

Preliminary Land Use Concepts Feedback Summary

PAYSON
UTAH



Introduction

On July 29, 2021, the Spring Creek Area Specific Plan Steering Committee met to review five land use concepts developed by Landmark Design and hear preliminary analysis of each concept from representatives of Hansen, Allen and Luce (HAL), Parametrix and Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI). Following the presentation, members of the Steering Committee gave their initial thoughts and ideas to the planning team. It was decided that additional time to review the concepts in detail and provide feedback would be given.

The following is a summary of comments given by the Steering Committee during the July 29th meeting as well as subsequent feedback on the concepts given from **July 30 through August 30, 2021**. It also includes comments by city staff. **Five members** of the Steering Committee sent comments during this period, though one also represented additional family members who own property in the planning area.

General

There was some question about whether the concepts captured the overall vision of the community. Members emphasized that this shouldn't be the same as other development in Payson and should focus on a rural atmosphere with connections to open space, equestrian facilities and larger parcels (2.5 to 5 acres) that allow continued animal rights. There was also concern about whether this planning process would be able ensure the rural character of the area is preserved since other communities like Lindon and Lehi made similar promises only to later give into development pressure. Suggested areas of refinement for all concepts include:

- Limiting development to an average density of one unit per acre
- Encouraging the clustering of residential units in appropriate areas while maintaining a focus on larger lots throughout
- Placing an emphasis of singly family housing while also allowing some attached housing such four-unit single level structures for seniors, etc.
- Discouraging two-story townhomes or multiple story multifamily buildings
- Setting aside at least 200 acres for open space, amenities, recreation and activity centers
- Emphasizing trails and connections for walking, biking and equestrian uses
- Don't extend industrial areas west of Spring Creek

General areas of interest or concern for city staff include:

- The need for ordinances to support the type of development envisioned (cluster, average densities, etc.)
- City acquisition of land for the parks and open space shown in the concepts (zoning and land use tools, land purchases, etc.)

- Larger lots (2-acre) may result in future infill development – how to support large lots while anticipating potential infill (structure placement, maximum setbacks, etc.)
- Appropriate width for Spring Creek corridor and the recommended acreage of proposed parks
- Ensuring development is designed in a way that maintains public access to parks and open space
- Ensuring two-acre lot designation is consistent on each concept (Agricultural/Estates vs. Large-Lot Rural Residential, Estate and Equestrian, etc.)

Equestrian/Event Center

Overall, members of the steering committee supported the idea of centering the area around some sort of equestrian/event center. While the primary vision for this venue is to provide horse-related services and events, members felt the center could also be used for bike events (BMX, skills, etc.), rodeos, high school graduations and other community events. The venue could also serve as a catalyst for attracting related businesses such as a country store or veterinarian office(s).

There was a consensus that the equestrian centers shown in the current concepts were not large enough. Most felt 100 acres was the approximate size for a functioning equestrian center, though some felt it could be slightly smaller. Heber City's equestrian center was offered as an example to research when sizing the center in future concepts.

Committee member also emphasized the need to buffer the equestrian/events center from surrounding residential neighborhoods to lessen the impact from event traffic, noise and lighting. Suggested buffers include parks, trails and open space, commercial and industrial/business park. Members also stressed the need for proper access to a major corridor(s) and the freeway because of the traffic impacts (large trucks/trailers, regional automobile traffic, etc.)

Some members did question the feasibility of an equestrian/event center. Given its total acreage, they felt more density, either in the study area or surrounding areas, may be needed to support it financially. These members stated detailed research and planning was needed to determine its viability and suggested that a "Plan B" for the site be worked into future concepts.

Transportation

Most feedback about transportation was focused on freeway access, particularly for commercial areas and the proposed equestrian/events center. Members felt the capacity of Utah Ave. was limited due to the existing overpass and restraints on the east side of the freeway. They emphasized that route planning should focus on moving traffic to the freeway exits and cautioned that traffic impacts may limit the units that were feasible in the planning area.

Some members also felt that the extension of 800 South was very important and suggested it should be included in all future concept refinements. With the amount of acreage in West Payson, they felt that a major east-west connector is necessary to support long-term growth. There is a recognition, however, that the existing railroad corridor makes this an expensive project that is likely beyond Payson's capability and would require state or federal funding to complete.

The accommodation of cycling in the area was also discussed. This member emphasized that bicycle routes and their connection to community centers and amenities should be considered and included as the concepts are further refined.

Utilities/Infrastructure

There was some concern about using Spring Creek to handle storm water. The concerned committee member felt that stormwater should be required to percolate onsite in all but these most extreme conditions such as 100- and 500-year flood events.

Concept A

The general consensus among committee members was to **eliminate** this option, though some felt some property owners viewed this option as a way to preserve the existing rural character of the area.

