

# Comments written on comment cards:

The following table contains the comments written on the comment cards from the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. They also explain what action staff took to address the comment, and an explanation from staff where necessary. If the staff action shows “Mapped” then the comment was directly drawn on the new maps labeled “PUBLIC COMMENT ‘WANTS AND NEEDS’ MAPS.” These maps are ONLY a collection of the comments offered by the public in the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. If the staff action shows “Listed,” then the specific comment is either on the “DON’T WANT LIST” or the “COMMENTS NOT MAPPABLE” list that are associated with the maps.

As you look over the comments and compare them to your own values/desires, also review staff’s comments and follow-up questions. If you can answer the questions or feel the need to offer more comment, please do so using the comment cards in the meeting, or send them to the Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner, County Planning Division at [cewert@co.weber.ut.us](mailto:cewert@co.weber.ut.us), or 2480 Washington BLVD. Ste 240, Ogden, UT 84401.

Comment.	Staff Action.	Staff explanation or follow-up questions
No more one acre lots! I support PRUD and Clusters. Up to 10,000 square foot. Put <u>all</u> open space into large agricultural parcels, homes together. Develop land trust to purchase conservation easements so farmers can purchase land. No trails and minimal parks	Listed	New cluster ordinance provides for much of this, but right now a cluster is voluntary, not mandatory.  As the community grows and more people are present, parks, trails, and other recreation amenities will be needed to serve the travel and recreation needs. How should this need be met?
No little open spaces.	Listed	
There needs to be a major roadway to Little Mountain industrial area other than 900 South. The old railroad right-of-way known as the “rail trail” would have little impact on people and provide that major roadway.	Mapped	
Keep it County. No less than ½ acre lots. Preferably one acre lots.	Listed	Many echoed the statement “keep it county.” Can we get feedback about what this statement means? Is it an opposition to annexation into a city? Is it a

		<p>statement about open land uses? Is it advocating for less urban services?</p> <p>Under existing zoning, future development is inevitable to some degree. Is this statement advocating for reduced land-rights on other's property?</p>
<p>The general plan needs to be updated. The Weber River Flood Zone study needs to be completed. The PRUD needs to be amended, designated minimum lot sizes with bonus density credit given for only developable agricultural land. Infrastructure needs to be improved to support growth.</p>	Listed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This public process is scoping the need for a new/updated general plan.</li> <li>• PRUD code amendment currently in progress.</li> <li>• Infrastructure plans forthcoming.</li> </ul>
<p>I would like to see 3500 West continue to the section line and tie back into 4700 West.</p>	Mapped	
<p>I would like to see the whole picture. You have pamphlets on the tables. You should make these available (with a fee of course) so we can really get an idea of the growth we will have in West Weber.</p>	Listed	<p>We are happy to offer all information – FREE. Contact Charlie by phone or email. He will discuss any planning topic with anyone. 801-399-8763 or <a href="mailto:cewert@co.weber.ut.us">cewert@co.weber.ut.us</a>.</p>
<p>[Complaint about a specific neighborhood zoning violation omitted here, but forwarded to enforcement for followup]</p>	Omitted	
<p>Future roads stay on section lines.</p>	Mapped and Listed	<p>There are a couple of future roads that we added to the map, but there were not many future roads listed in the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. If growth occurs under existing zoning, then many more roads – and wider roads – will be needed. Where will it be most important to make future street connections?</p>

