

SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 3 June 2020

TIME COMMENCED: 6:03 p.m.

LOCATION: Electronic Meeting through Zoom

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS:

Tim Grubb
Gary Boatright
Rob Osborne
Wes Johnson
Taylor Walton

CITY PLANNER: Barry Burton

CITY ENGINEER: Brandon Jones

DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR: Kimberli Guill

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

ATTENDEES: Dan Murray, Scott Mortensen, and Blair Halverson.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Grubb

Public Comment: Written public comments must be submitted by email to publiccomment@southwebercity.com. Comments must be received prior to the meeting start time. Subject line should include meeting date, item# (or general comment), first and last name. Comments without first and last name will not be included in the public record.

Public Comments through Zoom are as follows:

- a. Individuals may speak once for 3 minutes or less
- b. State your name and address
- c. Direct comments to the entire Commission
- d. Note Planning Commission will not respond during the public comment period

Jeffery Eddings, 2645 E. 7800 S., voiced his concerns with the proposed Morty's Car Wash. He is concerned about the lighting and location of the business sign – static sign, flashing sign, etc. He would like to know how much lighting the bays will create and if they are on a timer. He is concerned about the noise from the car wash late at night. After he reviewed the plans, he noticed temporary fencing. He would like to see something more permanent. He requested shade trees be planted.

Amy Mitchell, 1923 Deer Run Drive, read from her recent email which was sent to the Planning Commission. She has reviewed the packet and she has several concerns in regards to

Morty's Car Wash. She brought up the inconsistency in the documents in which it stated there are three self-serve bays and three automatic bays, yet the drawings show four self-serve bays and three automatic bays. She is concerned about access by Maverik since it is near the dump station. She feels the car wash should have its own entrance and exit and should be a standalone business. She requested clarification on the type of fencing between the school and carwash. She hopes the sign is not big and bright. She also read Corinne Johnson's comments, 8020 S. 2500 E., who is concerned about east end of building that has no drawings and would like to know more about the landscaping.

Paul Sturm, 2527 Deer Run Drive, sent an email concerning the carwash. He questioned the easements from the pipeline company and storm drain. He would like to know if Brandon Jones, City Engineer, concerns have been addressed. He is concerned about increased traffic on 2700 East. He asked if an assessment of Reeves & Associates analysis has taken place. He is concerned about light & noise from the car wash. He would like to know how South Weber City is going to enforce the lighting. He asked who paid for the sound study. He is concerned about the hours of operation. He would like to know when the final letter from South Weber Water District be signed as well as the agreements with the pipeline companies. He is concerned about the distance for a vehicle to exit the premise.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- **Minutes of 9 April 2020**

Commissioner Grubb moved to approve the consent agenda. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. Commissioners Boatright, Grubb, Osborne, Walton, and Johnson voted aye. The motion carried.

Final Subdivision Plat: South Weber Transition Subdivision (1 Lot & Remainder Parcel) approx. 4.2 acres zoned CH located at approx. 7700 S 2700 E on Parcel (13-034-0065).

Applicant Dan Murray: Commissioner Osborne asked if the Planning Commission has any comments concerning this agenda item. Commissioner Grubb pointed out this is a one lot development but there is still a remainder parcel. He asked if there are any improvements that need to be required or escrowed, because there is an opportunity right now and that parcel may never be developed. Brandon Jones, City Engineer, suggested waiting. Barry Burton, City Planner, agreed to leave it be until a plan is submitted for that parcel.

Brandon pointed out the original legal description does not match the lot. The legal description for the rezone request should be used so that they match. Scott Mortensen stated he doesn't have a problem with that.

Blair Halverson suggested updating the plans. Barry explained the site plan, landscape plan, grading plan, etc. shows the correct boundary and matches the lot line as it has been expanded out. Commissioner Grubb read the legal description and it matched. Barry explained the rezone request description matched the lot line. Dan Murray stated he wants it to match and will make those adjustments.

Commissioner Walton asked if it is okay to approve a subdivision plat when the City Council has not approved the rezone request yet. Barry remarked the subdividing of the land is not dependent on rezoning in any way.

Barry Burton, City Planner's, memo of 13 May 2020 is as follows:

PL 1: The proposal has been altered from 3 lots to one lot with a remainder parcel. Lot 1, intended for a car wash, has been slightly enlarged to accommodate all the necessary vehicular circulation and access improvements.

PL 2: Curb, gutter and sidewalk are existing on 2700 East. Utility connections will be part of the conditional use/site plan for the car wash.

PL 3: I advise the Planning Commission forward this final plat to the City Council with a recommendation of approval.

Brandon Jones, City Engineer's, read his review of 22 May 2020 is as follows:

Our office has completed a review of the Final Plat for the South Weber Transition Subdivision, dated May 20, 2020. We recommend approval subject to the following being addressed prior to final approval from the City Council.

PLAT

E1. It is our understanding that there are two petroleum line easements: one for Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) and one for Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American Pipeline, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline).

a. The final plat needs to be submitted to both companies for their review. An approval letter from both companies is needed to verify that the easements have been shown correctly.

b. A signature line is needed in the Easement Approval block for both companies.

