

# **SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**DATE OF MEETING:** 26 January 2023

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

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

**PRESENT:**

**COMMISSIONERS:**

**Gary Boatright  
Jeremy Davis  
Julie Losee  
Marty McFadden  
Taylor Walton**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE DIRECTOR:** Trevor Cahoon

**DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR:** Kimberli Guill

**Minutes:** Michelle Clark

---

**ATTENDEES:** Rolayne Collins, Robert Colling, Janet Gibbs, Kathy Meeks, Connie Stone, Ann Durrant, Kenny Durrant, Brian Skousen, Lynn Poll, Linda Conners, Sharon Judd, Phil Judd, Paul Sturm, Rod Westbroek, May Cast, Kevin Schon, Adam Gehring, R. Jefra Hicks, Jessica Gehring, J. Cornia, Marlesse & Rod Jones, Julie & Chad Smith, Ricky Benitez, Jeff Muntinga, Scott Phillips, Michael Poff, Wesley Stuart, and Terry & Susan Flitton.

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

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

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

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

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**Commissioner Losee moved to open the public hearing for Prelim/Final, Conditional Use & Agreements for RV General Parcel/ s #130180090 & 130230214 Located at the corner of 475 E & 6650 S by Applicant: Kevin Schonsheck of the MacOgden Group LLC. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

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

**3. Prelim/Final, Conditional Use & Agreements for RV General Parcel/ s #130180090 & 130230214 Located at the corner of 475 E & 6650 S by Applicant: Kevin Schonsheck of the MacOgden Group LLC:** Community Services Director, Trevor Cahoon explained the developer of this project desires to improve approximately 16.430 acres of property into a commercial development known as General RV.

**Final Plat.** Because the developer is requesting a single lot subdivision, they have chosen to move forward with their subdivision as a Preliminary/Final submission. Final Plat items to consider:

- *Legal Description:* This has been supplied.
- *Subdivision Name:* The Subdivision name appears on the plat and is consistent with the application that has been submitted.
- *Lot Sizes and Orientation:* N/A.
- *Parcel Numbers or Lot Numbers of Surrounding Properties:* When recording the plat it is necessary to indicate the parcel identification numbers or the lot number for adjoining subdivisions. This plat has that necessary information.
- *Right-of-Way (ROW) Dedication:* The ROW has been indicated on the drawings for dedication to the City and the widths comply with the City Standards.
- *Utility Easements:* The General Utility Easement required for each property has been indicated on the plat. Developer has supplied the necessary easement dedication for the Powerline Corridor and is consistent with widths required in other areas.

**Site Plan:** The commercial use required the submission of a site plan to the Planning Commission for approval. The site plan includes a Lighting Plan.

**Landscape Plan:** Review proposed landscape plan. Developer has requested a reduction to 10% landscaping by placing trees along the roadway to create a better look and feel to the area.

**Conditional Use Permit:** Conditional use is needed as the project is over an acre and the use is a conditional use.

**Architectural Review:** The project requires an architectural site plan review.

**Improvement Plans:** Developer has submitted improvement plans to be included in the submission.

**Maintenance Agreement:** With the inclusion of the landscaping along the public right-of-way and numerous public utilities that will be included in the project staff has drafted a maintenance agreement that will commit the property to maintain their improvements on their site.

The developer has requested incentives as part of this development from the City Council. The Council has met and discussed these incentives in a preliminary conversation. However, the Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction in this area, therefore, it is not part of the decision.

The current zoning for this project is Commercial-Highway (C-H). The use is allowed within that zone as a conditional use and will need to be processed through the conditional use application.

The Project totals 16.430. This is smaller than the original site. The developer is requesting to exclude the area that is designated as wetlands and will continue to work with the Army Corp of Engineers to include the rest of the area later in a subdivision amendment. This could have implications for the required fencing and may cause issues because it creates a parcel that cannot be accessed except through the property itself. As the developer continues to work with the Riverdale Canal Company and Army Corp of Engineers, they want to exclude this portion and the City can waive the requirement of the fence until such time a solution can be made, otherwise the City could require a temporary fence along the border.

There is no minimum lot area requirements. Setback needs to be 50' from the front and 20' from the side that is fronting 475 E. The site plan provided shows this to not be an issue.

