

**From:** [Natalie Browning](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 2700 E Lofts  
**Date:** Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:06:14 PM

---

South Weber CC and PC,

I am writing you as I am concerned about the Lofts rezone request. This has been a problematic development from the beginning. At this time the density does not match the requested zone, and our current code doesn't support what is being requested. Another concern I have is the safety issues from this proposal in regard to the two entrance/exits. This is a busy road already, and with the slope road it has the potential to impact sight lines based on the proposed building placement and height. This proposed development is on a very small piece of property. Is there enough space in this plan to allow cars to stop behind sidewalks before exiting out onto 2700 E? With a development of this size and the flow of traffic on 2700 this may be a big problem. The height of the building is also very worrisome. As I look around at what is happening along the Wasatch Front we are being overrun with these monstrous developments. My hope is that this development will not look out of character and become an eyesore in this beautiful neighborhood. From my understanding with the last general plan which was completed twice with input from many citizens, R7 was the highest density that is allowed in our city. The 11 units per acre seems extreme and very out of character for South Weber. The last city plan was also greatly against HDH which he is asking for in his his proposed development agreement to increase the density.

Your decisions in this proposed development will impact this area for our lifetimes. Your thoughtful appreciation about this critical development and the impact it has on our citizens is tremendous.

Thanks for all of your hard work and thoughtful consideration,

Natalie Browning  
South Weber Resident

**From:** [Gary Boatright Jr.](#)  
**To:** [Trevor Cahoon](#); [Kim Guill](#); [Jeremy Davis](#); [Julie Losee](#); [Marty Mcfadden](#); [skolachad@gmail.com](mailto:skolachad@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Comments Regarding Feb. 9 PC Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 7:47:04 PM

---

Fellow commissioners,

I apologize for not being able to attend the PC meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 9. This is an important meeting and I am disappointed I cannot attend. I have a commitment for work that I cannot miss. Otherwise, I would be with you. I understand that since I am not at the meeting, I really have no voice (or vote) other than that as a citizen of the community. It is in that spirit that I share these thoughts.

**Consent Items** - The minutes from the last meeting state that I "thanked commissioner Boatright for his service." This needs to be corrected to state that I thanked commissioner Walton for his service.

**Agenda Item #5** - Good luck to whomever is selected chair and vice chair. I have thoughts about this, but since I will not be attending, it would be inappropriate for me to share. I do believe we need to change the bylaws to have the chair and co-chair serve on the code committee. I think it would be valuable to have some new perspectives brought to the group.

**Agenda Item #6 (Crosswind Subdivision)** - I don't have any major concerns with this, though one thing did raise a question. The summary states "the developer has chosen to move forward in different steps." Is the developer driving the process or are they following the process established by the city? If we have a process, we need to stick with it.

**Agenda Item #7 (Lofts Rezone)** - This parcel of land is the most contentious piece of property in the city. Some of the worst and most argumentative meetings I have been in are with this developer. (It may be a good thing I am not there. I may not have a lot of nice things to say. ) A few questions:

1. What changed? The developer pushed hard to create high density housing development with commercials. After several long meetings they received approval, then put the property for sale with the approvals. Now a couple of years later, with little or no movement on the approved project, they are coming back with new plans that are more in line with what was wanted (but they are far from perfect). What changed? Why are they changing their plans? (Again, I like these plans better, but something causes me to pause on this.) Something does not add up.
2. Why build this in phases? This seems like a small enough project that it should or could be done in one or two phases, not four. If I were in the meeting I would ask for an explanation.
3. Does the number of units align with the conditions in the R7 zone? (I'm not a math person.) If not, I would not recommend approval.
4. Will these be 2 or 3 stories? Not a fan of 3 stories. In the draft development agreement it states that none should be higher than 38 feet. I would love to know what the neighbors feel about this.
5. If this is rezoned and the developer receives all the approvals, will the developer build this or will they sell the project to another developer? Past experience shows they would try to sell it. I recommend making the development agreement non-transferable, if that is possible.
6. I like that no more than 25% of these units can become rentals. Would love to see that

number lowered.

**Agenda Item #8 (Ordinance 2023-02)** - I am leery of overlays. I would like to ensure that there are no loopholes in the overlay that a developer could use to develop something other than what is intended by the code. If that can be confirmed, I would likely vote to recommend approving this.

**Agenda Item #9 (Training)** - I will be surprised if you have time for this. I recommend this be moved to the March meeting.

I am sorry I will not be with you and I hope the meeting will not go long.

Gary Boatright

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission  
for 09Feb23 Meeting  
by Paul A. Sturm**

**Public Comments and Questions for Agenda Item #7 -Packet Pages 31-70 of91**

7. Public Hearing and Action on: Preliminary Plan (35 lot Townhouse Plat), Rezone (from C-O to R-7), & Development Agreement for Deer Run Townhomes Parcel# 13-364-0001 2.914 acres located at 7897 S 2700 E by applicant: Joseph Cook of Deer Run Investments LLC.

**A) Please See Packet Page 31-35 of 91 - Planning Memorandum**

The current zoning for this project is Commercial-Overlay (C-O). The development agreement illustrates the need for the Applicant to rezone the property to Residential Multi-Family Seven (R-7). They have submitted an application for this rezone in conjunction with the project.

- 1) How can South Weber take an action on a Preliminary Plan when there is no current zone that would permit 35 Townhomes on 2.914 acres? Please Explain.
- 2) The new R-5-SG zone being proposed *is planned to replace R-7 that only permits a maximum of 8 units per acre , (ORD 2023-02,)* with an outstanding design concept. *This is based on an R-5 with a maximum of 60% bonus density.* That would equate to a total of 24 units on this parcel. I do not see anything in the design proposed that rises to an "outstanding" level. Please Explain **35**.

**B) Please See Packet Pages 36 to 37 of 91 - Engineering Review #1**

There are many unanswered questions posed in this engineering review that should be addressed before a preliminary approval is made. As pointed out by the engineering reviewer, the phases proposed appear to be out of sequence for the needed infrastructure development. The City does not want to be put in the position to preliminarily approve a design that, in the future, may be untenable with the next phases, and thus potentially force the City to further accept/permit amending the design, possibly to the City's detriment.

**C) Please See Packet Pages 38 to 56 of 91 - Project Preliminary Design**

A few of my many concerns with the Deer Hill Drive roadway between Phases 1 & 2 are:

- 1) The road appears to be quite steep with a rise of approximately 20-25 feet over a run of 133 feet. I have a concern about the ability to egress up the road after a snowstorm.
- 2) At the top of the road is a sidewalk that is traversed by many children and others on a daily basis. I recommend that a 25 foot flat pad be installed prior to the sidewalk for both site distance issues and the ability to stop prior to the sidewalk, especially in inclement weather.