<p>I live on the new freeway you have built on 3500 West. Cars and trucks speeding constantly past. Average speed is 50+. No sheriff has given any tickets. The cars start at 12<sup>th</sup> street and see how fast they can go – several 100 MPH cars have gone by. They also head north at significant speed and run the stop sign at 12<sup>th</sup> street. It has been run over at least 3 times Car parts are collecting at the intersection. Jake brakes and gearing up are constant. Sometimes 10 an hour.</p> <p>No one is watching what is happening. I have seen several trucks overflowed with dirt and rock that it is falling off the trucks. Most are not covered. That is the law and it is not enforced. <u>No oversight</u> of what is going on. Sheriff's nowhere to be seen. 12<sup>th</sup> street is less wide than 3500 West. The state has no plans to widen HWY 39. Fix Hwy 39 and enforce the laws before you let any more growth happen!</p>		<p>While we would love to help with this topic, unfortunately, it will not likely be addressed by this forum. It is a question of law enforcement, which is better suited for the Sheriff's Department.</p> <p>While we would love to fix all enforcement concerns, perhaps think about it this way: growth is not a construct of the County (or government), it is a result of private land-rights and the free market. The County can attempt to shape growth, but if we wait to address growth until all laws are better enforced the growth will occur all around us without the community's ability to appropriately shape it – making a bigger future enforcement problem.</p>
<p>No trails down 3600 with dead end. No PRUD developments. We prefer to stay a farming community.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>If 3600 remains a dead-end then no trail would ever be needed. But under existing zoning, growth is likely to occur in the area, leading to a greater need for transportation safety connections, and very likely pedestrian transportation facilities.</p> <p>Other comments have asked for 3600 to connect northward and ultimately connect over the river – which would support growth under existing zoning.</p> <p>With all that in mind, is this statement advocating for reduced land-rights on other's property in the area?</p>
<p>Proper notification to the citizens of the community; such as send out to Water District's billing or some utility (monthly notice). Like: planning changes, amendments, zones, land use permits.</p> <p>PRUD needs to go away.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>This is a great idea. We are discussing the possibility and logistics. The challenge twofold: first, not everyone in Western Weber received utility bills – giving them a disadvantage to have their voices heard; and second, Weber County does not control the utility, so working out the logistics might be tricky given existing resources.</p>

<p>Properly notify the community of development, future planning and zoning changes. This has failed in the past. Suggesting: notify Water District and send notifications with monthly utility bill such as water bill.</p> <p>Do away with PRUD.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>See answer to comment above.</p>
<p>I can't see how you plan for all of this growth when you have no plans at all for a sewer system or a secondary water system to support this amount of growth. If a lot costs \$85,000 and a septic system costs \$25,000 it makes a home unaffordable.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>This is a great support for proper planning. Sewer and water are necessary to support growth. The County is currently in process of creating a sewer master plan.</p> <p>One thing this comment may not acknowledge is that – given enough financial resources – developers will find a way to provide both water and sewer whether the county has a plan for it or not. So we need to be aware that with or without County planning to help shape it, growth will likely still occur given the rights that exist under current zoning.</p>
<p>My brothers and I have some acreage that could be developed but the quality of lifestyle in our area is more precious than the potential dollars.</p> <p>Thanks for the chance to give input.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>We love to hear this! Whether you are doing this for yourselves or for the community-at-large, your philanthropy is appreciated!</p> <p>Do you think your posterity will feel the same way? If so, there are great tax incentives for permanently preserving your land in a conservation easement. We can get you in touch with conservation folks if you are interested.</p>
<p>Don't use eminent domain unnecessarily.</p> <p>Density increases change communities too much.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>Please help us with a little clarity, by “density increases,” is this referring to changing the zoning so more houses can be built? Or is this referring to not letting people build the number of houses to which they have a right under existing zoning?</p>

<p>Small lots encourage a more transient population. This encourages people not to buy/build plant roots and stay put.</p>		<p>Small lots do occasionally have a relationship to community turn-over. A few questions we need to consider as we contemplate the solution: can the average person afford to plant roots? Can the young families afford to purchase a one-acre lot? Can the aging population afford to live on a one-acre lot (taxes/maintenance/etc.)? What can the County do to help enable people to “age in place?”</p>
<p>I like cluster but need to do away with bonus density and require more open space.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>At this time clustering is a voluntary option under the land-use code. It is not required. Bonus density is intended to incentivize the option in hopes that more will do it.</p> <p>The County could change or reduce bonus density as well as increase open space requirements if there is support for it, but it might come at the expense of getting cluster (and open space) development.</p>
<p>I would love to see 22 acres of commercial land on 47<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> street. ☺</p>	<p>Mapped.</p>	<p>47<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> street is currently listed in the general plan as being a commercial “node” (mixed use village). It expanding this desirable to the public?</p>
<p>We need a stop light at 4700 and 12<sup>th</sup> street regardless of the growth.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	
<p>I like cluster subdivisions to have more open space and more land in agriculture. I don't like acre lots or more because over time the extra space becomes nothing but weeds and a junk area. Which makes the whole neighborhood look more trashy and unattractive. I highly favor cluster subdivisions.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>The new cluster ordinance now provides for this.</p>

