

**Spring Creek Area Specific Plan
Public Open House
September 30, 2021, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Verbatim Comments (Personal Information Redacted)**

PAYSON
UTAH



I like Plan 3 more community parks. If they can move the equestrian center further south maybe it would disturb less people.

-

My idea is to expand the sidewalk on Utah Avenue to Liberty Sake.

-

I don't like the idea of a road going over my new home. I think that it can be done and not impact anyone's house yet.

-

We feel that the plans of progress are not needed. Sure a few major land owners want to sell, but I feel the majority land owners don't. Our firm is a direct effect of any or all of the plans. I don't want the city to take my retirement home that we have worked so hard for. Our "new" home and garage is only 2 years old. Also I don't feel that the city should tell me how many lots I can have on my property, my family wants 1 acre lots for their own farms. I vote "no" on the new developments. I live out in W.M. because I want the space. [NAME REDACTED]

-

6. Take the industrial area around West Glen Estates and make it a community park. *No heavy industrial west of the railroad.

-

1 – Not the industrial.

2- The 10 year plan is going to bring highways around Utah Lake. Why not make the industrial area on the south end of Payson. This would solve two problems 1) congestion – trucks can go around the lake using the main highway without cutting through residential areas. If we tied a main road into the overpass on the south side of Payson, or made a new off ramp / exit that would connect in with the highway around the lake then trucks could access both major roads around the without causing congestion on the roads. 2) There would be fewer residential neighborhoods affected. This would allow industrial growth closer to major road connections and so allow residential housing to grow around industry rather than industry being forced to fit in around residential. Note: In the end growth is coming. We should plan for it. I think for this reason industry should be planned for the south side of Payson so we can connect it with future roads as these road ways are built down along the west and south side of Utah Lake.

-

On Payson's high density projects so far there is not enough open space and too far from any ball fields or parks where kids can play or schools or store. By pre-determining zones you basically are devaluing one are while giving all the value to another. Our property value will go up or down on your whim of ideas and that's not fair. If you put someone in industrial and they are surrounded or across from something that drops their value and then down the street they develop at the most valued all because of zone. The city should not have the power or say. On all three of your plans you have industrial zone surrounding a subdivision of already existing signal family homes. Why not let that area continue with single-family homes when there is already a subdivision there. Payson City already has an industrial area that is not filling in it has un-used buildings now.

-

Why do you have industrial on all of your plans around a residential subdivision which is already there? THAT'S JUST STUPID. You have an industrial park that's 20 years old that is still not full, small business is what's needed.

-

I think that option 2 fits a great balance between keeping the rural theme of Payson and fostering growth that will benefit the community. Ride or Die, 2021. Thank you.

-

High density is needed in the city but should be in the city not west of the freeway, this brings business to the city, high density 3 to 4 miles from the city center and business is an issue. There are no parks, no business in the area of high density, there is nowhere for the youth to go.

[ADDRESS REDACTED] If my property is coming into the city I want it high density because the ground will be worth more. So the city is valuing my ground by what zone it is brought in at. The reason the city wants to allow high density 3 to 4 miles from town is because they are essentially accepting a bribe in the way of sewer water and power ran out there at the developer expense. This is the only way the developer can afford to run it that far. So the city zones it that way so they don't bare any expense.

[NAME REDACTED]

-

If we are going to have parks don't make a bunch of small parks that are expensive to maintain and not of much use. Make a big park that is multi use and cheaper to maintain. Keep low density farther west and high density closer to town. People always think they want to live next to animals until the smells and sounds are revealed. Nothing like baling hay in the middle of the night with lights and noise to build good friendships. Also an average of 4 houses per acre really means a developer will put many more for an increase profit. Make the # precise, 4 houses per acre.

-

Keep rural feeling. Limit dense housing. Follow what neighbors say and not let developers pressure to get bigger money. Statement of vision is to keep area unique. Dense housing does not do that.

-

1) Make sure the Red Dridge development put in the road of the second exit continuing on to the west! That exit needs to connect directly to the west mountain area. This road is a must!

2) None of the plans show this. Move all higher density housing closer to the city. As you go further out the lower density it should get. See map on front.

3) Keep businesses centered around major intersections like 5600 W 10400 S.

4) Get a plan, then force developers to adhere to the plan or a resemblance of the plan.

5) Build a big park out west somewhere with soccer fields, pickle ball courts, etc.

-

I don't like any of this! I have lived here for over 50 years and watched [ILLEGIBLE] as developers have come in and taken over our farm ground to plan houses and Payson City has taken over all water rights. Ask yourselves what will happen when transportation breaks down and people start going hungry and there is no place to grow food to feed them. Keep your ATV Park out of my backyard as well. I shouldn't have to put up with the noise because those who want to ride ATV's don't want them in their yard. I live on that mountain for a reason and it certainly isn't to put up with weak inconsiderate people who think they can do anything they want.

