

SOUTH WEBER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 9 July 2026

TIME COMMENCED: 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: South Weber City Office at 1600 East South Weber Drive,
South Weber, UT

Meeting streamed on YouTube on 9 July 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSIONERS:

**Brad Dopp
Julie Losee
Marty McFadden
Chris Roberts
Chad Skola (excused)**

DEPUTY RECORDER:

Raelyn Boman

CITY ENGINEER:

Brandon Jones

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER:

Lance Evans

INTERN:

Celeste Wu

Minutes: Michelle Clark

ATTENDEES: Paul Sturm, Tim Hall, and Christine Hall.

Commissioner Losee called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

1. Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner McFadden

2. Public Comment: Commissioner Skola opened the floor for public comment and reminded those in attendance of the following guidelines:

- Each speaker must go to the podium to comment.
- State your name and city of residence.
- Please address your comments to the entire Planning Commission.
- Each speaker will have 3 minutes or less to speak.
- Note the Planning Commission will not be entering into a dialogue during this portion of the meeting.
- Individuals not at the podium should refrain from speaking.

Commissioner Losee closed the floor for public comments.

ACTION ITEMS:

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

- **June 11, 2026 Minutes**

Commissioner Roberts moved to approve the minutes of 11 June 2026 as amend the minutes to include Community Development Manager Lance Evans attachment addendum and noting any reference to road to Layton to be South Weber north or south entrance. Commissioner McFadden seconded the motion. Commissioner Losee called for the vote. Commissioners Dopp, Losee, McFadden, and Roberts voted aye. The motion carried.

4. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an External Accessory Dwelling Unit (EADU) on 0.413 acres at 1974 E 7775 South. The property is zoned R-L (Residential Low Zone) and allows External Accessory Dwelling Units as per the Land Use Matrix. The proposal is for one 1,062 square foot residential building for use as an accessory dwelling unit.

Community Development Manager Lance Evans explained the proposed building is 1,062 square feet, single-story two bedroom home. The applicant has responded to each of the city code requirements and standards as stated in Chapter 10 of the City Code in the application in addition to the civil plans. An EADU requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the R-L Zone. Staff have reviewed the application with the city code requirements for EADUs and recommend approval with the condition that a parking space be installed to the side or rear of the primary building. Commissioner Dopp parking space must adhere to city code for hard surface cement or asphalt. Commissioner Losee appreciated that the EADU is centered in the backyard. Commissioner McFadden expressed this is an appropriate use for the property. It was noted the meeting packet states “Quirarte South Weber Tire and Service Center” and should be removed as the EADU will not be a tire and service center.

Commissioner McFadden moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a 1,062 square foot External Accessory Dwelling Unit (EADU) on 0.413 acres at 1974 E 7775 South with the following conditions:

- 1. A hard surface cement or asphalt parking space be installed to the side or rear of the primary building.**

Commissioner Dopp seconded the motion. Commissioner Losee called for the vote. Commissioners Dopp, Losee, McFadden, and Roberts voted aye. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:**5. General plan discussion**

Community Development Manager Lance Evans explained the purpose of tonight's discussion is to review and discuss potential amendments to the South Weber City General Plan. As the city's long-range policy document, the General Plan provides guidance for future land use, transportation, infrastructure, economic development, parks and recreation, and other community priorities. This work session is intended to identify areas where updates may be needed to reflect changes in state law, community needs, and city priorities. The Planning Commission's discussion and feedback will help establish the scope and direction of any proposed amendments before draft revisions are prepared for future public review and consideration.

Amendment/ Issue areas:

1. Amend Projected Land Use Map R-P clouds Delete the R-P clouds for 25.3 acres with the R-P Cloud on the Projected Land Use Map. (The Planning Commission agreed to allow City Engineer Brandon Jones to update the projected land use maps).

