to costly, do not need, not worth the rise in traffic coming through the small town feel you want to keep. Pushing through to Layton makes zero sense! If your worried about evac routes out of city we have plenty do not knee jerk do to a small fire! NO ROAD TO LAYTON OFF 1900!!!	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
269	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON EVER!!!! We have so many other options.	6/15/2020 2:14 PM
270	None	6/15/2020 12:22 PM

# Q14 Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following trails in the general plan?

Answered: 506 Skipped: 221



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Bonneville Shoreline Trail	29.64% 150	40.12% 203	8.89% 45	10.67% 54	10.67% 54	506
Weber River Parkway Trail	29.45% 149	42.89% 217	6.32% 32	11.86% 60	9.49% 48	506
Canal Trail	22.53% 114	27.47% 139	12.25% 62	26.48% 134	11.26% 57	506
View Drive Trail	20.55% 104	34.39% 174	10.67% 54	16.60% 84	17.79% 90	506
Old Fort Trail	21.94% 111	34.39% 174	10.87% 55	14.23% 72	18.58% 94	506
South Hillside Trail	20.55% 104	29.84% 151	12.45% 63	19.96% 101	17.19% 87	506

## Q15 Additional Comments Regarding Trails

Answered: 160 Skipped: 567

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Keep any trails out. Some of the trails are on private property. Some are in unincorporated South Weber. How are you going to keep safety on the trails & keep vandalism at bay. You can't see from South Weber Drive what is going on.	7/6/2020 3:13 PM
2	We have a trail already we don't need more!	7/6/2020 1:40 PM
3	Keep trails dirt. No cement. Some trails are on private property. Who is responsible.	7/6/2020 1:28 PM
4	The first two trails are great but some of the others are on Private Property. That means stay out.	7/6/2020 11:44 AM
5	Let's do this!!	7/6/2020 10:06 AM
6	Trails along the canal & on the south hillside are not safe for wildlife, residents whose property is adjacent. Trash & property damage can occur. Fire & erosion danger is increased. Contamination of canal water is a concern.	7/6/2020 9:41 AM
7	Trails along the canal on the South Hill side are not good for wildlife, residents who own property along there will have trash, property damage, and increasing violent crime. Water contamination is also a concern.	7/2/2020 5:32 PM
8	South Hillside trail is a danger to people living on the edge of the trail. We already have issues with trash from the dump, we have wonderful wildlife, & we have privacy. Don't take that away from us! Weber River parkway trail raises similar concerns.	7/2/2020 5:11 PM
9	Let our children grow up the way we did. We do not need more crime, traffic, developments, etc. There is a reason why we moved in South Weber.	7/2/2020 4:32 PM
10	Trails are always an asset to communities as long as they are well maintained and safe. Please ensure the proper infrastructure is in place & can be maintained before allowing any trail to go in.	7/2/2020 4:15 PM
11	Canal Trail - Probably 0 allowed by ditch company.	7/2/2020 4:03 PM
12	Canal Trail: My residential address location demonstrates that the highest privacy fence I will have to erect, will not be high enough to block foot level traffic from my view, and vs/vs trash, privacy, delinquency, crime, are some of my concerns. Against strongly!!	7/2/2020 3:55 PM
13	If the canal trail is made safe with agreements with property owners.	7/2/2020 3:47 PM
14	This just brings problems to those who own property near the trails.	7/2/2020 3:36 PM
15	Too close to private property. Too much up keep	7/2/2020 3:24 PM
16	Litter, noisy	7/2/2020 3:13 PM
17	Upkeep too expensive, litter, not everyone on trail there to walk.	7/2/2020 3:05 PM
18	Pay for keeping nice expensive	7/2/2020 11:35 AM
19	Canal road would be used for parties. No parking at other options.	7/2/2020 11:22 AM
20	I think we need to consider the cost to build and maintain these trails. We also need to consider the homes they will border. Having trails through people's backyard can be a big negative to the homeowners. Definitely need parking lots for trail heads.	7/2/2020 10:53 AM
21	I feel there should not be any trails near homes - invades privacy	7/2/2020 10:50 AM
22	We don't need more traits - the ones available need some upgrades.	7/1/2020 5:26 PM
23	We have several trails - maintenance should be the prime objective.	7/1/2020 5:13 PM
24	Recreational areas is what we need not more housing!	7/1/2020 11:54 AM
25	Who pays?	7/1/2020 11:48 AM
26	Trails are great, providing undue cost is not incurred.	7/1/2020 11:42 AM
27	I don't want all of our tax dollars being spent on trails. I think a few are okay, but do we really need 6?	6/30/2020 11:34 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

28	I can't think of any reason why we wouldn't want these trails	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
29	This plan sounds like it will cost the residents a lot of money. We don't need tax hikes.	6/30/2020 11:00 PM
30	Citizens do not want trails that border or go through their private property.	6/30/2020 10:10 PM
31	Living in the Pleasant Valley Park Sub. that has over 30 mostly one acre lots that are allowed to have horses, it would be nice to have an equine trail connection coming out of the east end of Canyon Drive that follows along the highway and up to the road that is proposed as a future bike connection that could connect to the Bonneville Shoreline trail without have to take the horses on to South Weber Drive to travel down to fishermans access road.	6/30/2020 9:14 PM
32	South Weber needs to stop pretending we are a big city in the mountain next to a ski resort. There are more than enough trails, for those who want to use them, in other areas. There is absolutely no reason to pay millions for trails that do not generate tax income and do not add millions to our quality of life. There are parks, PUD trails and even sidewalks - besides, I'm sure you would make it illegal to have dogs on those too.	6/30/2020 9:08 PM
33	As an avid biker (mountain and road) and hiker, I like the idea of some of these trails but not at the expense and loss of privacy and safety for residents who would have them in their backyard.	6/30/2020 8:47 PM
34	I like the idea of the canal trail as a way for residents to access larger portions of South Weber and to enjoy our beautiful hillsides etc, but I know a lot of the residents whose back yards back up to the canal and they are not in favor of it. My wants should supersede their concerns.	6/30/2020 8:19 PM
35	Orem was able to get a grant from federal government to put there canal trail in. Its world class we could have one go to Roy it would get bikes off south weber drive.	6/30/2020 7:26 PM
36	The trails going thru developed neighborhoods provide easier access for criminal activity. We shouldn't have a trail on top of a sand hill that is already prone to erosion.	6/30/2020 7:11 PM
37	I need to see more information concerning cost and how residents will be affected by the trails. I WOULD PREFER TO SEE A BIKE LANE ADDED ALONG SOUTH WEBER DRIVE TO REMOVE BIKES FROM THE TRAFFIC LANES ON A TWO LANE ROAD. The lanes on South Weber Drive are too narrow and there are too many blind curves to accommodate the bicycle traffic that use this road!!	6/30/2020 6:40 PM
38	I do not feel it is the cities responsibility to build trails within the city. I do not mind if trails are put in and paid for by businesses and contractors. The only problem with the second option is the cost, we as tax payers will need to pay for maintenance and upkeep. If the business is willing to pay for and maintain the path, then I agree with adding trails.	6/30/2020 6:26 PM
39	These would be great additions to the community. Something that we've been lacking.	6/30/2020 5:35 PM
40	We are planing way to many trails for a city of our size!	6/30/2020 4:58 PM
41	I don't think we need to spend money on any trails	6/30/2020 4:35 PM
42	Davis -Weber Canal Company (DWCC) owns this land and such a trial would be a serious liability to DWCC. The trail is also be in citizens back yards and would create privacy issues and reduce property value rather than any benefit from the trail. Besides, DWCC has shareholders who require access to diversion structures that should not have general public access that such a trail would provide. The South Hillside Trail would require cuts into the hillside to make the trail. This trail would require continuous maintenance, be in citizens back yards and destabilize the hillside and create a greater potential for a landslide than already exists..	6/30/2020 4:25 PM
43	We need trails within the city budget. I question cost, Garbage left behind? Like the idea of trails on the city bounderies.	6/30/2020 4:23 PM
44	People don't want trails through or bordering their property. I don't want my taxes to go up for trails.	6/30/2020 4:06 PM
45	Trails are great as long as they are not too much of a burden on residents	6/30/2020 4:05 PM
46	Have not studied this enough. I disagree with canal because of liability and water hazards.	6/30/2020 3:25 PM
47	No one listens to the public, how is this any different?	6/30/2020 2:43 PM
48	I oppose all trails along the canal by the south bluffs	6/30/2020 1:17 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

49	Why do we need a stupid train track that no one can use but 1 resident?!?!?!? get rid of that and make a walking track all around the park. Give us some basketball courts, Tennis courts, a city swimming pool. A skate park! Have you ever been to Greyhawk park right up on our border with Layton? It's awesome! Let's do that.	6/30/2020 12:36 PM
50	Non	6/30/2020 10:15 AM
51	We have several trails along the Weber river, and the foothills (not to mention a national forest only 20 minutes away). We should not place trails through existing residents back yards.	6/30/2020 9:48 AM
52	We presently have a huge trail system along the Weber river and the foothills. (Not to mention a large national forest only 20 minutes away). Some of the proposals would put a trail running through peoples property. We shouldn't encroach on private property to make a trail system.	6/30/2020 9:23 AM
53	We already have plenty of trails. I do not want anyone to give up their property for a trail and I don't think we need a trail system anywhere near South Weber Drive.	6/30/2020 3:02 AM
54	South Hillside Trail and Weber River trail could provide a Bonneville Shoreline loop.	6/30/2020 12:35 AM
55	Canal Trail - Too many places it is in people's backyards - no privacy with people walking past all the time. Weber River Trail - Must be on the south side of the river to avoid going through people's backyards. There needs to be a better plan over by Cottonwood Drive to avoid those residents. View Drive Trail - Whose property is it going through at the top of the hill? Are those residents okay with it? Why doesn't it come straight up the hill instead of heading west before connecting to View Drive?	6/29/2020 10:59 PM
56	The more trails the better!	6/29/2020 10:37 PM
57	the more trails the better	6/29/2020 10:37 PM
58	Hiking and biking trails with connections to the surrounding existing trails will enhance the value of South Weber and make it a more enjoyable place to live and exercise.	6/29/2020 10:22 PM
59	We do not need a trail by the canal! That is just opening up the city for more problems and additional costs. We also do not need to put a South Hillside trail on contaminated land and sandy soil. That is also a disaster waiting to happen!	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
60	I think the trails are great providing they do not impact or take from others land.	6/29/2020 9:17 PM
61	It would be nice to have some paved trails to walk on that are off the busy roads like the ones in St. George, Utah.	6/29/2020 9:06 PM
62	All trails proposed near the canal will disrupt bird nest/migration. It also leaves residents backyards exposed to mischief and trespassing. There is also a liability issue with respect to injuries. No development - even for paths should occur near or around the canal.	6/29/2020 8:50 PM
63	Again, see my answer in #4...	6/29/2020 7:38 PM
64	No need for trails. Hardly anyone uses them anyways and seems like a waste of money.	6/29/2020 6:13 PM
65	n/a	6/29/2020 3:53 PM
66	Trails would be great to keep bicycles off SWD and allow others a place to recreate	6/29/2020 3:43 PM
67	Please do not waste any money on future trails. This money could be put to better use in the maintaining of the infrastructure of the city.	6/29/2020 3:40 PM
68	NA	6/29/2020 2:24 PM
69	I am troubled that the city sent out a survey to see what they residents wanted for amenities. They asked for our Christmas List. With no \$ amount attached. Of course everyone wants it all. I would like a Ferrari until I find out the cost,,,then I will actually get a mazda 6, Putting up trails will scar our beautiful slopes and mess with our natural resourses and our natural wildlife. Stop saying that trails will make people be healthier. No People make people healthier. Why bother making all these wonderful sidewalks and doing videos showing how nice they are then don't encourage them to be walked. I walk 10 miles every day. I don't require trails to be healthy shoes and a road and an inner drive for being healthy	6/29/2020 1:52 PM
70	Dumb ass survey	6/29/2020 12:40 PM
71	I agree as long as there is sufficient safety and parking taken into affect.	6/29/2020 11:58 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

72	I do not support using tax money to build bike lanes	6/29/2020 9:56 AM
73	Trails increase resident's quality of life and bring the community together in positive ways.	6/29/2020 5:38 AM
74	WHERE IS VIEW DRIVE TRAIL & SOUTH HILLSIDE TRAIL???	6/29/2020 1:10 AM
75	Only dirt trails if any	6/28/2020 7:52 PM
76	We really need more trail options, we lag behind every other city/town in all of Davis/Weber counties.	6/28/2020 6:21 PM
77	I think we need to protect the hillside from over use	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
78	We need to protect our hillside	6/28/2020 5:47 PM
79	I am disappointed that again all these trails are hyped up. But again this is asking for a christmas list from your community. None of them have a \$\$\$\$ amount tied to them. Everyone wants amenities until they find out what the cost is to their taxes. And I'm also very tired of the thought that this will get people more healthy....This is false on a great percentage. People make people healthy. I walk 10 miles every morning of every day with very few exceptions, because I care about my health. I don't need to walk trails to be healthy. We have many roads that are a wonderful path, with many sidewalks. It isn't trails than motivate me....its me that motivates me. What is the point of big sidewalks if they are not used. You put in a bunch of trails then you disrupt the natural nature of our slopes and streams. There is a lot of wildlife there..deer, fox, cats, turkeys, birds of prey etc etc....We watch them almost every day and hear their calls during the day and at night....Trails ruin that. Where do you think the road name "Deer Run Drive came from....I have on many occasions through the 30 years I have lived here had them in my yard and actually running down "Deer Run Drive".	6/28/2020 5:33 PM
80	Trails are great in theory but only when there's a lot of land that has been left vacant. South Weber has decided that it's best to develop every square inch of land into housing, so there's little left for trails and outdoor recreation unless people want strangers walking right behind their house at all hours.	6/28/2020 4:29 PM
81	-	6/28/2020 3:26 PM
82	Maintenance of trails becomes an issue	6/28/2020 1:02 PM
83	No motorized vehicles and no trails along the canal. The safety of our citizens should be paramount. The first kid we pull out of the canal dead we would have blood on our hands.	6/28/2020 12:32 PM
84	The city should stop pursuing a trail along the canal. This would be a very unwise and unsafe decision, and the canal company has said it will never allow a trail, due to safety and liability concerns. The canal is steeply sloped, concrete lined, fast moving. Anything (children, pets, etc) that accidentally finds its way into the canal is not going to easily get back out. We should stop trying to put this dangerous idea on the general plan. The South Hillside Trail should also be taken off the plan because this land should be protected as a sensitive land.	6/28/2020 11:44 AM
85	Too expensive for the city to establish and maintain.	6/28/2020 10:42 AM
86	Trails can be dirt trails without being paved and should only be done if there are funds to do so. We shouldn't bring in more commercial development so satisfy the desire to build more trails.	6/28/2020 9:42 AM
87	Trails are awesome but should not infringe upon property owner rights. The state has ruled that they do not have eminent domain.	6/27/2020 5:52 PM
88	I like trails!	6/27/2020 3:48 PM
89	The trails enhance the small town concept.	6/27/2020 10:12 AM
90	Due to legal issues it is highly unlikely a canal trail is possible. Spend the city's time and effort on trails which have more impact	6/26/2020 10:43 PM
91	I agree with trails except the Canal trail being dangerous to children because of the water.	6/26/2020 10:24 PM
92	I love walking trails if the nature of the areas are preserved.	6/26/2020 9:20 PM
93	We feel its very needed	6/26/2020 5:02 PM
94	Need to show how you can afford to police all those trails, South Weber isn't big enough for that many trails. Its really not for our citizens, it just brings in a lot of outside people.	6/26/2020 2:26 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

95	Any trail that invades other's privacy is a NO for me. I definately do NOT want people peering into my back yard as they walk or jog on the canal behind my house.	6/26/2020 1:59 PM
96	Too many unanswered questions on the canal trail. Will it be covered? Will the city be building a fence along the trail to protect homeowners? I think there are too many property owners affected with this trail.	6/26/2020 1:18 PM
97	Like trails	6/26/2020 12:15 PM
98	like trails	6/26/2020 12:12 PM
99	Putting a trail by a canal only asks for trouble and high expenses.	6/26/2020 11:33 AM
100	Trails are wonderful in the moment and in the day light, but never worth the cost financially, structurally, or emotionally to our community. They intrude on peoples privacy if they go close to houses. They bring outsiders into our neighborhoods. They are a breeding ground at night for people and activities that are not conducive to our community. If we maintain our small town charm, walking anywhere in our city on sidewalks will be a pleasing experience for all, and will predominately serve only those who live here.	6/26/2020 9:25 AM
101	Now this is something I agree with.	6/25/2020 10:39 PM
102	South Hillside Trail would run along property lines to the east of the trailhead. Also, the hillside is unstable and would put the homes at risk of landslides when the trail was cut in.	6/25/2020 8:43 PM
103	Trails are not a necessity like road and hydrants or our emergency services	6/25/2020 7:49 PM
104	We need a few trails	6/25/2020 3:37 PM
105	This will enhance our city and our way of life, unlike heavier traffic and high density housing. I think you must no this.	6/25/2020 2:14 PM
106	It seems the Bonneville and Weber River trails might be options as much is already establish and well used. However, need a better understanding of the costs and where does the money come from. I do believe we need to live within our taxes collected and do things that must be done, not just what we might want. The Canal trail seems like it would be a high cost trail. Not many citizens are happy with people walking in their backyard. Crime could increase. Not familiar with the other areas. To make a good decision on this subject, we would need a lot more information to make an informed decision.	6/25/2020 1:04 PM
107	None	6/25/2020 11:00 AM
108	A trail along the canal would be dangerous.	6/25/2020 10:53 AM
109	I like the idea of a weber river trail but the county border will likely change to I-84. With that I think the city should change and the weber river trail will no longer be in south weber. Services north of I-84 do not serve the city as well as services south of it. The canal trail would be used more by residents.	6/25/2020 8:21 AM
110	We need more outdoor recreation options. Trails are great, what about bike trails?	6/24/2020 11:09 PM
111	Sorry, tough to get too excited about trail systems that require ongoing maintenance and are improperly used by so many.	6/24/2020 7:27 PM
112	Please concrete the bike trail along the river that connects to the Riverdale bike trail.	6/24/2020 7:10 PM
113	No comment	6/24/2020 6:23 PM
114	I don't want to have to pay to put trails in.	6/24/2020 4:52 PM
115	If we have to pay for any trails I think its a bad idea.	6/24/2020 4:04 PM
116	If possible some sort of trail for cyclists that currently drive on South Weber Drive would be wonderful.	6/24/2020 2:17 PM
117	South Hillside trail will encroach on private property. The private property owners will need compensation for any 'taking' to build this trail. Weber River Parkway Trail needs to be the #1 priority for the city, with connectors to the Weber River Parkway Trail at Canyon Drive and Old Fort Road trailheads.	6/24/2020 11:38 AM
118	We need much more information such as the costs of these proposed trails. We need to live	6/24/2020 9:30 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

within our tax means, not continue to increase taxes based on our wants. I agree to the Bonneville and Weber River trail if funding supports these. They are already established and used. The Canal trail would have to cost lots of money? But this information is not provided. Many citizens of South Weber do not want trails in their backyard. Again, need much more information to make an informed election in this area.


119	Once again I think you're violating too many property owners rights.	6/23/2020 7:59 PM
120	Place the collector road in the proposed location of View Drive Trail and build them Jointly. Giving better access to South Weber Drive. At Less cost.	6/23/2020 6:16 PM
121	Yes to all the trails	6/23/2020 3:26 PM
122	Na	6/23/2020 11:43 AM
123	Trails need to eliminate bike traffic on South Weber Drive.	6/23/2020 10:31 AM
124	What a great addition to SW!!	6/23/2020 10:28 AM
125	Trails are fine	6/23/2020 10:00 AM
126	Trails are awesome, they can be used by everyone, lets build more!	6/23/2020 8:15 AM
127	The Weber River Parkway trail leads people right along a beautiful view of 1-84 and exhaust fumes from semis.	6/23/2020 7:25 AM
128	South Weber should not have to pay for these trails, and if we do we need to be able to do so without raising taxes or at to much of an expense to citizens or maintain them.	6/22/2020 11:09 PM
129	I think we need more trails, for recreation.	6/22/2020 10:56 PM
130	none	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
131	Thank you for adding something that benefits us!	6/22/2020 9:49 PM
132	No	6/22/2020 8:04 PM
133	No comment	6/22/2020 7:50 PM
134	No comment	6/22/2020 7:36 PM
135	AGAIN, Holy cow you ask for your citizens "CHRISTMAS LIST"and No amount of \$ tagged to any of these trail plans. Of course, people will want them until they find out what they cost to our taxes...Shame on you for doing this again. This is part of being up front with your citizens. NOW....not after the fact, Tell us now what these costs are. How will our taxes will be impacted..Not what is going to be given to us through wheeling and Dealing or grants....which can be all good and take a lot of work but what the bottom line will be...Impact fees, maintainance fees, engineering fees, soil studies on and on and on!!!! Quit asking for our "CHRistmas LIST.	6/22/2020 4:02 PM
136	We don't need any more trails added to our city leave peoples land alone and stop making a resort for those in government and those in places of moderate power to pad their ego. This is supposed to be a community of people who OWN property not who lease it from you until you can do whatever childhood dream of having a trial in your backyard while destroying what makes south weber great. This is not just one giant community park. The people who give enough of a crap about this city, to say something are telling you they dont want it, people move here for what it was when they moved here.	6/22/2020 3:46 PM
137	Sounds like these trails will just add to our city becoming a garbage heap.	6/22/2020 3:40 PM
138	the canal trail would be directly behind my home. We purchased this property because of the the privacy we have. that would be completely taken away from us and our surrounding neighbors. I have lived in places that have city maintained trails and they are never taken care of. My concern is for the wildlife behind our home and the fact that this trail will bring undesirable people right behind my home. It seems like there are plenty of recreational trails around the city. This area should be left alone. There are safety concerns for privacy of residence and safety around the canal. I feel like there will be people that will vandalize and ruin the canal.	6/22/2020 2:37 PM
139	Given the recent tax increases I would say South Weber needs to focus on spending monies on public safety and infrastructure issues. Trails are definitely in the catagory of nice to have, but	6/22/2020 11:10 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	not needed.	
140	walking trail around canyon meadows park	6/22/2020 11:06 AM
141	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:29 PM
142	No comments.	6/21/2020 3:26 PM
143	leave the trails by the river as is.	6/20/2020 11:33 AM
144	We need more trails and connectivity for quality of life.	6/20/2020 5:59 AM
145	We need more spaces that are dog-friendly.	6/19/2020 3:05 PM
146	trails are not something that I think needs to be a priority. Especially the canal trail. You would be giving access to residents who previously had private yards... also I am fully aware that some homes would need to be seized to build certain trails. I have heard some of the homeowners have also been harassed to give over their land to create some of these?! WHY?! why are we treating people so terribly? This is not okay. To that I cannot support any trail systems without knowing which ones affect any residents negatively and I think much more information is needed	6/18/2020 3:37 PM
147	I think all of these trail plans are essential improvements to our community. I think more effort should be placed on the potential of master planning some of our less developed portions of town to create a more robust network of trails. Wherever you can loop and better network trails going both north and south and east and west instead of just through hiking from point A to B brings more value as members of the community can use the same trail to mix up the routes without having to just go out and back on the same trail. With all of the potential this community has to create a better quality of life, more foot traffic available trails and networks is KEY. It helps promote a healthy active outdoor lifestyle that will continue to keep our community attractive.	6/18/2020 2:23 PM
148	I don't see the canal company ever allowing a trail to be constructed along the portions of the canal which are open. Too much of a liability.	6/17/2020 10:44 PM
149	I couldn't easily find the View Drive Trail, but in looking at the General Plan it sounds like it would be a safer way for kids to travel to the school. I don't see the need for the South Hillside Trail. If the road to Layton is not built, it doesn't make sense to spend the money putting in a trail through that area. Can we put a running trail around Canyon Meadows Park?	6/17/2020 8:00 PM
150	I see safety issues with several of these proposed trails. Canal Trail could result in drownings if children or others fall into the canal. Old Fort Trail sounds like it requires people to cross over a busy road and run the chance of being hit by an automobile.	6/16/2020 9:13 PM
151	I would love more trails for recreation. Right now people just have to walk and ride bikes in the street. Trails would be safer and add value to the city.	6/16/2020 5:55 PM
152	You cannot have enough trails! This will make South Weber unique for the area. Please make the trails bike friendly (i.e. wide enough for dual-use, perhaps with a distinct walking vs biking lane.) This will become a larger necessity with the rapidly increasing popularity of e-bikes and other personal modes of "pedestrian" transportation.	6/16/2020 5:51 PM
153	Why would you want a trail by the canal? That is asking for trouble. People having access to damage, tamper with, and drown in the canal is a terrible idea. The Integrity of the canal should be protected at all costs.	6/16/2020 2:20 PM
154	Green space and trails are much appreciated	6/16/2020 12:36 PM
155	None	6/16/2020 10:56 AM
156	Trails are a vitally important inclusion in the general plan, for both recreation and transportation.	6/16/2020 8:36 AM
157	We need more biking and walking trails	6/15/2020 10:56 PM
158	Trails open access for vagrants and people of less desirable intentions ease of access to our homes our children and mowing over our safety. We don't not owe trails to anyone. It isn't our job to create and fund them when the citizens do not want them.	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
159	More out door activities the better! gateway to outdoors.	6/15/2020 4:41 PM
160	We need more safe jogging trails. I'm thrilled to see these plans!	6/15/2020 4:08 PM

### Q16 Do you want to continue on to the longer version of the survey?


Answered: 507 Skipped: 220




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes, I want to review/comment on permitted uses in commercial zones, each map, and section of the draft general plan	35.70%	181
No, I am finished and ready to submit my comments	64.30%	326
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>507</b>

Q17 The following are some of the uses allowed in the COMMERCIAL ZONE (C), which shows up as dark red on the projected land use map HERE. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following uses in the zone?

