**Development Services Department**

|  |
| --- |
| **Hiatt Creek Master Plan Zone Change Request:** Tyler Horan on behalf of White Horse Land LLC is requesting an amendment to Payson City Zone Map. The amendment seeks to add density to several parcels of land in the South Meadows Plan area. See the applicant request below for all the requested changes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  Tyler Horan  White Horse Land LLC  **Staff Coordinator:**  Michael Bryant  **Citywide Application:**  Zone Change Requests for  RMF-10  R-1-7.5  **Commission/Council Action Required:**  Yes  **Alternative Actions:**   1. Approval of the request for changes 2. Deny the requested zone changes 3. Table the request with guidance to the applicant and staff regarding what additional information the city council would like to see. | **Relevant History:** The South Meadows Area Specific Plan was adopted in January of 2016. It was developed after construction of the Payson, Utah LDS temple and because of the area’s proximity to the 800 South interchange, the Walmart commercial center, the Payson Business Park and with the idea in mind that a higher educational facility was being sought for the community.  Development has begun to happen on the west side of I-15 including infrastructure and buildings in the Redbridge Development. Primarily Ridge Stone Condominiums, Payson Point Apartments and the MTEC Campus. This zone change will add to the density near the Redbridge Development and complement that area (the requested RMF-10 zone change). Additionally, this request would provide detached single-family homes in the southernmost portion of the South Meadows plan area (the requested R-1-7.5 zone change).  On December 10th, 2025, a public hearing was held with the planning commission on this request. The planning commission voted with a positive recommendation to approve the RMF-10 zone change request in this proposal with unanimous approval. Alternatively, the planning commission voted to deviate from the applicants request of R-1-7.5 Residential Zone instead be the R-1-10 Residential Zone, siting that the R-1-10 Residential Zone would better meet the intent of the South Meadows Area Specific Plan. This alternative motion carried unanimously. |
| **Applicant Request:** Refer to Attachment #1 Zone Change Request for more detail   * RMF-10 Multi-Family Residential Zone: for portions of Utah County Parcels #29:023:0030 and #29:023:0023 * R-1-7.5 Residential Zone: for the following Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004 |
| **Development Review Committee Concerns:** In discussion with the applicant and various departments of the city three major concerns were regularly raised.   1. ***Traffic.*** Traffic along the 800 S. corridor is already at an F during peak traffic times. With the entitled density for the Red Bridge Development (1240 dwelling units), the MTEC campus, future commercial development, the Payson Business Park and the area detailed in the current South Meadows Specific Area plan traffic volume and wait times will only increase. 2. ***Public Open Space.*** The west side of Payson until recently had very little development. As a result, very little useable public open space exists. With development occurring in this area parks and open space will be needed. 3. ***Utilities.*** There is a need for additional utilities and increased utility capacity within the area. |
| **Summary of Key Issues:**   * In general, staff is agreeable the zone change request for RMF-10 zoning on parcels #29:023:0030 and #29:023:0023 as shown in Attachment 1 Zone Change Request. This will bring increased population and traffic to the area. However, this change is in line with the South Meadows Specific Area Plan. * Staff are not fully in support of the R-1-7.5 zone change request because staff feels as if the request does not meet the intent of the South Meadows Specific Area Plan for a density of 4 units/acre. Staff feel that this density should be closer to 9,000 or 10,000 square foot lots, of which the South Meadows Area Specific Plan infers in the text of the plan and on the map identifying 4 units/acre. * Transportation and adequate road networks are currently very limited in this area for the anticipated growth. With a zone change and further development some of these concerns will be alleviated but transportation concerns will still exist due to the increased density and inadequate transportation facilities currently in place. Some of the only ways to address this issue, however, is through development. The planning commission and city council will have to determine if the zone changes are timely to expect this development and added transportation impact. * 1950 W. and 1700 W. are the primary north/south roads, and both are undersized for the transportation needs of the area. 1950 W. has areas that do not connect which adds to the transportation difficulties of the area. * 800 S. and 1130 S. are the only east/west roads, and both are undersized for transportation needs. * The applicant paid for and conducted a traffic study that identifies the related concerns and recommended solutions for the transportation concerns. * The applicant has paid for and completed an inventory of the utilities system and has shown what is needed for additional utilities and increased capacities in the area. Utility infrastructure will have to be improved upon further development of the property. This may be an opportunity for the city to upsize utilities in the area, either by the developer upsizing and being reimbursed through a pioneering agreement or some other mechanism |
| **Staff Comments:**  *Public Works:* **Favorable recommendation.** The applicant has paid for and provided utility infrastructure modeling to increase the capacity for utilities on and off site the proposed properties. Transportation remains a concern that will need to be addressed.  *Police Dept:* **Partial Negative recommendation.** The police department is concerned with current traffic and doesn’t wish to see it increased by an amendment to the plan. Additionally, the police department is not in favor of reduced setbacks as outlined in the draft development agreement.  *Fire Dept:* **Partial Negative recommendation.** While transportation issues are a concern the fire department generally feels that a change to the plan will not burden them significantly. The fire department is not in favor of reduced side setbacks in the draft development agreement. Otherwise, the fire department is in favor of the R-1-7.5 zoning designation request.  *Power Dept:* **Favorable recommendation.** Provided that the Power Department can obtain easements and property to adequately provide power to the area, the department has no further concerns.  *Development Services:* **Partial Negative recommendation.** Planning staff are generally favorable to increased density in the area as described in this zone change request. However, the issue of timing is of most concern to planning staff. Currently the transportation network in the area is not suitable for higher densities. Staff recommend approval of the RMF-10 Zone change as it meets the land use plan of the South Meadows Area Specific Plan. However, planning staff feel that the requested R-1-7.5 Zone change request does not meet the intended density for the area as shown in the South Meadows Area Specific Plan.  Planning staff would support a zone change request for the Utah County Parcels of #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004 to be changed to R-1-10 Residential zone instead of the applicants request for R-1-7.5 Residential Zone. |
| **Staff Recommendation:**  Staff have a positive recommendation for approval of the following requested zone change amendment   1. RMF-10 Multi-Family Residential Zone: for portions of Utah County Parcels #29:023:0030 and #29:023:0023   Staff have a negative recommendation for approval of the following requested zone change amendment   1. R-1-7.5 Residential Zone: for the following Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004   Staff alternatively would give a positive recommendation for approval of the following requested zone change amendment instead of the R-1-7.5, Residential Zone change request.   1. R-1-10 Residential Zone: for the following Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004 |

