

CC 2021-07-20 CI #1 Westbrook

**From:** [Lacee Westbrook](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Poll rezone  
**Date:** Thursday, July 8, 2021 5:51:10 PM

---

My comment is pretty simple please vote no. We don't want high density and R-7 is high density. We don't need the traffic nightmare it will bring. We don't want the added pressure to our aging infrastructure. We don't have the water to support our community in a drought as it is. Please vote no to the rezone.

Lacee Loveless  
7475 Jace Lane

--

Lacee Westbrook Loveless

## CC 2021-07-20 CI #2 George

**From:** [Terry George](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [Jo Sjoblom](#); [Wayne Winsor](#); [Angie Petty](#); [Blair Halverson](#); [Hayley Alberts](#); [Quin Soderquist](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Poll/Gateway Property Re-zone request 20 July 2021  
**Date:** Thursday, July 8, 2021 2:41:56 PM

---

Public Comment for July 20th, 2021 Poll/Gateway property Re-zone request.

Honorable Representatives,

Regarding the Poll/Gateway zoning change from Agricultural to a mix of R-7 and Commercial: Just vote "NO."

It's that simple. The request does not align in any way with the General Plan and what the community wanted in that location. So, just vote "NO."

The General Plan is what should govern a zoning change request more than anything else. For the Poll/Gateway property the Citizens wanted Commercial Highway; ONLY. This proposal is not that. So, Just vote "NO."

The citizens do not want ANY mixed use in any way, shape, or form. This proposal has mixed use. So, just Vote "NO."

The citizens made it very clear they don't want another "Lofts" type development. To us citizens this proposal looks a lot like another "Lofts" type development. So, Just vote "NO."

To vote other than "No" on this proposed change is a blatant slap in the face to all those who participated in the General plan. So, just vote "NO."

I am NOT going to write my ideas or suggestions as to what we should do with the Poll/Gateway property as some of you and some of the planning commission suggest. The reason is, that I, along with many other citizens two years ago who wrote in, and spoke at city council about the Lofts, and the Road etc. were told: "you are only 20, and we have 7,000 citizens." Then it was only, 50, then only 100 etc. you get my drift. When we asked: "how do we make our voices heard?!" The answer was: "Inputs to the General Plan are what governs the build out of our city." So, about 600 of us participated in the general plan, and did so TWICE, just so you were sure we meant what we said the first time. And everything we put into the General plan is crystal clear that we want nothing like what is being presented to you for the Poll/Gateway property. So, Just vote "NO."

Now you say we can't sustain just commercial Highway on this property and you say you want to know our desires... well, You'd better not listen to people who just write in. You better not listen to 5, or 20, or 50, or 100, because those suggestions are not an official part of the General plan. What we need to do is an amendment to the General plan, for this and other Commercial Highway only zones that makes our citizen involvement official. That amendment would also be good time to discuss using only buildable acreage for calculations versus total acreage. But, for tonight, and for this proposal... It doesn't represent what we the people want at all. So, just vote "NO", Then we can work together to see what we do want there for our City.

Respectfully,

Terry "TG" George  
7825 S. 2000 E.  
South Weber Utah 84405

P.S. Just vote "NO."

CC 2021-07-20 CI #3 Pellegrini

**From:** [Vincent Pellegrini](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Poll/Gateway Project  
**Date:** Thursday, July 8, 2021 7:51:25 PM

---

This is on behalf of myself and my wife. If the proposed development does not fit the general plan, and the general plan is the city's guiding document (and the council is considering deviating from the GP), can you please push out an amendment to the general plan to be voted on by the citizens?

I believe if you talk to citizens on a individual basis, and they understood what including the hillside acreage meant when it comes to calculation for housing density, the increased traffic and congestion it would cause on South Weber Drive, many citizens would not be in favor of the current proposal.

Thank you for the consideration you give to your constituents in these matters.

Best,

Vincent Pellegrini

CC 2021-07-20 CI #4 Sparkman

**From:** [amy sparkman](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Poll/Gateway zoning change  
**Date:** Thursday, July 8, 2021 11:11:08 PM

---

Regarding the Poll/Gateway zoning change from Agricultural to a mix of R-7 and Commercial: Just vote “NO.”

It’s that simple. The request does not align in any way with the General Plan and what the community wanted in that location. So, just vote “NO.”

The General Plan is what should govern a zoning change request more than anything else. For the Poll/Gateway property the Citizens wanted Commercial Highway; ONLY. This proposal is not that. So, Just vote “NO.”