Answered: 177 Skipped: 550



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020




South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>NO OPINION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Beauty and barber services	19.21% 34	48.02% 85	10.73% 19	18.08% 32	3.95% 7	177
Business services and professional offices	14.69% 26	43.50% 77	15.25% 27	22.03% 39	4.52% 8	177
Eating establishments, including drive ins	22.60% 40	44.63% 79	11.30% 20	18.64% 33	2.82% 5	177
Gasoline service stations	11.86% 21	25.42% 45	20.90% 37	37.29% 66	4.52% 8	177
Laundry and dry-cleaning services	7.34% 13	24.29% 43	22.60% 40	39.55% 70	6.21% 11	177
Retail trade, general merchandise	13.56% 24	33.90% 60	19.21% 34	27.68% 49	5.65% 10	177

Q18 The following are some of the uses allowed in the HIGHWAY-COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-H), which shows up as bright red on the projected land use map HERE. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following uses in the zone?

Answered: 177 Skipped: 550




## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020




	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>NO OPINION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Eating establishments, including drive ins	21.47% 38	52.54% 93	7.91% 14	13.56% 24	4.52% 8	177
Gasoline and diesel service stations	15.82% 28	36.16% 64	18.08% 32	25.99% 46	3.95% 7	177
Laundry and dry-cleaning services	10.73% 19	25.42% 45	26.55% 47	29.38% 52	7.91% 14	177
Retail sales	15.82% 28	42.37% 75	14.69% 26	20.34% 36	6.78% 12	177
Transient lodging	7.34% 13	11.30% 20	18.64% 33	55.93% 99	6.78% 12	177

Q19 The following are some of the uses allowed in the LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (L-I), which shows up as bright blue on the projected land use map HERE. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following uses in the zone?


Answered: 177 Skipped: 550



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020




South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020


	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>NO OPINION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Business and professional services	11.86% 21	54.80% 97	12.99% 23	16.38% 29	3.95% 7	177
Commercial storage	7.34% 13	33.90% 60	24.29% 43	28.25% 50	6.21% 11	177
Construction and contracting yards and buildings	3.95% 7	31.64% 56	20.90% 37	37.29% 66	6.21% 11	177
Experimental research and testing laboratories	6.78% 12	16.38% 29	16.95% 30	53.67% 95	6.21% 11	177
Manufacturing of food products, fabricated textile products, furniture, paper products, precision instruments, jewelry, machine products, wood products (except paper), ceramic products, electrical appliances, electronics, small tools and other light metal products and sporting and athletic goods	5.65% 10	21.47% 38	18.64% 33	49.15% 87	5.08% 9	177
Mobile businesses	5.08% 9	23.16% 41	24.29% 43	35.59% 63	11.86% 21	177
Printing, lithography and/or publishing shops	6.78% 12	45.76% 81	18.64% 33	21.47% 38	7.34% 13	177
Recycling and collection center operated within an enclosed building	2.82% 5	15.25% 27	24.29% 43	50.85% 90	6.78% 12	177
Repair services	5.65% 10	46.89% 83	18.08% 32	21.47% 38	7.91% 14	177
Wholesale trade and warehousing	6.78% 12	23.73% 42	19.77% 35	38.98% 69	10.73% 19	177

Q20 The following are some of the uses allowed in the TRANSITIONAL LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (T-I), which shows up as pink on the projected land use map HERE. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following uses in the zone?


Answered: 177 Skipped: 550



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020




South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020




	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Business and professional services	10.73% 19	50.85% 90	12.99% 23	15.82% 28	9.60% 17	177
Commercial storage	6.21% 11	29.94% 53	23.16% 41	31.64% 56	9.04% 16	177
Experimental research and testing laboratories	3.39% 6	15.82% 28	22.03% 39	49.72% 88	9.04% 16	177
Manufacturing of food products, fabricated textile products, furniture, paper products, precision instruments, jewelry, machine products, wood products (except paper), ceramic products, electrical appliances, electronics, small tools and other light metal products and sporting and athletic goods	5.08% 9	19.21% 34	23.16% 41	42.37% 75	10.17% 18	177
Printing, lithography and/or publishing shops	6.21% 11	41.81% 74	15.82% 28	24.86% 44	11.30% 20	177
Recycling and collection center operated within an enclosed building	2.26% 4	11.86% 21	24.29% 43	50.85% 90	10.73% 19	177
Repair services	6.78% 12	37.29% 66	18.64% 33	25.42% 45	11.86% 21	177
Wholesale trade and warehousing	6.78% 12	20.90% 37	21.47% 38	40.11% 71	10.73% 19	177
Uses judged by the Planning Commission to be similar and compatible with the purpose of this article	3.39% 6	19.21% 34	13.56% 24	50.85% 90	12.99% 23	177

Q21 The following are some of the uses allowed in the COMMERCIAL RECREATION (C-R), which shows up as light blue on the projected land use map HERE. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the following uses in the zone?

Answered: 177 Skipped: 550



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020



South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>NO OPINION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Child daycare facilities	7.91% 14	45.76% 81	12.99% 23	22.60% 40	10.73% 19	177
Eating establishments and drive-ins	11.86% 21	46.33% 82	16.95% 30	18.08% 32	6.78% 12	177
Recreational and sporting activities	21.47% 38	51.98% 92	7.91% 14	13.56% 24	5.08% 9	177
Recreational vehicle parks	9.04% 16	20.90% 37	19.21% 34	44.07% 78	6.78% 12	177
Rental of recreational and sports equipment	11.86% 21	45.76% 81	15.82% 28	21.47% 38	5.08% 9	177
Retail sales and general merchandise	10.17% 18	38.42% 68	17.51% 31	28.25% 50	5.65% 10	177
Transient lodging	3.95% 7	10.17% 18	19.21% 34	62.71% 111	3.95% 7	177

**Q22 DRAFT Projected Land Use Map** This map identifies future land use in the City. It is not the current zoning map. It is the vision and future land use plan for the City. Each color represents a different zone, which allows for different land uses (e.g. residential of varied densities, commercial, etc). When a property owner approaches the City with a development proposal that needs to rezone their property, this map acts as a guide for the Planning Commission and City Council on the vision of the City. [Link to view larger map](#) [Link to first draft map if you'd like to compare](#) (some zone colors have been updated on the second draft map so please double check the key for zone info) Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding this DRAFT Projected Land Use Map

Answered: 84 Skipped: 643

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Too much yellow & orange. Not enough Bright green & Pale green. To keep with the city small town charm.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Too much yellow. Too much orange. Not enough bright green and pale. All to keep up with city's country feel	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	Too much orange and yellow not enough of the light green and pale green.	7/6/2020 11:47 AM
4	Everything the City claims about "sensitive land" is bogus. HAFB DID NOT provide the city with maps from which to affect our City's Land Uses. Plume maps are defined ONLY officially in the RODs and amendment (subsequent) when they are formally approved by the Air Force, state of Utah & EPA. This huge error by the city greatly impacts everything in the west end of our valley.	7/6/2020 10:25 AM
5	Q 18: We have Maverik on the east side of town. We don't need anymore there, but one on the west side off of I-84 would be okay. Retail sales are okay as long as it is little shops - not superstores. Keeping commercial zones close to the highways is a good idea to keep business traffic out of residential areas. The residential area above the canal at 1900 E & Deer Run should be included in open space. This is a no access area now & should remain that way. Likewise the commercial recreation zone that is south of the canal on the west side of the city should remain open space.	7/6/2020 9:51 AM
6	Keep commercial zones near highway reducing traffic in residential areas. Areas above canal at 1900 E & Deer Run should remain open space with no access. The commercial recreation zone south of the canal should remain open.	7/2/2020 5:39 PM
7	Keep commercial close to the freeway to drive business & separate it from or cute quaint city. Open lands should remain open as they are wildlife areas, high erosion areas, & susceptible to fires. Light blue areas South of South Weber Drive are high erosion risks as well.	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
8	No commercial in the middle of town!	7/2/2020 4:48 PM
9	Consider tie in to Pacificorp development in the mouth of Weber Canyon in the long range plan.	7/2/2020 4:18 PM
10	Please consider making the commercial highway zone smaller. If we can't work together to make plans work. It is too much commercial.	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
11	The PC has shown we can't trust them to do what most of the citizens want.	7/2/2020 3:39 PM
12	When we built - Jones fought us for 12 years - they wanted to take some of OUR property for a MERGE - they wanted the road to Layton - even then. What will it benefit our citizens?	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
13	In regards to Section 4: Permitted Uses in Commercial Zones: "After the general plan is updated, the city would like to review our commercial zones..." After the general plan is updated. Why not before - sounds like this should be addressed before updating.	7/1/2020 5:17 PM
14	Be cautious what goes in each area - aesthetics is important to maintain the small town feel. Don't allow overcrowding.	7/1/2020 11:57 AM
15	I think that current agricultural area should be designated as very low density (A) especially along the I-84 so that the lots can be 1 acre and they are allowed to have horses and can access the trails that are going along that area. This would keep a bit of the country appeal in South Weber over time.	6/30/2020 10:43 PM
16	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:26 PM
17	No commercial in "downtown" area of SWC or on east side of Hwy 89. No multi-family housing over 2 stories tall (condos/townhomes) except in commercially zoned areas nor on limited access streets. No commercial or industrial of any kind that abuts residential areas.	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
18	Remove the Recreational zone along the south hill (1900e) there is no reason to zone this for recreational activities. Still way to much annexing of southern lands. Layton doesn't want it and neither do we.	6/30/2020 9:39 PM
19	Keep south Weber great as a small town feel! We need more low density housing. We are cramming houses in just to make developers money! And please stay away from mix use of zones!	6/30/2020 8:45 PM
20	Putting high density housing right next to 89, that is just asking for trouble/complaints/etc	6/30/2020 8:20 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

(remember it is going to get loader with the changes being made there). Roads do not seem to support the multi-family units well. I would think it would be better to keep those on major roads, not back roads (traffic, especially emergency situations). I personally do not believe that the red spots on frontage roads are good. There needs to be some significant oversight in to what can move onto small roads.

21	No Airbnb, limit transient housing to hotel chains by Highway 89 and I-84.	6/30/2020 7:33 PM
22	Please reference the preceding sections of this General Plan Survey (GPS). Section 3. - Quantity of Residential Zone - GPS pp 4-5 Section 5. - Location of Residential Zones - GPS p 6 Section 7. - Quantity of Each Commercial Zone - GPS pp 7-8 Section 9 - Location of Commercial Zones - GPS p 8	6/30/2020 4:59 PM
23	less Commercial. Low density housing yes...	6/30/2020 3:38 PM
24	What the Hell are you people thinking?	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
25	The whole north boundary of our community needs to be R-7 and C-H or a mixed use overlay.	6/30/2020 10:23 AM
26	I understand that retail will help with city taxes, but we have all of the needed retailers within 10 minuets of our town. Do we need to add a lot of retail businesses to the city limits?	6/30/2020 10:02 AM
27	Many residents are tired of city favoring Developer Property Rights and neglecting surrounding property owners rights in fear of lawsuit. Developers are just looking for the very fastest way to recover their investment often with HDH. Our City Development Planner is well paid and should do more than just assist with developers agenda and meetings, and actively seek 1-2 family owned/unique sit down restaurants and connect with Developers. We do not need a Planner to just faciliatiate developers wants, our Manager, Engineer, and Attorney can help in those roles. Restaurants like Burley Burger or larger, Car Wash, ATV/Snowmobile/Recreation rental shop, that Citizens cannot get within short distance and cannot buy online. We are proving Citizens and surrounding communities will welcome and help ensure their success as we have done for Burley Burger and Maverik. Stop chasing restaurant chains, dream of grocery stores, and mixed use with HDH.	6/30/2020 1:11 AM
28	Comments on land use designations that might be cleared up before release. Many overlap and have similar items and only one or two differences. Why? C and C-H seem like they could be combined. The same with Light Industrial and Transitional Light Industrial. What are "Mobile Businesses"? What does a Day-care Center have to do with Recreation? It's only located there. What is the difference between "Retail Trade" in C and "Retail Sales" in C-H and C-R? Doesn't the LDS church own some land on South Weber Drive just west of 475 East? Should that be shown as Institutional for future plans rather than Residential Low Moderate?	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
29	We need more very low density, low density and low moderate. We have plenty of everything else. Take off the patio and multi family all together! Let's not build more of that in our city, we have more than enough!	6/29/2020 9:43 PM
30	There is too much commercial recreational on the west end.	6/29/2020 9:31 PM
31	increase lower density	6/29/2020 9:27 PM
32	Business and high density housing including R7 should be kept farther away from R4 housing and under. By farther away I mean out of sight and out of traffic impact	6/29/2020 4:53 PM
33	Again I commercial or high density housing in the center of town	6/29/2020 3:52 PM
34	Remove R-7 zone north of 7800 south and west of 2700 east.	6/29/2020 3:46 PM
35	The City of the Current City Hall and the old Rays Gas Station - consider making this residential. Everything around it is residential, doesn't have any other surrounding commercial uses - it is a little island of commercial property. When Rays was the only store in town, it made sense to leave this as commercial, but now that other areas of the City are utilizing the commercial zones, it no longer makes sense to have this location.	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
36	The property owner can always petition to change zoning on a property. Doing this ahead of time just locks it in. I don't want a ton of business here. Things might change as we go but to just load it up now is ridiculous	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
37	No transient lodging, we have to put commercial we get that so bring in things that actually bring us revenue. No more storage sheds, no more housing, no apartments. Bring in a restaurant, a small grocery store, a nice retail park. Remember we are a SMALL TOWN and	6/29/2020 10:47 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

want to keep it that way. We ARE NOT Riverdale or Layton and never want to be. Keep your citizens in mind please.

38	no more new land development unless it is for parks and recreation	6/29/2020 10:02 AM
39	No agriculture...wow, lets fill every empty spot possible so we look just like Layton. This goes against even your own mission statement. "Retaining the Small Town Charm"	6/29/2020 1:54 AM
40	REMOVE ALL THE PLANNED COMMERCIAL ADDITIONS!!! ALL READY HAVE TOO MUCH,AND EXISTING COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS ARE NOT THAT FAR!!!	6/29/2020 1:35 AM
41	C should not be in the middle of the city, including existing residences. A better use of the gravel pit west of the highway would be to have commercial recreation there. I strongly disagree with where the plan has T-1.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
42	More moderate density in the west end	6/28/2020 10:54 AM
43	No commercial on Adams Avenue. There isn't any agricultural land zone. Need to increase the amount of very low density housing to keep the small town country feel.	6/28/2020 10:12 AM
44	Change Ray's to Moderate housing.	6/27/2020 6:01 PM
45	None at this time.	6/27/2020 10:18 AM
46	Commercial needs to be at a minimum, and at the freeway entrance on the west end and at the area off 89 and South Weber Drive. Commercial does not to be through the town.	6/26/2020 10:46 PM
47	Just remember it is a planning tool and guide, not something written in stone, we live in a ever changing world, and no one can see changes for the future. Let this be a guide that citizens were asked to look at in 2020 not a solid or change document.	6/26/2020 3:09 PM
48	Way too much residential. We have to have a way to off-set the residential cost so our taxes do not increase. We give way too much money to Weber county because of the convenience of restaurants.	6/26/2020 11:39 AM
49	We are over zoning for commercial use (all commercial zoning types). Commercial should be less area, moved more to the outskirts, and never go right next to existing residential or future residential. Regarding the types of use for each commercial zoning type, it should be based on what will enhance our goal of Small-town feel versus detract from that goal, and it should then be evaluated if it will benefit our community financially or bring a bigger burden. Residential Zoning: The lower the density the better for small town- feel and the better our housing values stay strong throughout the city. More "A", "R-L", "R-LM" a little less "R-M" and "R-P". Eliminate R-7.	6/26/2020 10:00 AM
50	South Weber is a very uniquely situated city. It is a little, until lately, undeveloped community squished between two larger cities. It still has a rural feel and a friendly personality. We have two choices right now. We can continue to be reactive in the city's development, approving every developer's dreams and encouraging every kind of commercial business because we are desperate for the building permit and tax revenues - or we (and I am using "we" here as a collective pronoun) can pause and take a breath and find a proactive vision for moving forward. By this I mean that we need to stop and think about what we want South Weber to look like when it is fully developed. Do we want the maximum number of "rooftops" with cement sidewalks in between with a Maverick on both ends and a slightly disheveled Super 8 Motel by Highway 84 - right across the road from a seedy strip mall built on lots where folks were forced to either sell their homes or enjoy that view from their front yards? Do we want our roads to become a shortcut to Layton for commuters when the Highway 89 interchange backs up? Or...could we work toward a South Weber that has a mixture of homes on different lot sizes? Could we put some restrictions in place for business development, encouraging unique small businesses, family-owned enterprises and boutique style shops. One thing is for sure, South Weber does not need any franchised chain-stores or brand name retail establishments! We have all we could want within three miles of us in both directions! We don't need another Target or Maverick gas station! We need a city council that will lead out with some inventive planning and creative problem solving and proactive energy toward pursuing commercial enterprises that will be the right fit for South Weber. We need to make decisions that will help South Weber be different from the commercial craziness of Layton and different from the inner city problems of Ogden. I think it is a pretty unanimous feeling among South Weber residents that we don't want to lose the "small town" community feeling of our city. Now we just have to have a plan to make that a reality.	6/26/2020 12:20 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

51	NO ROAD TO LAYTON. Limit high density to nicely architecture twin or townhomes with garages. Trails are good	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
52	No opinion	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
53	My only two issues are not connecting to the Layton Highway and stop approving more high density housing/	6/25/2020 2:31 PM
54	No road connecting to Layton. No more high density housing.	6/25/2020 2:18 PM
55	The new light blue areas are a bit confusing. How many years is this projected? We should maintain the home town feel of South Weber and develop moderate housing and lower. I also think the 55 and older, patio homes established, are very nice.	6/25/2020 1:15 PM
56	With growth come infrastructure problems. PLEASE address the FEASIBILITY and impact most of these plans have on schools, roads and people's private property!! This town is landlocked and we should not add residences and commercial without considerable thought and professional assistance AND public input. Current residents should be a HIGH PRIORITY above developers and other entities who do not care about the city, that are driven by the almighty dollar or some other private agenda. Live within our means, CAREFULLY select changes, and be aware that most of us like the city WITHOUT all the pressure of development that we have had to endure the last couple of years! We elect you to have the CITIZENS best interest at heart. LETS WORK TOGETHER TOWARD THAT GOAL!!!!	6/25/2020 11:14 AM
57	Too much commercial concentrated in a small area on the west side of the city. This affects citizens' quality of life who live nearby significantly. Businesses like a car wash being allowed to run 24/7 and allowing monstrous sized lit flashing signs in a neighborhood is simply unconscionable.	6/25/2020 11:09 AM
58	Where is the agricultural areas?	6/24/2020 11:17 PM
59	There is way too much commercial and HDH	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
60	There is way too much commercial and high density housing on the map. We want to keep a small town feel and putting in so much HDH and Commercial would destroy that.	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
61	Even against the property owners wishes this land has been changed out of agricultural. No more patio homes or HDH. There is absolutely nothing on this GP that protects anyone! The assumption that everyone is going to sell soon proves my point! If people do decide to sell and their is a road on the GP it puts a huge amount of pressure on the other land owners. Not to mention the scare of future eminent domain. This is why the citizens are gun shy and do not trust our govt.	6/23/2020 8:27 PM
62	Not at all easy to understand	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
63	No comment	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
64	Get rid of High Density and multi use zones	6/23/2020 10:19 AM
65	There is WAY too much commercial/business on the 2nd draft/map! People come to South Weber to LIVE NOT TO SHOP! If we wanted that much commercial land, we would've stayed in Ogden.	6/22/2020 10:19 PM
66	I sure am confused with your beginning goal to keep south weber a home town feeling. This map just shows you filling every possible space to house people and lose its natural resources and beauty for Homes everywhere you can fit them in....I feel your beginning statement is just to try to make it sound like you want to keep south weber its quaint little town but you really dont.	6/22/2020 4:35 PM
67	There is no way, that any part of this plan benifits the entire community outside of increasing population, to increase taxes, to increase our government bodies pay checks. We want a semi rural community with lots of farm land not to be allocated to any suburb as soon as its up for sale, the land should stay the same size and be sold to who ever can appreciate it for what it is. No matter how many times you ask the same question you only are diludeing what the citizens want to make what you want. You are for get the FOR the PEOPLE part of your jobs. Stop making South Weber like every other city in Utah.	6/22/2020 4:15 PM
68	Frankly disagree with it. The negatives outweigh the positives	6/22/2020 4:13 PM
69	none	6/22/2020 2:44 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