2. Annexation

A. South Bench (Evergreen/ Barlow Properties)

- ◆ Does SWC want to expand?
- ◆ What land uses and controls would the city need to put in place?
- ◆ Study - City utility costs, viability, land uses

Commissioner Roberts asked whether there would be any advantage to the city acquiring the property located on the south bench. He questioned whether obtaining it before Layton could provide South Weber with greater influence over future transportation planning, particularly regarding a potential north-south road. At the same time, he expressed uncertainty about whether the city would be able to do anything with the property, indicating he was unsure if pursuing control of it would provide any practical benefit. Commissioner McFadden said there could be strategic value in annexing the property because it might support future north-south transportation access. He explained that potential options could include either a standard public road or a toll road, noting that a city cannot operate a toll road without authorization from the Utah Department of Transportation, although a private company could manage one with the appropriate approvals. He suggested annexation could create opportunities for cross-access agreements that would facilitate a future roadway while minimizing impacts on residential neighborhoods. Mr. Evans said he has reached out to the Davis County Economic Development and the Northern Utah Economic Alliance to schedule a meeting. He explained that

these organizations are experts in economic development and market conditions and will help evaluate South Weber's opportunities for generating economic growth. Their discussion will focus on the viability of annexing the property, including the potential benefits, drawbacks, and overall feasibility of pursuing annexation. Commissioner Losee asked if there have been discussions with Evergreen/Barlow Properties to see if they have any interest in being annexed. Mr. Evans said there is still interest from a potential party that may eventually submit a proposal, although similar intentions had been expressed previously without action. He described the situation as both a potential opportunity and a threat in a SWOT analysis, depending on the city's long-term goals. Evans said evaluating the costs, benefits, and tradeoffs of annexation is important because, if the city annexes the property, it will have greater control over its future use and could potentially realize benefits. If not, others may ultimately determine how the property is connected and developed. Commissioner Losee cautioned against allowing the annexation discussion to become focused solely on transportation connections. She noted that previous studies, reports, and data have already raised concerns about the viability of one commonly discussed route. Instead, she encouraged exploring other access opportunities and connection points that could make annexation feasible, rather than limiting the discussion to past transportation proposals.

3. Review/Update Transportation Map

A. Staff review and present options

- ◆ 'S' Curve

- ◆ 475 East

B. Road to Layton

Commissioner Losee recommended ensuring that maps include all roads from approved developments, so they accurately reflect new and future connection points. She noted that incorporating these approved roads would provide a more complete picture of potential transportation connections. The Commission agreed to revise agenda item B. to use broader language, replacing the specific reference to north-south access with "transportation connections." Members felt the new wording better reflects an open discussion of all potential transportation and access options throughout the city, rather than focusing on a single corridor or predetermined route.

4. Central Park/ Future Downtown

What is the vision for the area?

What are the needs that can be met? What land use options for uses?

- ◆ Master Plan/ Small Area Plan for small commercial uses and a residential hub that transitions to the surrounding land uses.

- ◆ Aesthetic Options – look at other city core areas for possible building design and features

◆ Create a specific zone for implementation of vision

The Commission discussed the concept of creating a future downtown or city center around Central Park and the fire station, emphasizing the need to clearly define the study area before developing a vision. Members agreed the focus area should generally be bounded by 1250 East, 1375 East, Lester Drive, and South Weber Drive, providing a clear geographic target for future planning.

The discussion centered on developing a master plan and establishing a long-term vision for the area, including the potential to designate it as a Central Business District. Commissioners explained that updating the zoning and future land use designation would provide guidance for future development and redevelopment, ensuring new projects support the city's downtown vision rather than allowing incompatible uses that could remain for decades.

Staff proposed preparing information on commercial viability, opportunities, challenges, and potential zoning amendments for the Commission's review before presenting concepts to the public. The Commission also emphasized the importance of engaging affected property owners early in the process through dedicated meetings, recognizing that their input is critical because they would be directly impacted by any future changes. Commissioners agreed the proposed approach and agenda items were appropriate with the added clarification of the study area.

5. Sensitive Lands Map

Update the area and criteria. Clarify the development standards in these areas.

The Commission discussed whether the General Plan should provide clearer direction for development in sensitive lands areas. One commissioner expressed concern that the current guidance is too vague and has made it difficult to evaluate development proposals and determine appropriate mitigation measures.

Staff explained that the Sensitive Lands Map is intended only to identify whether a property falls within a sensitive area. If it does, developers must provide geotechnical and geological studies prepared by qualified professionals, whose recommendations determine the required mitigation measures. Staff emphasized that the city relies on those professional evaluations but can require an independent third-party review at the developer's expense if additional verification is needed.

