



**Commissioner Walton moved to open the public hearing on Preliminary/Final Plat, Improvement Plans & Rezone Request for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat) (Parcel# 130360101 approximately .628 acres from R-L to R-M) located at approximately 7888 S 2600 E by Applicant: Tyker Belnap. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

**\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING \*\*\*\*\***

**4. Preliminary/Final Plat, Improvement Plans & Rezone Request for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat) (Parcel# 130360101 approximately .628 Acres from R-L to R-M) located at approximately 7888 S 2600 E by Applicant: Tyker Belnap**

Community Service Director Trevor Cahoon explained city code allows an applicant for a Minor Subdivision (Between 1-10 Lots) to request a combined Preliminary and Final Application. The Sketch Committee recommends that this would be the case for this request.

Trevor expressed the property is currently zoned R-L which matches the surrounding area. However, the general plan designation for the area is consistent with the R-M request. The shape of the lot makes complying with the R-L lot requirements difficult. To have better use of the property the applicant is requesting a change to R-M.

Commissioner Losee asked if there was any public comment.

**Paul Sturm, 2527 Deer Run Drive**, queried if the developer is subdividing the property into more than one lot.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to close the public hearing on Preliminary/Final Plat, Improvement Plans & Rezone Request for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat) (Parcel# 130360101 approximately .628 Acres from R-L to R-M) located at approximately 7888 S 2600 E by Applicant: Tyker Belnap. Commissioner McFadden seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

**\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED \*\*\*\*\***

**Robin Belnap, 7841 S. 2600 E.**, explained her son will be building a home on this is family-owned property.

Commissioner Walton queried on the access. Trevor replied there are no concerns with the access. Commissioner Losee asked if a site plan is required. Trevor pointed out a site plan is only required for commercial, industrial, and multi-family developments.

**Commissioner McFadden moved to approve the Preliminary Application for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat), with a recommendation to the City Council to approve the Final Application and Rezone Request for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat) (Parcel# 130360101 approximately .628 acres from R-L to R-M) located at approximately 7888 S 2600 E.**

**Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

**Commissioner Walton moved to open the public hearing for Rezone Request (approx. 2.91 Acres from C-H & A to R-P) Located at approximately 7800 S 2700 E. Applicant: Phil Holland. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING \*\*\*\*\*

**5. Rezone Request (approx. 2.91 acres from C-H & A to R-P) located at approximately 7800 S 2700 E. Applicant: Phil Holland**

Trevor Cahoon explained this is an area in the General Plan that is at the discretion of the City Council to grant a rezone to Residential Patio (R-P). The request can act as a transitional buffer to the commercial to the north and the lower density residential to the south. The applicant wishes to use the property as a multi-lot patio home subdivision and has submitted a sketch plan to the city for review. The developer intends to continue through the development process but wants to proceed with the rezone request prior to engineering more of the project.

Trevor added a potential site plan is provided in the request but is not under consideration and the Planning Commission should make a recommendation about the rezone request on its own merits and not based upon a project that hasn't been submitted in full.

**Phil Holland, 1082 Dutch Lane**, explained he purchased the property approximately two years ago. He feels this is a great transitional area for patio homes located in between commercial and residential. He discussed the housing crisis in Utah, which is not only an inventory issue but type of housing as well.

Commissioner Losee asked if there is any public comment.

**Paul Sturm, 2527 Deer Run Drive**, voiced his concern with this development being next to Morty's Car Wash and the noise, lighting, and hours of operation generated from it.

**Rob Osborne, 2317 View Drive**, requested the Planning Commission deny the rezone request as the city has limited commercial space.

**Rob Edwards, 1579 South Weber Drive**, asked if the neighbors close to this project have commented. Commissioner Losee replied two neighbors have submitted comments.

Commissioner Walton read the public comment received from **Jeffrey Eddings, 2645 E 7800 S**.

Commissioner Boatright read the public comment received from **Kevin Poulsen, 2590 E 7800 S**.

**Wade Page, 2555 E 7800 S**, feels this plan is better than a patch full of weeds or commercial. He favored single family homes.