70	More low density	6/21/2020 9:10 PM
71	We should have more Low density	6/21/2020 8:34 PM
72	We need more low dense housing	6/21/2020 8:17 PM
73	The gravel pit should be cross-hatched for potential mixed-use. The A zone northwest of the gravel pit should be R-7 or C-H cross-hatched for mixed-use. The whole strip of land along the south edge of I-84 should be either R-7 or mixed use. We can create density along this area without impacting the rest of town! Taking advantage of undeveloped land adjacent to a FREEWAY on the edge of town is low-hanging fruit to increase our population density and generate demand for more commercial within our city limits without impacting our community's core. Making sure there are well-thought zone and design requirements that continue to promote density in undeveloped areas on the fringes of town, open space (with higher-density developments, you naturally create more open and common space), trail networking, creative city amenities, and parks, we can increase South Weber's ability to provide more of what the citizens want the city to provide in the way of amenities and public service upgrades that are only attainable with a robust commercial tax base.	6/18/2020 4:00 PM
74	less commercial. less mdh. more open spaces and better quality	6/18/2020 3:48 PM
75	Main concern with the commercial zone in center of the city across from City Hall. This has failed to be viable as commercial in the past and multiple recommendations for uses have been turned down. With the commercial locations and growth of commercial on east and west ends of town, I'd like to see this area re-zoned as residential.	6/18/2020 2:38 PM
76	I feel like the big parcels that are not currently being developed should be left agriculture. Let the property owners live in peace of not being hounded by developers to change their property prematurely. If someone wants to sell, let them get a proposal together and then approach the city!	6/17/2020 8:18 PM
77	Across the street from city offices needs to be residential. We have seen many businesses come and go. Freeway zones will support all SWC businesses	6/17/2020 7:33 PM
78	Depending on the type of highway commercial, crime rate will increase in South Weber. That has already been established in the past.	6/16/2020 10:44 PM
79	I emphasize to have the right balance of Projected Land Use to continue our small hometown feel to our South Weber community -- avoid over-crowding and congestion.	6/16/2020 6:03 PM
80	The highway Commercial zone should not be there. This is a country setting and that would disrupt that feel off 475 E.	6/16/2020 11:01 AM
81	I do not agree with the Residential Multi-Family (R-7) just west of Old Post Office Road, previous plan had Residential Patio Homes. I agreed with that option or the consideration of consistency with the surrounding homes of Residential Low-Moderate.	6/15/2020 11:58 PM
82	Most I am worried about is 1900 going through to Layton, NO, NO, NO	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
83	There is an awful lot of the commercial/recreation land. Can't we put more residential there?	6/15/2020 4:15 PM
84	This zoning doesn't reflect the desires of the residents of South Weber.	6/15/2020 4:11 PM

**Q23 DRAFT Vehicle Transportation Map** This map signifies the plan for future roadways in the City. It identifies general road connections, but does not lock in specific future alignments. Although there are exceptions, typically roads are built as development occurs. [Link to view larger map](#) [Link to first draft map if you'd like to compare](#) Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the DRAFT Vehicle Transportation Map

Answered: 86 Skipped: 641

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	This map needs to be looked at and put on another survey.especially the west end connection.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	This map needs to be looked at further on another survey. West end connections?!	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	Another survey would be better for this map.	7/6/2020 11:47 AM
4	The road proposals, south of the elementary school will be contested (especially a collector road) for a variety of just reasons. This proposal follows the city failure to address (continuously ) Lester Drive as this major conduct.	7/6/2020 10:25 AM
5	Roundabouts do not slow traffic - keep them out of South Weber. Keep the speed limit low. Do not extend 1900 E to Layton. We DO NOT need another road to Layton. We DO NOT need more traffic just going through South Weber neighborhoods. That area is steep. It is susceptible to erosion & slides. During the summer, it is a potential fire hazard. It should be left open space for wildlife with NO ACCESS other than emergency.	7/6/2020 9:51 AM
6	No roundabouts. Places in other countries are removing these traffic hazards. No road to Layton Jo, Leave that area for wildlife and a buffer from Layton	7/2/2020 5:39 PM
7	Do NOT extend 1900 E to Layton!	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
8	No roads to Layton - and no large roads from the new road by the posse grounds - we don't want any big roads through subdivision.	7/2/2020 4:48 PM
9	Again consider the Pacificorp development at the power plant in Weber Canyon possible road going to the general area. Long term planning.	7/2/2020 4:18 PM
10	Could the road up to Layton be a toll road? Limiting the number of cars allowed each day?	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
11	Anything showing any connection to Layton is out.	7/2/2020 3:39 PM
12	A frontage road along 89 would be a great option for	7/2/2020 10:55 AM
13	Vehicle travel should have been planned for years ago - they have no vision to what would have been needed now - build something and put roads in mish-mash- it is a little late to decide to put roads - just here and there to accommodate developers and costs citizens - people will move - if this continues and costs keep going up.	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
14	People moved to South Weber for the views, the small town feel so be careful where roads might be developed.	7/1/2020 11:57 AM
15	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:26 PM
16	South Weber streets need to be designed for South Weber residential traffic; NOT for any type of commercial or industrial use except in the designated commercial areas along I84 and Hwy 89/SWD. Expanding our streets will only serve to bring outside traffic through our city. Might I suggest perusing this Facebook page in detail as to what happens when bigger roads are built and other traffic phenomena. <a href="https://www.facebook.com/TransportationPsychologist">https://www.facebook.com/TransportationPsychologist</a>	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
17	I think South Bench drive is a horrible road. Yes we need connectivity between subdivisions down there and because of poor city planning and allowing developers to have only one access road in or out instead of connecting to the next development is irresponsible. We are trapped in our subdivisions so developers can have an extra lot.	6/30/2020 9:39 PM
18	Yes, no connecting to Layton through town.	6/30/2020 9:29 PM
19	Again to keep south Weber the unique community that we are we need to keep the roads residential and not let pressure from the outside of our community to alleviate their problems! The state needs to fix 89 and that will make our roads less traveled! STRONGLY AGAINST CONNECTING TO LAYTON!!	6/30/2020 8:45 PM
20	I strongly disagree with the road to Layton!	6/30/2020 8:39 PM
21	The plan is pushing a lot of traffic onto South Weber Drive, what is the growth path for that road? There are really only two ways out of South Weber one is South Weber Drive, and the other is 89. What happens with a disaster that shuts down 89? It Really feels like we should address some significant current safety concerns before address the growth that is on the table.	6/30/2020 8:20 PM
22	No more development on the bluff. Don't cut into the toe of the heel. We live in an earthquake	6/30/2020 7:33 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	zone and are prone to landslides.	
23	Please reference the preceding sections of this General Plan Survey (GPS). Section 11. - Option 2B - Roundabout Design - GPS pp 9-10 Section 12. - Option 2E - No connection to Layton - p-10	6/30/2020 4:59 PM
24	Do not want major connector road to Layton at all!! South Weber does not need more traffic. Not a drive through!!	6/30/2020 3:38 PM
25	No connector roads to Layton other than Hwy. 89.	6/30/2020 3:05 PM
26	Take the access off 1900 E. The city has not listed any of the other "ACCESS" roads on the city transportation map. Lets be done with all of this nonsense. IF you want to solve a problem lets fix the east west connections.	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
27	No connection to Layton!	6/30/2020 1:19 PM
28	Absolutely opposed to connection to Layton!	6/30/2020 11:58 AM
29	Are you planning to build houses in the gravel pit in the future? I feel that all of the future roads will be dictated by future projects.	6/30/2020 10:02 AM
30	Why is there a road going over the freeway and river and into Uintah just east of the I-84/US-89 interchange - and through the middle of the gravel pits? They might need some explanation in the General Plan.	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
31	We would really appreciate if 1900 does NOT get approved to connect to Layton.	6/29/2020 11:48 PM
32	NO LAYTON CONNECTION! It is un-necessary to connect us to Layton anywhere in our city and expect to keep it the way it is. We don't need to waste the money to even see if it's feasible! It's not!	6/29/2020 9:43 PM
33	Please consider adding Speed bumps when collector road through neighborhoods to help slow traffic and keep our kids safe.	6/29/2020 9:31 PM
34	No connection to Unita or Layton	6/29/2020 9:27 PM
35	Remove the east end of 7800 South as being a future collector road and do not connect to View Drive.	6/29/2020 7:19 PM
36	East West traffic flow options should increase so that we don't entirely depend upon South Weber Drive. But no connection or tollway to Layton please. The idea is to reduce traffic burden on existing roads, not increase.	6/29/2020 4:53 PM
37	I do not think we need any other roads in SW maybe a lower frontage road that runs along the north side of south weber and connecting to neighborhood roads along the way	6/29/2020 3:52 PM
38	Remove the east end of 7800 south as being a future collector road and do not connect to view drive.	6/29/2020 3:46 PM
39	A connection to Layton is vital. While I know those that live along 1900 will not agree, but unfortunately new roads and connectivity is what helps a City to thrive. In all reality the people who use this connection will be mostly residents of the City, there is no incentive for someone to take a round-about way home if they don't live in the City.	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
40	I feel by okaying this map it is as close to lock in as you can get at this point. If things develop then address them at that time. I feel saying yes to this gives you false statistics that you can use inappropriately as if we all were in favor. Why would you bother to get our approval if it didn't matter	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
41	No roads to Layton.. EVER.. Before we go and build a million dollar road to NO WHERE think of the residents and what is in our best interest. You can see on the plan and facebook and in meetings, we do not want more traffic we do not want more access we want to be logical in what we put in here. The million dollar road to no where could have been used to update parks or fix roads that need maintenance, instead of jumping the gun and pushing for a road no one wanted. Stay away from the elementary with new roads the appeal of that school is NO ONE knows where it is. Don't put highways next to it. Don't put roads on unstable hills.	6/29/2020 10:47 AM
42	we have enough roads	6/29/2020 10:02 AM
43	I think roads should be approved as they are needed as you stated. Not get locked in by this	6/29/2020 1:54 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	plan	
44	WHO OR WHAT WILL BE IN GRAVEL PIT AREA???	6/29/2020 1:35 AM
45	"619 It is important that major transportation routes through South Weber are protected 620 from unnecessary traffic motion." This should be taken into consideration when considering an access road to Layton. This will increase unnecessary traffic in the whole city as people use that road to commute THROUGH the city. This connection will never remain a "paved local road", but become a major commuter road by people seeking to avoid the traffic on highway 89. There will be many people using this road who do not live in our city, bringing all sorts of safety and crime problems that come with having people who don't live in the city commute through the city. "659 1900 East Street is an extremely important collector road. It has a serious safety hazard 660 at approximately 7550 South. Here it traverses a steep bluff which reduces sight 661 distance at the intersection with 7600 South and encourages traffic to speed as cars 662 travel north down the hill. It should be a priority to evaluate the possibility to mitigate 663 this safety hazard." This should also be strongly taken into consideration, considering you want to bring thousands of commuters through the city ON THIS DANGEROUS ROAD! Also, ample consideration should be given to the costs that this would bring to the city in building, maintaining, and making/keeping this road safe. Consideration of the contaminants found on/in the hillside should also be taken. This is not a safe or wise plan.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
46	No North-South roads into Layton.	6/28/2020 10:54 AM
47	None other than we should not have a road access into Layton (I know this doesn't show that but am just reiterating). That will only facilitate a more rapid development and lost the small, rural, country feel of South Weber.	6/28/2020 10:12 AM
48	Strongly against road to Layton. I have heard talk that it is in the UDOT's master plan to create another road to Layton. If this is the case the burden of payment should go to the state and not the residents of South Weber. Why are we doing their initial legwork? How on earth would a road to Layton benefit anyone in South Weber unless you worked at HAFB? You really want to increase vehicle traffic on our roads that we have already proved we are unable to maintain? Hillside studies have concluded ad nauseum that it is likely unsafe. We don't have enough police presence to enforce speeders as is. 1900 E speeding is atrocious already. People live on this road. They don't want the road.	6/27/2020 6:01 PM
49	I just think we all need to be patient and understand a few minutes more travel keeps our town's traditional environment intact.	6/27/2020 10:18 AM
50	More trails	6/26/2020 10:47 PM
51	IN NO WAY WHAT SO EVER CONNECT SOUTH WEBER DIRECTLY TO LAYTON.	6/26/2020 10:46 PM
52	Vehicle circulation should be considered as life safety issues, connection to different areas in one or more ways, no dead ends, let property owners decide how they want to connect to other areas and if it meets smooth and safe movement through the city, then get the city council, city engineer and other citizens that don't want change or not in my back yard out of the equation. Good fire and police access always comes first in a good design, pass that info onto developers.	6/26/2020 3:09 PM
53	Zero connection roads to Layton. Keep Subdivisions sub decided from one another to the max extent possible. (flow them to a connection road like South Weber drive, but not to each other.). This provides serenity and security for each neighborhood. Consider Emergency use only outlets to I-84, H-89.	6/26/2020 10:00 AM
54	Let's avoid making South Weber a shortcut racetrack to Layton.	6/26/2020 12:20 AM
55	NO CITY UTILITY ACCESS ROAD TO ALLOW FOR ANY FUTURE ROADS CONNECTING TO LAYTON.	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
56	We don't need to address this at this time.	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
57	Again do not build that tie in road to the layton road. I don't want the traffic and I don't want the expense. This road is going to cost you 4-6 million dollars. I know who gets to pay for it.	6/25/2020 2:31 PM
58	No "future road" connecting to Layton City ever!	6/25/2020 2:18 PM
59	Totally confused on the roads for west South Weber. I do not live there and do not know the needs. The road to Layton is a community and safety hazard.	6/25/2020 1:15 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

60	Gave feedback in a previous section. Do not want the Layton connection at 1900 due to safety concerns. Would appreciate other road to enter/leave the city.	6/25/2020 11:09 AM
61	No major connectors through neighborhoods	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
62	I don't think major connector roads through neighborhoods are a good idea. We need to limit how many cars go past houses.	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
63	Our city planning has been terrible. Take on 6650 two roads app. 30 feet away from each other across the streets but do not line up. A terrible afterthought dead end. DR Horton with houses on both sides that lines up with a very small canyon drive. Just a few examples of very terrible current planning! The land owners in the West end want to be left alone.	6/23/2020 8:27 PM
64	Even on full screen, very difficult to read	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
65	No connection from 1900 east to layton	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
66	2700 is going to have to be a mess .. will need to be widened somehow	6/23/2020 10:19 AM
67	The collector route from Layton to South Weber Drive via 1900 East needs to be stopped. Along with the steepness of the hill, trying to keep the speed down, high canyon winds, etc. it will also turn into a high speed shortcut from Layton to South Ogden. The road as projected runs through a residential area, would pick up speed from two hills in a straight line North. It would be a disaster accident wise.	6/23/2020 7:48 AM
68	Some of these roads don't make sense - are they going through the gravel pit? We should consider improving the roads we have then adding so many new ones.	6/22/2020 10:19 PM
69	So I understand planning but I disagree strongly that you should have it on the plan when you don't know what is going to happen. Agreeing with this now seems like you will lock us in and be able to put these planned roads in whenever you choose. I say if it calls for it then you consider it. Not lock people in....Hmmm	6/22/2020 4:35 PM
70	Absolutely, no on the Layton Connection.	6/22/2020 4:30 PM
71	NO ROADS THROUGH PEOPLES PROPERTY REGARDLESS OF DEVELOPMENT.	6/22/2020 4:15 PM
72	You are proposing that we literally intrude on peoples land, which they bought with hard earned money, just to have more traffic through our city. Lets not even start about how this will effect peoples yearly taxes.	6/22/2020 4:13 PM
73	none	6/22/2020 2:44 PM
74	Leave as is. Let people live there. NO connection to Layton.	6/21/2020 9:10 PM
75	We should keep it as simple as possible. Let the people who live near by have a deciding factor, and no connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:34 PM
76	Keep very simple let people that live nearby decide and no connection to Layton	6/21/2020 8:17 PM
77	No road to Layton on 1900 East!!!!!! It is just fine to take 89!!!!!!	6/20/2020 11:43 AM
78	NO ROAD TO LAYTON AND STOP PIMPING US OUT TO OTHER CITIES/DEVELOPERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	6/18/2020 3:48 PM
79	Is there no potential to complete the road interruption on 7650 S to connect residentially? Perhaps instead of the proposed road west and just prior to the "break" in 7650 S.	6/18/2020 2:38 PM
80	ABSOLUTELY NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON!	6/17/2020 8:18 PM
81	A collector road up 1900 E is beyond dangerous. Stop thinking with your wallet and think with your head. It's unsafe and a bad idea on so many levels.	6/16/2020 10:44 PM
82	I emphasize to have the right balance of Vehicle Transportation mapping to avoid congestion.	6/16/2020 6:03 PM
83	This looks acceptable.	6/16/2020 11:01 AM
84	I am concerned of a connecting road to Layton on such a steep grade and the access, and utilization of the road. I strongly disagree with option 2D.	6/15/2020 11:58 PM
85	N/A	6/15/2020 4:46 PM

86 A connection of South Weber to Layton will bring only costs with no benefits. South Weber does not have the municipal strength to maintain this road nor does the city have the support of the county or state maintain this project. Increased traffic, damage, and disturbance to South Weber will only degrade the cities quality and the residents will be the only source of funding to try and keep it up. This road is an attempt to use South Weber's resources to profit people and organizations outside of the city, instead of it's residents.

---

6/15/2020 4:11 PM

**Q24 DRAFT Active Transportation and Parks Map** This map signifies the plan for future trail connections, trail heads, bike lanes, and parks. [Link to view larger map](#) [Link to first draft map if you'd like to compare](#) Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding this **DRAFT Active Transportation and Parks Map**

Answered: 78 Skipped: 649

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Trails that are not in city current boundaries with the exception of Bonneville Shore Trail need to be revised. Is the city trying to	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	There are trails on this map that are out of city boundaries "Canal Trail" is on private property	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	There are trails on this map that are not within the city boundaries.	7/6/2020 11:47 AM
4	The Council Trail and the one proposed on the South hillside will never happen. Those are located on (or pass through) private, heavily polluted properties. Pollution which the Base has elected to leave in place as it allegedly will only create human exposures with "trespassers" and (of course) the landowners.	7/6/2020 10:25 AM
5	The area that the canal trail is proposed is dangerous for a trail area. It could potentially cause litter & contamination to the canal & residents that are adjacent to the trail. The Pea Vinery trailhead & trail is shown to go through open space. This is steep & giving access to this area will cause further erosion in an unstable area. It is a wildlife area & should remain that without any human encroachment, traffic, litter, & potential fire hazard.	7/6/2020 9:51 AM
6	No canal trail, Pea Vinery Trail head & Trail, Bonneville Shoreline trail. This will eliminate our privacy.	7/2/2020 5:39 PM
7	Keep your trails away from backyards & our culinary water source. Please & thank you!	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
8	Extend proposed trail from Weber Canyon Trailhead to possible development at the power plant in Weber Canyon	7/2/2020 4:18 PM
9	The canal road has gates locking access to walking there.	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
10	These trails just create problems for property and home owners.	7/2/2020 3:39 PM
11	Most have a hard time reading the maps, and then you read that it isn't current?	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
12	Recreation/trails is a must!	7/1/2020 11:57 AM
13	Please consider equine access along trails and zones that could be 1 acre very low density (A). Pleasant Valley Park Sub. is the only present Subdivision at this time zoned as such but it would be nice to have pockets of this zoning to keep the country charm of South Weber with livestock here and there.	6/30/2020 10:43 PM
14	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:26 PM
15	Hard to go against more parks and trails. My only suggestion is making some of or part of them Handicap Accessible.	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
16	Why didn't this survey provide the costs for these "wish list" items? Trails are a waste of our money. There are more than enough trails around us. Most of our older parks are so out dated but you want to spend money on giant new ones. We dont need more parks, we need to take better care of the ones we have.	6/30/2020 9:39 PM
17	I never consider there to be enough parks, I love open space. I would love to see a lot more green.	6/30/2020 8:20 PM
18	Yes to: Bonneville Shoreline Trail, Weber River Parkway Trail, View Drive Trail, and Old Fort Trail. No to : Canal Trail - Would adversely impact residents safety, security and privacy who live along this trail. South Hillside Trail - Cuts to make the trail would further destabilized this already hazardous slope.	6/30/2020 4:59 PM
19	Trails need to be considered by the cost. Who will pay for it and would our taxes raise. Maintain? Who and how much?	6/30/2020 3:38 PM
20	You guys really need a mitigation map.	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
21	It needs more north/south connections.	6/30/2020 10:23 AM
22	How much are theses trails going to cost? What is the impact on the neighborhoods that they go through? It is hard to agree or disagree with the plan, when so much is not known.	6/30/2020 10:02 AM
23	The City has spend a gross out of proportion of funds on Canyon Meadow Parks on the west side rather than equally spreading park funds on improvements and unique features at the	6/30/2020 1:11 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

large and smaller retention basin parks spread across the City. Central Park, Cherry Farms, and other parks are delapidates and the City continues to over spend with pickleball and other attractive features almost all at Canyon Meadows!