The discussion also addressed public concerns about potential development on contaminated or environmentally sensitive properties. Staff noted that the city has a responsibility to protect public health, safety, and welfare but must base its decisions on substantiated evidence rather than unverified claims. Commissioners

agreed that the city has historically made decisions using the best available information while allowing developers to complete the necessary due diligence.

Ultimately, the Commission concluded that this General Plan discussion should remain focused on reviewing and updating the Sensitive Lands Map and its criteria, rather than revising detailed development standards or code requirements. Members agreed that any changes to development regulations should be addressed through a separate code amendment process, while the General Plan review should determine whether the mapped sensitive land areas remain accurate or need to be expanded, reduced, or otherwise updated.

6. 2100 E South Weber Drive

What is the best use for this property balancing community needs, market viability, and property owner desires?

♦ Projected Land Use Map (PLUM): Highway Commercial/ ZONE: CH/ 3 acres

The Commission discussed the large parcel near 2100 East and South Weber Drive, located west of the storage units, east of the apartments, and south of the residential area along the bluff. The discussion focused on the property's future land use and whether its current Commercial Highway designation remains appropriate. Commissioners noted that the property is already zoned commercial, and the key question for the General Plan update is whether the city wants to continue supporting commercial development in that area or consider other future uses. One concern raised was whether the current Commercial Highway zoning allows uses that residents may not want in that location, but staff clarified that reviewing permitted uses would be more of a zoning code discussion rather than a General Plan amendment. The group discussed challenges with the property, particularly access. Because Utah Department of Transportation is unlikely to approve direct access from South Weber Drive and the hillside creates significant development challenges, commissioners felt access limitations may naturally restrict what can be built there. Potential past proposals, including an ice cream shop and other uses, were discussed, but access remained the primary obstacle. Commissioners also discussed the nearby storage unit property and the possibility that future changes, such as expansion or redevelopment, could affect the area. Staff noted that the storage facility owners have been working cooperatively with the city but have experienced issues with blowing sand impacting their business.

The Commission ultimately decided to keep this item on the General Plan discussion list but narrowed the focus to whether the future land use designation should remain Commercial Highway or whether another designation, such as residential or another use, should be considered. The purpose is not to redesign the property now, but to determine the long-term vision for the area.

7. Gravel Pit

- A. Development timeline – over 20 years.
- B. Determine future uses via market and needs analysis.

The Commission discussed the future of the South Weber gravel pit area and whether it should be the focus of the current General Plan update. The property is still actively used for gravel operations, and staff noted the operators are likely to have many years of remaining use. Some commissioners questioned whether it was practical to spend significant time studying future uses when development may not occur for decades. Others emphasized that the gravel pit is a major community priority and that the General Plan provides an opportunity to establish a long-term vision before redevelopment occurs. It was noted that the property owners may be open to future discussions, and creating a city vision could help guide potential redevelopment opportunities when the time comes. The Commission discussed whether the area could eventually become a master-planned community, with possibilities such as residential, commercial, recreation, trails, or other mixed uses. Members suggested gathering community input through an open house exercise where residents could identify preferred future uses through interactive tools such as maps, stickers, or voting activities.

The discussion clarified that the purpose would not be to determine immediate development plans but to identify the community's long-term vision and evaluate whether the current Commercial Highway future land use designation remains appropriate. The Commission agreed to keep the item on the list but place it lower in priority and revisit it after addressing other General Plan amendments. Members acknowledged that, even if redevelopment is decades away, establishing a future direction now could help guide decisions when opportunities arise.

8. Entrance to City

- A. Commercial use south of carwash
- B. S-curve uses
- C. 475 East/ Old Fort Road

The Commission discussed Item #8: Entrance to the City, focusing on future commercial uses near 2600 East, the S-curve area, 475 East, and Old Fort Road. They requested clarification on the exact areas being considered and discussed whether the current zoning and future land use designations still reflect the community's desired vision for these gateway areas. Staff explained that the area includes undeveloped property near the S-curve, including land owned by the city, primarily west of South Weber Drive and near the Cedar Cove area. The property is currently designated for commercial use, and the discussion is intended to determine whether that designation remains appropriate or if a different future use should be considered. The Commission noted that this area represents an important entrance into the city and should be evaluated for what type of development would

best serve the community. The discussion also connected to the broader question of whether additional commercial or industrial areas should be considered east of Highway 89, including areas previously identified by city leadership. The Planning Commission agreed this item is worth further discussion to determine the desired long-term character of these gateway areas and whether existing future land use designations align with the city's vision.