E2. The new storm drain easement needs additional information to clearly describe its location (e.g. dimensions along boundary, hatching, dimension of width, etc.)

Scott Mortensen reported the pipeline companies will be signing the final plat this Friday.

Commissioner Grubb moved to recommend approval to the City Council for the Final Subdivision Plat: South Weber Transition Subdivision (1 Lot & Remainder Parcel) approx. 4.2 acres zoned CH located at approx. 7700 S 2700 E on Parcel (13-034-0065) for applicant, Dan Murray subject to the following:

- 1. Barry Burton's review of 13 May 2020.**
- 2. Brandon Jones review of 22 May 2020.**
- 3. Previous request from C-H to C- Zone be changed to match lot 1 description.**

Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. Commissioners Boatright, Grubb, Osborne, Walton, and Johnson voted aye. The motion carried.

Final Site & Improvement Plans: South Weber Transition Subdivision Lot 1 (Morty's Car Wash). Applicant Scott Mortensen: Commissioner Osborne asked if the Planning Commission has any questions concerning this agenda item. Barry addressed the mistake on the

plans concerning the number of bays. He communicated the developer is requesting three automatic bays and four self-serve bays. Commissioner Osborne is okay with the entrance from Maverik. Barry stated there is a signed access easement from Maverik. He pointed out a traffic engineer would agree it is better to have this entrance versus creating another entrance on 2700 East. Brandon agreed there can be confusion if there are two entrances. Commissioner Osborne is not sure how the dump station is Mr. Mortensen's problem. He is okay with the fencing because it meets the city code. Barry pointed out there is no code requirement for fence because it is not residential property. Commissioner Osborne does not feel a privacy fence makes sense when there is a chain link fence along Maverik. Commissioner Walton asked if there is a buffer yard requirement in between the school and the carwash. Barry stated there is no requirement. Commissioner Osborne stated the sign meets the city code. He asked Scott what type of sign it is. Scott explained it is within city code, and there is a LED monument display to update individuals of certain specials. Commissioner Walton is concerned about the light emissions coming off LED lights and being close to the roadway. Commissioner Johnson does not feel the distance is important next to the roadway, but there seems to be more concern with the residents. Commissioner Walton suggested at night not using white LED lights. Commissioner Osborne is not sure the size of this sign will be as blinding as other signs around the City. Commissioner Boatright agreed. He discussed the landscape plan on page 28. Barry pointed out there is a lot of rock mulch, sod along park strip, etc. He thinks it is a decent design; however, he is concerned about the plants along the pipeline easements and he doubts the pipeline companies will allow the large shrubs. Commissioner Grubb identified the northeast corner having a couple of trees. Commissioner Osborne discussed the turning radius and has not seen any evidence that it is not adequate. Barry stated the plans show the turning radius for large vehicles. He feels the turning radius is adequate. Brandon discussed the sewer handling what is being discharged. Commissioner Osborne noted Dan Murray has the will serve letter from the South Weber Water Improvement District. Brandon is requiring an approval letter from South Weber Water Improvement District stating how the developer is proposing to connect is okay. Discussion took place regarding the packet sent out today and the lack of some of the schematic elevations. Scott will forward that information to City staff. Commissioner Walton appreciates the aesthetics being carried over from Burly Burger & Little Caesars across the street. Scott reviewed the elevations on the screen. He also explained the lighting for the 24/7 bays. Discussion took place regarding the sound study. Commissioner Grubb asked about the sound study. Scott reported the sound study compared decibels from busy street traffic 70 dB, rustling leaves 10 dB, military jet takeoff 140 dB, and large orchestra 98 dB. He stated the air dryer will be located inside the bay which minimizes the sound. He discussed hours of operation being 24/7. Barry asked if the automatic bays and vacuums can be shut down at a certain time. Scott discussed the need for hours of operation to be 24/7. Barry asked if there will be dryers installed in the self-serve bays. Brandon asked about the location of the vacuums. Scott stated they looked at different locations and felt aesthetically they should go where they are currently located on the plan.

Discussion took place regarding the traffic study. Brandon explained the traffic study addresses increased traffic at the intersection of South Weber Drive & 2700 East as well as the entrances. Brandon was hoping that Nate Reeve, of Reeve & Associates, was in attendance to explain the traffic study, but he is out of town. Brandon referred to the traffic study which was conducted by Reeve & Associates. He reported the level of service is a range and the existing level of service is Level of Service C at the intersection. After the car wash is constructed, the proposed level of service is also a C. At the two access points the level of service is B, and after the car wash is