24	You need to show or plan for parking areas near all of the future trailheads. We don't want people parking up and down the streets near each trailhead.	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
25	We love to bike and run. The idea of more trail options is great!	6/29/2020 11:48 PM
26	The Pea Vinery trailhead is also a waste of resources! We have plenty of parks, let's spend our money fixing them up and taking care of them instead of adding to it. Seems like the city already struggles to keep up! No to the canal trail and the south hillside trail too!	6/29/2020 9:43 PM
27	I prefer paved trails off major roadways.	6/29/2020 9:31 PM
28	Bring on the trails! (As long as they dont take land from our citizens)	6/29/2020 9:27 PM
29	Excited to see more trails coming to South Weber!	6/29/2020 7:19 PM
30	Just so long the cost is not passed on to SWC residents and their privacy is maintained, I am good with it. Like Taylor Walton suggested, maybe bike shop sponsors might pick up the tab.	6/29/2020 4:53 PM
31	Remove all future trails	6/29/2020 3:46 PM
32	Trails are great, if they can be maintained. We need to have an increase in public works employees to help maintain the trails. It would also be good if the trails were wheelchair accessible - or for that matter - wide enough for a stroller and another person to walk side by side.	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
33	Like I have said before Why do we need trails all over our city. All that does is scar our slopes and neighborhoods and natural resourses. This will move our natural wildlife out or damage their homes. There are many animals on our slopes. Where do you think the street DEER RUN DRIVE came from. I have personally seen deer on their road. Fox Ducks, geese, turkeys deer cats. Leave it alone. Trails don't make people healthy....people make people healthy. Why are we promoting all these beautiful sidewalks and then not promoting using them to get more healthy, without destroying our natural surroundings.	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
34	I think a bike lane and sidewalks are a MUST on South Weber Dr. and neighborhoods around our city. We must have safe options for recreation and I just don't think (at least for road bicyclists,) that it is very safe in some areas of South Weber Dr. It is very dangerous, in fact. I LOVE the trail ideas! Of course, as long as safety precautions are heeded and have sufficient parking areas.	6/29/2020 1:23 PM
35	Like the idea of more trails and parks.	6/29/2020 10:47 AM
36	don't mess with more roads	6/29/2020 10:02 AM
37	What is this obsession with trails. We are not a national park. I don't want the beautiful natural slopes or every nice area to be scared by trails. Trails = trash, distruction of our natural resourses, our wild animal populations of many varieties. Good grief. this is not going to make our citizens more healthy. That comes from within not from cutting into our beauty so it can be trampled and distroyed. This is coming from a person that walks 10 miles every morning 7days a week 365 a year. Leave it alone	6/29/2020 1:54 AM
38	I strongly oppose the canal trail. This is unsafe and we should stop trying to pursue it.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
39	The map looks fine and the locations/ideas of the trails look great. I prefer not having pavement put down for the trails. Have them all be natural. There are sidewalks everywhere and planned to go in which people can utilize if needed. Trails should be natural, hence the name... It also is much cheaper to build and maintain which saves city budget for other important items.	6/28/2020 10:12 AM
40	I love trails and bike lanes and use them often. If it encroaches upon someone's property and they are opposed to it then we should support their rights. Other people's recreation should not take precedence over property owners.	6/27/2020 6:01 PM
41	See earlier comments.	6/27/2020 10:18 AM
42	More trails!	6/26/2020 10:47 PM
43	I agree with parks and recreation additions.	6/26/2020 10:46 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

44	We need to work more on our city parks and less on trails, lets get access to the park 7550 (in a home owners association) we need to get direct access from 1900 east with parking, that is really a nice park, but people are a little scared to use it because it's in a private association. Let's take a look at what we have before we venture out trying to create new things. We really need another bigger park, money better spent on looking at property for this (and make sure there is enough parking for the use.)	6/26/2020 3:09 PM
45	No trails. Bigger hassle than they are worth. Not fair to residence close to trails. Trails around city parks? maybe if they protect the privacy or residence. Other trails/Nature paths etc seem great but at night they become shady and dangerous.	6/26/2020 10:00 AM
46	SHOULD BE VOTED BY CITIZENS PRIOR TO ANY SORT OF ANNEXATION.	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
47	I strongly disagree with the Pea Vinery Trailhead	6/25/2020 7:19 PM
48	Don't have a problem	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
49	I am good with the recreation parks and trails.	6/25/2020 2:31 PM
50	Too small to really read the fine details. Need better understanding on costs associated with new trails and who or how these would be paid for. This could be a community meeting in itself if funding or grants are available.	6/25/2020 1:15 PM
51	Would love to see much more in the way of trails and parks and I think bike lanes along So Weber Drive would be fantastic! Be a great way to access Riverdale. I realize it is a state road, but could we not partner with them? Would like dogs allowed in more places- will they be allowed on trails on a leash? Understand dog park in the works, but the only place we're allowed to walk a dog currently is on the sidewalks as they are not allowed in any park at all. One huge safety concern- the canal trail. I think that is not a good idea due to safety issues.	6/25/2020 11:09 AM
52	Need bike trails.	6/24/2020 11:17 PM
53	The canal trail and bike trail should definitely be taken off. But any trails that we have to pay for are a bad idea. I don't like the future park on 1900 E. It would take away any wildlife on that hill.	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
54	All trails that we have to pay for are not a good idea. Stop spending our money!!! Stop wasting resources on trails that dont belong here. The Canal trail is especially a bad idea. We would have kids falling in or people trowing garbage in there. We would haveto pay to service it. Future park on 1900 E. is a bad idea. Depending on how it's done. If it was a nature walk that might be okay but keep the integrity of the habitat that is there for the wildlife.	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
55	Best map of the whole series	6/24/2020 11:43 AM
56	I've talked to land owners near the Bonneville shoreline trail that are against this as well as many people who live by the canal that are also against this trail. Obviously it's not what the citizens want. The idea of some fancy trails is not as enticing as a govt that can be trusted.	6/23/2020 8:27 PM
57	Because of the colors easier to read GREEN	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
58	No comment	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
59	I think all trails can be a good thing, even if they ran close to my backyard. I do not see the Weber River being a good trail for exercise, with the highway so close.	6/23/2020 7:48 AM
60	I like the new trails.	6/22/2020 10:19 PM
61	We don't need trails planned without \$ amounts attached...Again you are not being up front with asking this question. Example... Well, I want to buy you a car....I will take a a corvette Z06(Christmas List) Well, it will cost you 80K. Oh, Well I guess I will take a 2015 Mazda 6. You shouldn't ask for an answer without all the info given out so a responsible answer can be given. If roads are being built through emanate domain We should put our citizens property first. No progress is worth stomping on our neighbors property as if "the city" was more important than the years of life they have spent and invested.	6/22/2020 4:35 PM
62	Not a single on of these trails should be on here, we don't want them even if they don't cost a dime they destroy the natural habitat that many animals enjoy, not to mention the pointless efforts to make them cost less. these serve no purpose and is an insult to the reason we live here in the first place especially along the hill because we enjoy how natural it is, we don't want to watch people running around up there or even see , or know that anyone other than the wonderful natural creatures are up there, leave it alone	6/22/2020 4:15 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

63	These trails are just as, if not more, invasive to the communities livelihood as the proposed roads. Another negative outcome.	6/22/2020 4:13 PM
64	none	6/22/2020 2:44 PM
65	Maintain what we already have.	6/21/2020 9:10 PM
66	We should take care of what we have and not raise taxes to have more.	6/21/2020 8:34 PM
67	We need to develop and take care of what we have	6/21/2020 8:17 PM
68	Leave the river trail for the fishermen	6/20/2020 11:43 AM
69	Great plan! But needs to be more robust with more thought toward looping / creating more trail intersections. This shows too much out and back. The potential loops a walker, hiker, biker could do are too large. I want smaller loops on protected trails to take my children for loops that take less than an hour. Having more variety of routes increases the motivation to get outside and experience the community and benefitting from essential exercise. Our trail networks can continue to stand as one of our community's biggest assets that provides a plethora of benefits that contribute to a higher quality of life. I am not alone in the continuously rising populous voice that I do not need a backyard; my community and the world around me is my backyard. More creative and high-value density with more publicly accessible creatively designed common space.	6/18/2020 4:00 PM
70	Back off on trails until we know which we already have access to without IMPOSING on our neighbors and friends to simply fork it over..	6/18/2020 3:48 PM
71	I do not want to see the canal used as a trail. That is a disaster waiting to happen! I also don't want to see the Pea Vinery trailhead. This should not be counted as a park! We can't afford to do anything nice with it so we should focus on the parks we already have!	6/17/2020 8:18 PM
72	WE need more recreation places, etc. (pickle ball, family picnic areas, playground area with area to rent out for family events, pavilions, dog parks, splash pad)	6/17/2020 7:33 PM
73	I feel the balance of transportation and parks is a good balance.	6/16/2020 6:03 PM
74	We definitely need MORE access to parkway trails from South Weber. I hate having to drive to a trail head to get on a trail, and we need to get bikes and people OFF SOUTH WEBER DRIVE!!	6/16/2020 5:13 PM
75	Approved.	6/16/2020 11:01 AM
76	N/A	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
77	Looks great! Can't wait to have more trails.	6/15/2020 4:15 PM
78	The trails are an unnecessary use of funding for the city. Much like parks with mini railroad tracks that see no use. Walking trails only benefit a small percentage of residents.	6/15/2020 4:11 PM

**Q25 DRAFT Annexation Map** This map identifies land currently outside South Weber City's boundary that could become part of the City in the future through annexation. [Link to view larger map](#) [Link to first draft map if you'd like to compare](#) Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the DRAFT Annexation Map

Answered: 76 Skipped: 651

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I don't agree with annexation across city/county boundaries. Let land owner decide if they want to annex if they want or not	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Let landowners annexation when they want to annexation over county lines	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	Annexation is okay other than when they go into other counties. Landowners should decide.	7/6/2020 11:47 AM
4	Our properties immediately below the HAFB gold course have been studied by engineers seeking the most useful and cost effective for future development. Those engineers were strongly and unitedly opposed to developing into South Weber. We've so informed the City. We expected it to honor our decision by not continuing to show this property within the City's future plans.	7/6/2020 10:25 AM
5	Annexation of these areas is fine as long as the south hillside & southwest sides of the canal & the east bench areas remain open space. The area where we are supposed to be sharing with Layton City should be in sole control by South Weber so it can remain no access except for utility access of the culinary water reservoir.	7/6/2020 9:51 AM
6	Keep control of overlap with Layton. Keep what is open space open space. Especially on South West & East Bench.	7/2/2020 5:39 PM
7	Layton City already ruined the dump don't let them ruin our culinary water source too.	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
8	We do not need to annex the hill behind the school	7/2/2020 4:48 PM
9	N/A	7/2/2020 4:18 PM
10	No problems if they want to be annexed.	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
11	I see not positives to annex anything.	7/2/2020 3:39 PM
12	No annexation of residents personal property	7/2/2020 11:24 AM
13	What is the reason to Annex each of the land proposals? Do the citizens living there want annexation?	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
14	No annexing! More expenditures.	7/1/2020 5:17 PM
15	I don't think we should be annexing more land when we just had to increase our taxes 100% to cover what the city is spending now!	7/1/2020 5:06 PM
16	What will happen to our taxes?	7/1/2020 11:57 AM
17	I support adding more land and residential LDH/MDH to our already wonderful city.	6/30/2020 11:45 PM
18	Very concerned about the south annexation due to the issues with the land on the south slope. Would prefer no annexation since unlikely it will be developed.	6/30/2020 10:43 PM
19	We should not annex and land on the south slopes that would require us to have a road to provide services.	6/30/2020 10:26 PM
20	SWC needs to annex as much of the land surrounding our city so we can control what happens to the land around us and protect ourselves from encroachment; particularly the block of land that overlaps with Layton's annexation plans.	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
21	No need to annex. Layton doesnt want the property either.	6/30/2020 9:39 PM
22	Why would we want the hillside, it feels as though someone is planning on building up there, and we have seen the homes in Salt Lake and bountiful that have seen major issue for build on that type of terrain. It feels like a major liability for the city and the residents moving forward. Not to mention fire challenges, and wild life issue. It is also above the water level for the city in many cases, that is going to be expensive to pump water up there. The statement holds for a lot of the blue. It really feels like a contractor that is seeing dollar signs on homes sales and not seeing the challenges of engineering that will come with those changes. I believe that most of this would cause additional costs and danger for the community. I do not believe that it is a good idea at all. Not the right terrain for housing.	6/30/2020 8:20 PM
23	On the land use of the landfill after it is full so that land use does not cause added pollution or traffic issues.	6/30/2020 7:33 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

24	The only area that make any sense whatsoever is the area east of US89. The southwest hillside does not make any sense at all. Annexing this area would require SWC to provide utilities and other services that would be an excessive cost to SWC since the WDCC canal would be a substantial barrier to installing any services,	6/30/2020 4:59 PM
25	No not need to annex into Layton. The hill is a big concern for contaminants and cost so that is a NO from me!!	6/30/2020 3:38 PM
26	Put all the land back on the Annexation map that was taken off. Clearly some of you guys do not understand what the purpose of the Annexation map is or how it benefits the city.	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
27	No comment.	6/30/2020 10:02 AM
28	It would help if you split up the potential future plans for the annexation areas. The General Plan says that the east and south benches should be left open space due to the steep hills. Other annexation paragraphs in the General Plan indicate that future development and services would need to be planned for. Make the map show those different future plans with different colors. Why are we looking to annex any property north of I-84 and the Weber River (except maybe the gravel pit hole north of the river)? We can't get to those areas without going through Uintah. Let Uintah have them or leave them off our plans	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
29	We do not need to annex anything on the south side of the city! There isn't enough reason to service it!	6/29/2020 9:43 PM
30	None	6/29/2020 9:31 PM
31	Annexation areas to the south are on slopes. That will increase the cost to SWC tax payers. Don't annex them. The flat land Prussian blue areas are easier to annex. We can annex them. The guiding principle is SWC residents tax burden should not go up.	6/29/2020 4:53 PM
32	We should not allow annexation of any part of SW	6/29/2020 3:52 PM
33	Do not seek annexation.	6/29/2020 3:46 PM
34	No comments - this doesn't seem to have changed drastically over the years.	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
35	if you are wanting these for more business I am not in favor. If you want it for a cushion of nature then I am in.	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
36	I strongly agree with this proposal. I feel like more land means more great people to be added to our already wonderful city. I still think we need to limit the amount of commercial, but for LDH/MDH I am all for adding more land for that!	6/29/2020 1:23 PM
37	only annex to protect the land from development	6/29/2020 10:02 AM
38	If it stays open with out comercial businesses then I don't see a problem. If you are planning on filling it with houseing and commercial.....Abolutely NO NO NO	6/29/2020 1:54 AM
39	No annexation - Annexation should be left to the property owner.	6/28/2020 6:34 PM
40	I strongly OPPOSE annexing the land to the south at the top of the bluff from Layton.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
41	Annexation on the east side or North side seems fine but the others don't seem to make sense as much	6/28/2020 10:12 AM
42	I believe it is better for South Weber to Annex the land so we can say how it gets developed.	6/27/2020 11:39 AM
43	Any time we can acquire more land we should. That open the issue of how to use it. I'm not in favor of commercial developments beyond the established area's of hwy 89.	6/27/2020 10:18 AM
44	No not agree or want annexation with Layton City.	6/26/2020 10:46 PM
45	Lets keep our current annexation boundaries as is, if we give it away we have no control what is going there. At this time we may not be able to provide some services, but time stops for no one. At some point we may be able to provide those services, sorry my crystal ball broke years ago.	6/26/2020 3:09 PM
46	Always good to obtain more land. Depending on what the goal would be with this land.	6/26/2020 11:39 AM
47	No Annexing of anything between us and Layton. Let that be there problem. I will sacrifice the potential that they put something on the skyline I don't want in order to preserve the burden and danger of needing to maintain the annexed are and thus needing access up to there. Regarding	6/26/2020 10:00 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

the areas blow the ridge line, Annex if it makes sense to maintain our small town-feel and will benefit the community. Don't annex if it will cost us a lot resources or if it is to benefit development.

48	It looks like a road is drawn in from 1900 E to Layton. Take that road off.	6/25/2020 11:15 PM
49	AGAIN AGAIN AGAIN....NO ROAD CONNECTING TO LAYTON, OR TO I-80 OR TO MARS. We are good how we are.	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
50	There is no benefit to our city	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
51	Do not annex in that Layton Road. The light blue area is what I am objecting to. I also would not like more commercial but just residential east of HWY 89.	6/25/2020 2:31 PM
52	Do not annex any Layton property.	6/25/2020 2:18 PM
53	No comment	6/25/2020 1:15 PM
54	no comments	6/25/2020 11:09 AM
55	I think the city should move to align with the county and put the northern border at I-84.	6/25/2020 8:28 AM
56	Don't annex the hill to our city. We would have to pay to take care of it.	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
57	We don't want the annexation of the hill! Then we have to service those areas and we don't need the added expense!	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
58	WE need to annex to protect our viewshed	6/24/2020 11:43 AM
59	The problem with this plan is I don't think it's ours to develop or can we even afford it? Is most of it sensitive lands? We have had our fair share of ruining those!	6/23/2020 8:27 PM
60	This map is easy to read, I am not sure of the value of Annexation.	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
61	No comment	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
62	No real problem with this, except of course zoning	6/23/2020 7:48 AM
63	Do we need more land to maintain and spend money on? It's just more burden on the taxpayers.	6/22/2020 10:19 PM
64	Depends on the benefits it would bring or the detriments it would case....More information given is imperative before answering this question.	6/22/2020 4:35 PM
65	I am okay with adding these places to our city with very limited and careful uses dictated by the citizens not the planning community.	6/22/2020 4:15 PM
66	AGAIN: WE DO NOT NEED ANY CONNECTION INTO LAYTON OR HAFB! THE TRAFFIC FLOW ALONE INTO OUR CITY WOULD BE A NIGHTMARE. PICTURE HIGHWAY 89 ONLY THROUGH OUR CITY NOT OUTSIDE IT!	6/22/2020 4:13 PM
67	none	6/22/2020 2:44 PM
68	We do not need to extend South	6/21/2020 9:10 PM
69	No to the South	6/21/2020 8:34 PM
70	Annexation to North is okay no annexation to South	6/21/2020 8:17 PM
71	Why would we want a landfill and tainted soils????	6/20/2020 11:43 AM
72	no need to annex any of these lands. They're unstable at best and any connection requires that we be able to provide services to those areas. We don't have large enough fire dept, snow removal etc as is. Don't put the horse before the cart on this one. This seems like very poor planning and pipe dreams	6/18/2020 3:48 PM
73	I don't see the need to annex anything on the south side of town. That is a dangerous hillside full of contamination and other hazards! Leave it un-incorporated and when problems arise maybe we can share it with Layton!	6/17/2020 8:18 PM
74	I'm very hesitant about annexing...I don't want to lose the small hometown feel to our South Weber community.	6/16/2020 6:03 PM

South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

75	N/A	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
76	Having land on the other side of 89 is confusing, and shouldn't be considered.	6/15/2020 4:15 PM

Q26 DRAFT Sensitive Lands Map This map identifies areas within the City that may have hazards on the land and could require additional study or verification when developing. [Link to view larger map](#) [Link to first draft map if you'd like to compare](#) Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the DRAFT Sensitive Lands Map

Answered: 71 Skipped: 656

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	NO or very limited development in these areas. If development have an (?) ordinance to have developer place (?) zoning in trust & have the developer assume all responsibility for his development in (unknown) (unknown), bankruptcy will not affect this. They will still be held liable.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	No development in these areas!	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	NO development in these areas.	7/6/2020 11:47 AM
4	The city is wrong. It has no factual background supporting data to justify any of its plume maps. The maps it possesses originated as models. They are incompatible with official super fund records. The City's application of it's diminutive plume maps jeopardizes health and well-being of hundreds (close to a thousand City residents (mostly the new unexpecting ones)	7/6/2020 10:25 AM
5	No further development in those hazardous areas. Could be a danger to families.	7/2/2020 5:39 PM
6	N/A	7/2/2020 4:18 PM
7	I notice the sensitive lands are included as part of the road to Layton. Sensitive subject.	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
8	No more money spent on these areas - Enough studies done - Please no more spending here.	7/2/2020 11:24 AM
9	I understood studies have been done - several times - what hazards are prevalent in each area?	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
10	The studies have been done - hasn't changed much!	7/1/2020 5:17 PM
11	There has already been studies on most of these areas and they should be used before spending more money in the hopes of a different outcome!	7/1/2020 5:06 PM
12	It's important to study the land before going ahead with specific plans!	7/1/2020 11:57 AM
13	Building on possibly contaminated land should never be an option.	6/30/2020 10:43 PM
14	The strong language in the 2014 plan that talks about not developing on our slopes should be added back into the plan.	6/30/2020 10:26 PM
15	ANY prospective development that takes place on sensitive lands needs to acknowledge and confirm exactly WHY those lands ARE sensitive, then address what their development might do damage, or to enhance those sensitivities as well as how those sensitivities might affect the development, i.e. unstable soil, pollution, etc.	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
16	Leave the land alone! We have done enough test to know that this land needs to be left alone	6/30/2020 8:45 PM
17	Feels like we are late to the party on this one. Those lands are pretty full already. There are some sound issues as well in several locations. Those F35 are a lot loader than the F16's we used to have. I think there needs to be a general study to assess safety I could also use more explanation on this map. It does not clearly show what would be expected by wind patterns. I would question the validity, without more information to explain how and why each of the areas were created.	6/30/2020 8:20 PM
18	The proposed "Road To Layton" "RTL" has numerous environmental and geologic hazards associated with it. This would make such a road prohibitively expensive to develop. As mentioned previously the RTL creates an increased safety hazard to 1900 E. (due to increased traffic) as acknowledged in lines 258-263 of the GP document.	6/30/2020 4:59 PM
19	Refer back to other studies already done. No need for more cost to do it again. It would only be a worse evaluation over time because of the dump and HAFB	6/30/2020 3:38 PM
20	Please before there is any sort of development on any of the contaminated land get it tested. Better yet better safe than sorry just don't develop in the areas that show possible contamination.	6/30/2020 3:31 PM
21	This map is a nice map, but the city does not use it. Typically the city concedes to the developer and does what the developer wants regardless if it is on the map or not.	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
22	No comment	6/30/2020 10:02 AM
23	It might be helpful to color code the sensitive lands per their potential safety hazard. At least	6/29/2020 11:54 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

separate out steep hills and potential flood areas. There are a lot of residential homes in the pink areas. It would be nice to know why they are highlighted while many others are not.