The citizens do not want ANY mixed use in any way, shape, or form. This proposal has mixed use. So, just Vote “NO.”

The citizens made it very clear they don’t want another “Lofts” type development. To us citizens this proposal looks a lot like another “Lofts” type development. So, Just vote “NO.”

To vote other than “No” on this proposed change is a blatant slap in the face to all those who participated in the General plan. So, just vote “NO.”

I am NOT going to write my ideas or suggestions as to what we should do with the Poll/Gateway property as some of you and some of the planning commission suggest. The reason is, that I, along with many other citizens two years ago who wrote in, and spoke at city council about the Lofts, and the Road etc. were told: “you are only 20, and we have 7,000 citizens.” Then it was only, 50, then only 100 etc. you get my drift. When we asked: “how do we make our voices heard?!” The answer was: “Inputs to the General Plan are what governs the build out of our city.” So, about 600 of us participated in the general plan, and did so TWICE, just so you were sure we meant what we said the first time. And everything we put into the General plan is crystal clear that we want nothing like what is being presented to you for the Poll/Gateway property. So, Just vote “NO.”

Now you say we can’t sustain just commercial Highway on this property and you say you want to know our desires... well, You’d better not listen to people who just write in. You better not listen to 5, or 20, or 50, or 100, because those suggestions are not an official part of the General plan. What we need to do is an amendment to the General plan, for this and other Commercial Highway only zones that makes our citizen involvement official. That amendment would also be good time to discuss using only

buildable acreage for calculations versus total acreage. But, for tonight, and for this proposal... It doesn't represent what we the people want at all. So, just vote "NO", Then we can work together to see what we do want there for our City.

Respectfully,

Amy Sparkman  
2142 deer run dr  
South Weber Utah 84405

P.S. Just vote "NO."

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** [Julie Losee - Mansell](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** City Council Meeting - Public Comments for 7/20/2021  
**Date:** Monday, July 19, 2021 4:02:20 PM

---

To South Weber City Mayor & City Council Members,

I want to take this opportunity to make my thoughts/comments clear – The motion for recommendation to approve the rezone request on the Poll Property came with 3 conditions. Adding these 3 conditions was the only reason I voted “Yah” instead of “Nah” for recommendation for approval to the City Council during the June 10, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

1 - A rescind/reverter clause was to be asked for/added by the City Council to ensure that zoning goes back to Agricultural Zoning should the Building Permit not be issued and the development not come to fruition.

2 - The Commission requested a Traffic Flow and Interface with Highmark Charter School - while school is in session - to be able to clearly assess the impact the current rezone request/proposal would have in that area. During school drop off/pickup, there are cars parked along the entire length of South Weber drive, that extends from the East side entrance to the school and extends all the way to the storage facility located on the west end of this proposed development 5 days a week, Monday - Friday. FYI - The 2021-2022 school year for Highmark starts on August 17, 2021.

3 - I specifically asked the Developer to look at the overall Proposed Residential density and consider lowering it, even if on just a portion of the requested Residential acreage. The Developer has come in at our Maximum allowable density of R-7 and I believe it is still too high for the area, especially on a parcel of land that in our General Plan has been identified as Commercial – Highway NOT Residential for future land use. It begs the question to be asked - Why is the majority of the available acreage being given to a zone that this parcel was never identified as potentially being?

I will fully admit that I was not as quick on the uptake with what Commissioner Johnson was saying early on during the Planning Commission meeting on June 10, 2021 about switching the 8.85 acres to Commercial and the 2.78 acres to be Residential. That miss was on me and I will own it! I would like to see the 20 units located in the middle of the proposed plan removed completely so that the units at the south end of the plan can be moved away from the hillside that appears to not even be in a buildable area and more open space and amenities can be added to the proposed plan that will be of benefit to our future citizens, who will live/shop here. If this is something that can be discussed/worked through with the Planning Commission during the Preliminary Plat approval stage, then so be it, but I wanted this brought up for City Council consideration at this stage, when the rezone is being requested. Once the rezone acreage is approved, we can't go back and change it!

I'm not trying to speak for Commissioner Johnson but his opposition was expressed very clearly as there is too much residential being proposed on a parcel of land that has always been identified as potential Commercial. He was opposed to identifying this property with the "Development Plan and Agreement required" as indicated on the General Plan - Projected Land Use Map. This designation makes this property an illegitimate "Mixed Use" zone,

which was highly objected to by our citizens.

Side note - Our code really needs to be looked at in order to establish a set ratio for these mixed-use/multi-zone type properties. It's an item that been discussed but no set percentages or Ratios have been established in our Code.