constructed the level of service is also B. He pointed out the numbers do not increase much at all. Brandon commented this is a study that has been stamped by a professional engineer, and he did not see anything in the study that would cause him to question the numbers. Brandon remarked the width of 2700 East is going to need to be increased. It has three lanes at the intersection, but it narrows down as you head south. He pointed out long term this road will need to have three lanes; however, this proposed development does not require 2700 East to go from two to three lanes. Brandon stated as property develops along 2700 East, the aggregate result is that it will need to be widened. He then discussed the importance of impact fees. He suggested once the general plan is updated and completed, he would recommend updating the Transportation Impact Study. This particular use does not require the widening of 2700 East right now, but future development along that street will require three lanes. Commissioner Osborne reiterated according to Reeves & Associates traffic study this development will not impact 2700 East. Commissioner Grubb addressed the width of the exit onto 2700 East. Brandon explained the southern access onto 2700 East is 32' wide. For a commercial application like this, especially contemplating future use on the rest of the property, he feels that the access should be as wide as the Maverik access (approx. 38'), and allow for two lanes out and one lane in. Barry commented what the developer is proposing with the access of 32' wide is adequate for this particular development. Brandon agreed and understands 32' is adequate. Commissioner Grubb discussed the Landscape Plan indicates 13.7% landscaping. The City Code (10-7-5B) requires 15%. Commissioner Boatright feels the 15% was put into the code for a reason. Dan Murray suggested if Scott increases the landscape buffer on the side by the school by 3' that will increase it to 15%.

Barry Burton, City Planner's, review of 22 May 2020 is as follows:

PL 1: The proposal is to establish a car wash with 3 automatic bays and 3 self-serve bays on Lot 1 of the South Weber Transition Subdivision. The Planning Commission previously recommended approval of a rezone on the property from C-H to C and granted preliminary conditional use/architectural site plan approval.

PL 2: Curb, gutter and sidewalk are existing on 2700 East. A water connection in 2700 East will be required. Sewer and storm drain are already stubbed into the site.

PL 3: Standards for approval are found in Section 10-7-3 D of the South Weber City Code. They are as follows:

1. The proposed use shall not generate enough traffic to be detrimental to the immediate neighborhood.

The Traffic Impact Study performed by Reeve and Associates indicates there will be no change in the level of service on 2700 E. nor at the intersection of South Weber Drive and 2700 E.

2. The proposed development shall not overload the carrying capacity for which local streets were designed.

See the comment above.

3. Internal traffic circulation shall not adversely affect adjacent residential properties.

There are no adjacent residential properties.

4. *Parking facilities location shall not adversely affect adjacent residential properties.*

There are no adjacent residential properties.

5. *Parking facilities shall be effectively screened from adjacent residential properties.*

There are no adjacent residential properties.

6. *The relationship of structures and parking shall be complementary to the aesthetics of the general area.*

This structure and its parking will be complimentary to Maverik adjacent to the north and should have no ill effect on any other adjacent property.

7. *The proposed sign(s) shall not adversely affect the development itself or the overall aesthetics of the general area.*

The proposed sign is a pole sign 16' in height and 48 square feet in area. That area is for one side, but according to our ordinance, we only count one side of a two-sided sign. Both height and area are well within Class 5 sign allowances. The sign is placed so that it will be blocked from view from nearby homes by the building. The sign will be similar in character to other signs in the area.

8. *The proposed landscaping shall be sufficient to enhance the aesthetic acceptability of the development.*

The landscape plan will provide for an aesthetically pleasing yard with an interesting design, a variety of appropriate plantings and good use of different rock mulches.

9. *The project shall be landscaped and maintained with a sprinkler system.*

An irrigation plan has been submitted that provides for appropriate plant watering throughout the site. Except for the grass park strip, the site will all be drip irrigated for a water-wise design.

PL 4: I recommend this proposal be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation of approval as submitted.

Brandon Jones, City Engineer's review of 22 May 2020 is as follows:

Our office has completed a review of the following plans and studies:

- Final Site and Improvement Plans for Morty's Car Wash from Reeve & Associates, dated May 20, 2020
- Geotechnical Report from CMT Engineering, dated March 24, 2020
- Trip Generation Study from Reeve & Associates, dated January 27, 2020
- Traffic Impact Study from Reeve & Associates, dated March 23, 2020

- Photometric Study from Nichols Taylor, dated January 22, 2020
- Sound Study from Supreme West, dated March 1, 2020

STUDIES / EVALUATIONS

- **Geotechnical Study**. No unresolved detrimental impacts were identified. Construction must comply with the recommendations of the study.
- **Traffic Impact Study**. The results of the TIS indicate no change in the Level of Service (LOS): “LOS of the existing accesses and roadways are projected to remain the same post construction.”
- **Photometric (Light) Study**. No significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding residential properties were identified.
- **Sound Study**. No significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding residential properties were identified.
- **Sewer**. Based on the 265,000 gal/month usage amount provided by Scott Mortensen, we have calculated 25 ERU’s for sewer. The existing sewer system has excess capacity sufficient to carry these projected flows.
- **Parking**. If a high intensity use is assumed, Section 10-8-5 of the City Code would require 14 stalls for the car wash. 25 are being provided. Therefore, sufficient parking is being provided.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend approval subject to the following items being addressed prior to final approval from the City Council.