**Michael Grant, 2622 Deer Run Drive**, suggested office space for this property which doesn't use as much water.

Mr. Holland acknowledged the public comments but expressed the property will eventually be developed into something. He is a commercial developer but doesn't feel this property is the best use for commercial. He pointed out this request is for low density patio homes.

**Rob Osborne, 2317 View Drive**, suggested in an effort to maintain some commercial space, positioning residential homes along 7800 South and commercial behind it.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to close the public hearing for Rezone Request (approx. 2.91 Acres from C-H & A to R-P) Located at approximately 7800 S 2700 E. Applicant: Phil Holland. Commissioner Walton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Davis, Losee, McFadden, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

\*\*\*\*\* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED \*\*\*\*\*

Commissioner McFadden voiced being conflicted with this proposal. He understands there have been different proposals but feels what is being presented is well positioned; however, he understands the need for commercial.

Commissioner Walton agreed with Commissioner McFadden. There is value as commercial and value with patio homes.

Commissioner Losee researched and listened to audio meetings concerning the last proposal for this property in February 2020. She asked if there has been any complaints concerning Morty's Carwash. Trevor reported the city has received complaints concerning the lighting and a little bit of traffic generated. Chris Tremea did conduct a noise test, which complied.

Commissioner Walton is concerned with residential homes next to commercial.

**Commissioner McFadden was excused at 6:52 p.m.**

Commissioner Boatright discussed commercial and expressed the difficulty because there isn't a lot coming. He supported the idea of light industrial.

Commissioner Losee expressed the need for viable commercial.

Commissioner Davis favored the patio home concept but does have concerns about water. He questioned how much tax base comes from office space. He understands commercial revenue is needed; however, there may not be a viable commercial option. He added if the plan follows city code and the general plan then we need to follow it.

Trevor reminded the Planning Commission tonight's decision is based on the rezone and not the site plan.

**Commissioner Walton moved to recommend the City Council approve the Rezone Request (approx. 2.91 Acres from C-H & A to R-P) located at approximately 7800 S 2700 E.**

**Applicant: Phil Holland based upon the fact that it complies with the general plan. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Davis, and Walton voted aye. Commissioner Losee and Boatright voted nay. The motion tied.**

**6. Action on Final Plat for Petersen Farms PUD (25 Lot Plat) (Combined R-L, R-LM & R-7 zoning) 13.06 acres located at approx. 6950 S 475 E. Applicant: Timothy Grubb**  
Trevor reviewed after the preliminary plan approval, the next step in the process is recommending approval or denial of the Final Plat to the City Council. The Planning Commission, as the Land Use Authority, has made approvals of the preliminary plans after which the city staff verifies the improvement plans are finalized to construction ready drawings. The Plat is the only item that needs City Council approval as this is a decision about how to subdivide the property.

#### **APPROVALS PREVIOUSLY GRANTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION**

- Site Plan: The multi-family units required the submission of a site plan to the Planning Commission for approval. The plan was submitted at the April Planning Commission Meeting and was approved with the preliminary plan.
- Conditional Use Permit: The conditional use permit for the PUD application was submitted at the April Planning Commission Meeting and was approved with the preliminary plan.
- Architectural Review: The multi-family units require an architectural site plan review. The architectural review was completed at the April Planning Commission Meeting as part of the preliminary plan.
- Improvement Plans: The Planning Commission reviewed the preliminary improvement plans at the April Planning Commission Meeting. City Staff has verified that a complete set of construction drawings were submitted with the Final Plan Submittal which comply with all requirements of the submittal.

#### **STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY**

City Staff has done a review of the Petersen Farms PUD and have reviewed the following items:  
Planning Review:

PL-1: Use – **Complies**

Dwelling: Single Family is a permitted use in any of the underlying zones.

Dwelling: Twin Home is a permitted use in the R-7 zone.

Dwelling: Multi-Family is a permitted use in the R-7 Zone.

PL-2: Lot Requirements – **Complies**

Density: Developer can spread density and uses throughout the project. PUD's purpose is to provide greater open space opportunities while clustering the development of the residential uses. The allowed density for this project in combining uses is 35, the developer is proposing 25.

An agreement exists between the city and the developer to allow the use of the donated portion of Canyon Meadows West Park to be used as open space for the project and be counted in the density calculation.