<p>The walking trail would go next to our land and we are concerned. We do not want the growth! We are being forced into a way of live we moved here to avoid.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>Increasing public traffic adjacent to private land is a concern we take seriously as well. If growth does not occur, then there would be no need for transportation or recreation resources in the area.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the County has very limited to control over the existence of growth. Any forcing into a way of life is a product of the private market and property rights – not the County</p> <p>However, the County can control the shape of growth. How can we help preserve a way of life while also allowing the free market to do what it does? Where should new people go? Where should they recreate? The County, vis-à-vis the public, can control this aspect, and we would like to know how you would propose helping us do so.</p>
<p>More strict development regulations and less development. New cluster design close houses together BIG open farm.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>The new cluster ordinance now provides for this.</p>
<p>I would like to see the area stay as rural as possible. We all moved here for the “country” feel. We like being out of the city and don’t mind the drive time to get places.</p>	<p>Mapped and Listed.</p>	
<p>One acre lots are still possible while keeping agriculture land available. The mountain view subdivision in Farr West is one acre lots with Chugg’s a Papageorge’s have successful farm operations. I understand expansion is going to happen sooner or later. We still need our space.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>We will look into this. Thank you.</p>
<p>I don’t want PRUD’s. Cluster Subs are okay. I would like to see the agricultural land preserved.</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>The new cluster ordinance now provides for this.</p>

<p>I see the benefit of clusters but I don't see benefit of PRUD's. There needs to be a plan for the future.</p>	<p>Listed</p>	
<p>Why should I make a comment if you never listen anyway?</p>	<p>Listed.</p>	<p>This comment was made in the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting a number of times. We are painfully aware of the lack of trust that exists between the public and the government. We hope it is obvious by this process that we are here to not just listen, but to also rebuild. In the end, not everyone will get exactly what they want, but the point of this process is to explore a future that everyone can reasonably live with.</p> <p>We cannot hear the comments left unsaid. Help us help you.</p>

# Comments written on the maps:

The following table contains the comments written directly on the maps from the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. They also explain what action staff took to address the comment, and an explanation from staff where necessary. If the staff action shows “Mapped” then the comment was directly drawn on the new maps labeled “PUBLIC COMMENT ‘WANTS AND NEEDS’ MAPS.” These maps are ONLY a collection of the comments offered by the public in the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. If the staff action shows “Listed,” then the specific comment is either on the “DON’T WANT” or the “COMMENTS NOT MAPPABLE” lists that are associated with the maps.

As you look over the comments and compare them to your own values/desires, also review staff’s comments and follow-up questions. If you can answer the questions or feel the need to offer more comment, please do so using the comment cards in the meeting, or send them to the Charlie Ewert, Principal Planner, County Planning Division at [cewert@co.weber.ut.us](mailto:cewert@co.weber.ut.us), or 2480 Washington BLVD. Ste 240, Ogden, UT 84401.

Comment.	Staff Action.	Staff Explanation
High School at 2200 South and 4300 West	Mapped.	
Nature Park in the Weber River wetlands in and adjacent to Ogden Bay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian trails</li> <li>• Equestrian trails</li> <li>• Dirt bike park</li> </ul>	Mapped.	The comment included a large land area. We do not know if the comment came from a land owner of the park-area or another. If created, a regional park would not be built without the acquisition of land from willing sellers. If the park is desirable the County would work with willing sellers over time to create it.
There's an FAA tower at about 4700 West and 2200 South	Mapped.	
No PRUDs!!!	Listed.	
Pedestrian and bicycle trails along Weber River.	Mapped.	A little controversy here.

