



## **PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**

### **West Side Planning Committee Meeting**

5:00 PM, Tuesday, January 10, 2017  
Room 310, City Conference Room  
351 West Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

## **Agenda**

### **Roll Call**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Staff</b>
David Harding, Council Member and Chair	Clifford Strachan, Council Executive Director
David Knecht, Council Member	David Day, Development Engineering Coordinator
Gary Winterton, Council Member	Greg Beckstrom, Public Works Division Director of Public Services
Kay Van Buren, Council Member	David Walter, Redevelopment Director
Phillip Rash	Elizabeth VanDerwerken, Council Executive Assistant
LaDonn Christianson	
Sara McNamara	
Terry Herbert	
Bill Hulterstrom	
Beth Alligood	
Excused: Shannon Ellsworth	Excused: Community Development staff

**Public Attendees:** Becky Bogdin, Benjamin Allen

### **Approval of Minutes**

- December 20, 2016 West Side Planning Committee Minutes

Bill Hulterstrom moved to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2016 West Side Planning Committee Meeting. Seconded by Kay Van Buren. Approved: 10:0.

### **Policy Choices – Continued**

Council Member David Knecht combed through the language in Provo's Vision 2050 document to aggregate any text relating to planning on the West Side and agricultural uses (see attachment). The committee had been sent this document, along with several others, in the week preceding the meeting for their review and study.

There was some discussion among committee members regarding the nuances and implications of the FEMA Floodplain boundary, definition, and general understanding. The currently adopted FEMA maps are dated 1988, however there have been several non-adopted drafts for future FEMA designations which have been presented in West Side Planning Committee meetings. Committee members had concerns where these two definitions vary, as there are major implications for homeowners who live in areas affected by the change.

It was recommended by staff that in regards to the “FEMA Floodplain,” the Committee stick to the definition as listed in the original FEMA plan used—that is, the meander line which was historically understood to be a problem for farming and development. The legislative intent in any documents referencing FEMA maps was with regards to the current FEMA standard.

The general consensus of the Committee was that Lakeview Parkway does not correspond with the FEMA floodplain designation; the FEMA floodplain designation line extends further to the north side of the Parkway. Engineering staff reiterated that Lakeview Parkway was not designed as dike, nor should it be treated as such.

Previously as a City, policymakers chose the FEMA map as the line in the sand. FEMA has not made any determination about development; this was City policy. Typically the Title Report, mortgage issuer, and/or insurance company will document when a property is located in a flood plain (“in a floodplain” refers to a federally designated floodplain by the FEMA 1988 standard). David Day, Development Engineering Coordinator, indicated that the Compromise line is a better standard [than the meander line] since this refers to a specific elevation.

The discussion turned briefly to issues with lake water versus ground water. Council Member Kay Van Buren indicated that ground water and lake water are not the same thing in the context of these definitions. As a builder, Mr. Van Buren has had issues with groundwater in the Grandview and Riverwood areas; it is not only the West Side which may experience issues with flooding. Bill Hulterstom explained there are water pumps at the temple, at the hospital, etc.; this is a common problem wherever development and building is occurring. David Day explained that the minimum finished floor elevation is 4496 feet for building permits that the Engineering Department approves. The compromise line is at 4495 feet, which means the habitable area is a foot above the flood line.

Council Member and Committee Chair David Harding next presented a document titled “West Side Objectives,” which originated with Community Development and listed proposed policies for discussion (see attachment). The Committee reviewed the document, made some edits, and discussed its contents. Some highlights of the discussion points are listed below:

- Proposed purpose: Support farmers to be able to work the land as long as they desire and enable smart, sustainable, quality development if and when they choose to stop.
- Bill Hulterstom thinks that conceptually, this is something that the Committee is willing to support.
- “Quality development” includes things like open space, commercial retail development, etc.
- What does ‘support’ mean in the context of this statement of purpose?
- [Provo City Code Chapter 14.08 – A1 Agricultural Zone](#)
  - The purpose and objectives of supporting agriculture are already laid out in the General Plan—there is a desire to continue this, but this purpose statement expands the idea to include the notion that the farmers have agency in how long they want to farm the land. This proscribes a logical progression of development and makes it clear that we’re not pushing people out, but

planning for when that land may be converted, to ensure that it experiences quality development.

- Mr. Knecht's constituents have voiced that it is very valuable to them to preserve agriculture. They felt as strongly about agriculture on the West Side as most Provo residents felt about Rock Canyon as a community asset.