24	It's shocking that so much has been built already on sensitive lands in this city. We should stop digging up the contamination until we know for sure that it's gone!	6/29/2020 9:43 PM
25	None	6/29/2020 9:31 PM
26	Our health could be at stake if this land is developed. Please protect our citizens!	6/29/2020 9:27 PM
27	If there is toxic waste dumping on these lands, then lets not disturb these lands. Our liability goes down and the "open spaces" feel goes up. We don't need to build build build on every piece of land.	6/29/2020 4:53 PM
28	Leave things the way they are. If there not broke don't fix them	6/29/2020 3:52 PM
29	No comment	6/29/2020 3:46 PM
30	No changes.	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
31	Amazing that we were never informed of these sensitive lands before we built. Just more reason to leave the slopes alone	6/29/2020 2:11 PM
32	I support cleaning up toxic lands	6/29/2020 10:02 AM
33	My guess very few if any residents knew they were building on these lands. I know I did not on either one of our houses. This would be much easier to see if the colors were different and not in the same family.	6/29/2020 1:54 AM
34	No more studies on this land. we have wasted enough money on this. It should not be used - it is sensitive.	6/28/2020 6:34 PM
35	A lot of the planned development is on sensitive lands--commercial recreation, roads, etc. It is almost as though this map is just here to give recognition that the planning commission KNOWS these are sensitive lands, but don't care and just want to push their agenda through anyway.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
36	Sensitive land area is far too large and larger than is needed.	6/28/2020 10:54 AM
37	None at this time.	6/27/2020 10:18 AM
38	We do not need to REPEAT prior studies. Too Costly and unnecessary.	6/26/2020 10:46 PM
39	Since clean up is going along nicely from Hill Air Force Base, the government is trying very hard to get this done and off their plate. Like South Weber, and any other cities in surrounding communities would like to get it off their plates, time is about the only way to get rid of all the contaminates but the government is trying every new technology to speed time along. I guess I would like to point out it was us humans and human error that created the problem, at least we the citizens are trying to reconcile this issue for our future generations. I'm very happy with the progress we have made and all of the new technology we are using, seems like we hear and are using something new at every RAB meeting.	6/26/2020 3:09 PM
40	Protect the wetlands!	6/26/2020 11:39 AM
41	Avoid to the max extent possible. Tread smartly and lightly when it can't be avoided. Seems we as a city have flubbed this one up a few times. Lets avoid creating problems and do what is smart for the community.	6/26/2020 10:00 AM
42	Well it looks as if the road you want to connect South Weber to Layton would be on land that needs further study because it would lay on land that is deemed potentially hazardous. This road isn't a good idea. Please spend the money fixing the problems that currently exist instead of studying if a road should be put on hazardous ground.	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
43	I need more information	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
44	Why would anyone in the Council or Mayor put us in the legal potential problem and lawsuits. Don't let the building residential or commercial be built in areas where you make people sick. It is bad enough we have done that with the Perry homes area.	6/25/2020 2:31 PM
45	Do not develop on any land that may have hazards!	6/25/2020 2:18 PM
46	We should not be digging into the South slopes for a road and put safety at risk.	6/25/2020 1:15 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

47	I would hope that you would carry out whatever studies or verification with absolute due diligence should some of those areas come up for development. Nearly the entire area is classified as sensitive. Just because land is available doesn't always mean it should be developed.	6/25/2020 11:09 AM
48	Stop trying to put things too close to the hill. It will only come down when the hill gives out!	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
49	I think you need to look at the studies that have already been done by professionals. I myself have found over 100 studies pertaining to this hill. If you insist on having somebody else come out, they will just reference the studies already done.	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
50	Need maps to show landslide potential, wildland interface,	6/24/2020 11:43 AM
51	My biggest suggestion is before to leave the sensitive land areas alone! I know of way too many people who live in these areas that have passed away or currently have Cancer. I think it was Kent Hyer that said, "everytime some old person dies we can attribute it to this." The people I'm referring to are not old! This has been proven again and again!	6/23/2020 8:27 PM
52	Deserves caution for expansion	6/23/2020 10:56 AM
53	No comment	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
54	Please for the health of citizens don't disturb the plumes for building on .. could lead to lawsuit ..Discourage building there	6/23/2020 10:19 AM
55	This shows how ridiculous it is to try and change South Weber from a residential area to a business hub, or what I think eventually would become North Layton. Keep it as a residential city, with recreation and parks. Yes I will be willing to play more taxes. I realize you cannot stop land owners from selling to developers, but you can zone what they can develop.	6/23/2020 7:48 AM
56	I hope we don't consider building on those lands, they seem dangerous.	6/22/2020 10:19 PM
57	Wow, I rest my case... leave our slopes alone. At the very least the citizens should be made aware. My home is in this pink area and we were never made aware of it. Sounds like a lawsuit ready to happen.	6/22/2020 4:35 PM
58	no money should be spent on developing any hazardous land, as I have personally witnessed the dangers of these hills, with land slides and also unknown chemical hazards from hill airforce base. LEAVE THEM ALONE	6/22/2020 4:15 PM
59	Why spend tax dollars on sites that are potentially hazardous? There is a reason they don't waste time trying to develop the land around Mt. Saint Helens. Let it be natural	6/22/2020 4:13 PM
60	none	6/22/2020 2:44 PM
61	The land south that is being debated as a connection to Layton isn't stable enough to house a road. No connection. To expensive.	6/21/2020 9:10 PM
62	Studies have already been done we should look at those. Sensitive lands should not be messed with	6/21/2020 8:34 PM
63	Very careful study should be made because of instability of south hills and land it should be left alone	6/21/2020 8:17 PM
64	Expensive a stupid. Just leave these lands alone!!!	6/20/2020 11:43 AM
65	I think there are PLENTY of studies already done and I don't agree with the city paying for MORE just to tell us what is obvious. Leave the slopes alone and don't act like it isn't the responsibility of the city to tell potential residents about contamination. I wish the city would have notified us when we were looking at the lots. I'm fully aware that some land owners were paid off by the base NOT to develop their land due to contamination and they've done it anyway. Where is the due diligence and where does the liability fall. It is a scary thought.	6/18/2020 3:48 PM
66	I can't believe we live in a sensitive area! Had we known, we would have kept looking! Cancer has already hit our home hard and if we do any further studies, it should be to see how badly our city has been affected by the contamination! Let's not stir up anything more by building on the bluff... anywhere along the bluff!!	6/17/2020 8:18 PM
67	Leave them alone. Animal greenbelt is needed for water and migration	6/17/2020 7:33 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

68	It's already been established that the hazardous areas are just that....A HAZARD. Houses and roads on steep, toxic slopes are senseless.	6/16/2020 10:44 PM
69	Test as needed	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
70	The residents need more information on the environmental impact of HAFB.	6/15/2020 4:15 PM
71	This map should be enough for planners and city officials to see how bad of an idea a connection to Layton is. These impacted areas don't disappear after a development project begins. The environment compliance and maintenance will continue as long as the development exists.	6/15/2020 4:11 PM

## Q27 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the Introduction and Master Goal Pages

Answered: 76 Skipped: 651

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	What orders are in place to prevent agriculture in South Weber??? To keep "small town charm!!!"	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Listen to the citizens. Not the mayor	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
3	You have no plans for agriculture use.	7/6/2020 11:48 AM
4	The biggest flaw with the master goal 'concerns' the pressing for higher density in residential areas. Superfund Risk Assessments stress that increased density is the most probable cause (by placing more human receptors around HAFB pollution).The city has ALREADY caused a huge problem. It's new subdivisions in known polluted areas ahead place more present & future residents at greater risks of toxic exposures.	7/6/2020 10:28 AM
5	The master goal to retain the city's rural atmosphere & small town charm is excellent. That is why I want to live here.	7/6/2020 9:51 AM
6	Maintain City Charm and keep South Weber rural feel.	7/2/2020 5:40 PM
7	Town charm; Let's keep that.	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
8	Keep the "small town charm" in the fore front. Quit allowing high density housing...we have more than enough now. I vote for 1/2 acre lot minimums.	7/2/2020 4:19 PM
9	Please no more high density housing. Keep the "small town atmosphere" - why we moved here!! NO ROAD TO LAYTON!!	7/2/2020 4:05 PM
10	No more expensive surveys - This could have been much easier.	7/2/2020 11:24 AM
11	These maps are too hard to read - very confusing	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
12	South Weber is a safe, neighborly area with small town appeal, let's keep it that way!	7/1/2020 12:00 PM
13	South Weber has, is, and will remain a residential community with little attraction for retail businesses which would need large numbers of customers from outside SWC to patronize their stores to be financially viable. Our location and population simply do not support retail development. Any potential customer coming from outside South Weber would have to drive by multiples of virtually every kind of retail establishment before they arrived here. Imagine driving by 3 Mavericks just to buy gas at the one located at SWD and 89. It's non-sensical. As someone that worked in retail site selection for a large international company I know what it takes to make a good retail location; and South Weber City does not have it outside of hosting a large destination type store such as Cabela's or possibly a large ATV/RV/Boat/Motorcycle/PWC type dealership; which I understand the city was approached by several years ago and turned away. The only other possibility I can think of is turning the gravel pit into an entertainment venue where off-road racing, monster trucks, trophy trucks, motorcycles, ATV's, circle track and figure 8 racers and the like could compete AND concerts, rodeos, and other types of live entertainment could be held. The pit could be reconfigured to fit the event coming up. South Weber needs to be leery of growing too large. We don't need to fill every nook and cranny of this valley with homes. We don't need to provide homes for low to moderate income people. What the formula says is moderate income doesn't come close to owning a home in the Salt Lake area, much less in SWC. I know, I've wanted to buy here for 20 years and it just keeps getting farther and farther away. Heck, I can't afford to buy anywhere respectable any more. We need to keep SWC the way it's been for decades; a quiet, safe, happy little town that some people in Ogden and Layton don't even know exists. All the reasons WHY we live here and others want to move here. Let's keep it special. Unique. Now when I tell someone I live in South Weber, 9 times out of 10 I hear back, "Oh, it's so nice there". If we expand too much, build too much, at some point that's going to change and I'm not willing to push that boundary too much farther. Our population density is 1,622 people per square mile. Grand Junction, Colorado's is 1619. Salt Lake City is 1688. The average nationwide is 87. Seems to me we need to spread out just a bit instead of jamming ourselves closer and closer together so we can "enjoy the open spaces".	6/30/2020 11:18 PM
14	South Weber is unique and special. We are unlike any other community. Let's not fall prey to becoming an undesirable place to live by cramming in as much as we can. Let's manage the growth responsibly.	6/30/2020 10:54 PM
15	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:27 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

16	<p>Our goal is not to be a "gateway to outdoor recreation". We dont have any outdoor recreation nor are we close by. There is no reason to stop at South weber to rent a white water raft to go down the weber river. Theres no snowmobiling trails or ATV trails. This was a cute thought but is not a goal. Our goal should be to create a small town with a historic past and great place to live. We should have a Christmas tree lighting and decorated entrance that carried down through the businesses on south weber drive to the one day new town hall. We would be seen from the top of both hills, and like Ogden could attract holiday business by utilizing the future businesses along south weber drive. We need to look into how we are going to help our small commercial zones grow and be successful, and nothing about "a gateway to the outdoors" will do that. West Yellowstone is that, we need to be proud of our small town charm and history. We have some incredible historic homes and of course the cemetery. Our introduction and master goal read like a developers guide to building whatever the hell you want. We need to take some time and put together a real plan, and stop trying to sell out the citizens. I also think its sad, that as you read other city's general plan introduction, they proudly talk about what makes their city special - we do the opposite. Every developer who reads this should have this in mind.</p>	6/30/2020 9:56 PM
17	<p>Keep south Weber the town it is and we love! Stop cramming houses in!</p>	6/30/2020 8:45 PM
18	<p>In general the ideas are good, and well thought out. But it does not address the real issue correctly. It seems clear that there is a strong push for growth, but the growth we have experienced has not been fully resolved. We need to step back a minute and try to figure out what we do with the current overgrowth, before we consider any significant additional growth. Managed growth is not the right words, it is hiding a lack of desire to fix what is already broken first. I don't trust wording like that anymore as it usually leads to explosive growth, and feels deceptive in today's society.</p>	6/30/2020 8:31 PM
19	<p>I absolutely disagree with the statement, "...while acknowledging that agriculture plays a minimal role in the current and future economic base of the community" That little sentence, how it is worded, diminishes the importance of the role the agricultural families put their heart and soul into in this community. Please think of revising to something that shows pride in what the families have done and have given to the people of South Weber. Or consider removing all together. 85 A primary goal of the city is to 86 maintain a portion of its historic rural character 87 while acknowledging current and future economic changes of the community. Also, how are we a "Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation"? I-84 runs East/West, and we have Highway 89 running North/South but we do not want that traffic flowing through our city in order to get people up to the mountains. Unless you are planning on ONLY limiting the "opportunities to capitalize on local recreational activities" along the South Weber Drive exit of Highway 89, then I would suggest NOT BOLDING (sorry, I can't bold here and wanted to get my point across) that "Slogan".</p>	6/30/2020 7:26 PM
20	<p>We agree with the goal to "pursue the retention of the small-town charm that is its hallmark." We don't feel that is consistent, however, with the goal to "promote itself as the Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation." The gateway path would sacrifice the small-town charm. We can't have both.</p>	6/30/2020 7:05 PM
21	<p>Typos, Grammatical and other errors should be corrected prior to finalization of the entire General Plan document as well as corrections made in this GP Survey.</p>	6/30/2020 5:01 PM
22	<p>Keep records for citizens to refer to. Appreciate the counselors that are involved. Did not have time to look at this.</p>	6/30/2020 3:40 PM
23	<p>Add that the city council says they want to listen to its citizens, but will usually side with the developer.</p>	6/30/2020 2:51 PM
24	<p>The motto of our city is "Country comfort - City Convenience. I wish that the planning commission would keep this in mind when making decisions. I accept change, but we don't need to expand our city to be like all of the cities surrounding us.</p>	6/30/2020 10:06 AM
25	<p>"Gateway to North Utah Recreation" - use Commercial pits area to develop a Recreation Ski Village/Boardwalk and create this vision of being the Gateway just like Alpine/Lehi has developed "Silicon Slopes" and Farmington Station on a much smaller but unique scale. To do this we need to actively pursue locally owned recreation rental and proactively connect with property that matches general plan. Major retailers and chains we don't support their market traffic needs.</p>	6/30/2020 1:21 AM
26	<p>I think the promotion of Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation is bold, yet baseless. We don't have any businesses to support recreation. How are we located any better/closer than other</p>	6/29/2020 11:54 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

cities such as Mountain Green? I like the small-town, historical focus. Being a recreation gateway doesn't exactly seem to mesh with that.

27	Your general plan discusses the risks of destabilizing the south hillside with numerous potential complications for the community - why don't you leave it alone - forever?	6/29/2020 10:57 PM
28	Keep the city small. It is referenced several times and we should keep it that way! So decreasing the zoning would really help with that!	6/29/2020 9:47 PM
29	We do NOT want higher density housing and the loss of agricultural is so sad. We should preserve our small town as much as possible.	6/29/2020 9:32 PM
30	None	6/29/2020 9:32 PM
31	Stop! It is time to stop raising taxes and work on improving or repairing current infrastructure.	6/29/2020 8:55 PM
32	Good question. My thoughts: Yes population is increasing. It should not be the job of SWC to dwell on how to fit in or adjust to population growth. Or accommodate them. Maintain pre-existing homes and lands. This means newer homes should have minimal impact and be of the same or better category, that is R4, R3 or lower. Avoid R7. No HDH. Same with commercial. Just a little commercial on edges of our City. The traffic impact and the lighting/billboards etc, impact should be minimal. Or don't invite such commerce. The storage unit on 2192 E South Weber Dr is discrete but Maverick is in your face. I prefer the former quiet ones that have minimal impact. I think we get enamored by license fees and impact fees but in the long run it adds to tax payers expense. Going forward our operating principle should be- if it increases long term tax liability for SWC residents, then it is not a good project. Easy and simple rule to follow. Thanks for the opportunity for me to opine.	6/29/2020 5:03 PM
33	I think we need to complete all current construction put in pathways for bikes and a frontage road to the north end of SW	6/29/2020 3:54 PM
34	No comment	6/29/2020 3:47 PM
35	None - I think it is very well written, nicely done!	6/29/2020 2:35 PM
36	Amazing that the main goal is to keep south Weber with its small town charm and fill it to the brim to make it look more like a busy city. Seem to be opposites. I don't want to be the GATEWAY to Northern Utah Recreation. Sounds like a political plug. I want it to remain a quiet sleepy small town. I don't think that;s really what is being proposed.	6/29/2020 2:17 PM
37	Line 104 What does the "Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation" mean. Are you adding that in there with an ulterior motive in mind. We are not the Gateway to recreation we are small town in the mouth of the canyon. Needs to be removed. Also added on line 95/96 "likely" that needs to be removed it leaves it open to change. South Weber WILL remain a small, distinct community.	6/29/2020 10:53 AM
38	Seems so silly to me to say South Weber should vigorously pursue the retention of the small-town charm that is its hallmark. Yet, you try to fill it to the very brim. That's not charming. "Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation" That sure doesn't sound like small town charm...That sound like capitalizing on filling it with Business and too many people. Total opposite of your very own statement. To me that is insulting and irritating at best. Lets just destroy our natural resourses in the name of "the good of its Residents" Being a healthy person comes from inside everyones own head not from trails. It certainly doesn't take trails for people to be healthier. I keep hearing boasting about these lovely sidewalks. I thought those were for walking....Trails destroy nature and scare our wildlife from their own homes.	6/29/2020 2:08 AM
39	WILL LIKELY MOVE!!!	6/29/2020 1:39 AM
40	"As the city continues to grow, South Weber should vigorously pursue the retention of 99 the small-town charm that is its hallmark." Connecting a road to Layton defeats this Master Goal.	6/28/2020 11:55 AM
41	Subscribe more to the past practices of the city government than to the new way of expanding the city. Many new residence like South Weber for the rural feel, but as soon as they move into the city they want to change it to the way it was in their past residence. Keep us rural.	6/28/2020 10:57 AM
42	The proposed general plan does not seem to align with the master goal of keeping South Weber a historic, rural, and small town charm.	6/27/2020 9:14 PM
43	Master goal seems good, but many proposals on the general plan seem to contradict the goal.	6/27/2020 9:13 PM
44	I think the city must not ever forget why people, including myself, choose to live here! I love the	6/27/2020 10:20 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

small town feel. I'm fine driving to other locations (Riverdale, Layton, Ogden) for all the commercial needs. If we flood our city with such businesses, I'll simply move up the canyon to keep my small town feelings alive, and drive longer for those commercial needs.

45	Would like to have residential where every possible. Parks and trails when safe and appropriate.	6/26/2020 10:50 PM
46	Would just like to say, please know there is a larger crowd of silent majority, and a very, very small loud minority. This small minority do not represent the large majority and the Council and Mayor should represent the majority of the population. Keep in mind they have a right to speak their opinions but we all live in this great county that allows for this. The City Council and the Mayor have a duty to listen, but they represent very quiet and private majority. Never let how you vote represents your fear of not being re-elected, because the majority will look at how you represented them and vote accordingly. Sure wish your time on the Council and Mayor was a better experience and because of a few that don't want to run, want to decide how they want this city to look, by being very vocal and expressing their opinions and half truths. But again that's what makes this country and this city such a great place to live. Thanks for your time and effort.	6/26/2020 3:28 PM
47	I moved out of Morgan because of this very reason. They are not managing growth well and they are allowing way too many residential vs commercial. Be smart. This is supposed to be about a community! Don't make it so big that is no longer feels that way.	6/26/2020 11:40 AM
48	I feel the key point of "Small-Town Charm" needs to be at the opening of the introduction and Master Goal. I think the master goal lacks SMART goal criteria (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-Bound) It's cute and fluffy versus strong and impactful.	6/26/2020 10:07 AM
49	I would like to see the City Council articulate some details about how they intend to "vigorously pursue the retention of the small-town charm that is its hallmark."	6/26/2020 12:26 AM
50	No connecting road to Layton	6/25/2020 10:53 PM
51	I did through out the survey	6/25/2020 3:53 PM
52	Once again most of these things you are proposing make sense and I know and love you all. But don't build the tie in road and connect to Layton and don't approve more high density housing. Be careful of the builders you are considering getting into bed with, some of these guys have a low life reputation.	6/25/2020 2:33 PM
53	No road to Layton. No more high density housing. Keep commercial to bare minimum and only that which draws a minimum number of people. Be very careful with hazardous land development. PLEASE!!!!!!	6/25/2020 2:20 PM
54	None	6/25/2020 1:16 PM
55	"As the city continues to grow, South Weber should vigorously pursue the retention of the small-town charm that is its hallmark." Agree profoundly. Unfortunately, nothing says charm like a 24/7 car wash in people's back yard! Nor do I understand the idea of being a Gateway to Northern Utah Recreation. We have little in the way of trails, little in the way of outdoor recreation other than kids' parks. We have limited access points to the river- THAT should definitely be capitalized upon.	6/25/2020 11:14 AM
56	I like the small town theme.	6/24/2020 4:59 PM
57	I think it looks alot better than last time.	6/24/2020 4:19 PM
58	We have steep slopes with landslides yet you want to put a road. We have beautiful wetlands but you're filling them in or wanting to mitigate them. We have proven govt contaminated areas but we let people build on them. We're putting roads through peoples property and infringing on their rights.	6/23/2020 8:42 PM
59	very complicated and in some cases difficult to understand, really difficult to read maps, even magnified.	6/23/2020 11:05 AM
60	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
61	Unable to access	6/23/2020 7:50 AM
62	I like the master goals, however, a lot of the proposed plans do NOT align with that goal. If we are focusing on small town charm and being the gateway to recreation, why are we building	6/22/2020 10:24 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	many more roads, connecting to Layton, adding a lot more commercial zoning?	
63	If we follow almost any of this plan it will destroy and dimean and prove that this government does not actually care about its citizens. IF our city is so great than why are we making so many pointless changes to things to make us just like everyone else. keep us rural, keep us small, cut out pointless businesses. OUR City is not our Mayor's (and her henchman's Play ground)	6/22/2020 4:23 PM
64	"A primary goal of the city is to maintain a portion of its historic rural character..." How is putting more CRAP in our city supposed to accomplish that. "Though the city still has area that can sustain growth, the city will likely remain a small, distinct community." NOT IF YOUR PLAN GOES THROUGH. It may very well become another dumpy city.	6/22/2020 4:22 PM
65	none	6/22/2020 2:45 PM
66	Fast growth almost always ends with huge community problems. Hopefully our elected officials will represent the views and respect the wishes of their voters.	6/22/2020 11:34 AM
67	We have too many people as is and we need to not continue to grow.	6/20/2020 11:46 AM
68	I like the use of the word "gateway."	6/19/2020 3:11 PM
69	It is well written. If I would add anything to it, I would add that the community will work to maintain its small-town charm suppressing through traffic from one end of town to the other and grow in residential density and commercial footprint along its fringes to maintain the quaintness of its core by aggressively working to increase its population, public amenities, commercial demand and footprint, and educational/institutional needs, and create from nearly non-existence a badly needed robust commercial tax base to ease the community's burden of an astronomical increase in local taxes they are currently staring down the barrel at right now.	6/18/2020 4:12 PM
70	I agree with keeping in line with the HALLMARK of Country comfort, city convenience. We do not need to try to compete with surrounding cities. We have an identity already and no need to change it.	6/18/2020 3:50 PM
71	I totally agree with the master goal. Can we get the city staff to also agree to it? It seems like all they are looking at is to build us out! Let's work to maintain what we have and limit growth! We do not need the input of the Wasatch Front Regional Council to give us any ideas on how to change our city! Let's keep it small and unique!	6/17/2020 8:21 PM
72	I concur with the Introduction and Master Goal pages.	6/16/2020 6:03 PM
73	I agree	6/15/2020 11:59 PM
74	For most part straight forward, but to stress once again no road through 1900 to Layton.	6/15/2020 4:46 PM
75	The goal is self defeating. Keeping the small town character does not happen by expanding, commercializing, and poor planning.	6/15/2020 4:17 PM
76	There is far too much high-density residential. Layton has tons of it, and this is known to be a smaller area. To keep the old town charm, we need less apartments and townhomes.	6/15/2020 4:16 PM