GENERAL

- E1.** Subdivision Plat. The car wash is proposed to be located on Lot 1 of the South Weber Transition Subdivision. The subdivision needs to be approved prior to approval of this site plan.
- E2.** SWWID Approval Letter. A Will-Serve letter has been received. Final plans need to be submitted to the South Weber Water Improvement District and an approval letter provided indicating that the improvement plans meet their requirements.
- E3.** Petroleum Lines Approval Letters. There are three petroleum lines that cross the property. Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline) owns two lines, and Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) owns one. Final Plans need to be submitted to both companies and approval letters from both companies will be required.
- E4.** Architectural Review. According to Title 10, Chapter 12 of the City Code, the Planning Commission “shall determine if the proposed architectural and development plans submitted are consistent with this Chapter and with the purpose and objectives of this Title.”
- E5.** Conditional Use Permit (CUP). If there are specific conditions that the Planning Commission feel are required to mitigate any detrimental impacts of this development, these should be specified and made part of the recommendation to the City Council.

IMPROVEMENT PLANS

- E6.** The southern access onto 2700 East is 32’ wide. For a commercial application like this, especially contemplating future use on the rest of the property, we feel that the access should be as wide as the Maverik access (approx. 38’), and allow for two lanes out and one lane in.
- E7.** The Landscape Plan shows using culinary water. Secondary water is being provided by the SWWID. The correct connection and service location needs to be shown. If connection into the road needs to be made, the City Standard patching requirements must be followed.

E8. The Landscape Plan indicates 13.7% landscaping. The City Code (10-7-5B) requires 15%. However, if the Planning Commission determines that “exceptional design and materials” have been used, then the requirement can be reduced to 10%, and the proposed plan would comply.

Commissioner Grubb moved to recommend approval to the City Council for the Final Site & Improvement Plans: South Weber Transition Subdivision Lot 1 (Morty’s Car Wash) for applicant, Scott Mortensen subject to the following:

1. **Barry Burton’s review of 22 May 2020. Amending to three automatic bays and four self-serve bays.**
2. **Brandon Jones review of 22 May 2020.**
3. **Developer reach 15% landscaping as required by code.**
4. **Recommend the color scheme of the gray tones be included on all four elevations.**
5. **Recommendation based on rezone from C-H to C Zone.**

Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. Commissioners Boatright, Grubb, Osborne, Walton, and Johnson voted aye. The motion carried.

Conditional Use Permit: South Weber Transition Subdivision Lot 1 (Morty’s Car Wash).

Applicant Scott Mortensen: This conditional use permit application is for car wash located south of 2577 East South Weber Dr. The anticipated number of employees is two with the anticipation of 200 customer daily. There are 27 available parking spaces. The hours of operation include open 24 hours a day, 7 days week.

Commissioner Osborne is concerned about the hours of operation. He was under the understanding that it would be closed at night. Commissioner Boatright agreed and pointed out several newly installed carwashes are not open during the night. He thinks the residents have concerns about that as well. Commissioner Johnson suggested setting a time of 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. at night. Scott explained there are individuals who have different schedules and might want to wash their cars at 5:00 a.m. He pointed out they have security cameras. Commissioner Osborne asked how many people are really washing their vehicles in the middle of the night. Scott estimated 5%. He suggested going with allowing the carwash to be open 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Commissioner Walton discussed a sound study was completed and there is considerable distance to the nearest resident. Commissioner Grubb asked if this can be reviewed in six months based on sound or complaints. Commissioner Boatright does not see the need to keep it open 24/7. Scott would like to have the same rights or abilities that Maverik has of being open 24/7. Commissioner Osborne suggested being open 6:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. and in six months from opening the hours of operation be reviewed. Scott suggested the hours of operation from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Commissioner Grubb pointed out the self-serve bays will be open 24/7. Commissioner Osborne is okay with operating hours from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. for the automatic bays with a review in six months. Commissioner Boatright is concerned about how this will affect the residents and the noise will be a concern. Commissioner Osborne suggested the self-serve and automatic bays operating hours from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and six months from open date there will be a review. Discussion took place regarding the lighting. Commissioner Osborne is okay with the lighting and is not in favor of having any dark areas. It was stated the location of the sign is optimal. Commissioner Walton is concerned about the LED

lighting. *He indicated the LED lighting was not included in the light study. Commissioner Walton asked if there will be any type of car show sponsored. Commissioner Osborne does not think that applies here.

Commissioner Grubb moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Conditional Use Permit: South Weber Transition Subdivision Lot 1 (Morty's Car Wash) for applicant, Scott Mortensen subject to the following:

- 1. Barry Burton's review of 22 May 2020 amendment of number of bays.**
- 2. Brandon Jones review of 22 May 2020.**
- 3. Hours of operation of automatic bays and vacuums to be closed from 11:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m.**
- 4. Six month review of CUP hours of operation from date of opening.**
- 5. Self-serve bays to be open 24/7.**

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. Commissioners Grubb, Osborne, Walton, and Johnson voted aye. Commissioner Boatright voted no. The motion carried 4 to 1.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Boatright: He thanked the City staff for all they are doing during this COVID pandemic to keep everyone safe.

Commissioner Walton: He asked about the general plan update. There was an email on 22 May 2020 from David Larson, City Manager explaining the dates. He suggested reviewing City ordinances that need to be updated. Barry agrees. Commissioner Osborne suggested each Planning Commission member look at ordinances that they want Barry to update and submit them to him for review.