Committee members were asked whether there is a good sense of the percentage of produce sold at local farmers markets which is grown in/from Provo. The agricultural homeland of this area is Utah County and beyond; there are major farmers markets in Salt Lake City and farms throughout Utah and Salt Lake Counties. Beth Alligood shared some information regarding the last dairy farm in Provo, which just sold their herd; she wondered whether this plan is intended for the next 5 years or the next 50 years. The tradeoffs of agricultural land for open space is an interesting tradeoff, which can take a lot of funding, but Mr. Hulterstrom observed that the hierarchy is the Committee cares about agriculture, and agriculture plays into the Committee's priority of preserving open space.

The Committee continued review of the West Side Objectives document.

1. Preserve Agricultural Heritage and Support Agriculture
  - a. Item A: Agricultural Commission officially recognized by the City Council – codified as a commission, they would be a recommending body researching specific issues, tools, and policies to present to the Council. The Commission would liaise between farmers and the Council to promote and advocate agriculture. Items B. and C. would be a subset of Item A. as instructions to the Commission.
  - b. Item G: Establish a Provo City Farmland Trust Fund
    - i. Council Member Kay Van Buren questioned the structure of this fund; another Committee member posed the Covey Center Fund as an example, but Mr. Van Buren took issue with the comparison as the Arts Council doesn't deal with land use issues.
    - ii. Would the fund be city-controlled or otherwise?
    - iii. This may need more detail/research as far as policy recommendation from Community Development to the Council.
2. Preserve and Create Quality Usable Open Space
  - a. Areas to consider: natural areas, developed parks, agri-tourism, agricultural fields, neighborhood open space; these are things we want to support and protect.
  - b. The Committee discussed the notion of "usable" open space, which took them back to what is the purpose of agricultural preservation.
    - i. Agricultural fields are one type of open space, but some Committee members contested whether they can be considered "usable"; agricultural land is usable to its owner or the farmer, but it is not publicly usable, like a park or recreation space, other than to provide ambience.
3. Require Healthy Residential Development Patterns
  - a. The Committee continued discussion of multifamily housing.
  - b. Ms. Alligood cited Alpine Village as a development where mixed use has not worked. Other Committee members and staff acknowledged this observation, but

coupled it with their view that the policy should not preclude having this kind of stacked housing; it should simply be more dependent on the market demands, zoning, specific location, etc.

- c. Phillip Rash said that new housing should not just fit in, but enhance the surrounding area – that is how you maintain the existing housing stock. Alan Prince’s project enhances the area in Mr. Rash’s opinion.
  - d. Item D: Housing types should be mixed without barriers—this item needs clarification. Discussion of the Committee led to a consensus that the overall principle is to maintain connectivity. As stated, having neighboring housing types with no barriers would prohibit homeowners from placing fencing.
  - e. It’s very difficult for a developer to build so much variety into one small area.
  - f. Item F is difficult to state and qualify – this may need more direction or clarification from Community Development. With whichever kind of housing model the Committee leans toward, you still have to find someone willing to build it (e.g., John Dester became the spokesperson of pocket neighborhoods).
  - g. Daybreak is an interesting case study in which there was one developer but multiple builders. There’s a lot to learn from Daybreak and the concept.
  - h. Chair Harding shared a graphic displaying diversity within a block (see attachment) to illustrate some of these principles and policy directions.
  - i. Item F needs more discussion in the future.
4. Section 5 – Create a Robust Transportation Network
- a. In the Downtown area, blocks are roughly 4 acres. This plan calls for 10 acre blocks, which is closer to Salt Lake. Perhaps inside the block, there might be smaller roads which make more sense for the development.
  - b. Mr. Hulterstrom doesn’t love the use of the grid system in newer neighborhoods.
  - c. Mr. Knecht likes the grid systems of Joaquin and Maeser because there are lots of ways to get where you’re going.
  - d. Daybreak is 4000 acres. There may be helpful illustrations of similar concepts in this development, such as breaking up some of the area into 10 acre blocks, then have smaller roads within the block.

The Committee will further review these documents individually, and staff will look into using the Open City Hall tool to enable working on it as a group.

## **Adjournment**

Beth Alligood moved to adjourn. Seconded by David Knecht. Approved by unanimous consent.

Next Meeting:            January 24, 2017 at 5:00 PM



# Diversity within the block





When the West Side Planning Committee started our work, we had no relevant information to work with in determining what our policy should be regarding Agricultural Preservation. I left our last meeting with the impression that the future of Agriculture is not addressed in our General Plan. I therefore decided to do some research.(I highlighted with blue anything that is not found in our City documents.)

What does our General Plan say about the future of Agriculture in Provo ?

The following are relevant passages regarding growth and agriculture on the West Side.

## Chapter Six Land Use

### Purpose

The Land Use Element establishes policies regarding urban growth, annexation, General Plan Map designations, and key land use policies for individual neighborhoods and groups of neighborhoods within Area Councils. The Land Use section is organized:

- to plan for sufficient land for residential, industrial, commercial and public uses;
- to appropriately locate land uses in order to enhance community character;
- to preserve important natural resources and sensitive lands; and
- to enable the City to efficiently ensure that adequate municipal services are provided.

