

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission  
for 10Feb22 Meeting  
by Paul A. Sturm**

**Public Comments General Comment on Agenda Items #7 (Pages 20-21 of 40) and  
Agenda Item #9 - (Pages 38-40 of 40)**

I have a question regarding the process/procedure being used for Agenda Items #7 and # 9 in this packet. This is the first time, possibly in a long time, where we have had two potential City Ordinances presented to/developed by the Planning Commission in the same meeting. Why is the Planning Commission now preparing a complete City Ordinance document with all of the "Whereas" statements and signature blocks for the City Council?..It thus appears that what the Planning Commission is proposing for a City Ordinance is a foregone conclusion, and that the City Council will approve it without changes. Is this the case, or has this process/procedure been changed? Has the City Council been consulted about this process, if this is a protocol change?

**End of General Public Comments**

#####

**Comments For Public Hearing - Agenda Item #6 -Pages 8 through 17 of 40**

6. Public Hearing & Action on Preliminary Plat, Improvement Plans & Rezone (C-H to R-M) for Sophia's Haven Subdivision 3 Lot Plat R-M zoning. 1.41 acres located at approx. 1550 E/South Weber Drive. Applicant Rob Edwards.

- 1) Several of the drawings in this presentation do not have "Legends" which make them difficult to fully interpret. I realize that these are just preliminary drawings, but a legend would assist in their assessment by the Planning Commission and the Public.
- 2) The information on the Plat Map on Page 13 of 40 does not match the information provided on Pages 12 and 14-16 of the packet. There are different areas and numbers shown.
- 3) These drawings also seem to show that the Sophia's Haven Subdivision's property includes a portion of South Weber Drive. This is UDOT property.
- 4) Does an Environmental Assessment/Review need to be performed since this site had USTs.
- 5) And probably of greater importance is that this property contains a potential Historic Site. The brick building in the middle of the property is the site of the remains of South Weber Amusement Hall that was built in 1897. (For reference, please see Pages 327 thru 333 of the book "SOUTH WEBER" 'The Autobiography of One Utah Community' by Lee D. Bell, published in 1990, and which was distributed/sold by South Weber City.)  
It is also believed that any building more than 100 years old needs to be considered as a potential historical site by the Federal Government and that they should be contacted. The State of Utah should also be informed, especially the Utah Division of State History or the Utah State Historic Preservation Office regarding any potential change/destruction of this site so that any required preservation or documentation can be accomplished.

#####

**Comments For Public Hearing - Agenda Item #8 -Pages 22-35 of 40**

- 8. Public Hearing & Action on amending South Weber City Code Chapter 15 Landscape Regulations.
- 1) There are at least three legislative actions now being considered in this current session of Utah Legislature concerning landscaping. The actions that I know of are: HB095, HB121, and SB110.
- 2) Since there are potential changes to State law, I believe that it would be prudent for SWC to table this item and its discussions at this time. SWC needs to see if there are any potential impacts or changes required, to what is currently being proposed, as a result of any over-riding or pending State law changes.

#####

**Comments For Public Hearing - Agenda Item #9 -Pages 36-40 of 40**

- 9. Public Hearing & Action on (Ordinance 2022-03) amending South Weber City Code Section 10-8-5 Number of Parking Spaces.
- 1) Parking spaces have been a concern for several years. It was difficult to compare what changes are being proposed between current City Code, and what is being proposed as the information is being presented.
  - a) This has recently become more of an issue within the City when considering resident and visitor parking at Multi-Family dwellings, IADU's, Airbnb's, etc., since these categories have become more common in SWC.
  - b) A direct one-to-one comparison of "From (current code)-To (proposed code" would be a great benefit to SWC Citizens to see what changes are really being made. It is difficult to compare any increases or decreases in the number of "Parking Spaces" when the denominators, i.e., dwelling unit, square feet, seats, etc., in the calculation are not comparable in some cases.
- 2) The International Build Code used may be too high of a standard for a City of SWC's size and residential makeup with large families. Having discussed the Lofts and its parking requirement of two and one half parking spaces per dwelling unit, I was informed that this was a negotiated number. I suggest that we codify this number at 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for these types of dwellings because of the past research, discussions, and decisions made and agreed upon by SWC!