**Q28 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the  
Citizen Involvement section**

Answered: 87 Skipped: 640

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Listen to the residents of South Weber	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	If we get involved listen to what we are saying! We have done a survey already but here we are again!	7/6/2020 1:42 PM
3	Listen. We have spoken.	7/6/2020 1:32 PM
4	Listen to what the citizens want not what the committee wants.	7/6/2020 11:48 AM
5	Public input is essential. Application of indisputable facts in combination with common sense is even more important. As stated above, the city has failed relating to its decisions concerning the polluted portions of our valley. It also seems obtuse in adhering to valid widespread public disapproval of a new road to Layton.	7/6/2020 10:30 AM
6	The surveys & information on the General Plan NEED to continue. The planning commission also NEED to take the time to read & incorporate citizen opinion. If not, citizen involvement will dwindle & that defeats the purpose. In other words, don't tell us you want our opinion, then do what you as a commission had already decided upon.	7/6/2020 9:52 AM
7	It wouldn't be growing if we weren't putting houses in everywhere. The geography here is an asset. Don't screw it up. Don't let 2 people cram garbage down our throats we don't want!!!	7/2/2020 5:43 PM
8	Surveys = thumbs up	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
9	We seem to tell the city what we want, but you are not listening. No large roads - No road to Layton.	7/2/2020 4:48 PM
10	Great job making as many citizens as possible aware of the plans/meetings.	7/2/2020 4:19 PM
11	City is doing better at keeping citizens aware of meetings & plans. BUT doesn't seem to be LISTENING. Why are we discussing road to Layton again when already given negative feedback???	7/2/2020 4:06 PM
12	Put some of your United Citizens to work on committees. They need a job.	7/2/2020 3:50 PM
13	Why involve the citizens when you don't listen to them	7/2/2020 3:39 PM
14	Should have listened to citizens the first time - we don't need a second survey. Using money that was used for survey - waste of money.	7/2/2020 3:29 PM
15	Doing this twice waste of money. Already voted no on Layton connection.	7/2/2020 3:15 PM
16	Citizens don't seem to have a real opinion. The connection to Layton was already voted against. How can the city ask for our involvement and then disregard how we vote?	7/2/2020 3:07 PM
17	Like being able to vote on things. Please continue that.	7/2/2020 11:37 AM
18	Please listen to residents - not the "silent majority" - more open meetings. No more promises from PC.	7/2/2020 11:25 AM
19	Only pressing matters should be funded until we can open the city offices.	7/1/2020 5:31 PM
20	Please listen to your citizens!	7/1/2020 12:00 PM
21	The Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission, and other city employees involved with the direction the city is headed need to listen and heed the words of the citizens of South Weber, not their own or the developers knocking at our doors.	6/30/2020 11:22 PM
22	I appreciate the opportunities for citizen involvement in the future of our city. We have invested our lives to be where we are and moved here for a reason. South Weber is a one of a kind city and we want to keep it that way. This can be done with communication, ideas and common goals between city officials and citizens keeping in mind that city officials should represent the desires of the majority of the citizens and defer to those desires when developers desires conflict with that of the citizens.	6/30/2020 11:02 PM
23	More information should be added regarding the Layton Connection and the citizen involvement in that decision.	6/30/2020 10:27 PM
24	Our Citizen involvement section sounds like a spoiled child being forced to say their sorry. It list what you had to do and all the comments you let us make. It didn't say nor do I feel like we are	6/30/2020 10:03 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

being listed to. Heres what other city's say: OGDEN City: "In October of 1998, Ogden City launched the update of its General Plan: Involve Ogden, Plan Your Future. Ogden City made a commitment to engage anyone who had an interest in the City's future. This commitment began with the creation of a citizen Steering Committee that reflected the diverse interests of the community: residents, business leaders, stakeholders, planning commission, city council, and staff. The Committee was organized to guide the planning process and provide guidance to the planning staff and consultants." MURRAY City: "To guide the update process Murray City established a Steering Committee consisting of representatives of City Staff, City Administration, City Council, and the public. The consultant team worked under the guidance of the Steering Committee and the Murray City Department of Administrative and Development Services. Steering Committee members functioned as liaisons with the public process by participating in focus groups (described in the public outreach section following)" HURRICANE City: "A General Plan is sometimes referred to as a "Master Plan" or "Comprehensive Plan". It is a community's general guide for making land use decisions. It usually describes how the community wants to grow, where the community wishes various land uses to take place and what the community wants to look like. In many ways, a General Plan is a reflection of the community's values." PAYSON City: "Maybe even more important than the advanced planning activities of the General Plan, is the ability it gives citizens to create the type of community desired. A meaningful General Plan can significantly influence future development patterns. It will take a lot of forethought and planning to avoid the urban sprawl pattern of the Greater Salt Lake City area. The Payson City Planning Commission prepared the General Plan incorporating citizen and staff input. In the preparation of each element, a citizen group was organized to discuss the issues surrounding the particular element. Along with the citizen input, appropriate City staff members were asked to provide input regarding specific implementation needs. Each of the elements was then reviewed in order to prepare a General Plan Map." I could keep going, but you get the idea. I believe we should require our city's general plan to have a citizen-based committee involved and engaged in every section of the General Plan.

25	The city needs to be more transparent and notify the citizens better for public notices! Weather it is through the mail or emails.	6/30/2020 8:47 PM
26	I do appreciate the efforts that are made to help the community stay involved and part of the discussion. I think we need to do a little better specifically with the new pandemic issues. I believe that we need to improve our use of technology, and we need to work together more to solve problems. It seems that a true home town feel is when you can call the appointed officials because you know them by name and they know you. You can have a calm debate over the right directions and both sides listen for opportunities to compromise. Much of that seems to have been taken away by the words we will study that issue. I really think if we want a home town feel that the key is caring for those around you rather than jumping to conclusion too quickly. Listen, talk, care.	6/30/2020 8:38 PM
27	Create an excel spreadsheet that can be added to the document that lists out WHEN these meetings took place, or links to the minutes of these meetings. For instance, add a "For Minutes and Documentation Click [Year]"	6/30/2020 7:28 PM
28	Citizen involvement is a very key component for SWC to development right the first time rather than learn by the case of "hard knocks". Citizen involvement will result in the fewest adverse impacts to citizens.	6/30/2020 5:22 PM
29	Have done a great job keeping us informed on the last few issues. Love that the community is definitely more involved and the new counselman	6/30/2020 3:41 PM
30	LOL. Maybe add a line. If we don't get the answers we want the first time from the community, we will put out another survey and see if we can get something else.	6/30/2020 2:52 PM
31	I now realize that my input is important. The only people that worry about the city plan seem to be the people wanting to develop more businesses and high density housing. I will pay better attention in the future, because the city that I have lived in for over 38 years is quickly disappearing.	6/30/2020 10:11 AM
32	Empower more citizen volunteers. Citizens are ready to reestablish CERT program but the City so far has been very slow moving forward to even contact recommended CERT Captains. Drop "Country" Fair Days as we are now far more residential and no longer "Country" and officially rename it "South Weber Days". The City is doing many positive things like Open Houses, but also many negative in not representing Citizens property rights or working against citizens who elected them. Few communities on Wasatch Front do citizens genuinely love their community	6/30/2020 1:31 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

like our Citizens have proven and are willing to fight against developments that do not compliment their future vision of South Weber wise development.

33	It is good to get citizen input. The struggle comes when the "majority" votes don't show up as implemented. Maybe clarify that input is used in making decisions, but is not simply taken to be the stance/approach adopted.	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
34	We should have more citizen involvement! We have key resources that are rarely tapped into and it is a disservice to the residents! I suggest adding 2-3 citizens to every committee! I also don't agree with having to do this survey a second time when the results were very clear the first time! It should have been finished then!	6/29/2020 9:49 PM
35	Looks good.	6/29/2020 9:33 PM
36	Grateful for the publicity this is getting.	6/29/2020 9:32 PM
37	Avoid too many surveys esp repeat surveys. People don't have the patience or tenacity to engage every single time. I bet they participation this time will be half as much. .	6/29/2020 5:05 PM
38	I think that everyone should be invilved	6/29/2020 3:54 PM
39	All I can say here is please listen to what the residents have to say!	6/29/2020 3:48 PM
40	we need more citizen involvement and attention paid to their findings.	6/29/2020 2:55 PM
41	Citizen involvement in this process has gone OVER and ABOVE any other review of the plan. The City has done an exceptional job keeping the public informed about revisions, gathering input, providing opportunities for input for long periods of time, etc. If someone hasn't participated, it is because they are CHOOSING not to do so.	6/29/2020 2:37 PM
42	Obviously, you want to say you involve us but you don't really want to listen to your citizens. You seem to feel you know way more than we do. Yet South weber is home to many many educated intelligent citizens. Because of this we are still being asked about the connection to Layton when clearly the citizens spoke.	6/29/2020 2:19 PM
43	If you really wanted citizen involvement you wouldn't put questions such as your road maps pictures..and force us to choose one of "your" plans and have "no" options other than your plans....We had to answer one of your three plans or we couldn't continue the survey. Totally LAME and can be used against its residents!!! The fact that you are still addressing the option of a connection to layton is a fabulous example of not listening to the people. Our last survey overwhelming voted for "no connection.....Yet, because some of our officials didn't like that response or said that they had people tell them that they did want that connection, but didn't bother to fill our the last survey, we then must be still dealing with this issue. I can also say that I know many people that definitely dont want this connection that didn't take the survey...Sounds like my kids going back and forth from mom to dad to try to get what they want. The people already spoke.....if they didn't voice their concerns then shame on them. Hearing about the "Silent Majority" ... and that it is on the side of the Layton connection is just a blatant lie. Most people I have spoken to are much more afraid to speak their mind because of love for their city officials and afraid to go against these officials desire for this connection, Definitely not because they want the connection. Just wonder how many times we need to do this to have your listen. HMMM Seems like something important has been forgotten..".and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth"	6/29/2020 2:29 AM
44	Citizen involvement was done on the first survey and was not adhered to due to the "silent majority". Additional resident money wasted again. Please do as the residents want and not your own agenda. Thank you to City Council for listening and explaining.	6/28/2020 6:37 PM
45	Please listen to what the citizens want, the mayor and the planning commission work FOR the citizens.	6/28/2020 11:56 AM
46	The city needs more representation in city government according to areas of the city as well as age representation. The more citizens involved with the city, the more diverse and balanced we will be.	6/28/2020 11:00 AM
47	As a citizen I don't feel my concerns and ideas are acknowledge by some of the city leaders. On the first general plan survey the majority of the citizens were against the connection to Layton via 1900 E. Why is it on this survey?	6/27/2020 9:18 PM
48	Seems like there are some people in city leadership that do not want to listen to the citizens.	6/27/2020 9:17 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	We already voted not to have a connection to Layton via 1900 E.	
49	i love the surveys	6/27/2020 3:56 PM
50	I like the idea of asking the citizens their views. Too often politicians simply listen to those they 'value' and then piss a lot of people off! Remember, you represent all of us, not just those you agree with! I hope our citizens are engaged and do their part as well.	6/27/2020 10:22 AM
51	I Like the information made available on city community sites by new councilmember! And the online council meetings are helpful. I could not pull up this link.	6/26/2020 10:57 PM
52	Sometimes citizen involvement that is not educated on the government issues and laws can create a lot of unrest to the population that also does not understand the process, always our job to educate these people. Half truths and ideas taken out of context is really dangerous to citizen that don't really understand the process. Wish we could educate everyone.	6/26/2020 3:32 PM
53	The citizen involvement has increased greatly over the last year. This is absolutely the citizens plan and the commission, council, mayor and planner are the tools of the citizens to ensure the citizens vision is realized. Listen to the citizens collectively and stop pushing your own internal agendas or ideas. The connection road to layton is a prime example of how the citizens feel you ignore them unless it fits your idea.	6/26/2020 10:11 AM
54	Citizen involvement should always be first in considering future plans to any small city. This is why people move to small towns.	6/25/2020 10:55 PM
55	Not sure what you mean. Please use clarity and not confuse us. There is no reason to make this complicated	6/25/2020 3:55 PM
56	The citizens who intend to live here need to be in the forefront of your mind. Consider the citizen that you are effecting during annexation procedures.	6/25/2020 2:36 PM
57	Citizen involvement should occur from step one and forward in the future planning this precious city!	6/25/2020 2:21 PM
58	We have many active citizens in South Weber. There should be a joint task group to review new proposals and present jointly at meetings. I have seen and read information and research from many citizens that have put a lot of energy and commitment for the good of our community.	6/25/2020 1:18 PM
59	I would like to be able to have the city leaders have the citizens requests and opinions be the highest priority, not second or third to developers, builders, and revenue..	6/25/2020 11:18 AM
60	That's what you are supposed to do. Thank you for allowing various opportunities to provide input. And I appreciate the responses I receive in return. Please, no more surveys for a while tho. This is the third I've completed. They are a means for getting input, I realize. I was so disappointed after the first one a few years ago when it seemed to change nothing. Hopefully this one will have better outcomes.	6/25/2020 11:17 AM
61	There needs to be documentation of how many surveys were done and what the citizens have said.	6/24/2020 5:00 PM
62	I think there needs to be documentation on what the citizens have said concerning the city. Especially on South Bench Drive and the connection on 1900 E.	6/24/2020 4:20 PM
63	I appreciate the SWPCA and all of their involvement in helping the citizens be aware of the decisions being made.	6/23/2020 8:44 PM
64	Very Important, however it needs to be streamlined and condensed. It takes several hours to get through	6/23/2020 11:08 AM
65	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
66	Need citizen involvement	6/23/2020 10:22 AM
67	Unable to access	6/23/2020 7:50 AM
68	The citizens have been very involved recently and we appreciate that. However, the sentiment is that we have been dismissed and ignored.	6/22/2020 10:26 PM
69	Use whatever means available to make sure the residents are aware, in advance, of any items that will effect our community.	6/22/2020 4:32 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

70	"Participation and input from residents are important to ensure a General Plan that reflects the attitudes and desires of city residents. For this document to be an effective planning tool, the public needs an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed contents prior to adoption. To facilitate this, the city made the first draft available online where residents could view the draft and leave feedback. The city held two open houses to allow residents and property owners the opportunity to see detailed maps, ask questions of City Staff, and submit written comments. The city also solicited feedback through an online survey made available to residents. Additionally, residents were invited to several public joint work meetings of the Planning Commission and City Council where the General Plan was the only agenda item. The city collected, organized and incorporated much of the feedback into a revised draft which was also published online and open for comment. Prior to its adoption, the General Plan was the topic for an official public hearing held before the City Council." IF YOU ARE WANTING GOOD, HONEST FEEDBACK, YOU SHOULD ALSO READ THAT FEEDBACK INSTEAD OF HAVING TO HAVE YET ANOTHER SURVEY WHERE CITIZENS WILL LIKE HAVE THE SAME FEEDBACK!	6/22/2020 4:30 PM
71	Citizens should be notified via more avenues other than your insecure website, letters and emails should be sent as well as fliers and many other ways, and make it easy to opt in and people should be instructed via emails or other means of how to opt into these notifications.	6/22/2020 4:23 PM
72	none	6/22/2020 2:45 PM
73	I feel very good about the systems being used to get feedback to our elected officials. These have been promoted, largely, by newly voted in council members and concerned citizens. I DO NOT trust our mayor to take citizen involvement to heart and let these surveys help her make decisions moving forward.	6/22/2020 11:25 AM
74	Citizens should have the final say in everything, Mayor and city council you are our voice	6/22/2020 11:14 AM
75	Citizens are all ready really involved and the Mayor and City Council should listen to them.	6/21/2020 8:18 PM
76	Obviously we need to get more involved to stop your greed from destroying our city!!!!	6/20/2020 11:47 AM
77	Nice job. Very aggressive community involvement.	6/18/2020 4:13 PM
78	More needs to be done to inform our elderly residents who may not have internet/physical ability to attend open houses.	6/18/2020 3:51 PM
79	Please put a couple citizens on your committee's who are not tied to a political position, but can offer some of the much needed input from the community!! We need more representation there than 2 council members, mayor and city staff. Especially when the city staff do not have a vested interest and seem to bend over backwards to help developers before they look out for the citizens who pay their income!!	6/17/2020 8:24 PM
80	The citizen involvement is an important tool. In 2016 our zoning change without our knowledge...	6/17/2020 7:40 PM
81	In the 23+ years I have lived in South Weber, I have never seen the citizens speak up so insistently in defending their community. It's time to listen to what the citizens are asking for instead of the developers.	6/16/2020 10:45 PM
82	I greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide comments/suggestions -- my family and I selected South Weber as our home after retiring from the military. We love the small hometown feel to our South Weber community and want to emphasize avoiding over-crowding, congestion, and too much business.	6/16/2020 6:06 PM
83	Please think about the highway commercial zone and the residents living in that area. Restaurants are fine but fast food would be terrible.	6/16/2020 12:48 PM
84	I appreciate the involvement allotted to each citizen and hope my opinion is taken into consideration.	6/16/2020 12:00 AM
85	Seems all venues are covered, maximize online feedback since most can not attend gatherings.	6/15/2020 4:48 PM
86	Citizens of the city should have the attention of planners and city officials. Businesses and developers have too much sway over what happens in South Weber.	6/15/2020 4:20 PM
87	I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this plan. I hope the city council will listen to the residents and make the best choices for them, not just the developers.	6/15/2020 4:17 PM

**Q29 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the Existing Environment section**

Answered: 65 Skipped: 662

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Listen to residents! Residents spoke out about level lands in train park subdivision. It was put to the City Council. It was ignored. Even then look what happened. The City chooses not to listen to residents, but instead listen to the developer. How much is it costing the residents now!!!!	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Leave things alone! It's been proven with the wetlands things need to be left as is!!	7/6/2020 1:42 PM
3	Listen to the people take a look at the canyon meadows park and the wetlands	7/6/2020 1:33 PM
4	You need to listen to the citizens more.	7/6/2020 11:48 AM
5	Again, the city has radically blotched the pollution issues - much of western South Weber is documented on the National priority list (NPL) as one of the most threatening to human health in the entire country. INCREASING HUMAN DENSITY makes this city'created error even more hurtful to the health & well-being of our population. Also, lines 370 - 388 are a combination of falsehoods and gross misrepresentations...the city can defend almost nothing within it.	7/6/2020 10:45 AM
6	The existing environment is existing - can't change it. What we can change is not building on every available inch of space in our city and/or limiting the housing density to low or moderately low density.	7/6/2020 9:53 AM
7	Sounds ok. Don't overbuild we have a very nice town.	7/2/2020 5:44 PM
8	We only have so much space, use it wisely	7/2/2020 5:15 PM
9	Reduce the moderate density by 1/2. Moe the numbers to Low-Moderate.	7/2/2020 4:20 PM
10	Reduce Moderate Density - Low Moderate number.	7/2/2020 4:06 PM
11	Nothing stays the same. We have welcomed all to live in our community. We hope that 'wave and say hi' feeling will continue.	7/2/2020 3:51 PM
12	Much of the dust in our community comes off the hill to the south. Davis County lands, but county should do something to help control dust.	7/2/2020 3:40 PM
13	Let's make this small town a mecca for recreational enthusiasts! The infrastructure will be greatly effected by unprecedented growth.	7/1/2020 12:01 PM
14	South Weber needs to remain just like it is. If we can attract businesses that will employ our, as well as other cities citizens that's great. But we do not need to sell out our environment just for the sake of a few dollars. Businesses should be coming to us telling us what they can do for our city instead of asking what we can do for them. We don't need them, they need us.	6/30/2020 11:26 PM
15	All developed areas should be 1/2 acre lots.	6/30/2020 11:10 PM
16	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:28 PM
17	Again, please tell me how we are a gateway to recreational activities - we aren't. Which activities? The Uintah hotel isnt full of skiers or backpackers. The weber river isnt a wild river ride. We have no boating and barely any fishing. Most importantly, everyone of those near by activities already have cities around them providing those services.	6/30/2020 10:08 PM
18	It is clear that we have challenges in the way we have grown, and our area is prone to several significant natural disasters. Have we really thought through how to move people out of the city if 89 is closed. Keep in mind it will not just be our little community, it will be significant traffic from 89. I think we have we need to do more to look to those issues.	6/30/2020 8:41 PM
19	There are too many comments to show in this block. Please reference comments provided in the packet from the City Council meeting on 28Apr20 pp 149-154. Please reread and review again.	6/30/2020 5:22 PM
20	No development on the sensitive and contaminated slopes on the south side of SW. Causes concern for the citizens and their families health and well being.	6/30/2020 3:42 PM
21	Citizens opposed Short Term Rentals. WE GOT THEM. Citizens opposed Connection to Layton, we still are getting that. Citizens opposed RV Park WE GOT THEM. Doesn't matter what it says. I forgot, "I USED TO THINK LIKE THAT BEFORE I GOT ON THE COUNCIL - in other words, you aren't as smart as we are" is the best response from the council when we have concerns. Add that to the General Plan.	6/30/2020 2:56 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

22	I understand that all available land will be developed in some way or another. We could control the amount of growth by limiting the size of each lot, and also limiting the High Density housing.	6/30/2020 10:14 AM
23	A good summary with a lot of detail in some areas and simple, general information in others.	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
24	Again, this discusses the risks of land slides involving the South bluff as well as the contaminated soil from HAFB activities - leave it alone.	6/29/2020 11:03 PM
25	Population projections still seem way off! With all the environmental issues we face in this city, why are we wanting to build a road on the steep slopes mentioned?	6/29/2020 9:53 PM
26	Sounds good.	6/29/2020 9:34 PM
27	Little commerce on the periphery Commerce should not be intrusive, in terms of traffic or visibility. R4 or R3, or lower Whatever we do, as a general rule don't get enticed by impact fees and bigger tax paying base. Less is more!	6/29/2020 5:08 PM
28	I think that the current environment is perfect	6/29/2020 3:55 PM
29	no comment	6/29/2020 3:48 PM
30	No comments	6/29/2020 2:37 PM
31	Just because other states are flocking to Utah does not mean we have to change our city to fit them. We need our city to be what we all moved here for. If you build it, they will come...if you don't build it it can stay close to what we all cherish.	6/29/2020 2:21 PM
32	line 209 - Not sure best wording. But it should be added to the general plan that because of the unknown risks of the toxic disposal sites from Hill Air Force base that NO disruption to these lands can occur. We do not need to add "any permitted development" for this. It is unstable and unknown harmful effects of this land and should not even be considered as a topic on here. Line 225 we live on a fault line and we know it. Odd to include having structures away from the fault line. Not possible. We live in Northern Utah we know what that means. 306 why would you add that in there. It is feasible maybe at a cost but the studies were done showing it could happen. You are stopping it by putting this comment in there. Line 366 it is my understanding that due to this APZ that NO businesses can be built there and the soccer field should have never been approved. I would take off the entire first sentence and leave the last two. Line 472 - we have adequate amounts of moderate housing and multifamily units in south weber already we do not need anymore. The desire should be single family homes	6/29/2020 11:07 AM
33	The city officials are shifting away more from agriculture to wall to wall people and as much business as you can push on us. Quit making it sound like we have to do this. We do not.	6/29/2020 2:32 AM
34	WILL LIKELY MOVE!!	6/29/2020 1:43 AM
35	Natural hazards: toxic waste disposal from HAFB and/or the landfill. We shouldn't be trying to provide recreation on these sensitive, contaminated lands. Land slides: " Geologist have identified this area as a very high risk for potential landslides.1 254 Ample evidence exist of both ancient and more recent slope failure along 255 this bluff. It is important to analyze the feasibility of any development proposed on or 256 near this bluff." We should not be developing (roads or "commercial recreation" on these sensitive lands! Steep Slopes: " These slopes should be considered fragile from a development 280 standpoint and developers must comply with the Sensitive Lands Ordinance (Ord 10- 281 14). Building roads and subdivisions within these areas can cause environmental 282 damage, destabilize hillsides, and create a hillside scar/eyesore resulting from needed 283 cuts and/or fills to make the property developable." Again, we need to stop rezoning and planning development on these sensitive lands! "These 285 areas are important habitat for wildlife, including high value deer winter range." " The mountains are a 289 prominent feature of the landscape and any development or other impact will likely 290 reduce the community's overall quality of life." We should be striving to maintain the community's overall quality of life in South Weber, but unfortunately many of the ideas on the general plan do just the opposite. (Mainly connecting to Layton and developing on sensitive lands.)	6/28/2020 11:59 AM
36	I don't want South Weber to be a gateway for recreation. I want it to be a small town bedroom community.	6/27/2020 9:21 PM
37	none at this time.	6/27/2020 10:22 AM
38	Environment is important for future generations, but like everything we have to be educated on	6/26/2020 3:35 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

the process, always read and study and don't listen to comments from people who really don't know or understand.