Commissioner Osborne: He reported the Uintah/South Weber Boundary Evaluation Committee, consisting of Blair Halverson, Barry Burton, Mayor Sjoblom, and himself met this last week to determine the best alignment for boundaries between Uintah and South Weber. It has been determined that the boundary should cross I-84 at the east end of the northernmost Geneva Gravel Pit, follow along the north side of I-84 (next to the freeway) west until it reaches the east end of the McKay Winkel property, and follow the current river alignment until approximately Adams Ave where it follows a section line westward to the rear lot line of the last house on the north side of the west end of Harper Way. At that point, it would follow the south right-of-way line of I-84 to the Riverdale City boundary.

City Planner, Barry Burton: He discussed if the cities agreed on a boundary line then the counties would agree with that. Weber County will have their surveyor put together a description. He discussed the county line going to Adams Avenue Bridge, but there are properties in Heather Cove Subdivision that are in both counties. He will be meeting with the Weber County Surveyor to amend those properties and annex into Davis County.

ADJOURNED: Commissioner Johnson moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:46 p.m. Commissioner Grubb seconded the motion. Commissioners Boatright, Grubb, Osborne, Walton, and Johnson voted aye. The motion carried.

APPROVED: _____ Date
Chairperson: Rob Osborne

Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest: Development Coordinator: Kimberli Guill

*Amended as requested by Commissioner Taylor.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19"

Amy Mitchell
1923 Deer Run Drive

Planning Commission Members-

I have looked through the packet and I have several concerns in regards to Morty's Car Wash. In looking through the documents there are several times it refers to the car wash in having 3 self serve bays and 3 automatic bays, yet in the drawings it shows 4 self serve bays and 3 automatic. I hope this is just an oversight, but I think it needs to be corrected before moving forward so there is no confusion when it comes time for it to be built and they are putting in 4 because that is what is approved. We need to make sure that what is approved and what is built are the same thing!

I am also wondering how the city plans to address the parking issue at Maverick along the south side by the dump station with having an access to the car wash in the same area. I brought up that concern several months ago and now that summer is here and Maverick is getting more and more busy, I think we need to find a solution before plans are approved. We already see trucks with trailers and RV's lining up to use the dump station and delivery trucks all trying to find a spot behind the store. This is a huge concern as there is already limited access there. Adding an entrance to the car wash seems like a huge mistake!! Please reconsider allowing the entrance to be placed there!! Make them have their own entrance and exit, not piggy back off of a busy gas station that already sees a lot of traffic!!

Lastly, I would like some clarification as to the type of fencing being put in between there and the school. I would hope that it is not just a chain link fence, but something that can not only buffer the sound, but also provide privacy to protect students from whoever might use the car wash.

We have one good chance to have this look it's very best as this is what will greet people as they enter the city. I hope that the sign is not so big and bright that it is seen from miles away and all night, but that it is tastefully done and inviting. Our nearby residents who have to look at it all the time deserve to have it be appealing as well!

Is the subdivision and warehouse getting addressed as well? I am confused as to why it is included at this time.

Thank you for your time,
Sincerely,
Amy Mitchell

I've read the packet posted on the city's website for tonight's meeting including the potential final plan approval submitted for the new Morty's Car Wash.

I'm not opposed to this project. I think South Weber needs a better commercial base and car washes do have a proven business model. I'm glad they pulled the other 2 phases of this development out, because I am opposed to developers wasting our commercial zones by turning them into residential.

I've read through the packet a number of times and there are a few issues remaining from the initial presentation, that are still open and a few new concerns. I do not feel like this is ready to go to the City Council. I understand COVID-19 maybe making things difficult for everyone, but this submission is a mess. The included plans, previously submitted and described by Barry Burton on page 9 PL:1 as a car wash with 3 automatic bays and 3 self-serve bays, no longer match the new images or maps. Some of the plans still show 3 self washing bays, others now show 4. Was this change presented to the planning commission previously or was this just a developer change? We're not talking about landscaping, we're talking about adding a whole new additional self serve bay, which changes all the earlier size projections and their impacts – including the submitted usage and resource demands. This is also a new level of potential customers utilizing the space at any given time and could put even more stress on the frontage road which is near or beyond its limit. If the city was involved and aware of this change, it needs to be correctly stated in Mr Burton's recommendations and/or a statement referring to which parts of the plan still need to be reassessed with this new addition. This document needs to be clear in what is being requested, assessed and potentially approved or denied. It is a legal document after all.

My biggest concern with the plan itself, is that the attached conditional use permit clearly states 24-7 operation and specifically calls out self and auto operations which is different from what they said during their initial presentation. That means, at 4 am, the sprayers will spray, the pumps will pump and the 6 powerful 80+ dB vacuums will roar! A business making that loud of noise, should NOT be allowed to make that same level of noise and disruption at 4 am! To me this is a project killer! This isn't down in the pit - this is a hundred yards from existing and proposed homes. This was brought up at the previous PC meeting and they said they would not be running all of it 24/7, but then they submit this application with it specifically stating it will run both self and automated machines 24/7. This needs to be addressed and it needs to be spelled out in the conditional use permit or in city code and the project put on hold until we have something binding. Since these hours are spelled out in the conditional use permit, approving it will tie the city's hand when it comes to any real enforcement of it. 10:00 pm – 8:00 am should be required down times for the automated bays with its blowers and most importantly the row of vacuums. The amount of customers during these times would be minimal when it comes to the profitability of the business but have a huge impact on the homes in the surrounding area.