Lot Area: The development may use any of the underlying zone requirements to fulfill the lot requirements. All lots are compliant to the requirements. Lot Width:

The development may use any of the underlying zone requirements to fulfill the lot requirements. All lots are compliant to the requirements.

PL-3: Setbacks – **Seeking Variation Based on PUD**

The applicant has indicated the setbacks for the various parcels on the plat. Lot 1 is requested to be a 10-foot minimum setback from all property lines. The other lots within the subdivision will utilize 20-foot front, 7-foot side, and 15-foot rear excepting the twin home lots 18 and 19.

PL-4: Parking – **Complies**

The site plan has been approved which addresses parking considerations.

PL-5: Landscaping – **Proposed Agreement**

The R-7 Zone requires 15% landscaping. Only a portion of the required landscaping is being provided inside the development. The applicant wishes to include this in the Fee in Lieu agreement.

PL-6: Existing Conditions – **No Action Needed**

There is an existing home on 475 East that will be removed in order to connect the proposed Iris Lane with 475 East.

PL-7: Necessary Documents - **Complies**

Applicant has submitted all required documents for a Final Plan Review.

**Engineering Review:**

EN-1: City Standards – **Will Comply**

The improvement plans are complete and substantially ready for construction. There are some minor changes that still need to be addressed to fully comply with the city standards and generally accepted engineering practices. These comments have been provided to the developer and must be addressed before a preconstruction meeting will be scheduled.

Commissioner Boatright requested the minutes reflect he has no business dealings with Tim Grubb or his family. Tim Grubb expressed he has no ownership with Petersen Farms.

Tim acknowledged since the last meeting city staff has spent hours and hours on this project.

**Commissioner Boatright moved to recommend the City Council approve the Petersen Farms PUD (25 Lot Plat) (Combined R-L, R-LM & R-7 zoning) 13.06 acres located at approximately 6950 S 475 E. Applicant: Timothy Grubb. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

**7. Action on Final Plat (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.** Trevor explained the 2.02 acreage includes the dedicated right-of-way.

**ITEMS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW**

• **Final Plat.** After the preliminary plan approval, the next step in the process is recommending approval or denial of the Final Plat to the City Council. The Planning Commission as the Land Use Authority has made approvals of the preliminary plans after which the City Staff verifies the improvement plans are finalized to construction ready drawings. The Plat is the only item that needs City Council approval as this is a decision about how to subdivide the property. Sophia's Haven Final Plat Items to Consider:

- Legal Description: This has been supplied
- Subdivision Name: The Subdivision name appears on the plat and is consistent with the application that has been submitted.
- Lot Sizes and Orientation: Lot sizes and widths comply with the R-M zoning designation and the orientation of the lots coincide with the location of the Right of Way (ROW).
- Addresses and Street Names: Addresses and Street Names are shown.
- Parcel Numbers or Lot Numbers of Surrounding Properties: When recording the plat it is necessary to indicate the parcel identification numbers or the lot number for adjoining subdivisions. This plat has that necessary information.
- Right-of-Way (ROW) Dedication: The applicant was asked to include 1550 West in this subdivision to dedicate this area as a ROW. The ROW has been indicated on the drawings for dedication to the city and the widths comply with the City Standards.
- Utility Easements: The General Utility Easement required for each property has been indicated on the plat. Storm Drain Easements are indicated on the plat and are consistent with existing recorded easements or new requirements.
  - Public Works has identified that the water service for the home across the street (1590 E. South Weber Dr.) crosses Lot 3. An easement for this service line will need to be added once the exact location of this service can be identified by Public Works.
- Signature Boxes: All signature boxes are supplied

**APPROVALS PREVIOUSLY GRANTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION**

- Improvement Plans: The planning commission reviewed the preliminary improvement plans at the April Planning Commission Meeting. City Staff has verified that a complete set of construction drawings were submitted with the Final Plan Submittal which comply with all requirements of the submittal.
- Zone Change Recommendation: The planning commission recommended approval of the requested zone change from Commercial (C) to Residential Moderate (R-M) in the February Planning Commission Meeting.

**STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY**

City Staff has done a review of the Petersen Farms PUD and have reviewed the following items:

**Planning Review:**

PL-1: Use – **Complies**

Dwelling: Single Family is a permitted use in the R-M zone.