**OVERVIEW**

The South Meadows Specific Area Plan was adopted in January 2016. Since that time a few amendments have been made to the plan to better reflect the intent for the area and to realize goals identified in the plan for higher education. With the physical barriers to the western portion of the plan area, staff are of the opinion that some added density between the railroad and I-15 Interstate makes sense. The primary concern for realizing this density is timing. Utilities and transportation facilities need to have adequate solutions to address the concerns with additional densities. Future development west of the railroad tracks is naturally prohibitive. For this reason, staff feel that if additional density is warranted, that it should happen to be east of the railroad tracks including in the vicinity identified by the applicant in their amendment request.

The South Meadows Specific Area Plan is an extension of the Payson City General Plan and thus the following has relevance when considering a zone change request.

**GENERAL PLAN RELEVANCE**

The proposed zone change map amendments have relevance to several goals and strategies of the existing General Plan.

* **Goal 2.4** Collaborate with higher educational institutions (UVU and MTEC) to provide workforce housing/student housing and job opportunities (internships)
* **Goal 2.6** Focus development and redevelopment efforts on creating well designed centers, corridors, and connections that link housing, jobs, and services.
* **Goal 7.2** Build vibrant new neighborhoods consistent with the Vision
* **Goal 7.3** Increase housing choice
* **Goal 7.5** Provide a realistic opportunity for the development of moderate-income housing within the next five years to meet the needs of people of various income levels living, working, or desiring to live or work in the community.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS**

1. The area is already planned for higher density surrounding the MTEC campus and the Red Bridge Station Development.
2. The RMF-10 Zone change request is consistent with the South Meadows Specific Area Plan.
3. Physical barriers constrain development to this area without significant additional cost for utilities, road crossings beyond the railroad.
4. Future improvements to 12000 S. and 12400 S. will encourage increased density and development in the region to the south.
5. Transportation access in and through the area is constrained at times. Especially around peak travel times.
6. The southern portion of the South Meadows Specific Area Plan identifies 4 units/acre for development in the area where the applicant is requesting a zone change.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed amendments to the Zoning map will increase current densities and add additional residential homes to the southwestern portion of Payson. While anticipated in the South Meadows Specific Area Plan. Development must happen in a manner that is least impactful to current residents, transportation systems and utilities.