Did you know that Dutch Bros Coffee, which is one of the highlighted businesses on the Developers proposal, is currently under construction in Riverdale? What is the likelihood of Dutch Bro's Coffee also wanting to build a second coffee site in South weber, when we already have a coffee shop - Alpha Coffee - already approved, a Starbucks located within 1 mile to the North in Uintah, a brand-new Beans and Brews located in East Layton just off Hwy 193 and our local Maverick which also serves coffee and a variety of drinks? If additional Commercial development needs to come into our city, we can hopefully all agree that we all want it to be SUCCESSFUL!

Thank you for listening and for all that you do and for the consideration and efforts you give towards our city!

Julie Losee

2541. E. 8200 S.

**From:** [Terry George](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [Jo Sjoblom](#); [Wayne Winsor](#); [Angie Petty](#); [Blair Halverson](#); [Hayley Alberts](#); [Quin Soderquist](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment Poll/Gateway Property Re-zone request 20 July 2021  
**Date:** Monday, July 19, 2021 5:37:06 PM

---

Please confirm this was received.

Thank you

TG

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 8, 2021, at 14:41, Terry George <[tggeorge13@icloud.com](mailto:tggeorge13@icloud.com)> wrote:

Public Comment for July 20th, 2021 Poll/Gateway property Re-zone request.

Honorable Representatives,

Regarding the Poll/Gateway zoning change from Agricultural to a mix of R-7 and Commercial: Just vote "NO."

It's that simple. The request does not align in any way with the General Plan and what the community wanted in that location. So, just vote "NO."

The General Plan is what should govern a zoning change request more than anything else. For the Poll/Gateway property the Citizens wanted Commercial Highway; ONLY. This proposal is not that. So, Just vote "NO."

The citizens do not want ANY mixed use in any way, shape, or form. This proposal has mixed use. So, just Vote "NO."

The citizens made it very clear they don't want another "Lofts" type development. To us citizens this proposal looks a lot like another "Lofts" type development. So, Just vote "NO."

To vote other than "No" on this proposed change is a blatant slap in the face to all those who participated in the General plan. So, just vote "NO."

I am NOT going to write my ideas or suggestions as to what we should do with the Poll/Gateway property as some of you and some of the planning commission suggest. The reason is, that I, along with many other citizens two years ago who wrote in, and spoke at city council about the Lofts, and the Road etc. were told: "you are only 20, and we have 7,000 citizens." Then it was only, 50, then only 100 etc. you get my drift. When we asked: "how do we make our voices heard?!" The answer was: "Inputs to the General Plan are what governs the build out of our city." So, about 600 of us participated in the general plan, and did so TWICE, just so you were sure we meant what we said the first time. And everything we put into the General plan is crystal clear that we want nothing like what is being presented to you for the Poll/Gateway property. So, Just vote "NO."

Now you say we can't sustain just commercial Highway on this property and you say you want to know our desires... well, You'd better not listen to people who just write in. You better not listen to 5, or 20, or 50, or 100, because those suggestions are not an official part of the General plan. What we need to do is an amendment to the General plan, for this and other Commercial Highway only zones that makes our citizen involvement official. That amendment would also be good time to discuss using only buildable acreage for calculations versus total acreage. But, for tonight, and for this proposal... It doesn't represent what we the people want at all. So, just vote "NO", Then we can work together to see what we do want there for our City.

Respectfully,

Terry "TG" George  
7825 S. 2000 E.  
South Weber Utah 84405

P.S. Just vote "NO."

CC 2021-07-20 CI #7 Loveless

**From:** [Lacee Loveless](#)  
**To:** [Hayley Alberts](#); [Quin Soderquist](#); [Angie Petty](#); [Blair Halverson](#); [Wayne Winsor](#); [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment  
**Date:** Monday, July 19, 2021 6:48:03 PM

---

I am very concerned about The rezone on the city agenda for tomorrow. I've already written about the poll rezone before I knew the stephens property rezone would be on the agenda as well. We may not have commercial banging on our door today but I believe that it will come. With the new golf course, ski resort that will be just minutes from us in Peterson there will be a need for commercial in south weber eventually. If we really want to be the Gateway to recreation you need to leave the opportunities available to be just that. If we fill up our commercial land with HDH it will be a mistake.

Also I hope that when approving the final Riverside Trailer Park you hold that developer to every promise he originally made. The more corners he cuts the less likely it will be a great destination to stop and enjoy our valley.