My next concern is about the noise. The sound study was done by Supreme Car Wash Specialists and Distributors? And as such recommendations from it should be taken with a grain of salt. One vacuum at

10 feet was reported as 86 dB, which Purdue University equates to a garbage disposal or food blender, which they also point out can cause hearing damage over an 8 hr period. At 70 ft, it would still be 70 dB and at 150 ft 62 dB. To compare that to background noise because of a nearby highway is silly. 70 dB which is where their proposed town homes will be, is equal in loudness of standing next to a large vehicle driving highway speeds. Keep in mind that's only 1 of 6 vacuums, imagine having all 6 of them going at the same time. I would HATE to be the neighbors listening to that constant high pitch roar all day and night. Some better form of sound barrier needs to be set up to lower the sounds impact. There are sound proofing and damping measures they could take, including walling in the vacuum's area and using plants to dampen the noise. Keep in mind, at 150 ft, 60 db is comparable to listening to a TV or radio in your room. That's not huge, but 6 of them in the same room is what the citizens living near it will hear all day long. In the packet it mentions they are using the commercial storage they "plan" to build, as a noise reduction method, but there is NOTHING requiring the units be built, so in effect, the city would be giving them a free pass if you will, until they are built, which maybe years or never. Allowing this would be incredibly poor city planning as each approval needs to stand on its own merits.

Traffic - The Traffic Impact Study performed by Reeve and Associates indicates there will be no change in the level of service on 2700 E. nor at the intersection of South Weber Drive and 2700 E. Was a copy of this study and the numbers used provided to the city and if so why was it not included in the packet? Especially now, with a possible increase due to an additional bay which changes the amount of traffic. a large successful carwash will increase the traffic on the frontage road which should be expanded to handle the larger volumes. Larger vehicles and tucks pulling trailers, boats or ATV's will also have a difficult time pulling out onto the narrow frontage road. The City council will be dealing with this road and the nearby intersection for years to come, and as such should have a copy of the traffic study and why Reeve's indicated a business that relies solely on vehicles driving in and out of this location will not impact the flow of traffic.

Signage – a lit 16 ft tall 8 ½ ft sign is reasonable but I don't see it included in the light pollution study, so we don't know its impact on the area. Why was this excluded? How many lumens is this sign going to put off? Is it not going to be a back lit sign? Its placement, is so that it will be blocked from view from nearby homes by the building, but I see no due diligence done as to a line of sight drawing indicating the raised sign's location or if that is even feasible. What's required to show this has been meet? If the 16 ft tall, extremely bright sign's placement is going to be shinning in the windows of the existing homes and even proposed townhomes, it needs to be identified as such so the City Council has all the facts needed to make its decision and to not be left holding the bag when the agreed upon placement wont work. The sign should not be lit if its going to have that kind of negative impact, and it would be good to have some kind of proof that it will not before granting a conditional use permit. With more commercial projects fast approaching, signage and its impacts need to be address better in the submitted plans as its impact to the city and its residents is critical.

Fence - I didn't see a full description of the slated fence separating the school playground and the cars that could park there. Could be creepy. Would like further details on height and distance between slats. I'm sure it will be a solid fence, but school grounds always need special considerations.

As the Planning Commission discusses this project, I would hope they examine each plan individually and require it meet all the city's requirements without the other proposed phased developments - it needs to be able to stand on its own. If this isn't code or policy, then it needs to be. Since we have no idea when or if they will be building a commercial storage and town homes portion, we have to assume they will not. This means the flow of customer traffic MUST be considered only to how it relates to this property and project, not a possible phase 2. Vehicles need to be able to safely navigate and make the sharp exit out of the bays and onto the road, without the extra space the commercial storage units may someday provide or more likely, be in competition for. There are many tools online to calculate the required turn radius of a vehicle based on its size if needed.

Overall, I think it looks good and should make money for the owner and the city, with very little chance of it becoming blight. I think if we can reduce the noise and control the hours of operation for the vacuums and blowers, this car wash could be a win-win. The approval process is a legally binding agreement, and needs to be treated as such. This submission is missing too much information. I recommend it be cleaned up and the issues addressed before putting the Planning Commission's seal of approval on it.

Thank you,

Joel Dills

7749 s 2100 e

South Weber

To: Public Comment <publiccomment@southwebercity.com>

Subject: Car Wash Discussion points for Planning Commission meeting on 5/28/2020

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I truly dislike that these comments can not be made in person in a public setting for only the commission members to read (hopefully). The citizens should be able to hear what other citizens thoughts are as well, but I guess we have to work with the constraints being imposed for the time being.

My comments this evening are specific to Agenda Items #5 & #6 of the Planning Commission Agenda for 5/28/2020.