Before approving a zone change, the City Council shall determine whether such change is in the interest of the public and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Payson City General Plan. The City Council should also take under consideration the recommendations of Staff and the Planning Commission. The following guidelines shall be used to determine consistency with the General Plan: **(responses in bold)**

* Public purpose for the zone changes in question.

**These zoning changes will add to the overall density of the South Meadows area. They will bring additional residential housing opportunities to Payson City and bring additional residents to support higher education and commercial businesses.**

* Confirmation that the public process is best served by the zone changes in question.

**The proposed zoning amendment will bring additional housing choices to the area and help to support additional growth and development of higher education and commercial businesses.**

* Compatibility of the proposed zone changes with General Plan policies, goals and objectives.

**The proposed amendments advance the goals, policies and strategies of the General Plan, especially related to housing. By increasing density in this area, it helps to achieve the General Plan goals noted above in the General Plan Relevance section of this report. Staff’s recommendation for the R-1-10, Residential Zone in the southernmost portion of the South Meadows Specific Area Plan namely Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004 better fits the intent of the plan than the applicant’s request.**

* Consistency of the proposed zone changes with the General Plan “timing and sequencing” provisions on changes of use, in so far as they are articulated.

**Timing is a big concern for this area. It primarily revolves around infrastructure improvements, the transportation network and parks and open space which are all identified as areas of concern within the plan. While an amendment to the zoning map may be reasonable at this time, timing of approval must be considered prior to any subdivisions and commercial development approvals to ensure that the proper infrastructure and roads are available to meet the development’s needs. Parks and open space remain a big concern for the western portion of the South Meadows Area Specific Plan area.**

* Potential of the proposed zone changes to hinder or obstruct attainment of the General Plan’s articulated policies.

**Not Applicable**

* Adverse impacts on adjacent landowners.

**Further development will always have some impact on current landowners. As the area develops people will have to endure the dust and inconveniences of construction nearby. Some people will not be in favor of denser development because it changes the environment around them. However, the city must always balance the property rights of all landowners and ultimately make decisions based on the entire community.**

* Verification of correctness in the original zoning or General Plan for the area in question.

**Not Applicable**

* In cases where conflict arises between the General Plan Map and General Plan Policies, precedence shall be given to the Plan Policies.

**While not interpreted as a conflict, staff are interpreting the South Meadows Specific Area Plan in the following way. Densities of 4 unit/acre, staff interprets as single family dwellings on lots ranging from 9,000 to 10,000 square feet. However, the applicant is requesting in this area the R-1-7.5 Zoning designation which would allow lots as small as 7,500 square feet. The applicant also requests a development agreement to further reduce setbacks and lot sizes within the requested zone.**

**CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

1. **Staff Recommendation:** Staff and the Planning Commission have a positive recommendation for approval of the following requested zone change request
   1. RMF-10 Multi-Family Residential Zone: for portions of Utah County Parcels #29:023:0030 and #29:023:0023
2. As presented by the applicant, staff and the Planning Commission have a negative recommendation for approval of the following requested zone change amendment
   1. R-1-7.5 Residential Zone: for the following Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004.
3. **Staff Recommendation:** Alternatively, staff and the Planning Commission would recommend approval of a zone change as noted below for these parcels instead.
   1. R-1-10, Residential Zone: for the following Utah County Parcels #30:065:0073 and 45:197:0004
4. Alternatively, the City Council may consider approval as presented by the applicant or approval with conditions.
5. Finally, the City Council may deny the requests for the zone changes within the South Meadows area. This motion should state reasons for denial.

**ATTACHMENTS**

* Attachment #1 Zone Change Request
* Attachment #2 Staff Proposed Alternative for a Zone Change
* Attachment #3 South Meadows Land Use Map