The City must balance demands for development of privately owned land and cost efficiency in meeting the needs of developed land for water, sewer, storm drainage, flood protection, fire protection, police services, street construction and maintenance, and other aspects of public support for the City's residents and businesses. In-fill development may be more timely and appropriate, in comparison to developing new areas and converting agricultural lands to new residential development, in order to provide for logical growth of the built environment and control of costs to taxpayers for expansion of municipal services. In Provo, those constraints on new growth are important on the mountainous bench areas to the east and on the agricultural lands of west Provo.

The natural boundary to urban growth on the west side corresponds roughly with the Federal

Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) definition of the "AE" flood zone, as defined on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

To be a truly "sustainable community," the demands on our natural and man-made resources should be in balance with the ability of those resources to be replenished. This does not mean that the City needs to create some kind of closed or self-sufficient ecological system. It does mean that the City needs to wisely use the resources it has, conserving where necessary and replenishing where possible. Having a strong agricultural base may become extremely important to the city if normal inter-urban or interstate lines of transportation are disrupted, if weather conditions adversely affect major agricultural suppliers, or if the supply of fossil fuels is suddenly disrupted.

The protection of some rural, natural, and even "wild" places in urban areas is something Provo's residents seek, almost as a refuge from the urbanization taking place all around us. Many communities that have set out to preserve significant open spaces on their periphery, and to guide development into more compact urban corridors, have found that their communities have become even more attractive places to live and work. Many high-tech companies gravitate to those types of communities for the quality of life.

#### Southwest Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

3. Restrict the conversion of agricultural lands to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Residential (R) area is developed in order to provide logical sequencing of development where infrastructure is available to support increased density and to avoid leap-frog development.
5. Development of wetlands and flood plain south of the Utah Lake meander line should be prohibited or restricted, subject to studies of potential wetlands, flood plains or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or by any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
7. It is the intent of the City to update these master plans in the near future. No development (including annexation, preliminary plan approval, rezoning, etc.) should occur in areas where development will place a burden upon Provo City and the ability to service the areas, and the City should process requests for additional development west of I-15 only after the City Public Works Department confirms that the street and public utility systems can comfortably absorb the additional development.

Fort Utah Neighborhood

4. The area bounded by Center Street and the Provo River, west of the Lakeside Village Subdivision, within the Residential (R) designation of the Fort Utah Neighborhood, should develop as one-family detached homes with lot sizes of one-half acre or greater, and may include limited animal rights.....

#### Lakewood

b. The collector road system should seek to make minimal impacts on existing farming/agricultural properties.

4. New development should be appropriately incorporated to respect the rural feel of the Lakewood area, to complement and enhance the neighborhood, and to provide adequate living space for growing families that wish to relocate to or remain within the Lakewood neighborhood.

#### Provo Bay Neighborhood

Goals of the Provo Bay Neighborhood:

1. Preserve the current open feel of the neighborhood. New development should always enhance not detract from the neighborhood.

#### Key Land Use Policies – Provo Bay Neighborhood

2. Discourage residential development west of 3110 West to avoid airport flight paths and the airport protection area, as identified in the Airport Master Plan (Appendix B-1).

#### Sunset Neighborhood

2 b. Those currently wishing to maintain animal rights should do so through the application of a Residential Agricultural (RA) zone on their property.

#### The Character of the Community

The character of Provo City consists of agricultural, residential, commercial, public/institutional, and industrial land uses. Annexation proposals should be evaluated based upon the compatibility of the proposed land use with the character of the overall surrounding neighborhood and city.

#### Chapter 9 Environment



## Flood Insurance Study

A flood insurance study for the city has been developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The study includes flood insurance rate maps that identify areas of the city subject to flooding during 100 year flood episodes. Land use policies should discourage dense development in flood hazard areas.

The following excerpts come from the Airport Master Plan:

### Land Use Around the Airport

The area north of the airport is primarily farming, scattered residential and the Utah Lake State Park. Current land use plans include continued and additional land use in this manner.

Recommendations To maintain compatible land use around the Provo Airport:

It is recommended that a buffer zone be created that precludes a higher level of residential use than what is there today. The plan refers to this as "Land Use Protection Area". Its intent is only to prevent rezoning to a higher level of residential use. Rezoning of the property could be accomplished if the land owner petitions the City and the proposed land use is compatible with Airport operations, such as commercial or industrial zoning. If the owners wish to continue to use the land for agricultural purposes, they would not interfere with any of the operations of the Airport. If they wish to sell, the City will make arrangements to purchase it at fair market value.