PL-2: Lot Requirements – **Complies**

Density: less than 2.80 units per acre

Lot Area: Greater than 9000 sq. ft.

Lot Width: Greater than 80 ft. and comply with the percentages required by code

PL-3: Setbacks – **Able to Comply**

There is enough room within lots to have an allowable buildable area.

PL-4: Parking – **Able to Comply**

PL-5: Existing Conditions – **No Action Needed**

Developer has begun demolition of the current structures on the property. City will continue to work with applicant to ensure the materials are cleared in a timely manner.

PL-6: Access – **Complies**

The development includes many cross-access agreements. Agreements have been verified and provide necessary protections for the project.

PL-7: Necessary Documents - **Complies**

Applicant has submitted all required documents for a Final Plan Review.

### Engineering Review:

EN-1: The location of the water service to the home on 1590 E. South Weber Dr. needs to be identified by Public Works and a corresponding easement needs to be provided on the plat prior to recording of the plat.

Discussion took place regarding the fiber optic line. City Engineer Brandon Jones explained before the plat is recorded the fiber optic line will be located and/or possibly relocated. Rob Edwards explained he has an agreement with Crown Castle (owner of the cell tower).

Commissioner Losee questioned Lot 3 access point. Brandon replied; the developer has received approval from UDOT on the access from South Weber Drive. It is actually an existing access.

**Commissioner Walton moved to recommend the City Council approve the Final Plat (C-H to R-M) for Sophia's Haven Subdivision 3 Lot Plat R-M zoning. 1.41 acres located at approximately 1550 E/South Weber Drive for applicant Rob Edwards with the condition that the location of fiber optic line and water utility line be identified on the final plat. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.**

### Planning Commission Comments:

**Commissioner Losee:** announced she is not on the Planning Commission for a paycheck. On June 11<sup>th</sup> there is a service project at Canyon Meadows Park from 8:00 to noon.



**Commissioner Boatright:** reported he listened to the May 10, 2022, City Council meeting and was shocked with the increase in pay for Planning Commission members, and feels it is unnecessary.

**ADJOURN:** Commissioner Losee moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting 7:50 p.m. Commissioner Boatright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

APPROVED: Julie Losee Date 7.14.22  
Chairperson: ~~Jeremy Davis~~ JULIE LOSEE

Michelle Clark  
Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest: Kim Guill  
Development Coordinator: Kimberli Guill

**Comments to South Weber City Planning Commission  
for 06Jun22 Meeting  
by Paul A. Sturm**

**Public Comments**

**A) Agenda Item #4 -Packet Pages 7 to 14 of 41**

**4. Public Hearing & Action on Preliminary/Final Plat, Improvement Plans & Rezone Request for Belnap Estates (1 Lot Plat) (Parcel# 130360101 approx. .628 Acres from R-L to R-M) Located at approx. 7888 S 2600 E by Applicant: Tyker Belnap**

- 1) I investigated this agenda item, prior to the Packet itself being available, to determine why the developer is making this request. My assumption was that the developer wants to subdivide and increase the number of lots since it is called **Belnap Subdivision** (Informed the word "Subdivision" is a SWC technicality term even for a single house.). I researched both SWC R-L and R-M zoning codes and the results are attached. (With Comments. - See Page 2)
- 2) Please Note that Page 10 of 41 in the Packet is **MISSING!!** The Page numbers go from 9 of 41 to 11 of 41. and is just a page numbering issue.
- 3) Packet Page 8 of 41 under Planning Review on PL2 of the Staff Summary **DOES NOT COMPLY** with the SWC code for R-M. (Reference the first paragraph in the Attachment for calculations.) Please reference SWC Code 10-5A-4: Building Lot Requirements (below):

**10-5A-4: BUILDING LOT REQUIREMENTS:**



A. Density: There shall be no more than 2.80 building lots per acre contained within the boundaries of each phase of every subdivision or planned unit development; except when previously completed phases of the same development have sufficiently low density so that the average is still 2.80 building lots per acre or less.