-

Payson City assured West Mountain residents that West Mountain would always be a ranchette style space when initial annexation occurred. Now high density housing! I initially moved here from high density housing for health reasons as did other residents. When will that be addressed?

-

My opinion is 5.25 lots. We didn't move out to the country to be in the city.

-

We live across the street from [ADDRESS REDACTED] and as we look at the "Study Area Boundary" we wonder why the line goes thru the middle of our property rather than at the north end of the property line? Also what happened to our lake? [NAME REDACTED]

-

I don't know why we need commercial lot out in the W. M. area – that doesn't make sense. Also we would like to be able to develop our land, but do not want to see high density housing (4/acre or more). We would like to see the rural feel of the area preserved with no smaller than 2 are lots or possibly one acre areas with animal rights. Also we would like to include the land we own including our pond in our development and not as a "public park". We favored plan "B" but proposal I has so many changes that we can't really get behind it. Commercial area across the street, equestrian park next to our property. Also we would probably want all of our land in the "study area" rather than being cut in half.

-

The creek that you show starting on the south side of the road at 5123 W 10400 S does not start until the Laney pond. Why is the equestrian area so large it seems a great waste of land?

-

[NAME AND ADDRESS REDACTED] We are not happy with any of the proposal, with what you have planned. We are interested in low density single dwelling on 2 acres. We are not interested in equestrian or commercial – too much space for equestrian.

-

For every mile of 4 lane highway you are looking at about \$6-\$10 million dollars of cost per mile. Why not connect into the highway coming around Utah Lake by putting the industry on the south end of Payson. This means less traffic in the middle of Payson and keeps traffic closer to the main highway and saves on the size of roads that need to be built.

-

- 1) Road extension over 800 would be good for traffic and safety.
- 2) Industrial area should be moved close to the freeway. Not to the areas noted. (West Mountain) No to industrial expansion west of current area, west of railroad tracks.
- 3) All West Mountain Area should be maintained as a rural low density housing area – ½ acre lots.
- 4) Expansion of industrial area will drop property values of current residents.
- 5) Any industrial area of West Mountain should be light industrial only. Rezone to light now.
- 6) All these areas should be not smaller than half acre lots.
- 7) There should be "open space" between any industrial area and residential properties. Create a buffer zone around industrial and Business Park.
- 8) All West Mountain west of railroad should be residential.
- 9) Spring Creek should be protected in open space with industrial area kept away from the creek area.
- 10) Commercial and industrial should all be located close to the freeway for easy access of trucking north residential areas.

-

I pick "A" that was removed. If I had to pick something else it would be 1. No to annex into Payson City. I know a developer is saying they will pay for infrastructure but there is no money in infrastructure. Money is in housing and development, all plans effect our livelihood. More cars – more accidents. 170 accidents on the major road from 2005 -2021, 4 deaths. High percentage of accidents with injury. Taresa Hiatt should not be on city council, she is benefitting from all these plans.

-

300 North has a ditch from SR 198 to Barnett Elementary, cars have got stuck in that ditch. My neighbor has a lot of complaints about it. This is a trip hazard for residents as well.

-

Can the [NAME REDACTED]'s and the [NAME REDACTED]'s pay for the sewer and water to make this work. It appears that they want the high density. The other high density you show isn't in the city yet, and may not ever be. We don't want to be in the city. We don't want to lose greenbelt status.

-

Concept 3 is the WORSE! The higher density housing and major roads don't make sense for a rural community. Concept 1 is feasible. However, I do not agree with the 4 unites / acre. 1 unit per 1 acre up to 4 acres would be considered agricultural/rural. I live in a rural area so I feel comfortable with my kids playing in the yard. Bringing multiple parks to the area doesn't make sense for families such as ours. Farm work is our way of life.

-

I want a trail system instead of an equestrian center.

-

Taresa Hiatt should recuse herself as she stands to make considerable financial gain if any of these plans are adopted. There are not any access roads that can handle increase of traffic. Payson City does not provide enough support to make this enticing. Payson requires the home owner to do all improvements before any work can be approved. Commercial on the concept makes it impossible for the current property owner to sell their land as anything other than commercial. Same with future industrial. What happens to home owner's who's current property is in proposed park areas, who is going to purchase their property and how do the homeowner's make a profit. Proposed roads take out current homes. You can't farm on only two acres as part of it would be a home. Would there be any incentive to someone who wanted to keep farming? For people in the planned area, can they keep farming or do they have to forfeit their land for the proposed roads.