A traffic study has been submitted and verified and shows no concerning numbers for the affected traffic impact. The developer will not be adding roads to the project area. There will be a need for striping along Old Fort Road and 475 E.

Developer is responsible to install a trail connection for the area as shown in the General Plan. Working with the developer the City has requested that the sidewalk in the Public ROW be widened to accommodate both a trail connection and sidewalk for the ROW.

At least fifteen percent (15%) of the total site shall be thoroughly landscaped, including an irrigation system to maintain such landscaping. For use of exceptional design and materials, as determined by the Planning Commission, the landscaping may be reduced to ten percent (10%) of the total site. The developer has committed to improving the landscape along Old Fort Road and the trail/sidewalk and are requesting the 10% consideration for this effort. Buffer Yard is not necessary as the site does not abut residential.

South Weber City Code indicates that a masonry wall is needed along the I-84 corridor. This requirement can be waived based upon recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council if they determine that the purpose of the fence (protection from wildfire and automobile accidents) is not necessary for the development. Upon review by the South Weber Fire Chief, Derek Tolman, staff feels that this site has other mitigating factors such as large, asphalted areas that will accomplish the same purpose.

There is sufficient parking for the project. There will be a total number of customer dedicated parking of 144 stalls. Internally, the site will have RVs behind fencing with internal flow adequate for general traffic. The main entrance and exit appear to be on 475 E with the drive on Old Fort road being an exit gate only.

The City has received all required Will Serve letters, and plan approval letters from South Weber Irrigation Company (SWIC), Davis County Surveyor's Office, Riverdale Bench Canal Company (RBCC), and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD). The developer has been working with Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) and is still waiting for their official approval.

The developer is working on approval from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for potential wetlands along the Riverdale Bench Canal, but that is not part of Phase 1, and will be addressed with Phase 2.

The Geotechnical Report by ECS did not report any issue of concern. The groundwater in the area is relatively shallow, but the design of the project has taken this into consideration and should only have an impact during construction.

The Traffic Impact Study by A-Trans identifies that there is virtually no change in Level of Service (LOS) due to the addition of the development. The East Bound Left (EBL) movement at the intersection of Old Maple Road and 475 East changed from LOS B to LOS C with an additional delay time of 1.3 seconds. South Weber's LOS for intersections is LOS C. So, no additional mitigation is required. The center lane on 475 East will be re-stripped to allow for left-hand turns into their site. The developer is using the access on Old Fort Road as an exit only access with a gate for security.

All site utilities will be privately owned and maintained. In order to be clear on where city ownership ends and private ownership begins along with requirements for maintenance, an Ownership & Maintenance Agreement has been prepared and will help to make sure the private utility systems are maintained properly.

The fire flow test has been completed and came back at 1,620 gpm. A temporary fence will be installed along the south side of the canal until the canal is piped. It would be helpful if the plans included a cross section view covering the area from the road to the property line on the north and east sides of the road to show the width of the park strip and sidewalk as well as the location of the fence.

The site will be surrounded by a 6' chain link fence (black vinyl-coated). The Ownership & Maintenance Agreement indicates that the landscaping in the ROW will be the responsibility of the developer.

Commissioner Davis asked if there was any public comment.

**Rolayne Collins, of South Weber City**, lives in the Riverside Place adult community and opined this is a significant commercial development adjacent to the new subdivision in the area. She added as neighbors they have discussed the pros and cons of this business and requested the following:

1. Respectfully asked for additional consideration for the buffer between the dealership and the surrounding homes. She questioned what size of trees will be installed to create the buffer?
2. She queried if the historical marker on Old Fort Road can be moved?
3. She discussed the possibility of installing a masonry fence along Old Fort Road that compliments the existing walls around the power station and new homes.
4. Light pollution is a great concern and suggested minimizing lumens, installing canopies, and controlling illumination.
5. She addressed concerns with the access out of the RV dealership and inquired about a right turn only sign exiting the dealership.
6. Vehicle parking along the road is a concern.

She added addressing citizens' concerns will go a long way in creating good will.

**Janet Gibbs of South Weber City** voiced concerns with future impact on home values in the 55 and older community. She queried if there are long term plans for RV storage and is there a time limit. She requested parking be contained inside the business. Ms. Gibbs is concerned water usage and questioned how often the RV's will be washed. She queried on the size of signs, limit on lights, location of signs, delivery schedules etc. She suggested landscaping with native plants and trees.