**As cited in the Attachment, even .628 acres equals only 1.7584 lots.**

- 4) Suggest that the Applicant try another rezoning request for a zone that better matches their intent for the number of lots they are trying to achieve for their subdivision.
- 5) The next question I have is how did the acreage suddenly go up from the Davis County Property Search number. This is the same thing that happened with the Lofts Project. The acreage suddenly went up and increased the number of units allowed under SWC Code C-O! At this rate, I guess the surface area of Davis County will continually increase!

## B) Agenda Item #5 - Packet Pages 15 to 18 of 41

5. Public Hearing & Action on Rezone Request (approx. 2.91 Acres from C-H & A to R-P)  
Located at approx. 7800 S 2700 E. Applicant: Phil Holland

(Note: Prior to starting this presentation Trevor Cahoon informed everyone that the Staff Summary contained an error in the acreage shown. This was addressed in Public Comment opening statement.)

- 1) My first question is why the Staff Summary Sheet for both Belnap Estates and "Manor Villas Subdivision" (Phil Holland) show the Gross Site area of 0.628 acres. It is highly unlikely that both of these properties are the same area to the third decimal place!! The Davis County Tax information included in the Packet shows only 2.90 acres and Agenda Item #6 text shows 2.91!
- 2) My next concern is the fact that this property is directly adjacent to Morty's Car Wash. The City will need to address several issues that were discussed and agreed upon during the Car Wash approval process, particularly noise, lighting, and hours of operation. SWC appears to be renegeing on the agreement with Scott Mortensen concerning potential hours of operation that would be addressed later depending on complaints received. This cannot happen with the details in the proposed Noise Ordinance pending consideration at the 14Jun22 City Council meeting, and the proposed Patio Homes proximity to the Car Wash with its obvious noise, lighting, and hours of operation issues that were previously approved by SWC.
- 3) Also, according to the drawing provided on Page 16 of 41, it appears that this development possibly does not comply with Paragraph C (Lot Width) of the R-P Zone. The minimum lot width is sixty-five (65) feet in the R-P Zone as shown below in Paragraph C. According to the drawing provided, it is possible that Lot #1 (63.85 or 61.90 feet), Lot #5 (60.38 or 77.55 feet), and others may or may not comply. The lots do comply with both Paragraphs A - Density ( $4 * 2.90 = 11.6$  Lots and 11 are proposed) and Paragraph B - Lot Area (6,000 sf minimum) of the R-P Zone.

### 10-5P-4: BUILDING LOT REQUIREMENTS:



A. Density: There shall be no more than 4.0 dwelling units per acre contained within the boundaries of each phase of every development; except when previously completed phases of the same development have sufficiently low density so that the average is still no more than 4.0 dwelling units per acre.

1. Areas within a given development that contain land use easements purchased by the State of Utah for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the citizens of Utah and assuring the continued operation of Hill Air Force Base as an active military base, shall not be utilized in density calculations.

B. Lot Area: There shall be a minimum of six thousand (6,000) square feet in each lot on which a single-family dwelling is located. Single-family dwellings shall each be located on a separate lot.

C. Lot Width: Each lot shall have a minimum width of sixty five feet (65'). (Ord. 17-16, 11-21-2017; amd. Ord. 2021-06, 5-25-2021; Ord. 2022-07, 4-12-2022)

**Attachment**  
**Comments on SWC Zone Code for R-M and R-L and Belnap Estates**

0.628 acres On Application = 27,355.68 sf





Davis County Property Search shows 0.569 acres = 24,793 sf Which is correct??

Zone R-M = Minimum 9,000 SF per Lot = ~3 Lots at .628 acres with total sf if that is the **only** criteria, but **THIS IS NOT THE CASE** (Note: At 0.569 acres it is ~1.6 Lots)

**SWC Code 10-5A-4, Paragraph A states that no more than 2.80 Lots per acre.**

Even at 0.628 acres, only 1.7584 (**2.80 \* 0.628**) Lots Are Allowed under Zone R-M!!

The 9,000 sf minimum **DOES NOT APPLY** because it is superceded by the 2.80 maximum !!

**10-5A-4: BUILDING LOT REQUIREMENTS:**    

A. Density: There shall be no more than 2.80 building lots per acre contained within the boundaries of each phase of every subdivision or planned unit development; except when previously completed phases of the same development have sufficiently low density so that the average is still 2.80 building lots per acre or less.