From the newly proposed Vision 2050

### Section 4 Natural Resources

Objective 4.1.5 Identify and evaluate the urban forest and habitat areas within the city and develop policies and ordinances that would protect plant life, encourage planting, maintain a green belt and preserve habitats for wildlife; and

Objective 4.1.6 Evaluate open spaces in the community and recommend policies and ordinances that would protect and enhance green belts and open space.

As per Wikipedia:

"A green belt or greenbelt is a policy and land use designation used in land use planning to retain areas of largely undeveloped, wild, or agricultural land surrounding or neighboring urban areas."

Hopefully the reference to Green Belt in our Vision 2050 is a reflection of our General Plan that calls for Agricultural uses to be part of our future.

## Section 5 Heritage

Provo City's sense of place and community identity is enhanced by the continual preservation of the city's unique historical and cultural resources. Provo residents and visitors have the opportunity to become aware of the city's heritage through the preservation of its historic structures and sites.

It would be nice if we included our farming heritage in our Vision for 2050. Certainly Murray takes their farming heritage seriously.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry\\_J.\\_Wheeler\\_Farm](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_J._Wheeler_Farm)

The Henry J. Wheeler Farm is one of the few remaining late 19th century farmsteads in the Salt Lake Valley that have not been lost to expanding housing developments of metropolitan Salt Lake City.

# Southwest Provo Area Plan Goals and Objectives

Purpose: Support farmers to be able to work the land as long as they desire and enable smart, sustainable, quality development if and when they choose to stop.

1. Preserve Agricultural Heritage and Support Agriculture
  - a. Approve the creation of a Provo Agricultural Commission to support local commercial and non-commercial agriculture.
  - b. Work with the Provo Agricultural Commission to remove obstacles and impediments to the success of current and prospective farmers and to explore micro-farming and other ways to increase agricultural viability.
  - c. Work with the Provo Agricultural Commission to explore tools for agricultural preservation including Conservation Easements, Transfers of Development, Community Land Trust, and Utah County's "Agricultural Protection" Program.
  - d. Encourage the productivity of agricultural land, particularly if any public subsidy is being used on the land.
  - e. Support Agriculturally Oriented Development and Agritourism.
  - f. Encourage our state lawmakers to add money to the LeRay McAllister Fund. (This fund is dedicated to purchasing easements for the preservation of farming.)
  - g. Establish a Provo City Farmland Trust Fund. (Money contributed/donated to this fund by private citizens can be matched by those offered by State and Federal programs.)
2. Preserve and Create Quality Usable Open Space
  - a. Natural Areas (Provo River, River Delta, Lake Shore, wetlands, boardwalks)
  - b. Developed Parks (neighborhood parks, regional sports park, Provo Beach)
  - c. Agritourism (Corn mazes, Wheeler Farm type parks, Young Living Farm type park, community/school gardens)
  - d. Agricultural Fields
  - e. Neighborhood open space should be an integral part of the neighborhood design.
3. Require Healthy Residential Development Patterns
  - a. Create a mix of housing types to accommodate various stages of life.
  - b. A range of housing types from single-family detached homes to multifamily is acceptable in Southwest Provo;
  - c. The scale and style of residences should fit in with and enhance the surrounding area, regardless of housing type.
  - d. Housing types should be mixed without barriers separating types or densities;

- e. Single-family detached and attached should be the predominant housing type and the use of other types should augment and not detract from the single-family feel of the area.
  - f. Concentrations of housing targeting a particular demographic and blocks of a single housing type should be avoided.
  - g. Design corridors will be used for important corridors in Southwest Provo.
- 4. Allow for Commercial Amenities and Employment Opportunities in Appropriate Locations.
  - a. Regional commercial uses may be located adjacent to the I-15 or within the Airport Related Activities district. (This relates to Objective 1f.)
  - b. Neighborhood and Community Shopping zones may only be located at high-volume intersections; and
  - c. Design, scale and intensity of commercial zones or properties should transition to adjacent residential uses to minimize impact on the residential use;
- 5. Create a Robust Transportation Network
  - a. The planned collector road network will be built as development occurs. No development will interrupt the collector road network.
  - b. Major-local roads will be laid out in a grid pattern to create blocks of roughly 10 acres. If possible, major-local roads will be aligned across collector roads.
  - c. Minor-local roads will be used to provide access within the 10-acre blocks as appropriate for the proposed block development.
  - d. All modes of transportation will be considered in the creation of a “Complete Street” network.
  - e. Corridors will have sufficient right-of-way to accommodate public transit.
- 6. Require Proper Sequencing of Development
  - a. The 10-acre blocks are the smallest unit that will be considered for rezoning.
  - b. All utilities and public infrastructure (sidewalks, curb and gutter, etc) must be installed for the entire block, even if not all of the block is being (re)developed.
  - c. A 10-acre block will only be considered for rezoning if it is adjacent to a non-agriculturally zoned block.