The Commission discussed the undeveloped area near 2700 East, south of the car wash and near Maverik. The discussion of potential hotel development in the area and the potential revenue benefits, including transient room taxes generated from hotel stays. Commissioners noted that this conversation ties into the broader need to identify future revenue opportunities for the city and consider how key entry points should be developed. The Commission consensus was that these entrance areas should continue to be envisioned for commercial development rather than residential uses, and the items could remain lower on the priority list for further discussion.

9. Commercial uses east of Highway 89/ future industrial or commercial area?

The Commission discussed an additional undeveloped area identified by Mayor Westbrook, located east of Highway 89 near 2800 East. The property has historically had proposals for development, including a gymnasium or gymnastics facility, but none of the proposals moved forward. Commissioners discussed whether this area should continue to be considered for future development and whether the city's vision for the property remains appropriate. The Commission noted that Mayor Westbrook specifically requested this area be reviewed as part of the General Plan discussion, but there was limited additional information available regarding past proposals or why previous plans did not proceed.

Mr. Evans summarized the Commission's priorities for the General Plan discussion items. He stated that:

1. **Item #1** – Staff will review and make the necessary changes before bringing it back for Commission review.
2. **Item #2 (Annexation)** – Considered a higher-priority discussion item requiring further analysis and follow-up.
3. **Item #3 (Transportation Connections)** – Also a high-priority topic requiring a larger discussion.

4. **Item #4 (Central Core/Future Downtown Area)** – Considered a mid-level priority. The area needs to be better defined, with options and potential planning approaches explored.
5. **Item #5 (Sensitive Lands)** – Staff will review the sensitive lands map for technical updates or boundary changes and provide recommendations; major changes are not anticipated.
6. **Item #6 (2100 East Commercial Area)** – The current commercial designation will remain for now. Future discussion should focus on the long-term vision and viable uses for the area.
7. **Gravel Pits** – Considered a lower-priority item due to the long timeline for potential redevelopment, but it may remain on the list for future discussion.

Mr. Evans noted that the first six items generally fall into similar priority levels, with annexation and transportation connections among the most important topics to address first.

REPORTS:

6. Commission

Commissioner Losee: asked whether the landscaping company operating farther up the road toward Layton had completed the required approvals and requirements. He noted that the business appeared to be operating out of a residential area and suggested confirming whether all necessary conditions had been addressed. Losee indicated that the question could potentially be handled under general discussion. Mr. Evans reported the landscaping company is complying with city requirements and has made significant improvements to clean up the property. He noted that the business has addressed previous concerns and is operating in a more acceptable condition. The discussion briefly shifted to the trout farm and annexation status, with clarification that the area being referenced is south and appears to be within the designated green area.

Commissioner Roberts: raised the idea of improving the 475 East entrance to the city by adding a more welcoming and attractive entry feature, such as signage or landscaping improvements. He suggested a “Welcome to South Weber” type of feature to create a better first impression for visitors entering the city. Roberts acknowledged this could involve additional spending but wanted to discuss whether enhancing city gateways should be a priority or something the city does not pursue. The Commission discussed the possibility of researching options for improving the city entrance appearance, including signage or a landmark feature welcoming visitors to South Weber. The idea was prompted by the earlier discussion about entrance improvements and creating a more attractive first impression. Commissioners referenced existing examples, such as the large flag display at General RV, and noted appreciation for prominent community identity

enhanced or incorporated into a "Welcome to South Weber" feature. The group agreed that staff would research potential options and costs for entrance signage or improvements. The discussion was informal, with members acknowledging the need to balance community enhancements with budget considerations.

7. ADJOURN:

Commissioner McFadden moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 7:25 p.m. Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Dopp, Losee, McFadden, and Roberts voted aye. The motion carried.

APPROVED: Julie Losee Date 8.19.26
Co-Chairperson: Julie Losee

Michelle Clark
Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest: Raelyn Boman
Deputy Recorder: Raelyn Boman