**Lynn Poll of South Weber City** is grateful to see something that will help with the city's tax base. He suggested keeping as many trees along Interstate 84 as possible to help reduce noise. He feels this is a good thing for the community.

**R. Jeffrey Hicks, of South Weber City**, reminded everyone of the neighborhood near this development. He favored the conditional use and encouraged the planting of larger trees and increasing the setbacks. He suggested limiting idling delivery trucks along the street.

**Jeremy Cornia, of South Weber City**, discussed the possibility of creating a dark hour requirement for the dealership to maintain the feel of the neighborhood.

**Paul Sturm, of South Weber City**, is impressed with the thoroughness of General RV. He suggested the conditional use permit should include: (1) Aspects of dark sky program that has been integrated into prior South Weber City developments, (2) Lighting for such a large area needs to be carefully considered because of the development being adjacent to residential areas, and (3) Hours for lighting should be from dusk to closing. After that, only for security purposes. He queried who will be involved in the development of the conditional use requirements.

**Scott Phillips, of South Weber City**, recommended limited lighting hours because this is the closest business to his home and suggested larger safe sidewalks for his children.

**Ricky Benitez of South Weber City** voiced concerns with intersection of Old Maple Road and 475 E. and suggested a light or round about at the intersection.

**Jeff Muntinga of South Weber City** favored the small town feel of South Weber City. He is concerned about test drives in a location where there are families, children, etc. and suggested they be avoided.

**Michael Poff, of South Weber City**, suggested the installation of a 4' landscaped berm along the road to help with vehicle head lights, 6' sidewalk, and acknowledged the City's general plan does identify a visual buffer along Interstate 84.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to close the public hearing for Prelim/Final, Conditional Use & Agreements for RV General Parcel/ s #130180090 & 130230214 Located at the corner of 475 E & 6650 S by Applicant: Kevin Schonsheck of the MacOgden Group LLC. Commissioner Walton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

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

**Kevin Schonscheck of South Weber LLC and representing MacOgden Group LLC with General RV as the user.** He acknowledged they are working on approval from the US Army Corps of Engineers for potential wetlands along the Riverdale Bench Canal. He addressed the lighting and photometric lighting plan for the development. He will consider the right turn only out of the exit, as he isn't sure they will be using that exit much. There will be no third party storage of RV's. The signage will be what is allowed by city code. There will be no on street parking. The delivery of RV's will take place during business hours. The Draper City store is not closing. They will do whatever they can to help sponsorship of the community. Masonry wall along Old Fort Road isn't possible because it is too expensive and restrictive for security. The grade won't allow a berm.

Commissioner Boatright favored this option out of all other options for this property. He is concerned about lighting. The entrance and exits can be dangerous if going straight across. The historic marker should be saved and moved to a different place. The landscaping should include drought tolerant plants.

Commissioner Walton doesn't understand the location of the trail along the frontage of the development and queried if a possible trail location on the north side of the property is dangerous because of the canal. Mr. Cahoon replied there is a concern the trail would be isolated in that area and provide additional access to the business which may be a security concern as well as encourage illegal behavior. Commissioner Walton disagreed because there are other parts of trails that are not part of public view. He doesn't understand the logic as to why the trail isn't installed on the north side and is further concerned as to why it would be installed along the frontage of this development with the increased traffic. He acknowledged there are several citizens who enjoy walking, biking, skate boarding, etc. and travel over Interstate 84 to the Weber River Pathway Trail. He would like to provide a safe environment for that and is concerned about a sidewalk being the main component of the active transportation plan in this area. He suggested the installation of a bike lane along Old Fort Road and 475 E. for more protection for those who do access the Weber River Parkway Trail.

Commissioner Davis favored the trail along Old Fort Road because it creates a 17' buffer. He doesn't feel it is a safety concern with visibility.

Commissioner Losee is concerned about safety entering and exiting the development. She favored landscaping and not just rock. She added trees in the park strip need to be maintained as per city code.

Discussion took place regarding the trees along Interstate 84. Mr. Schonscheck reported all the trees on the property will be removed; however, there are trees closer to the interstate that are not on this project's property.

Commissioner McFadden favored the wide sidewalk and wide trail for a safer community. He does favor a trail between Interstate 84 and the development.

