

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

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.