39	I think SW should protect any and all wetlands. No one should be allowed to fill them in. They are there for a reason. Respect nature.	6/26/2020 11:41 AM
40	I am grateful that we lowered the allowable number of units down to a maximum of 7. I still believe we can reduce the "buildout" population if we add more area of lower density zoning and lessen areas with higher density zoning. I believe that is what the majority of our citizens prefer. There is a lot of good information in this section. There are areas though that still have a lot of fluff and opinion versus straight facts and to the point. There are a lot of paragraphs that are simply copy and pasted from elsewhere. If this plan is important to our city's future (and it is!) then right it like you'd right your Phd Thesis not your term paper.	6/26/2020 10:33 AM
41	Unfettered growth is not necessarily in the best interest of South Weber. The projections of population growth are disturbing. I don't mind the people, it's their cars that are the problem. South Weber has a problem with traffic. There's only three ways out of this place and two of them are at either end of the same road! And that's not really going to change anytime soon! I believe that the City Council should consider how much traffic our roads can happily accommodate and work backwards with zoning and development. Decisions for development and growth should always be based on such factors! Requiring a certain percentage of two acre lots in each development is an example of what could be done to make sure our growth does not out strip the City's ability to maintain roads and keep residents safe and quality of life maintained. If we end up with wall to wall houses on tiny lots, South Weber Drive and 475 East will end up like freeways and those who own homes on them will bear the brunt of the home devaluation and the disruption of daily life. It is already nearly impossible to back out of our driveways during early morning and late afternoon traffic. It is my opinion that the projections for housing density should be lowered with more low-density housing and less high density. We have enough townhouses and apartments in South Weber. We don't need anymore. They come with too many vehicles!	6/26/2020 12:57 AM
42	Don't be dumb and develop land that could be hazardous. Accept the fact that South Weber is small, and people like it that way. Fix the problems within the land we have.	6/25/2020 10:56 PM
43	This survey needs to be simplified.	6/25/2020 3:57 PM
44	We want South Weber to stay a home town feel to it What we create can destroy that in a heart beat. Pleas don't do anything that creates reasons for people to drive through our community to get to Riverdale or South Ogden etc. We cant and won't be a New York city so keep our attractiveness in having spacious properties and not high density. Environmental concerns are to be considered and we to be protected both physically and from lawsuits.	6/25/2020 2:41 PM
45	I do not think we need 10% increase in multi housing. I was confused when reading these pages that a road to Layton is even being considered? On facebook we have read additional safety hazards that may need to be added to Steep Slopes and Land Slides.	6/25/2020 1:22 PM
46	No comment	6/25/2020 11:18 AM
47	This general plan doesn't stress the sensitive slopes enough. It needs stronger wording.	6/24/2020 5:07 PM
48	In the 2014 general plan it has stronger wording. I think that it shouldn't be downplayed. The sensitive slopes need to be stressed!	6/24/2020 4:34 PM
49	Line 150 - Identify which gravel pit is nearing its end. Line 337 - add, "F-35 noise levels are detrimental to the health and welfare of the citizens of South Weber."	6/24/2020 11:51 AM
50	Be careful with the wetlands and contaminated areas. Our city has blatantly disregarded both of these!	6/23/2020 8:49 PM
51	Important, listening and proceeding the best information and loyalty to the citizens of South Weber	6/23/2020 11:11 AM
52	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
53	Our city is a disaster waiting to happen .. too many risks to keep building we have a lot of sensitive land ..landslides..contamination, the ground isn't stable	6/23/2020 10:33 AM
54	Unable to access	6/23/2020 7:51 AM
55	There are literally TOO MANY reasons NOT develop more housing in South Weber. All of these	6/22/2020 4:38 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

existing conditions should have more of a halt on productions than any input I can give. Existing citizen health should outweigh any measures to keep healthy the people that may take residence here.

56	If the natural resources are so important than why are so many of them being completely ignored to build houses and subdivisions. EXPAND AND PROTECT WETLANDS AND NATURAL AND SCAPES stop destroying them or even developing them. You want to do some good Buy the wetlands from land owners and protect them from development.	6/22/2020 4:28 PM
57	none	6/22/2020 2:45 PM
58	test and find out where the plumes are	6/22/2020 11:14 AM
59	Existing should remain existing	6/20/2020 11:48 AM
60	South Weber is not "the gateway to recreation" we are near no lakes, not that close to skiing, there are MUCH closer better choices for that. We should be trying to preserve the town we all chose to move to, not for what it could one day become, but for what it already was! When you have something good, don't spoil it.	6/18/2020 3:54 PM
61	Please limit the rest of the growth! The barracks are dense enough and we need more single family homes to balance it out!! We have a lot working against us and a lot working with us as far as what can and should fit in the city!	6/17/2020 8:26 PM
62	The Existing Environment is almost a perfect balance between residential and agriculture. I recommend creating more outdoor options/activities for families and want to emphasize avoiding over-crowding, congestion, and too much business.	6/16/2020 6:08 PM
63	South Weber has a need for many things that I feel have been pushed back... Something needs to be done about the big trucks up and down south weber drive, the bicycle riders on the streets, you can't pass them, etc. they are in huge groups. We need more small, mom/pop type places. Keep the small town support feel. So many people in SW think they are entitled to something and it's sad to have that feeling after living here for 23 years.	6/16/2020 5:16 PM
64	N/A	6/15/2020 4:48 PM
65	The impact of the landfill south of the city should be addressed.	6/15/2020 4:22 PM

**Q30 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the  
Land Use Goals and Projections section**

Answered: 63 Skipped: 664

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Need less density housing on map.. Maybe 1 house per acre or 1 house per 5 acres to keep 'small town charm' in South Weber west end. reduce yellow Orange. Add more green.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Please stop!! Your building is forcing generations of residents out its BREAKING up FAMILIES!! Just stop if you want a city, move and leave our town alone!!	7/6/2020 1:43 PM
3	Less density housing "small town charm"	7/6/2020 1:33 PM
4	Need less houses and more agriculture.	7/6/2020 11:48 AM
5	We own much of the wooded hillside as issue (above the elementary school). It too is heavily polluted. Moreover, the Council & Planning Commission have both been repeatedly informed that our family had studies conducted and our properties above the canal according will not be available for annexing into our city.	7/6/2020 10:45 AM
6	Land use goals need to be primarily residential & maintain open areas to retain the rural feel. Any commercial areas should remain near the freeway access points to limit traffic through the city.	7/6/2020 9:56 AM
7	Land use open spaces & residential maintain rural feel keep commercial areas by highways.	7/2/2020 5:44 PM
8	Don't build on wildlife & highly erosive areas.	7/2/2020 5:16 PM
9	Again when an area has/ha a IDU per 1/2 acre keep it that way. Do not allow D.U.'s to be smaller because the developer put a green space in the development.	7/2/2020 4:20 PM
10	Keep 1/2 acre lots.	7/2/2020 4:07 PM
11	Please put the gravel pit back to blue. Please look for recreational possibilities. A little "Lake Farrell" at the bottom with businesses around it like Myrtle Beach Lake Mall	7/2/2020 3:52 PM
12	Again - mecca for recreational enthusiasts.	7/1/2020 12:01 PM
13	Less commercial, more LDH/MDH to continue to grow South Weber in a responsible way.	6/30/2020 11:46 PM
14	South Weber is fine the way it is.	6/30/2020 11:27 PM
15	As mentioned earlier on my survey a way to keep the country charm is to try to encourage some development that allows horses and properties can connect to the trails.	6/30/2020 11:18 PM
16	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:28 PM
17	I think you did a good job changing this section.	6/30/2020 10:12 PM
18	For the land use on 475 E and 6650 S we need to make sure it stays as commercial! Put in an aquatic center or something like a Trader Joe's. something the bring in the city some money and something us citizens can use	6/30/2020 8:50 PM
19	I would slow things down more than we have. I don't think we have taken the steps required for our current growth.	6/30/2020 8:43 PM
20	There are too many comments to show in this block. Please reference comments provided in the packet from the City Council meeting on 28Apr20 pp 155-157. Please reread and review again.	6/30/2020 5:23 PM
21	Cut down on Commercial zones. No high building please. Too much traffic through town is not a plus.	6/30/2020 3:43 PM
22	Not sure we have a Land Use Goal. Seems like the city will consider anything a developer brings. Not a very well written goal, but an accurate one.	6/30/2020 2:57 PM
23	You state in your projections that the goal is to keep the rural feel of South Weber. Well we have nearly lost that feel already, and we seem to be running toward making another congested city with all of the problems of a congested city. I accept that all of the orchards are now housing, and all of the existing fields will be built upon, but I hope the city will not give up what we now have, in order to expand to much.	6/30/2020 10:20 AM
24	Same as above. Information looks good. As noted before, the zoning map is not showing one Institutional location where the LDS church owns land for a future building. That should be noted on the map.	6/30/2020 12:01 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

25	The idea of a transient mobile home park is one of the worst ideas any community can come up with. Why did all of you cave in and invite another problem like the VRBO house?	6/29/2020 11:05 PM
26	No to moderate density, patio and Multi family!!	6/29/2020 9:54 PM
27	Please preserve our open feel as much as possible. Large lot sizes preferred!! No high density and tall buildings	6/29/2020 9:36 PM
28	Fine.	6/29/2020 9:34 PM
29	Little commerce on the periphery Commerce should not be intrusive, in terms of traffic or visibility. R4 or R3, or lower Whatever we do, as a general rule don't get enticed by impact fees and bigger tax paying base. Less is more!	6/29/2020 5:09 PM
30	n/a	6/29/2020 3:55 PM
31	No comment	6/29/2020 3:48 PM
32	No changes. I like the addition of the illustrations for lot layout.	6/29/2020 2:38 PM
33	WE dont want to be another layton or sunset. We want to be South Weber.	6/29/2020 2:23 PM
34	the gravel pit has been almost done for 30 years. Now they bring things in to keep it open. I'm not going to hold my breath but I certainly DO NOT want it to change to commercial. I think that when businesses attempt to build there they can then try to change zoning. That way the citizens can have a much bigger voice in what happens there. Holy cow, we don't need more parks. Most of them are empty most of the time. And when you do make improvement it needs to be for all the citizens parks not just they new areas or the pet projects. BE FAIR	6/29/2020 2:38 AM
35	LESS LIKELY TO MOVE.	6/29/2020 1:45 AM
36	I don't think the dark red commercial zones in the middle of the city make much sense when there are residential neighborhoods all around these areas, especially where the old Ray's is and the current city building. The area south of SW Drive on the curve makes more sense, but why are the homes across the street going to be rezoned as commercial? I disagree with that. I disagree strongly with the commercial recreation zone all along the south hillside (with the + overlay)--these are sensitive lands and should be left alone. I also strongly disagree with putting a trail along the canal--this is dangerous and irresponsible to have a trail alongside an open, steeply sloped, concrete lined canal. children and pets can easily fall in and become trapped and I don't think the canal company wants the liability of that. We should STOP pursuing this option as a city and planning commission. I also strongly disagree with zoning the west gravel pit as commercial highway. A much better use of this land (when it becomes available) is commercial recreation.	6/28/2020 12:01 PM
37	If you would like to have the development next door to you, it's probably good. If you wouldn't want it next door to you, nobody else would either.	6/28/2020 11:01 AM
38	Again, I want the city to keep the small town feel. That is why I chose to live here. I don't care about adding to our tax base with commercial interests. I would rather pay a few more dollars out of my pocket verses become a commercial hub of 89.	6/27/2020 10:23 AM
39	Lets not do this process again for least 20-25 years, the general plan is a guide or road map, it can't possible show the future, again no crystal ball, just a lot of new technology. We have to allow the future to catch up to the new present, before we revisit this road map. Thanks for your time.	6/26/2020 3:40 PM
40	I am fairly pleased with this section. I still push that the plan for the agriculture lands of many great families should be zoned with lower density residential. This may be at odds with their desires when they choose to sell, but it is more in alignment with the vision of the community. Smaller is better all the way around. Again, we've programmed for way too much commercial type zoning.	6/26/2020 10:37 AM
41	There are many modern sustainable farming operations that have been popping up all over Utah. Perhaps some of those families who own agricultural lands could be encouraged in some way to rent or lease a piece of their property to growers with the goal of promoting this kind of farming in South Weber. These operations tend to be rather small, using perhaps five acres for intensive growing of produce, chickens/eggs/poultry or pork. Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a few of these small farms in South Weber?	6/26/2020 1:05 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

42	The goals and plans for the city have not been voted on by the people of the city. About 15% of your plan is appealing. it will help keep the charm of South Weber. The other 85% is garbage and stinks.	6/25/2020 10:59 PM
43	I have answered this view my comments	6/25/2020 3:58 PM
44	We can use a little more commercial development but let's not get carried away.. Trails will be a great addition.	6/25/2020 2:43 PM
45	I like line 429- a goal of the city and community is to keep the rural feel of South Weber-is this really true? Then line 542/543/544 encourage commercial development near 89/South Weber Drive. Again, I think SW Drive perhaps can support small commercial business with low impact traffic flow. However, the frontage road is too narrow. 89 development may make it feel even more congested. I live very close to 89. In 30years the noise has increases 100%. But I still love sitting on the front porch looking at the beautiful mountains. Please do not take that away from us by adding HD housing and commercial business in our established residential neighborhoods.	6/25/2020 1:28 PM
46	Already commented	6/25/2020 11:19 AM
47	There is too much commercial zones	6/24/2020 5:07 PM
48	I still think that you have too much commercial and recreation zones.	6/24/2020 4:35 PM
49	Lines 576-578 "The river corridor should be protected as an important recreational resource in South Weber and as valuable wildlife habitat." Should be deleted since the city plans to abandon ownership of these lands. Line 587 show add, "only if permission is granted by the canal company." Line 602-603 "The city should be open to the development of additional church sites." should be deleted, violates separation of church and state	6/24/2020 12:51 PM
50	We need to be smart about what land we have left. The townhouses in South Weber are the worst ones in Northern Utah. Vinyl fence up to the townhouses then chainlink! Nice! Super poor planning up to this point!	6/23/2020 8:51 PM
51	The gravel pits create a great deal of dust, and becomes areal inconvenience for those of us that live in the wind tunnel. Maybe if one pit closes, they can focus on the remaining pits dust control.	6/23/2020 11:16 AM
52	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
53	Too much building	6/23/2020 10:33 AM
54	I already expressed my opinion on land use in the previous part of the survey.	6/22/2020 10:31 PM
55	Anything and everything I have said or have thought of saying has been said	6/22/2020 4:39 PM
56	Don't get to far ahead of yourselves. There is a lot going on right now development wise. Do not rush and make sure you are listening to S. Weber residents.	6/22/2020 4:34 PM
57	none	6/22/2020 2:46 PM
58	we dont need any more high density or moderate density	6/22/2020 11:15 AM
59	please maintain open spaces and allow for more agricultural use!	6/18/2020 3:55 PM
60	Please keep as much of the rural character as possible!! When people are ready to sell, let them come to you with a proposal! The city should never look to help people market their land or to help develop it. Let's take the time needed to put in the right kind of developments, not the hodge podge that we have now. More single family developments with larger lot sizes should be where to start first!! No more HDH... even the R-7 is too high and should be limited in the city!!	6/17/2020 8:30 PM
61	I concur.	6/16/2020 6:09 PM
62	No Comment	6/15/2020 4:49 PM
63	Increased development is going to require greater maintenance of storm water and other utilities which will continue to cost citizens.	6/15/2020 4:25 PM

## Q31 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the Transportation section

Answered: 79 Skipped: 648

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Need to relook at west end roads. Need additional survey	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Stop don't bring more "trash in"	7/6/2020 1:43 PM
3	No more roads!	7/6/2020 1:33 PM
4	Need additional survey.	7/6/2020 11:48 AM
5	What happened to Lester Street being a secondary primary roadway. The City's problem here has been its insistence. You keep changing your plans about roads so why should property owners trust/rely on anything you supposedly plan now? Moreover, when you 'plan' to cut right through the middle of a continuous 30+ acre piece, the City should have the courtesy of at least discussing this with us.	7/6/2020 10:48 AM
6	Transportation should not include paving or opening access at 1900 East through the open space area to Layton. Leave that road dirt surface & accessed only when needed to get the culinary water reservoir. When finishing 6650 S into Old Fort Rd., leave out roundabouts. We do not need roundabouts in our city. Keep speeds low. We have plenty of patrols by Davis County. Sheriffs to maintain safety.	7/6/2020 9:58 AM
7	No paving or opening access to 1900 E through open spaces leading to Layton. Leave it as it is. Leave out roundabouts. There is no need for them. Law Enforcement slows traffic.	7/2/2020 5:45 PM
8	Don't connect 1900 E to Layton!	7/2/2020 5:16 PM
9	Acceptable but no road to Layton. No Road to Layton.	7/2/2020 4:21 PM
10	NO road to Layton! -chemical contamination -hill slide -steep slope -high traffic -High crime potential	7/2/2020 4:07 PM
11	I know that Jones, Mayor, and Grubb, and Osborn have vested interests - they tried to back-door these plans that no-one wanted! Grubb and others got their plans through with no hassles! Vote those out who don't care about or city. Fire Jones & Associates - there are many engineering companies out there - check how much he makes month	7/1/2020 5:33 PM
12	Be careful how roads impact the people and neighborhoods.	7/1/2020 12:02 PM
13	Think of other roads leading out of South Weber that would not be in the way of children and neighborhoods.	6/30/2020 11:32 PM
14	NO road to Layton. NO roads that will increase traffic in the city. NO roads that will bring non-citizen traffic into SWC.	6/30/2020 11:28 PM
15	As soon as the general plan is finished and adopted, it would be beneficial for the city and citizens to work together to adopt an emergency exit plan.	6/30/2020 11:20 PM
16	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:28 PM
17	I think the transportation section is much better but should also include information on speed mitigation. The city has a MAJOR problem with speeding it should be addressed in the general plan - and no, it cant just say Srgt Pope. We need some real solutions.	6/30/2020 10:16 PM
18	NO CONNECTION TO LAYTON!!!!	6/30/2020 8:51 PM
19	Transportation seems to be the biggest issue with this area. we have unique location and minimal entry and exit points. With the changes proposed on 89 we are going to get a really bad bottleneck right at South Weber drive ever night at rush hour. It is already bad enough but the funnel will now allow faster flow to our bottleneck. I believe this is among the most significant challenges that we have as a community our off ramp is pretty dangerous right now. especially when we see all of the impatient drivers off to the side of the main travel lane. We have a lot of work to do to make this place safe, and the construction on 89 is going to take us further away. what are we planning there??	6/30/2020 8:49 PM
20	I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH A ROAD TO LAYTON	6/30/2020 8:40 PM
21	Widen South Weber Drive enough to add a bike lane.	6/30/2020 7:48 PM
22	There are too many comments to show in this block. Please reference comments provided in the packet from the City Council meeting on 28Apr20 pp 158-160.. Please reread and review	6/30/2020 5:23 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

	again.	
23	Do not add larger roads through residential areas!!! No thru to Layton!!!	6/30/2020 3:44 PM
24	Maybe add, we will do what we want and just not tell the citizens. Unless we get caught, then we will throw the mayor under the bus.	6/30/2020 2:58 PM
25	NO ROAD TO LAYTON NO NEW ROADS ANYWHERE	6/30/2020 1:41 PM
26	Do not want connection to Layton via 1900 East.	6/30/2020 12:01 PM
27	Would you remove the homes already built in order to reduce the grade? This has been a problem since before 7600 was even built. It is a problem, but there are no easy answers.	6/30/2020 10:29 AM
28	Good comments on many roads, especially to connect View Drive and 7800 S. Also to note the safety hazard for 1900 E hill.	6/30/2020 12:01 AM
29	I think if we are already worried with the speed of cars coming down 1900, which has been stated in the general plan, connecting it to Layton will not help with cars slowing down that road in order to get to South Weber Drive. Most likely it will increase the speed of the cars as they come down the hillside.	6/29/2020 11:54 PM
30	No to the Layton connection for the numerous reasons stated before and the concerns that are outlined in the general plan already - it will primarily benefit Layton.	6/29/2020 11:06 PM
31	Under the 1900 East street, there are already plenty of reasons not to add to this road! NO LAYTON CONNECTION!! This city spent too much money building a road to no where and wont get us a very good return on it, so why are we even thinking of doing any more?	6/29/2020 9:56 PM
32	No connections to other city to make our small city a thoroughfare. :(	6/29/2020 9:37 PM
33	Sounds good.	6/29/2020 9:35 PM
34	Traffic should not increase on existing roads No connection to Layton	6/29/2020 5:09 PM
35	As long as no other roads connect to SWD that is fine	6/29/2020 3:56 PM
36	no comment	6/29/2020 3:49 PM
37	No changes.	6/29/2020 2:39 PM
38	Im quite tired of everyone saying we are in such danger if there is a disaster. We had a disaster and we were very organized because we are and organized city. I have never once had trouble with traffic in South Weber in 33 years. The scare treatments are really annoying. There are many options in a major emergency that could be in place. not cutting through our citizens properties when they don't want us to. Have respect for our citizens properties. In some cases when a street doesn't connect. I think the extra min it takes to go down another street shouldn't mess us up so much that we need to take over their property. That also goes for trails cutting through citizens properties	6/29/2020 2:30 PM
39	No road to Layton. No new roads anywhere	6/29/2020 12:52 PM
40	Line 659- here you state that 1900 is a serious safety hazard and steep road with reduced site. This being the same road you are trying to increase traffic by 7000 cars a day! This right here shows WHY we do not need a road to Layton. Line 697 - Agree 6650 needs to stay a dead end but in here you say their needs to be an alternate east west road. Well right now they (Mostly Soccer traffic) use old maple road and then the other side of 6650 as their "shortcut" to soccer. They travel on this road over the speed limit (25mph and 15mph) on a road that has NO SIDEWALKS and lots of walking children, a bus stop and bikers. Not to mention it is barely wide enough for 2 cars. This is a residential area and traffic needs to be diverted to main roads such as 475 and SWD. We need Speed Bumps, we need Signs, we need the cooperation of La Roca. This is a VERY dangerous section of road for those of us on the West End. We need more city involvement to get this road safer for residents.	6/29/2020 11:14 AM
41	no more expansion	6/29/2020 10:03 AM
42	I have lived here for 30 years. I have not once had issues with all this terrible traffic that you talk about, with one small exception. The Highmark school tend to be busy right close to the school. But it seems controlled. The new turn onto 475 is/was totally a waste of our money...It's just annoying and was unnecessary. A great example of not having the citizens behind /aware of what is happening. I feel that there are a few streets that have a small blocking of streets going	6/29/2020 2:57 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

through. But most of those are not as huge of a deal as the city makes them to be. So it takes you 1 min to go up a different street. Wow, are we so in a hurry in life that we have to force our citizens to do what we want with their property because we are more important. Even when we had the infamous fire, the traffic was worse for sure but flowed. I really am astonished how some of our planning commission leaders lead us on to believe how horribly unsafe we all are. This is insulting to a very intelligent community. Seems like we want to build more roads to load them up with businesses and so we can make sure we look like Layton or other cities not like our beautiful peaceful South Weber that most of us were drawn to when we all moved here.