Commissioner Losee queried if gates will be installed at the entrance and exit. Mr. Schonscheck replied that a motion censored gate will be installed at the exit. Commissioner Losee questioned if lighting caution signs can be installed. Mr. Schonscheck favored that for safety reasons.

Commissioner Walton favored intersections lining up in case a streetlight needs to be installed. He inquired on the height of the lights. It was stated the lights are LED down lights and will vary in height with the highest being 20' to 21'. Mr. Cahoon discussed the city code requiring shoe box style light covers, and not seeing the light source from outside the property. It was acknowledged the City Engineer has approved the lighting plan. Commissioner Walton is concerned there is too much lighting in the southwest corner. Mr. Schonscheck discussed the need to cast the light out and reported it will be shoe box lighting shooting down. Commissioner Walton asked for limited lighting at night. Mr. Schonscheck replied there is a big buffer between the street and residential which he would like to be taken into consideration. He also discussed the need for lighting to help maintain security.

Further discussion took place concerning water use. Mr. Schonscheck explained the RVs are not washed weekly. Commissioner Walton discussed the intersection at Old Fort Road and 475 E. and the fact that a roundabout doesn't fit.

Commissioner Losee questioned if there is an area for public dumping or any fueling. Mr. Schonscheck replied it is all private and not for public use. Commissioner Losee asked about building materials. Mr. Schonscheck replied the building is made of precast concrete panels to help limit noise from Hill Air Force Base. Commissioner Boatright understands the interest in the look for this development in South Weber City, but acknowledged nobody has ever defined what that look should be and it doesn't seem fair to impose that on a developer when it is arbitrary. Commissioner Losee doesn't favor chain link fencing. She does favor a berm. Commissioner McFadden added with the right landscape the chain link fence will eventually disappear. Mr. Cahoon stated there is no restriction in the code for chain link. He discussed the conditions being actionable and mitigate any health, safety, and welfare in the area. He added the developer can use chain link fence, but the north side requirement is for masonry fence. Commissioner McFadden suggested installation of rod iron along the southwest portion of the property.

Commissioner Losee reminded everyone of the preservation of the historical marker. Wesley Stuart of Gardner Engineering reported the site plan shows moving it slightly to the west in the park strip.

Discussion took place regarding the need for signage off Interstate 84 and the west side of 475 E for the entrance to the development to help prevent traffic going into the neighborhoods. It was stated the Public Works Department will investigate the possibility of signage for those who aren't familiar with the area. Mr. Cahoon reported the roads in that area are 36' and do accommodate turning around. It was suggested to look at the possibility of considering no parking along Old Fort Road.

Mr. Cahoon reviewed the State Legislature Limitations for Conditional Uses and conveyed a **“Conditional Use”** is a land use that has unique characteristics or negative effects that may not be compatible in an area without conditions to mitigate or eliminate the detrimental impacts. The statutes governing conditional uses are found at § [10-9a-507](#) and § [17-27a-506](#) of the Utah Code. The statutes read as follows:

(1) A land use ordinance may include conditional uses and provisions for conditional uses that require compliance with standards set forth in an applicable ordinance.

(2)(a) A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.

(b) If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied.

Mr. Cahoon noted Commercial Conditional Uses are a recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council. He then addressed “**Applicable Standards**” which refers to guidelines in an ordinance that help determine the type and extent of conditions that may be imposed on a conditional use. These standards establish objective goals or levels of performance, which then guide decisions on the conditions which are adopted. He reviewed “**Detrimental Impacts**” in which most land uses impact the public’s health, safety, or welfare in some way. The detrimental effects identified for a conditional use should be related to negative impacts on legitimate governmental interests, or on the public welfare. He encouraged the Planning Commission to make sure the conditions are actionable and reasonable to hold up.

The developer is requesting a waiver on the following:

- (1) At least fifteen percent (15%) of the total site shall be thoroughly landscaped, including an irrigation system to maintain such landscaping. For use of exceptional design and materials, as determined by the Planning Commission, the landscaping may be reduced to ten percent (10%) of the total site. The developer has committed to improving the landscape along Old Fort Road and the trail/sidewalk and are requesting the 10% consideration for this effort. Buffer Yard is not necessary as the site does not abut residential.
- (2) South Weber City Code indicates that a masonry wall is needed along the I-84 corridor. This requirement can be waived based upon recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council if they determine that the purpose of the fence (protection from wildfire and automobile accidents) is not necessary for the development. Upon review by the South Weber Fire Chief, Derek Tolman, staff feels that this site has other mitigating factors such as large, asphalted areas that will accomplish the same purpose.