I have very strong concerns over the proposed driveway/access from the Maverick(South Boundry)/North side of the car wash property. More often than not there are semi's with trailers, trucks with trailers and larger vehicles parked and/or unloading or campers/RV's waiting to use the RV dump. Cars turning into and out of Maverick are either waiting on 2700 E to turn into or out of Maverick onto 2700 E heading in either direction (either North or South). and now we want to add in the additional traffic and access of cars, trucks, campers and trailers into and out of the car wash. I just don't see how there is going to be enough room and feel that this is a huge problem waiting to happen, if additional discussion isn't had regarding the proposed access points. Add on to this my concerns over the increasing congestion at 2700 E and South Weber Drive through out the day and the slow down and potential back-up into the intersection. (BTW - this already occurs anytime someone is turning into Maverik from 2700 E.)

I have concerns regarding the landscaping plan for the proposed car wash project provided in the packet. Given the issues we have on the west end of town with the soccer complex and complete lack of a thorough landscaping plan and the many frustrations expressed from the people who live and have to drive by that area on the daily, I would hope additional discussion can take place and clear expectations established from the start, before any conditional use permit is approved for the car wash, especially given the location of this project being right at the "Gateway" to our city. It needs to be a reflection of what the Citizens, in many different forums, have expressed they want our city to be like. Also, given the location and the likelihood of high winds (daily), I would hope that maintenance of landscaping and securing of the trees and shrubs to ensure they "take root" is maintained and expectations determined from the get go. Side note - I'm not sure why the light industrial proposal and town home proposed plans have been included in the packet and hope that the discussion on the plans for those 2 lots are not under Planning Commission review/discussion at this time. I'll state for the record, just in case - I do not want any light industrial in this area. Its a bad fit for the vision of this area and not the best use of this property - In my opinion.

I am not ok with the 24-7 operation referenced in the conditional use permit - this was changed from the original permit and goes against what was said in a previous Planning Commission meeting by the developers and is not an improvement. The people who currently live right next to this development (and any future residents, should a town home development be approved) should not have to worry about vacuums turning on or washing bays engaging, be they self or automatic, at 2:00 am in the morning.

Finally - just my personal opinion, but the signage needs a major conceptual overhaul - what's being presented is not in line with what I would hope South Weber represents and projects out into the community and those driving by and through it.

To leave on a positive comment - I think the color and material schemes being presented look nice. Maybe the developer can design a sign that is more in line with the building/materials itself. Stone base, lower height, etc. Just please don't place it too close to the access point off 2700 and make it a visual obstacle/hinderance for drivers turning south or north onto 2700 E!!

Thank you for listening!

Julie Losee
2541 E. 8200 S.

Presentation to the South Weber City Planning Commission - 28May20

Questions and Comments on the Planning Commission Packet

for the 28May20 Meeting

by Paul A. Sturm

Packet Page 9 - Barry Burton Letter of 22May20:

PL 3: Standards for approval are found in Section 10-7-3 D of the South Weber City Code. They are as follows:

1. The proposed use shall not generate enough traffic to be detrimental to the immediate neighborhood. The Traffic Impact Study performed by Reeve and Associates indicates there will be no change in the level of service on 2700 E. nor at the intersection of South Weber Drive and 2700 E.

Questions:

- 1) Regarding the Traffic Impact Study, the report states that "there will be no change in level of service on 2700 E. ...", yet there will be increased traffic on 2700 E. by the very presence of the car wash.
- 2) Why is the level of traffic at the intersection of 2700 E. and South Weber Drive when it is over 50 yards away from any exit?
- 3) Reeve and Associates is being paid by the developer, has any independent assessment of the reasonableness of the numbers been done?

Packet Page 7 - Brandon Jones Letter of 22May20 #1:

Have Brandon's concerns been addressed?

PLAT

E1. It is our understanding that there are two petroleum line easements: one for Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) and one for Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American Pipeline, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline). a. The final plat needs to be submitted to both companies for their review. An approval letter from both companies is needed to verify that the easements have

been shown correctly. b. A signature line is needed in the Easement Approval block for both companies.

E2. The new storm drain easement needs additional information in order to clearly describe its location (e.g. dimensions along boundary, hatching, dimension of width, etc.).

Packet Page 11 - Brandon Jones Letter of 22May20 #2:

Questions:

1) Under the introductory paragraph - Reeve and Associates apparently formally submitted their package to SWC on 20May20 as indicated in Brandon's letter. Yet, both Barry's and Brandon's letters are dated 22May20. How did Barry and Brandon both provide their responses in the intervening 1-2 days? It appears that the project is are being pushed through rather quickly.

2) Under STUDIES/EVALUATIONS - Bullet 2 - Traffic Impact Study - What is the source of the quote, "LOS of the existing accesses and roadways are projected to remain the same postconstruction."? Is this from the Reeve and Associates report?

3) Under GENERAL -

E2. SWWID Approval Letter. A Will-Serve letter has been received. Final plans need to be submitted to the South Weber Water Improvement District and an approval letter provided indicating that the improvement plans meet their requirements. **Note:** This conditional letter is attached in the packet.

E3. Petroleum Lines Approval Letters. There are three petroleum lines that cross the property. Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline) owns two lines, and Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) owns one. Final Plans need to be submitted to both companies and approval letters from both companies will be required. There is no such approval letters in the packet from the three pipeline companies. **Note:** Without this approval how can SWC proceed with any approval of this project?