1. Areas within a given development that contain land use easements purchased by the State of Utah for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the citizens of Utah and assuring the continued operation of Hill Air Force Base as an active military base, shall not be utilized in density calculations.

B. Lot Area: There shall be a minimum of nine thousand (9,000) square feet in each lot.

C. Lot Width:





1. A maximum of twenty five percent (25%) of all lots within any development phase may be a minimum of eighty feet (80') in width; and

2. A minimum of twenty five percent (25%) of all lots within any development phase shall be a minimum of one hundred feet (100') in width; and

3. The width of all lots within any development phase shall average a minimum of ninety feet (90') in width. (Ord. 2000-9, 7-11-2000; amd. Ord. 1505, 7-14-2015; Ord. 2021-06, 5-25-2021; Ord. 2022-07, 4-12-2022)

\*\*\*\*\*

Zone R-L = 12,000 SF per Lot = ~2 Lots - SWC Code states no more than 1.45 Lots per acre.  
0.628 acres = 0.9106 Lots Allowed!!

**10-5D-4: BUILDING LOT REQUIREMENTS:**    

A. Density: There shall be no more than 1.45 building lots per acre contained within the boundaries of each phase of every subdivision or planned unit development; except when previously completed phases of the same development have sufficiently low density so that the average is still 1.45 building lots per acre or less.

1. Areas within a given development that contain land use easements purchased by the State of Utah for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the citizens of Utah and assuring the continued operation of Hill Air Force Base as an active military base, shall not be utilized in density calculations.

B. Lot Area: There shall be a minimum of twelve thousand (12,000) square feet in each lot.

C. Lot Width:

1. A maximum of twenty five percent (25%) of all lots within any development phase may be a minimum of eighty feet (80') in width; and

2. A minimum of twenty five percent (25%) of all lots within any development phase shall be a minimum of one hundred feet (100') in width; and

3. The width of all lots within any development phase shall average a minimum of ninety feet (90') in width. (Ord. 2000-9, 7-11-2000; amd. Ord. 15-05, 7-14-2015; Ord. 2021-06, 5-25-2021; Ord. 2022-07, 4-12-2022)

**From:** [Kevin Polson](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 7800 S 2700 E Rezone  
**Date:** Friday, June 3, 2022 8:40:50 AM

---

Hello,

In regards to the rezone request submitted by Mr Holland, I have a few thoughts I wanted to express. The first being, it's difficult to take city authorities seriously on extreme drought conditions and the necessary restrictions, while they're also considering and approving every rezone request to higher density housing. I'm in no way trying to slam the door closed on other people wanting to live in our great city, but I am wondering at what point do we realize that we have limited natural resources? Wouldn't it be prudent to consider halting any high density rezone requests until we're out of the drought at the very least?

When my wife and I moved back to South Weber, we bought a 100 year old existing home and have worked hard to improve it's condition so our children could have a nice yard to play in, and a great community to be raised in. Now we're being told that we can't keep our grass green by the same people who continually approve higher and higher density rezones for more families to pack in and take showers, flush toilets, wash dishes, and do laundry.

Aside from the drought, why is it that the citizens of South Weber are asked to contribute thoughts on the General Plan (which takes quite some time for everyone to get through) for the city to then toss it out the window months later and do whatever they want anyway? The citizens have spoken I don't know how many times, and yet we're still sent notices about changes to land that we've already expressed opinions on. I know I don't own the land so I have very limited -if any- say in what happens with it, I just ask that our time isn't wasted with requests to comment on a general plan that's going to be ignored either way.

I understand that everyone wants in on the high density gravy train money, it's just a shame that so few landowners have any sort of respect for, or love for what South Weber has always been. I am an implant and yet it feels like I and so many others are the ones fighting to keep South Weber a great place for our kids. It's a shame that those who grew up here and enjoyed the great things about South Weber no longer seem to care about preserving it. My dream would be that we approve single family housing/low density zones that naturally foster a community of people who put roots down and want to build a life with us in this great city. If every vacant lot is going to end up as high density anyway, let's just approve them all now and get it over with because that's the path we're on anyway and it'll save everyone's time.

Kevin Polson  
2590 E 7800 S