Commissioner McFadden recommended a rod iron fence. It was stated that cannot be a conditional use requirement but can be included in the reduction of landscaping. Commissioner Losee voiced frustration with the preliminary and final being together. Mr. Cahoon suggested approving individual components and then continuing an item to another meeting if necessary.

Commissioner Walton voiced the only condition he would suggest for the conditional use is limiting night lighting. Commissioner Boatright commended the developer for the preparation and overall plan of this development. Commissioner Davis agreed. He doesn’t feel an official recommendation can be made on the fencing because it does fall under city code; however, he does recommend a 4’ berm with anything other than chain link fence. Commissioner McFadden discussed the slope of a berm creating it difficult to water the grass, which doesn’t work. Commissioner Boatright is willing to exchange something along the south side for a different type of fence, but chain link fence on north side is okay.

**Commissioner Walton moved to recommend approval to the City Council for Prelim/Final, Conditional Use & Agreements for RV General Parcel/ s #130180090 & 130230214 Located at the corner of 475 E & 6650 S by Applicant: Kevin Schonsheck of the MacOgden Group LLC.**

- 1. Visual recommendation on the Conditional Use Permit be considered for limiting nighttime light pollution.**
- 2. The Planning Commission agrees to reduce the landscaping from 15% to 10%.**
- 3. Recommendation of fencing on south side of development be upgraded to rod iron or more aesthetically pleasing material for the landscaping requirement.**
- 4. The additional exception to the northern boundary of the development area with the acreage identified in the letter by the City Planner from the overall development proposal.**
- 5. City Council to possibly consider re-evaluating the potential for the trail on the northern boundary.**
- 6. Lighting plan to address the southwest corner of the development and reducing any light pollution in that section.**
- 7. Detailed plan be provided to City Council with more description in regards to the historical monument on the west side of the property.**

**Commissioner McFadden seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

Mr. Cahoon pointed out there was nothing mentioned in the motion concerning the associated maintenance agreement with the property. Commissioner Walton explained he left that out of the motion because it wasn't defined as action in the packet. Mr. Cahoon replied the packet states, *"Prelim/Final, Conditional Use & Agreements for RV General Parcel/ s #130180090 & 130230214 Located at the corner of 475 E & 6650 S by Applicant: Kevin Schonsheck of the MacOgden Group LLC."* Commissioner Walton noted the Planning Commission didn't have a lot of conversation of the agreements and the verbiage in them and queried if there are other opinions with the Planning Commission.

**Commissioner Walton moved to amend the motion to recommend approval of the maintenance agreements included in the packet as written. Commissioner Boatright seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

Commissioner Boatright noted for the record he doesn't favor re-evaluating the trail on the north side. Commissioner McFadden agreed.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

**Commissioner Losee:** suggested Code Committee review development process.

**Commissioner Walton:** thanked those who attended and gave public comment. He thanked the developer for his willingness to work with the City. He is excited for the potential this development might bring to the City. He suggested the Planning Commission receive more

information regarding the engineering reviews. He pointed out at one time disclosing conflict of interest was on the agenda and recommended adding it again. He would like to see the City focus on architectural design standards. He doesn't understand why Preliminary/Final are combined. He thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve the City. He hopes South Weber City is a better place by his service.

**Commissioner Davis:** thanked those who attended the meeting tonight and had the courage to voice their public comment. Everyone was well prepared.

**Commissioner Boatright:** announced the Planning Commission is the recommending body. He suggested if individuals have concerns, they need to address their concerns with the elected officials.

**ADJOURN:** Commissioner Boatright moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:31 p.m. Commissioner Losee seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

**APPROVED:** Jeremy Davis Date 3/9/2023  
Chairperson: **Jeremy Davis**

Michelle Clark  
Transcriber: **Michelle Clark**

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

**From:** [Amy Mitchell](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment  
**Date:** Friday, January 27, 2023 9:54:00 PM

---

Dear Mayor, City Council and Planning Commission,

This is from my post on Facebook and I know that this was one man's opinion.... Which he is entitled to. But he is still our representative on the PC, so I will share what I wrote and please take it as not only my opinion, but the opinion of the many who filled out the 2 surveys.