Thanks

Lacee Loveless  
7475 Jace Lane

## CC 2021-07-20 CI #8 Code

**From:** [Shawna Code](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 7/20/21, Item #7, Shawna Code  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 11:25:32 AM

---

As a neighbor to this parcel, I would like to respectfully suggest that a decision to rezone is postponed until the city is provided the concept plan that the city requested. At that point, the council and public can subsequently review and provide informed comments. By the wording provided in the packet (and excerpted below), a postponement in no way precludes the owner and/or developer from getting this property rezoned, it only lets them know that the city and the neighbors of the parcel expect and deserve transparency with regards to how the property will be used. The developer has offered no reason, let alone a compelling reason, that I can see in the packet as to why this rezone needs to take place without the concept plan made public. Rezoning with no concept plan makes me question what they are trying to hide, which may be nothing. I fully understand they may not be trying to hide anything; however, transparency makes a good neighbor.

Respectfully,  
Shawna Code

*"The applicant has not provided a concept plan, which the Commission and Council have requested accompany rezone applications. While a concept is not specifically required in a rezone application, having one allows the City to have some understanding of the developer's intent in pursuing the rezone. If the Council chooses to deny the rezone, the developer does have the option of submitting a new application and going through the rezone process again."*

**From:** [Amy Mitchell](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Meeting 7.20.21  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 1:27:38 PM

---

Amy Mitchell  
1923 Deer Run Drive

Hello Mayor and City Council,

Looks like another packed meeting! Thank you to all of you for all you do for our beautiful city! A couple things I would like to give public comment on for this meeting:

1. Rezone for "South Weber Gateway": I see that this is before the council and while I think this plan is better than any of the others, I am still concerned about all of this being built on such a small piece of property and so close to the school. I wish we could push for a much smaller density. Is there a contingency plan for the commercial, especially in phase 3, that if we don't get the other commercial spaces filled, what happens to it? Can it just be landscaped rather than an empty, ugly plot of land. How does the city plan to address parking along South Weber Drive, especially during the pick-up for Highmark? That area is a hot mess during the afternoon and while it may not be Highmarks problem or the new developments problem... it is the City's problem. That area is getting more and more congested and rather than making more room in the roads, or providing decent parking or carpool options, we just keep applying a bandaid and pushing it off. The school zone needs to be addressed, as does the parking along South Weber Drive.

2. Rezone of the Stephens Property: I don't think any zone changes should happen to this area without some kind of concept plan attached to it. If we change it, we open our city up to who knows what without a plan. Let's not get duped into another blanket zone change until we know for sure what the plan is for that entire parcel. Why request a zone change without some idea. Please ask for it to be shared with the council first.

3. No Turn on Red sign: Can we please petition to have that sign changed to apply hours to it. Maybe it only applies during the peak daytime hours. I have sat there for what seems like an eternity in the evening with only one or two cars coming down South Weber Drive. It seems like it would be an easy fix to a stupid sign that never should have been place there.

We have an opportunity with these rezones to keep us a small community. Please take advantage of them and help us stay as close to the way we are as possible. Please apply a sunset clause to all developments that are reasonable, but could make the zone go back to AG if the development changes hands or isn't finished in a certain amount of time.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to another interesting meeting.  
Amy Mitchell

Comments to South Weber City Council  
for 20Jul21 Meeting  
by Paul A. Sturm

Public Comments on Meeting Packet

Agenda Item #6 - Packet Page 90 of 138, Ordinance 2021-10: Rezone South Weber Gateway, Applicant: Colliers International.

I have several concerns with the information provided by Mr. Brad Brown and Mr. Skye Hazlehurst for this City Council meeting. I expressed these same concerns during the Planning Commission meeting of 10Jun21.

1) In the Zone Change Application, Brad Brown is requesting a rezone from A to H-C. SWC does not have an H-C zone. There is a Highway Commercial (SWC -C-H) zone, but, although this is only a transposition, it is inaccuracy in an official document.

**Please Note:** This inaccuracy was noted during my presentation to the Planning Commission meeting of 10Jun21 and still has not been corrected.

2) On page 97 of 138 (Green Area), I have a question regarding the south central portion of the property as depicted. It appears that a corner of this parcel, as shown below, should be "Residential" and would not have been designated as "Agricultural" as presented. It is also owned by Jennifer Hubbard, not the Farrell Poll trust. This needs to be reconciled. **Please Note:** This inaccuracy was also noted during my presentation to the Planning Commission meeting of 10Jun21 and still has not been addressed in this presentation to the City Council.