43	WILL LIKELY MOVE!!	6/29/2020 1:48 AM
44	All roads should be "normal roads" not collectors. Lower speed limits - South Weber Drive speed limit should be lowered and enforced. Thank you Council members working on emergency exits and not additional drive - throughs.	6/28/2020 6:39 PM
45	In your general plan draft it states: "It is important that major transportation routes through South Weber are protected 620 from unnecessary traffic motion." I can guarantee you that connecting a road to Layton is going to bring thousands of unnecessary commuters through our city on a daily basis! "The US-89 project creates an opportunity to install an underpass for the continuation of 652 the Weber River Parkway Trail/Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST)." I strongly support this "1900 East Street is an extremely important collector road. It has a serious safety hazard 660 at approximately 7550 South. Here it traverses a steep bluff which reduces sight 661 distance at the intersection with 7600 South and encourages traffic to speed as cars 662 travel north down the hill. It should be a priority to evaluate the possibility to mitigate 663 this safety hazard." This fact right here should be reason enough to not connect this road to Layton! It is dangerous, steep, passes through RESIDENTIAL neighborhoods with CHILDREN playing along the road all the time. Bringing in unnecessary commuter traffic is going to cause dangerous conditions for the residents, change the city, add to congestion on existing roads, and bring crime to our city.	6/28/2020 12:03 PM
46	We're a small city, with transportation congestion only at short times of the day. Don't over do transportation plans trying to plan for the most congested times of the day.	6/28/2020 11:03 AM
47	No connection to Layton please. We already voted no on this issue.	6/27/2020 9:25 PM
48	No connection to Layton!!!!	6/27/2020 9:24 PM
49	As mentioned before, I'm against the 1900 connection. While it looks good on paper, it's not in harmony with the 'feel' I believe most in South Weber want.	6/27/2020 10:24 AM
50	More Trails!	6/26/2020 10:49 PM
51	Please make that 1900 east connection south out of the city now, we need it. Let any other south bound connection appear with future changes in history, technology and land ownership.	6/26/2020 3:43 PM
52	1900 E. does have a serious safety hazard. This road should never be considered for a connection to layton. No traffic light anywhere unless it becomes absolutely necessary. Do what fits our community. Not what UDOT states or outside agencies predict. Do what is best for us as a small town community.	6/26/2020 10:40 AM
53	Without a doubt there is too much traffic on 475 East. Speed limits are not observed and pulling out of your driveway is often very frustrating and sometimes dangerous. Long lines of traffic during rush hour make life on 475 miserable at times. As I look at all the new proposed roads in South Weber it seems clear that perhaps these roads will take care of some of the NEW (doesn't exist yet) traffic from the developments that they will be built to serve, but I don't think there will be any reduction in the traffic on our lovely straight road that hooks right up with I-84. The more homes there are in South Weber, the more traffic there will be on 475 East. No one will be encouraged to turn onto a road that has twists and turns and roundabouts on it in order to get to I-84. It just won't happen.	6/26/2020 1:26 AM
54	No high density housing, especially close to the elementary. Trails are great. Work to cut down traffic within the city, add sidewalks, more law enforcement, and fix the roads currently that we drive on daily. Don't add a drive through road on hazardous land. That is plain stupidity. It makes me wonder what kind of people are leading this city. They apparently don't care as much for our city residents, but really like the Layton residents, or government.	6/25/2020 11:03 PM
55	I have answered this view my comments	6/25/2020 3:58 PM
56	Just keep us unconnected to Layton with a road. It will not be a blessing and is horrifically	6/25/2020 2:45 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

expensive to do. And if you have looked the steepness of that road and conditions will make it a nightmare to maintain. But is the traffic I don't want.

57	Suggestions are working with UTA for better options.	6/25/2020 1:29 PM
58	No thoroughfare from other cities as a connector route	6/25/2020 11:20 AM
59	1900 doesn't need to be mitigated. Just don't add any more cars to it!	6/24/2020 5:08 PM
60	1900 E is dangerous enough without adding additional traffic.	6/24/2020 4:39 PM
61	Studies provided by the city indicate many flaws with having a link to Layton by extending 1900 East.	6/24/2020 12:51 PM
62	The lower the density of housing the less commercial the least amount of roads we need. People don't want their quiet peaceful lives being disturbed by roads. I think it's in the best interest of all who live here to do what the tax paying citizens want.	6/23/2020 8:57 PM
63	US-89 very important to SW and the expansion will definitely affect the traffic on SW Drive. An underpass for the BST would be absolutely the best. 1900 E critical especially for those of us that live on or close. Not only the hazard at 7550 S, but the speed control above and below 7550. making it a connector to Layton CANNOT happen, traffic, speed, heavy trucks, school buses and our children's safety make this project a disaster. SW Drive, Traffic signals a must today, the heavy truck traffic, as well as the speed and curves and width of the road, make this a priority situation to solve. View Drive must stay a dead end at 2370 East, it would become as bad as 1900 E traffic and speed and 7800 S cannot handle it.PERIOD	6/23/2020 11:44 AM
64	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
65	More building, more roads more cost and keep up	6/23/2020 10:35 AM
66	I've already expressed my opinion on transportation and roads in the previous question.	6/22/2020 10:31 PM
67	Refer to #30	6/22/2020 4:40 PM
68	Again, no connection to Layton.	6/22/2020 4:39 PM
69	STOP BUILDING POINTLESS ROUND ROADS WITH POINTLESS ROUND ABOUT. Round-about's are a bad engineers excuse for order. DO NOT cut through existing properties in the first place and make the excuse "It's for the community!" those people ARE the community ITS THEIR LAND YOUR ARE STEALING.	6/22/2020 4:31 PM
70	none	6/22/2020 2:46 PM
71	no connection to layton	6/22/2020 11:15 AM
72	Please no connection to Layton. We do not want to become a drive thru city	6/21/2020 8:19 PM
73	our current streets seem to be more than sufficient and I don't see a need to add additional roads aside from residential connections as needed	6/18/2020 3:56 PM
74	In the GP it talks of 1900 East street being a problem and a serious safety hazard. Let's not add to it by making the problem even worse with a 14% grade road going to Layton!	6/17/2020 8:32 PM
75	As it has been said many times, "South Weber is a destination; not a drive through." Let's keep it the unique town that it is.	6/16/2020 10:47 PM
76	As far as transportation, I want to emphasize keeping our small town feel and not invite outside traffic to overcrowd our community and create more potential hazards/accidents.	6/16/2020 6:10 PM
77	With an increasing population there are many more cars and people speeding on what we're once quiet roads. Nothing is done for those residents experiencing these changes to their community.	6/16/2020 12:51 PM
78	NO SOUTHBENCH HWY	6/15/2020 4:49 PM
79	The statements of reducing traffic in South Weber are circular and contradictory to the proposed connection of South Weber to Layton.	6/15/2020 4:29 PM

**Q32 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the  
Active Transportation section**

Answered: 65 Skipped: 662

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Keep all trails put. Remove all trails not currently in South Weber boundaries.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Don't bring in more "trash"	7/6/2020 1:34 PM
3	Keep all trails dirt.	7/6/2020 11:49 AM
4	No Canal Trail. No South Hillside Trail. Both pass largely through our properties. Allowing them would eliminate our privacy. The utility of the properties and complicate obvious liability issues. Both trails, through our ground, are polluted.	7/6/2020 10:50 AM
5	No to Bonneville Shoreline Trail, Canal Trail, & Pea Vinery Trails. As stated in several other areas of this survey these trails run through what should be & should always remain open space. These are wildlife areas & shouldn't be contaminated with litter, human traffic, & possible fire hazards. Privacy for the homes that are close to these proposed trails is also a concern.	7/6/2020 9:59 AM
6	No trails!!! They run through what should always be open spaces. We want our privacy and low crime.	7/2/2020 5:46 PM
7	Don't build on erosive areas. We have already seen an increase in crime due to population density. Don't give criminals easy access to our backyards.	7/2/2020 5:17 PM
8	Trails are a great benefit to the City. Please insure we will be able to maintain a good trail before developing it.	7/2/2020 4:21 PM
9	No large collector roads - LEAVE CITY ALONE - we don't want money wasted on more surveys or trying to develop every square inch!	7/2/2020 3:30 PM
10	Bad intersection on 475. Too many people speed on South Weber Drive	7/2/2020 3:15 PM
11	South Weber Drive needs lower speed limit. Intersection on 475 is poorly designed. Confusing, left hand turn from 475 to Adams will become impossible.	7/2/2020 3:08 PM
12	Hate turning left at 475 Intersection	7/2/2020 11:37 AM
13	The money (tax) for the Transportation study - etc. should have been earmarked for what it would be used for, so citizens could decide for themselves.	7/1/2020 5:18 PM
14	If a connector road is added to 1550 E then regular police patrols will be necessary to control speeders.	7/1/2020 12:02 PM
15	good	6/30/2020 11:29 PM
16	1 acre or more properties that allow horses with access to trails would be a wonderful benefit to our city.	6/30/2020 11:22 PM
17	No Additional Comments	6/30/2020 10:29 PM
18	The survey was a wish list - a pie in the sky dream and didnt offer price tags associated with trails. So now we have a whole section about how we would all start walking and exercising if we only had a trail... so few citizens would use it. Its an image thing not realistic.	6/30/2020 10:19 PM
19	No connection to Layton	6/30/2020 8:51 PM
20	I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH A Road TO LAYTON	6/30/2020 8:40 PM
21	Trails should be by the river and the Bonneville Shoreline trail and not provide access for criminal activity. Maybe the canal from 1900 East and west and not through the neighborhoods.	6/30/2020 7:50 PM
22	There are too many comments to show in this block. Please reference comments provided in the packet from the City Council meeting on 28Apr20 pp 161-162. Please reread and review again.	6/30/2020 5:23 PM
23	Trails around the city are fine but we have had Felons run behind homes in the past and that criminal element access to homes is a concern on trails.	6/30/2020 3:45 PM
24	Keep trying.	6/30/2020 2:59 PM
25	NO ROAD TO LAYTON NO NEW ROADS ANYWHERE	6/30/2020 1:42 PM
26	No comment	6/30/2020 10:30 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

27	I really like the south hillside trail idea. That is the best at keeping a country feel in the city IF we can keep the forested hillside and some greenery between the trail and the canal and people's yards.	6/30/2020 12:01 AM
28	same.	6/29/2020 11:06 PM
29	No to the canal trail and the South Hillside trail. Doing a bunch of trails inside the gravel pits would be a great use of the land! Maybe put a small lined pond at the bottom for fishing and small kayaks!	6/29/2020 9:57 PM
30	I love the idea of trails but dont force land owners	6/29/2020 9:37 PM
31	Think about adding something to slow transportation through neighborhoods.	6/29/2020 9:36 PM
32	Traffic should not increase on current roads. Expenses and taxes should not go up just because we undertook new projects or developments.	6/29/2020 5:10 PM
33	City shouldn't spend tax dollars on any future trails.	6/29/2020 3:50 PM
34	No changes.	6/29/2020 2:39 PM
35	I am troubled that the city sent out a survey to see what they residents wanted for amenities. They asked for our Christmas List. With no \$ amount attached. Of course everyone wants it all. I would like a Ferrari until I find out the cost,,,then I will actually get a mazda 6, Putting up trails will scar our beautiful slopes and mess with our natural resourses and our natural wildlife. Stop saying that trails will make people be healthier. No People make people healthier. Why bother making all these wonderful sidewalks and doing videos showing how nice they are then don't encourage them to be walked. I walk 10 miles every day. I don't require trails to be healthy shoes and a road and an inner drive for being healthy. I personally wasn't aware of this survey that went out... So I am in the Silent majority that is totally against ripping up our nature to we can walk in it.. walk on our new and improved sidewalks. Save us thousands and thousands	6/29/2020 2:33 PM
36	No Road to Layton. No new roads anywhere	6/29/2020 12:52 PM
37	.	6/29/2020 11:37 AM
38	leave it as is	6/29/2020 10:04 AM
39	This makes me so angry I have a hard time writing this. You say that the number one priority of South Weber residents was recreational activities and trails. When you did this survey no \$\$\$\$ were attached. So basically you asked us for our christmas list, without any information of what costs and damages it will do to our community. Shame on you. It is like telling me to pick what I want...Okay, I want a corvette....and a 3 carat diamond.....without knowing that it will cost me 150 grand....Well, then I will take a mazda 6. Wouldn't it be much much smarter to put a price tag on amenties so people are informed. Who really wanted all these trails. I walk 10 miles every day 365 days a year. I don't need or want them. Did all these people know the cost....Im sure they did not. I went through that survey line by line and tallied up all the wants. How many people actually knew about that survey. My understanding of the bonneville shoreline trail is that there are residents that are being forced to have it go through their property. If this is true, then I strongly oppose. Anytime residents are forced to cave into letting their property be run through I disagree. I understand that their have been extreme \$\$\$ amounts proposed for some of these trails although a small portion was arranged to be free.( the tunnel under the bridge???) Bottom line \$\$ are not worth destroying our environment and slopes	6/29/2020 3:17 AM
40	Again, I strongly disagree with the proposed canal trail and south hillside trail.	6/28/2020 12:03 PM
41	Trails will benefit the citizens of South Weber!	6/27/2020 9:25 PM
42	Trails are good.	6/27/2020 9:25 PM
43	already given.	6/27/2020 10:24 AM
44	More trails!	6/26/2020 10:49 PM
45	I think you're overthinking the transportation plan, it's just a guide, road map and lines on paper.	6/26/2020 3:44 PM
46	No trails unless its around parks that also don't intrude on residential privacy. Trails always look good on paper and in daylight. In reality they are a money pit and at night an invitation for predators, drug dealers and other less than desirable activities.	6/26/2020 10:42 AM
47	I have answered this view my comments	6/25/2020 3:58 PM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

48	You no my feelings no road to Layton.	6/25/2020 2:46 PM
49	No road connecting to Layton!	6/25/2020 2:25 PM
50	More information and cost analysis is needed to make informed decisions and offer feedback.	6/25/2020 1:30 PM
51	Already commented	6/25/2020 11:20 AM
52	Stop trying to spend money on things that we don't need! Bike and walking trails are EXTRA.	6/24/2020 5:09 PM
53	We don't need to pay for walking trails when Weber trails said they would make it happen. We don't have to have trails running through the city. There shouldn't be bike trails either! It's just another expense that we shouldn't have to take on!	6/24/2020 4:43 PM
54	Completely in favor of these trails	6/23/2020 11:45 AM
55	Ok	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
56	Our city won't be a bedroom community anymore if it keeps going On the way it is	6/23/2020 10:36 AM
57	I am unable to access on this computer and unfortunately we have stopped at the city offices twice, both times closed. Another road running East-West through the city would be nice to take pressure off SWD. The access to Layton should be shelved and emergency only routes planned.	6/23/2020 7:55 AM
58	Refer to #30	6/22/2020 4:40 PM
59	Trails, can not have enough.	6/22/2020 4:39 PM
60	none	6/22/2020 2:46 PM
61	I again want much more information on these trails before I vote on these. I completely disagree with the canal trail. I worry about imposing upon homeowners to take away their private land to construct these trails	6/18/2020 3:58 PM
62	Please DO NOT PUT THE CANAL TRAIL ON THE GP! This is the most ridiculous idea next to the road to Layton! Say NO to it!!	6/17/2020 8:33 PM
63	I concur and look forward to the improvement with outdoors.	6/16/2020 6:11 PM
64	Still no SOUTHBENCH HWY	6/15/2020 4:50 PM
65	City recreation plans should not be founded on a single survey done for a school project.	6/15/2020 4:32 PM

**Q33 Please provide any comments/suggestions you have regarding the  
Annexation Policy section**

Answered: 60 Skipped: 667

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Let land owners annex into city when they choose.	7/6/2020 3:14 PM
2	Wait for property owners to decide.	7/6/2020 1:34 PM
3	Please let landowners decide.	7/6/2020 11:49 AM
4	There is no value AND increased possible costs (coming under city jurisdiction) for us if we were to allow our property to annexed into South Weber. As mentioned before in this survey, the City should remove its proposed trails (Canal & South Hillside trail) from this proposed plan. As well will not allow the trails for an assortment of liability, privacy of other legitimate reasons. And once again, we ask that ALL Poll enterprises LLC property (above the canal) we REMOVED from the city annexation plans. Annexation is OUR call, not the City's and is unethical and unproductive for the City to mislead the residents in this town that the trails add issue or the annexation of our properties are viable options for the city of South Weber.	7/6/2020 11:14 AM
5	Annexation policy is fine as long as you adhere to keeping the east & south bench areas as open space as stated in lines 850 & 851. The area that is planned to be shared with Layton City should remain in South Weber's sole control because that area includes our culinary water source. Also a reason for it to remain with no public access.	7/6/2020 10:01 AM
6	Keep open as in lines 850 E & 851. Keep area shared with Layton they don't care about South Weber and laugh about their trash blowing down on us. It also contains our culinary water source. No public access to that.	7/2/2020 5:47 PM
7	Pull all the marked lands in when feasible	7/2/2020 4:21 PM
8	I see no benefit in annexing any ground into South Weber.	7/2/2020 3:40 PM
9	No annexation into City.	7/2/2020 3:30 PM
10	No don't annex.	7/2/2020 3:15 PM
11	Do not annex any property into the city.	7/2/2020 3:08 PM
12	Do not annex private property	7/2/2020 11:25 AM
13	Annex our overlap with Layton before they do. Annex all we can to protect our boundaries,	6/30/2020 11:30 PM
14	Since it is unlikely that the proposed annexations will be developed they should be removed.	6/30/2020 11:24 PM
15	No land should be annexed on the South Slope that needs a road in order to service it.	6/30/2020 10:29 PM
16	no need to annex	6/30/2020 10:19 PM
17	This feels like a really poor choice. There are a lot of issues with getting water to the locations designated. We already have low water pressure at my level. Higher is going to cost the city, and it is a very high probability for issues that we have seen in other communities. In the end the city is going to be stuck with the bill. We need to be exceedingly diligent in not allow poor constructions site to move forward. I believe most of what is being consider is in the realm of poor sites (there is some good property there but most of it is going to be an issue).	6/30/2020 8:54 PM
18	There are too many comments to show in this block. Please reference comments provided in the packet from the City Council meeting on 28Apr20 p 163. Please reread and review again. Also, reference Lines 863-864 - I do not understand what part of existing development belongs in this undeveloped unincorporated section. One Final General Comment: Once the final versions of the General Plan, and possibly the General Plan Survey are completed, a final review of spelling, punctuation, grammar, etc. should be accomplished in order to present the BEST face forward for a document representing the work of South Weber City.	6/30/2020 5:23 PM
19	Do not annex.	6/30/2020 3:46 PM
20	I don't think many understand why we have a annexation plan. Keep it like it was. Don't conceded anything.	6/30/2020 3:00 PM
21	I do not think we need to allow annexation	6/30/2020 12:19 PM
22	No comment	6/30/2020 10:30 AM
23	The writeup looks okay, except you should fix line 856 to say "If annexed to South Weber,	6/30/2020 12:06 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

SOME OF these lands ...." Not all of the land on the annexation map will be developed, as noted in the prior paragraph where it says some will be left as open space. As noted previously, consider showing different future plans for the annexation areas to differentiate which would be open space and which would be developed.

24	No to the annexing of the south slope!	6/29/2020 9:57 PM
25	No comment	6/29/2020 9:36 PM
26	Lands to the south on the slope are a bad idea to annex as it will drive up the cost of maintaining services to those properties. The ones in flat lands are okay.	6/29/2020 5:10 PM
27	Do not annex any lands.	6/29/2020 3:50 PM
28	No changes	6/29/2020 2:39 PM
29	I don't want them if you want them for business or industry. If you want them for beautiful cushions between cities then sure	6/29/2020 2:34 PM
30	.	6/29/2020 11:38 AM
31	only annex lands that you plan on preserving	6/29/2020 10:05 AM
32	IF you want these areas so we can add more businesses I am against them...Why does every beautiful natural area have to be blamed wih business. We don't need to be layton....	6/29/2020 3:20 AM
33	I strongly disagree that we should be annexing any land from Layton city and developing on it.	6/28/2020 12:04 PM
34	The west end of annexation maybe should go further west than shown.	6/28/2020 11:04 AM
35	Please keep our small town small. If I wanted more traffic I would live in Layton.	6/27/2020 9:27 PM
36	It would be better to annex the land so we have control over what is built.	6/27/2020 11:44 AM
37	Already given.	6/27/2020 10:25 AM
38	It's always nice to know the city has control over what may come onto annexation areas, let keep our seat at the table.	6/26/2020 3:46 PM
39	Annex things BELOW THE RIDGE and RIDGELINE that will help preserve our community character. Annexing anything up on the Bluff is a NOGO. It will cost us more than it is worth, and it is deemed by many as a means of some in the city offices to continue pushing for a connection to layton masked in the guise of protecting our skyline. A wolf in sheep's clothing.... Sacrifice the skyline control to preserve the small community feel and save the taxpayers money.	6/26/2020 10:47 AM
40	Please take annexation to the vote of the people	6/25/2020 11:04 PM
41	I have answered this view my comments	6/25/2020 3:59 PM
42	Just use your head during the annexation process. All that glitters is not gold. make sure it makes sense after understanding the property limitations and use. Don't put more commercial East o;f 89. Lets put housing.	6/25/2020 2:48 PM
43	Citizen vote should be taken riot to and for any annexation!	6/25/2020 2:26 PM
44	no comment	6/25/2020 1:30 PM
45	No annexation	6/25/2020 11:20 AM
46	We don't want the city to annex this property. Then we have to take care of it.	6/24/2020 5:10 PM
47	We don't want to Annex this property to the city. It's just another added expense!	6/24/2020 4:44 PM
48	We should also indicate which properties within the current city limits that could be de-annexed by the city.	6/24/2020 12:53 PM
49	Do not annex anything on the South or West sides.	6/23/2020 9:00 PM
50	I am not in favor of expansion at this time. We have so many urgent projects in SW, 1900 E SW drive, local streets, curb and gutters, trails, all current developments that must be completed before we consider annexation.	6/23/2020 11:51 AM

## South Weber City General Plan Survey June 2020

51	Ok	6/23/2020 10:37 AM
52	Zone wisely.	6/23/2020 7:55 AM
53	Make sure "if" this happens that we can support any addition without any more burden on the residents.	6/22/2020 4:40 PM
54	Refer to #30	6/22/2020 4:40 PM
55	none	6/22/2020 2:46 PM
56	I disagree with annexation on any of the unstable slopes. I believe it creates a serious liability for the city and the residents	6/18/2020 3:58 PM
57	I don't see the need to annex anything on the south side of South Weber!	6/17/2020 8:35 PM
58	I caution when talking about Annexation -- we love the small hometown feel to our South Weber community and want to emphasize avoiding over-crowding, congestion, and too much business.	6/16/2020 6:12 PM
59	No comment	6/15/2020 4:50 PM
60	More costs to citizens.	6/15/2020 4:33 PM