I want to draw some attention to some comments from the last PC meeting that jumped out at me and I find very disturbing... especially after all the time and energy spent over the last couple of years by many of us... making sure that the road to Layton was off all plans. Yes, this is personal to me... any maybe some of you... and it's rearing it's ugly head once again. Many of the comments made by one of our PC members about all the opportunities in the city, and that we should work to be proactive rather than reactive with concerns to the "road to Layton" and the huge development going on up at the top. Maybe he isn't aware of or has ignored ALL the info brought up about the instability of the hill, the sensitive lands, the traffic study... as well as countless input given by citizens that most of us do NOT want a connection to Layton that will bring potentially thousands of cars down 1900. Making this road a quick access for people to take rather than fighting traffic on 193.

2 lengthy surveys and many months hashing it out... 85 % of us stomping down this connection. I feel like we are on repeat after we have been given assurances from our Mayor and City Council that the road is off the map... and that Layton City knows we do not want to develop it further. That it is to remain an access road only. Does this ring a bell for anyone else??

We shouldn't have to fight this over and over with every new person appointed or elected in this city!! All new Planning Commission members and City Council members should have to read the General Plan prior to being added to the Commission... and due to the nature of the surveys (being the biggest response this city has ever seen) PLEASE read through ALL of the responses to the survey! Yes, it will be time consuming, but as a representative of the citizens who live here, it would be a good investment to know how we feel. And just like with voting, if someone chose not to fill out the survey, then that's on them.

Thank you for your time. Good luck at the retreat!!

Amy Mitchell  
1923 Deer Run Drive

January 31, 2023  
Jeff Washburn  
622 E. Green Springs Way  
South Weber, UT 84405

South Weber City Planning Commission,

I attended the planning commission meeting held on January 26th 2023 regarding the conditional use permit by General RV to develop the land bounded by I-84, 475 East and Old Fort Road in South Weber remotely as I was out of town on that date. No opportunity was provided for those of us on the Zoom call to provide comments and the comments in the chat during the meeting were not expressed to the commissioners by the commissioner who was running the meeting. I do not know if he saw them - but he certainly didn't respond. In any event I would like my comments to be part of the minutes of that meeting and for my concerns to be addressed (they were not in the proposal that was approved by the commission and forwarded to the city council for final approval).

I am new to South Weber having moved from Draper in the spring of 2022. I was not made aware of the proposal to develop the land noted above while I was considering moving to South Weber. While it is clear that a development of some sort is needed on that property given the number of new homes that are going in around it (not to mention the really lovely older homes that are already there) I would have never guessed that it was going to be an industrial park. That certainly would have given me pause in making a decision to purchase there (I wonder if all the folks who are buying those new homes in the Pebble Creek subdivision are aware of that - the developer(s) can't be too happy about it can they?). You are aware that homes in that subdivision sell for well above the Utah and US averages aren't you? or at least did.

Anyway, since becoming aware of the proposal I have been talking with some of my neighbors who have been around South Weber longer than me and have learned a few things. Some of which are also concerning. To wit: It appears that there have been several attempts to develop the site and that they have all been ultimately rejected for one reason or another. It also appears that the conditional use permission requirements (zoning) have been changed here and there to accommodate the proposal du jour.

Be that as it may – the planning commission rubber stamped the developer's proposal and kicked the can to the city council so my comments and concerns specifically from that meeting will mean nothing - but they will be there on the record:

1. In my opinion the commission closed public comments prematurely then refused to reopen them on point of order when clearly the public had more to say and the developer wanted to respond.
2. The commission instructed the public to limit their comments to three minutes and to not repeat any comments. This is an arbitrary interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order and was used as a tool by the commission to limit discussion and advance their own agenda which was clearly to approve the developer's proposal with minimal or no conditions and get it to the city council. Furthermore – the commission did not hold themselves to the same standard, talking in endless circles over minor details in the developer's proposal that they knew they could not be definitively answered in the meeting and which were not included in the conditions for approval anyway.