Packet Page 19 - Reeve and Associates draw Sheet 4 of 9:

Comment:

There does not appear to be sufficient distance between the automatic car wash exit and the southeast property line for a long vehicle to turn to exit the premises.

Presentation to the South Weber City Planning Commission - 03Jun20

Questions and Comments on the Planning Commission's Meeting

Amended Packet from the Cancelled 28May20 Meeting

for the 03Jun20 Meeting

by Paul A. Sturm (Amended Comments)

Note: Comments below that were added from the 28May20 Meeting Comments version previously submitted are underlined

Packet Page 7 - Brandon Jones Letter of 22May20 #1:

PLAT

E1. It is our understanding that there are two petroleum line easements: one for Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) and one for Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American Pipeline, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline). a. The final plat needs to be submitted to both companies for their review. An approval letter from both companies is needed to verify that the easements have been shown correctly. b. A signature line is needed in the Easement Approval block for both companies.

E2. The new storm drain easement needs additional information in order to clearly describe its location (e.g. dimensions along boundary, hatching, dimension of width, etc.).

Have Brandon's concerns been addressed? If not, where and when will they be addressed **PRIOR** to the PLAT approval?

Packet Page 9 - Barry Burton Letter of 22May20:

PL 3: Standards for approval are found in Section 10-7-3 D of the South Weber City Code. They are as follows:

1. The proposed use shall not generate enough traffic to be detrimental to the immediate neighborhood. The Traffic Impact Study performed by Reeve & Associates indicates there will be no change in the level of service on 2700 E. nor at the intersection of South Weber Drive and 2700 E.

Questions:

- 1) Regarding the Traffic Impact Study, the report states that "there will be no change in level of service on 2700 E. ...", yet there will be increased traffic on 2700 E. by the very presence of the car wash. How can there be no change in the LOS? with the possibility of an additional 100+ cars per day?
- 2) Why is the level of traffic at the intersection of 2700 E. and South Weber Drive of issue/concern when it is over 50 yards away from any exit?
- 3) Reeve and Associates is being paid by the developer. Has any independent assessment of the relative values of their analyses been done?

Packet Pages 11 & 12 - Brandon Jones Letter of 22May20:

Questions:

1) Under the intro paragraph - Reeve & Associates apparently formally submitted their package to SWC on 20May20 as indicated in Brandon's letter. Yet, both Barry's and Brandon's letters are dated 22May20. The material provided on 20May20 is approximately 55 pages of text and drawings (some revised). How did both Barry and Brandon both provide their responses in the intervening 1-2 days? (Comment: It appears that the project is are being pushed through rather quickly.)

2) Under **STUDIES/EVALUATIONS**

Bullet 2 - Traffic Impact Study - What is the source of the quote, "LOS of the existing accesses and roadways are projected to remain the same postconstruction."? Is this from the Reeve & Associates report? How can that be true since there will be an additional entrance/exit onto 2700 E. as shown on the Reeve & Associates drawings? Also, won't there be an additional 100+ cars per day using these 2700 E. access points and the road itself?

Bullet 3 - Photometric (Light) Study. How can there be no detrimental impacts to the surrounding residential properties? (Please see pp. 45-47 of the 03Jun20 Packet.) The proposed sign would face the adjacent neighborhood near/on 7800

South. If the LED lights are of a moving/flashing design, this will be a constant distraction/annoyance to this neighborhood. The developer can say what they want, but how will SWC hold them to that agreement? Was informed that a similar situation happened with Maverik where Maverik agreed that their sign on the very tall pole would not flash, yet today it is flashing and is readily observed from the 7800 South neighborhood. How can SWC enforce any light annoyance, either from the sign or the bays?

Bullet 4 - Sound Study - What recourse does SWC have if the Sound Study performed by Supreme West (pp. 48-49) turns out to be inaccurate?.. It appears that their calculations are based upon static conditions. What happens when the frequent wind in that area carries the sound to the adjacent neighborhoods? Also, it is my understanding the hours of operation for the automatic car wash bays will be restricted. Will the self-serve bays also be regulated? There is the potential for noise/crowds, etc. at that location as is seen at other car wash locations. Has this been considered?

3) Under **GENERAL** -

E2. SWWID Approval Letter. A Will-Serve letter has been received. Final plans need to be submitted to the South Weber Water Improvement District and an approval letter provided indicating that the improvement plans meet their requirements. **Note:** This conditional letter is attached in the packet. When will the final letter be signed?

E3. Petroleum Lines Approval Letters. There are three petroleum lines that cross the property. Holly Energy (formerly Plains All American, formerly Rocky Mountain Pipeline) owns two lines, and Phillips 66 (Pioneer Pipeline) owns one. Final Plans need to be submitted to both companies and approval letters from both companies will be required. There is no such approval letters in the packet from any of the three pipeline companies. Without this approval how can SWC proceed with any approval of this project? Will not the lack of approval completely scuttle the car wash as it presently sits because the entrances to the bays directly crosses the pipeline right-of-way?

Packet Page 19 - Reeve & Associates drawing Sheet 4 of 9:

Comment:

There does not appear to be sufficient distance between the automatic car wash exit and the southeast property line for a long vehicle to turn to safely exit the premises.