

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission
for 09Dec21 Meeting
by Paul A. Sturm**

**Public Comments Agenda Item #2 Discussions on South Weber Gateway Development
Public Hearing & Action on Preliminary Plat, Improvement Plans (for ENTIRE development).**

1. Packet Page 15 of 299 - Subdivision Dashboard - Planning Commission
 - a) Please Note that under "Quick Stats" this preliminary plan **DOES NOT** meet City Code. This is particularly surprising since the Gateway concept has been under development for over a year.
 - b) Also, this plan will also require **YET ANOTHER** rezone. It appears that the developer is just throwing his plans against the wall to see what sticks.
 - c) Another concern is the developer requesting a waiver from City Code for the fencing requirement between R-7 and lower density zones. Their presentation appears to address only the two zones within their development, but not the zones on the development boundaries such as the Charter School and others. It should also be noted that the Mark Fernelius property abuts the Gateway property and should be fenced if Mark Fernelius so desires. Other owners bordering the Gateway development should also be consulted.

2. Packet Page 16 of 299 - Preliminary Application - Project Information
 - a) The "Owner" is shown as Jane M Poll - Trustee. Whereas, on Packet Page 23 of 299, The "Property Owner is shown to be Farrell Poll. Which is it?
 - b) Staff Review Summary - -Bullet #1 clearly states that the "Private Right of Way proposed does not meet City Code, yet they chose to proceed anyway. Do they want?
 - c) "Most" homeowners on the south side of the Gateway development have fencing. What about the rest? Suggest that the developer, if the resident wants a fence, should install one!
Also see Packet Page 18-19 of 299 - PL-8-Landscaping R-7 - Complete with conditions Bullet #2

3. Packet Page 18-19 of 299 - PL-8 - Landscaping - R-7 - Complete with conditions
Bullet #2 requires a six foot tall solid screening fence between R-7 and lower density zones. What about the Charter School, property owners and the storage units?

4. Packet Page 19 of 299 - PL-10 - Outdoor Storage Space - R-7 Complete
Once again, the developer is requesting a waiver to sidestep existing City Code! Inside storage **IS NOT** outdoor storage! I have two major concerns with approving this waiver:
 - a) Moving the storage inside will reduce the size of the garage area.
 - b) There is a major safety factor to be considered with having inside storage. Where will a resident store any flammable material that they may have such as camping fuel and supplies?..This is a safety issue for not only a single resident, but to all attached townhomes!

5. Packet Page 20 of 299 - Staff Assessment - Bullet #2 - City Code & Public Works Standards
This addresses the fact that, as mentioned before, **NO** Private Streets are currently permitted in the R-7 zone!

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission
for 09Dec221 Meeting
by Paul A. Sturm**

Public Hearing - Agenda Item #4

Public Hearing & Action on Preliminary Plat, Improvement Plans (for entire development) & Conditional Use (for CH zone over 1 acre) for South Weber Gateway Project (62 Lot R-7 Residential) & (18,824 sq ft. C-H Commercial) located at approx 2350 E South Weber Drive. by Applicant Brad Brown from Colliers International

1. Packet Page 20-21 of 299 - Staff Assessment - Bullet #4 Traffic Impact Study TIS)
 - a) Can this TIS dictate that UDOT restripe SR-60 (South Weber Drive) to have an eastbound right turn lane into the development?
 - b) What impact will this have on South Weber Drive parking adjacent to the Charter School?

2. Packet Page 20-21 of 299 - Staff Assessment - Bullet #5 - Phasing
 - a) I believe the Phasing aspect of this development needs to be carefully addressed, assessed and strictly defined so that it can be enforced.
 - b) How will the phasing agreement be enforced and development not run rampant with regard to project phasing? As was discussed during Planning Commission meetings, there is a C-H element to this development that is of great importance to SWC, and was one of the determining factors when the property rezone was approved..

3. Packet Page 21 of 299 - Staff Assessment - Bullet #6 - Buffer Yard
Once again, the developer is requesting another waiver. I have lost count on how many waivers have been requested so far. To me this appears to be another Lofts-type development where there are so many requested changes and challenges!

4. Packet Page 23-24 of 299 - Land Use Application and Conditional Use Application
 - a) Another concern I have regarding Phasing enforcement is that, as is currently presented in the Conditional Use Application document, it indicates that Farrell Poll (current), (or whomever is really the owner), is anticipating selling the Gateway development property to Colliers International (proposed).
 - b) My concern is that, since, Colliers International is a "Canada-based diversified professional services and investment management company with annualized revenues of \$3.6 billion (\$4.0 billion including affiliates)" [Note: description was extracted from their website]. It would be an extremely large company with which SWC would be doing business when trying to enforce the Gateway phasing or any other agreement. I do not know if a possible surety bond should be levied on this project to reduce risk to SWC.
 - c) The information in the Conditional Use Application is not complete. It does not identify all of the Bordering Zones and Surrounding Land Uses present for this property, thus it is incomplete!