Pedestrian and bicycle trails along all major canals.	Mapped.	
Extend 3500 West northward terminate at 700 North.	Mapped.	Another comment desired that 3600 remain a dead end street. If 3500 is built in this areas maybe 3600 can remain a dead-end?
Connect 700 North (quarter section line) westward toward 4700 West, and eastward to future connection across Weber River into Marriott-Slaterville.	Mapped.	More exploration with Marriott-Slaterville necessary.
Village at intersection of 4700 West and 12 <sup>th</sup> Street.	Mapped.	A village can help support the area with small neighborhood services, retail, and offices. It could even support a small amount of more affordable housing options so “affordable housing” can avoid being located in other neighborhood areas in the community that do not desire it, while still offering housing options somewhere.
Create villages where West Weber Corridor intersects with 2550 South and 900 South.	Mapped.	Commercial options at the interchanges seem an obvious choice. Can this be supported by the public?
Extend 3600 West northward over Weber River connecting into Marriott Slaterville.	Mapped.	
Create a land trust.	Listed.	This is not often done by the government. For example, in the Ogden Valley a land trust was created by concerned residents. The Ogden Valley General Plan has been modified in a manner that requires the County to look for opportunities to support the land trust. A similar thing can be created by willing residents in Western Weber.

Save viable farmland – even the small farm parcels.	Listed.	See note below.
Like cluster – lots no smaller than 10,000 square feet.	Listed.	Given existing land rights, this is likely the best way to preserve viable farmland.
Increase development potential (third to half acre lots) around existing sewer lines.	Mapped.	This has been mapped. We are curious whether there is strong support for it?
Extend 2200 South to 21 <sup>st</sup> Street I-15 Interchange.	Mapped.	
Favor cluster subdivisions – also allow smaller open spaces for the sake of water rights.	Listed.	
Preserve farmland.	Listed.	
Allow reasonable growth (limit to growth nodes)	Listed.	<p>This is an interesting idea. Through a Transferable Development Right Program (TDR) we may be able to create a market for property rights to be transferred from one parcel to another (imagine the right to build a home as if it is a water right that can be re-assigned to another's parcel).</p> <p>Would transferring development rights from agricultural land into village areas at major intersections be supported by the public?</p>
Protect agriculture.	Listed.	Help is figure out how this should be done.
I like the farming community the way it is.	Listed.	Under existing zoning, future development is inevitable to some degree. The County is not creating

		the growth – the private market and existing land rights are created the growth. What is the best way to honor existing land rights but also keep the farming community the way it is? Help us explore the options.
I like the farming community the way it is.	Listed.	See above comment.
I am on the fence. There is both good and bad with parks and trails.	Listed.	<p>There is good and bad with almost anything. As planners we typically advocate for parks and trails as a community recreation and transportation resource necessary for healthy life-choices. There is a wealth of literature about how parks and trails affect human health and their sense of overall well-being. We assert that in the long run the positives outweigh the negatives.</p> <p>But if the negatives are too burdensome for the public to accept, then pathways and parks should be saved for other future planning efforts and left out of this process.</p> <p>What do you think?</p>
Community fishing pond at 900 South and about 7100 West (near Reese Park)	Mapped.	It is unclear whether this specific request was made by a willing landowner of the area or a member of the public. What is significant about this specific area. Should a fishing amenity be offered here?
Only one acre lots, or at the very least ½ acre lots. No clusters.	Listed.	
No trails.	Listed.	

Need to bond developers.	Listed.	The County already requires developers to bond for the installed County-owned improvements.
Please stay with no less than ½ acre lots.	Listed.	
Keep it County.	Listed.	
Keep it County.	Listed.	
No lots smaller than ½ acre.	Listed.	
No 50% bonus density.	Listed.	At this time clustering is a voluntary option under the land-use code. It is not required. Bonus density is intended to incentivize the option in hopes that more will do it. Without a bonus, what would be the best way to incentive? We are open to exploring options with you.
No PRUDs.	Listed.	
More clusters and PRUDs. 10,000 square foot lots or larger.	Listed.	
No more one acre lots. All open space goes to agriculture.	Listed.	

More trails please!!!	Listed.	Where? No additional trails were mapped outside of the specific comments because we need to know where the public supports them.
Seniors opportunity.	Listed.	We would like help understanding this comment. What sort of opportunities should we be exploring?
Like the possibility of clusters.	Listed.	
High density housing is a concern.	Listed.	
Farmers able to develop land.	Listed.	
Like county. Do away with open space.	Listed.	Need a little clarification.