Reasons for eliminating this concept include:

- It is not consistent with general plan
- It is not viable from a land use, development and fiscal standpoint
- It is not community based and doesn't contribute to Payson as a whole
- The end result of on-going infill development would likely look more like the developer-driven speculative concept than the rural place that exists now

Concept B

Most committee members liked Concept B as a starting place to be further refined and developed. Those who supported the concept emphasized that they felt it would preserve the area's agricultural feel and provide lots of open space. Suggested areas of refinement include:

- Adding a small neighborhood commercial center to provide local services and add tax base
- Be sure to emphasize areas where animal rights will be preserved
- Limiting industrial uses to lower traffic uses and restrict the use of open freight yards to reduce truck traffic across the railroad crossing at Utah Avenue and avoid potential negative impacts on residential areas
- Properly sizing an equestrian/event center and exploring how the extension of 800 South would impact this facility
- Shifting the pocket of low density around 400 North to smaller lot development or moving industrial to this area and then adding Agricultural/Estate designation around Spring Creek

Areas of concern for city staff include:

- Some concern with how density is distributed:
 - Agricultural/Estate (two-acre lots) are currently located in center blocks with large lots along arterial roads – shouldn't this be the other way around?
 - Low density on perimeter limits growth options for future annexation areas
 - Infill concerns (short-term vs. long-term) in Agricultural/Estate areas

- There is a lack of commercial opportunities west of the railroad tracks because of the lower densities
- Not sure this concept is consistent with general plan as it currently exists

Concept C

Most committee members supported Concept C for further refinement and exploration. Those who liked the concept emphasized that it was logical compromise that allowed property owners who want to develop their land to absorb the cost of improvements while avoiding a developer-driven speculative land use pattern. They also liked the emphasis on large lots (1- to 2-acre) while providing some opportunity for smaller ¼ acre lots. Suggested areas of refinement include:

- Move commercial area to the corner across from the church
- Resizing and relocating the equestrian/event center and exploring how the extension of 800 South would impact this facility
- Reinforce the vision of small neighborhoods with more density around the community center
 - Increase commercial acreage along Utah Ave corridor
 - Concentrate Mixed Density in “center” around community center
- Use a transition between industrial and parks, trails and open space or further define industrial uses to avoid negative impacts on these recreation areas

Areas of concern for city staff include:

- Some concern with how density is distributed
 - Large-Lot Rural Residential Estate and Equestrian (two-acres) are located along main thoroughfares – was this by design to place large lots along the corridor to maintain the agricultural feel?
 - Should these larger lots be encouraged along the Spring Creek corridor?
 - With 4 units/acre (average), do we need to define a “not smaller than” lot size?
 - Infill concerns (short-term vs. long-term) for Large-Lot Rural Residential (two-acre) and Low-Density Rural Development (one-acre)

Concept D

There was support for further refining and developing Concept D among most committee members. Like Concept C, those who supported Concept D felt it was logical compromise that would allow property owners who want to develop their land to absorb the cost of improvements while avoiding a developer-driven speculative land use pattern. They also liked the extension of 800 South, the equestrian/events center, connected parks, trails and open space systems, opportunity for commercial development and the mixture of densities. However, members questioned if multifamily development is appropriate as it does not fit the vision of the General Plan and may impact the viewshed. There was also some apprehension about a major east-west corridor being placed along existing homesteads (the exact location was not specified). Suggested areas of refinement include:

- Moving or adding a commercial center to the intersection of 5600 W. and 200 S.
- Consider placing density along the thoroughfares and near community/commercial center

- Properly sizing an equestrian/event center and exploring how the extension of 800 South would impact this facility
- If 800 South extends to this planning area, moving the commercial and equestrian/event center along 790 S. where there is access to the freeway and S-1 zone amenities on the east of the freeway
- Providing an alternate plan with different locations for equestrian/event center and commercial area(s) depending on the extension of 800 South
- Placing two-acre lots near equestrian/events center, parks and open space
- Reducing two-acre lot areas and replace with areas with 4 units/acre while reducing areas 8 units/acre
- Limiting industrial uses to lower traffic uses and restrict the use of open freight yards to reduce truck traffic across the railroad crossing at Utah Avenue and avoid potential negative impacts on residential areas

Areas of concern for city staff include:

- Concern about increased traffic on Utah Avenue from the equestrian/events center and the fact that is not a direct route for visitors
- There is a need for tools to allow average density, conservation subdivisions, etc. and staff is open to recommendations
- What are the average lots sizes? Is there a “not smaller than” provision?
- This plan could include attached housing such as townhomes. Does the community anticipate attached housing in this area? The General Plan would suggest no.
- Is the concept consistent with densities in the General Plan?

Concept E

Committee members supported **eliminating** this concept. Reasons for elimination of this concept include:

- It is not consistent with the General Plan and does not meet vision shared by the City Council and Planning Commission.
- There are issues with freeway access and Utah Avenue alone will not support the traffic generated by this concept.
- There is not enough parks and open space for a higher density land use concept.