2. The motion to approve the proposal was conceptualized and expressed with virtually no forethought, was vague, disregarded virtually all public comments and was quickly and unanimously approved with no discussion.
3. After the closure of public comment the few concerns that were raised (there were and are many more) were categorically dismissed by either the developer or the commissioners during the commissioner's questions period. For example - Mr. Shonesheck dismissed the public recommendation for a more substantive barrier between the development and the neighborhood by indicating that they (General RV) had done their homework and assured the commission that the chain link fence was exclusively and specifically what they need for security purposes (another type wouldn't work and it was too expensive, he couldn't really tell the public the details because they wouldn't understand yada yada yada). What was the commission's response? Well maybe would General consider a nice wrought iron fence instead - would that work for you Mr. Shonesheck? In addition to the fence Mr. Shonesheck assured the community that General RV would put in a few nice trees and a wider sidewalk (nice shape - not too expensive with a little path running down the middle) so that the kids could ride their bikes there in perfect safety. I am no expert - but to me it seems that getting a stolen RV over a masonry wall and through a bunch of mature trees would be a lot more difficult than, say, cutting the lock on the front gate or cutting a hole in that nice chain link or wrought iron fence and driving it over that one foot berm.
4. In response to the public's concern about diverting RV traffic from the neighborhood to the extent possible, the commission indicated that there is no room to install a roundabout at 475 E and Old Fort road. Again I am no expert but I am pretty sure there is a 16 acre parcel of undeveloped land at that intersection and that roads can be altered slightly to accommodate a roundabout. The city is just one big accident at that intersection away from losing all that tax revenue from the RV sales. But yet - that was not part of the proposal to the city council either. "South Weber - our motto is RV sales first - Safety last". I had mixed feelings that the developer's proposal did not include barbed wire on the chain link fence like they have done at other sites - it would have added a really nice touch to the neighborhood - especially at Christmas (we could have our own light show!). And again - the security! Nobody brought up guard dogs but maybe they should have.
5. Next, the commissioners - although acknowledging that they also were not the experts, just took the developer's word for it that the lighting would be held to a minimum - after all, General had done their homework and had the PDF to prove it. The commissioners were just gushing in their praise of the developer "being so prepared". Really? - they are a multi-million dollar outfit in the middle of an RV boom trying to add a sales location to a very accessible location.
6. The final proposal that was forwarded to the city council for their approval was materially deficient in any kind of actionable information for them to consider - in point of fact the commission just rubber stamped the developer's proposal and recommended that the city council do the same. In my estimation that is beyond irresponsible and I request that the proposal be denied by the city council pending better, more informed information that adequately addresses the residents of South Weber's legitimate concerns and recommendations.

**From:** [Erin Winterton](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Rod Westbroek](#); [Jeremy Davis](#); [Julie Losee](#); [Gary Boatright Jr.](#); [Taylor Walton](#); [Marty Mcfadden](#); [Joel Dills](#); [Angie Petty](#); [Blair Halverson](#); [Quin Soderquist](#); [Hayley Alberts](#); [David J. Larson](#)  
**Subject:** RV Sales and Service  
**Date:** Thursday, January 26, 2023 12:08:26 PM

---

Dear South Weber City Mayor, Council, Planning Commissioners, and Manager,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment about the RV commercial development. I apologize that I can't attend the meeting tonight as I will be out of town. I live on Old Maple Road and after reading through the packet, I would like to express my concern. It appears that a traffic study was done, but has the impact to pedestrian traffic been considered?

One of the big draws to living in our neighborhood and South Weber is the close proximity to the beautiful river trail system. In the warmer seasons, we often ride our bikes with our children down 475 E to Cottonwood Drive to access the trail at the Centennial Trailhead. To do so, we ride past a freeway entrance and exit without a crosswalk or light. I am very concerned that we will no longer be able to do so safely with the addition of the RV dealership and the kind of traffic that it will bring. A pedestrian bridge over the freeway would be best but even the addition of crosswalks and lights to improve visibility of pedestrians when crossing the freeway entrances and exits would be a huge improvement.

We have so many young children in our neighborhood that it would be a huge loss to not have safe access to get to one of the best features of our area - the river trails. When making a final decision on the RV commercial development, or any commercial development on that land, I ask that Council and the Planning Commission members please consider the safety of South Weber pedestrians, most especially the young ones, and the value of the convenient access to that trailhead.

Thank you very much for your time and for all that you do for our city.

Sincerely,

Erin Winterton  
334 E Old Maple Road