Parcel ID : 130340069

**PROPERTY OWNERSHIP**

Owner : HUBBARD, JENNIFER

Mailing Address : 2356 EAST VIEW DR

Mailing City : SOUTH WEBER

Mailing State : UT

Mailing Zip : 84405

**GENERAL INFO**

Parcel ID : 130340069

Site Address :

Site City :

Site Zip :

Tax Legal Desc : BEG AT THE NW COR OF LOT 33, ROYAL FARMS ESTATES PHASE 3 & CONTINUING S 65°50'02" E 105.47 FT; TH N 20°47'38" E 70.00 FT; TH N 84°30'9" W 109.15 FT; TH S 20°47'38" W 35.00 FT TO THE POB. (Cont...)

Acreege : 0.127

3) On Packet Page 98 of 138, in Mr. Hazlehurst's letter at the first bullet, he states "Phase One of the project shall have a minimum of three retail pads constructed concurrently with no more than 33 townhome units. As depicted in Sketch Plan dated 5/24/21, Sketch number 7152-05". Once again the developers appears to not listen nor pay attention to what either the City Council and Planning Commission have told them in the past regarding this development. During prior presentations the developer was told on several occasions, by several members, that subdivisions with more than 30 units should have a second exit since this is a safety issue. [Please see SWC Code 11-4-4 (below), including Paragraph 3]. **Please Note:** This fact concerning a potential violation of City Code in the sketch plan was noted during my presentation to the Planning Commission on 10Jun21. This has not been modified for this City Council presentation. Mr. Hazlehurst acknowledged the City Code information regarding only 30 units with one exit during these meetings and presentations, also as pointed out by Councilman Winsor. Yet the developers come back with a statement (see above) and a sketch plan drawing that shows 33 units. This either appears to blatantly ignore the information provided by the City, or is possibly an attempt to circumvent SWC Code or push past its limits. Their response, during the Planning Commission meeting, to alleviate this issue made no sense, i.e., to push the lower road through the Phase 2 area yet to be addressed.

IAW Subparagraph A. of 11-4-4, the City may grant a waiver, under specific conditions, such as topography, that I believe does not apply to this parcel since a Phase 2 sketch plan is also being proposed at this time on adjacent land. I believe that this is a possibly another warning sign and believe the developer needs to be watched closely as this project proceeds.

#### 11-4-4: STREETS, EASEMENTS AND NUMBERS:



A. Arrangement: The arrangement of streets in the new subdivision shall make provision for the continuation of existing streets in adjoining areas (or their proper protection where adjoining land is not subdivided) at the same or greater widths (but in no case less than the required minimum width), unless variations are deemed necessary by the planning commission. The street arrangements must be such as to cause no unnecessary hardship to the owners of adjoining property when they plat their own land and seek to provide for convenient access to it. Proposed public streets shall be extended by dedication to the boundary of such property. Private rights of way or streets may be permitted by the planning commission if, in its opinion, the right of way is not needed as a public street to provide access to adjacent properties or to fulfill a recommendation of the general plan and the lots meet the provisions of the zoning title for private right of way development. Half streets along the boundary of land proposed shall not be permitted.

1. Every dwelling structure which lies farther than one hundred fifty feet (150') from a public street to the nearest point on the structure shall be accessible to fire department apparatus by way of an access road having all weather drivable and maintainable surface with not less than twenty feet (20') of unobstructed width and thirteen feet six inches (13'6") of vertical clearance with adequate turning radius capable of supporting the imposed loads of fire apparatus.

2. Dead end access roads in excess of one hundred fifty feet (150') in length shall be provided with approved provisions for a fifty foot (50') radius turnaround for the turning around of fire department apparatus.

3. Developments where the number of residential building units exceeds thirty (30) along a single street shall have a minimum of two (2) ingress/egress routes which are two (2) fully improved city rights of way. Thirty (30) residential units shall include all proposed residential units and all existing single-family buildings and lots, empty building lots, and each apartment unit located along a single road up to and including the nearest intersection with two (2) existing means of ingress/egress.

a. The City Council may grant a waiver to these regulations for more than thirty (30) residential units with one point of improved ingress/egress when unique topographic circumstances or "landlocked" (physically restrained from other access points) from adjacent, existing developments circumstances exist. A waiver of these regulations may require the City Council, with the recommendation of the City Engineer and Fire Chief, to apply additional development requirements to enhance public safety standards.

4. A development that extends more than one thousand eight hundred feet (1,800') from a connecting street will have a second ingress/egress. (Ord. 13-08, 2-26-2013)