

PAYSON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Payson City Center, 439 W Utah Avenue, Payson UT 84651
Wednesday, May 8, 2019 7:00 p.m.

CONDUCTING Kirk Beecher

COMMISSIONERS Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Kathy Marzan, Robert Mills (7:05 p.m.), Tyler Moore

EXCUSED John Cowan

ABSENT Adam Billings

STAFF Jill Spencer, City Planner
Daniel Jensen, Planner II
Kim E. Holindrake, Deputy Recorder/Admin Asst

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the Planning Commission of Payson City, Utah, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Four commissioners present.

3. Invocation/Inspirational Thought

Invocation given by Commissioner Moore.

4. Consent Agenda

4.1 Approval of minutes for the regular meeting of April 24, 2019

MOTION: Commissioner Marzan - To approve the minutes of the regular meeting of April 24, 2019. Motion seconded by Commissioner Frisby. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Robert Mills, Kathy Marzan, Tyler Moore. The motion carried.

5. Public Forum

No public comments.

6. Review Items

6.1 PUBLIC HEARING – Amendments to Title 19, Zoning Ordinance including Appendix A, Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance, and the Payson City Development Guidelines. (7:03 p.m.)

Staff Presentation:

Jill Spencer stated a public hearing was noticed tonight with the intention of having proposed amendments. Tonight will only be a discussion; staff will prepare proposed amendments for the next meeting. She reviewed proposed sections to consider for amendments.

Title 19, Zoning Ordinance

- Floodplain Ordinance – Repeal Section 19.6.23, FP-O Floodplain Overlay Zone, and replace with new Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.
- Average Density Ordinance – Limited to master planned communities. Determine project size. 5 acres? Detached and attached units? Allows development to include a total number of units that matches the base density of the underlying zone. Overall density instead of minimum lot size, lot width, etc. Minimum requirements to use this planning tool may include minimum house size, distinct architecture and housing designs, exterior materials, parking regulations, landscaping standards.
- Modified Setback Requirements – Proposed 20-foot front setback for dwellings along a 66-foot right-of-way.
- Designate “land use authority” and “appeal authority”. Example 1, Legislative – Application Type = Zoning Map Amendment, Land Use Authority = City Council following recommendation from Planning Commission, Appeal Authority = Not required because appeal goes directly to district court. Example 2, Administrative – Application Type = Site Plan, Land Use Authority = Staff, Appeal Authority = City Council.
- BPD Business Park Development Ordinance – Changes to permitted, conditional, and prohibited uses. Setbacks - currently 30-foot front, side and rear; proposed 30-foot front, 10-foot side, 10-foot rear; land use transition requirements; and building and fire code requirements including access around buildings. Increase total area of lot coverage - currently 60 percent, proposed 80 percent. Building design - defining acceptable “architectural features”, providing design requirements for multi-tenant buildings, clarifying use of wainscot for metal wall panels vs. design requirements for architectural metal panels, and storage area and fencing (limit fencing to storage areas, amount of storage area, location of storage).

Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance

- Corridor preservation includes requirements to dedicated additional right-of-way for future roads and increased setbacks to minimize impacts for future road projects.
- Remove duplicate and inconsistent provisions between the Subdivision Ordinance and the Development Guidelines.
- Appeal for terminated projects to include number of days or specify there is no appeal process.
- Amend public facilities report requirements to require applicant to submit payment for modeling services.
- General clean-up including concept plan procedures and review of Equivalent Residential Units (ERU’s), Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC), definitions, and use.

Payson City Development Guidelines – No changes at this time.

Daniel Jensen reviewed additional proposed amendments.

Title 19, Zoning Ordinance

- Sign Ordinance cleanup.

- Setbacks – Double frontage lots to allow accessory structures with regular setbacks of five feet. Address accessory structure size and height.
- Front Setbacks and Encouraging Appealing Front Elevations. The purpose and requirements enhance community and enhance walkability. Proposed language - *The Development Services Director, or designee, may reduce a front and/or corner lot side-yard setback to up to fifteen (15) feet for a single-family dwelling or twin home/duplex based on the following criteria. 1. The unit has substantial architectural features facing the respective side of the street with the setback reduction that includes multiple of the following: A. Wall articulation, multiple roof pitches and planes, gables, dormers, and decorative chimneys. B. Roof skirting, cornices, decorative stick work. C. Porches, porticos, proportionate and significant porch or portico columns, balconies. D. Masonry, stone, or other similar materials, decorative glass and panels, and material wrapping. E. Bay windows, window treatments, shutters, window boxes, arched windows or other custom windows designs, and proportionate window sizing and window grouping. 2. Any attached or detached garage or carport is setback at least twenty-five (25) feet from the front or front property line and sidewalk. Any corner lot, side entry garage or carport shall also be setback at least twenty-five (25) feet from the corner lot, side property line and sidewalk. 3. Any new unit on an infill lot or remodel or addition in an existing neighborhood shall maintain a twenty (20) foot setback or the average setback of the adjacent properties, whichever is closer to the front property line. 4. Greater the setback reduction, greater the number or quality of architectural features. 5. The area protruding into the required setback shall have significant architectural features on all three sides. 6. Floor plan includes gathering spaces at front of house facing street. 7. Door faces street.*

Discussion that this is an extra tool for developers who enhance the neighborhood. Add a requirement to meet a number of items from a list for approval. When addressing sidewalks, use back of sidewalk. Add direct pedestrian connection. Parking of RV's and the length of driveways.

MOTION: Commissioner Frisby - To open the public hearing on item 6.1. Motion seconded by Commissioner Marzan. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Robert Mills, Kathy Marzan, Tyler Moore. The motion carried.

Public Hearing:
No public comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Mills - To continue the public hearing to a later date. Motion seconded by Commissioner Marzan. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Robert Mills, Kathy Marzan, Tyler Moore. The motion carried.

7. General Plan Update (7:58 p.m.)

Daniel Jensen reviewed the General Plan updates that include vision, land use, transportation, public service, economic development, financial, housing, and environment/open space/trails. Master plans include culinary/pressurized irrigation, sewer, storm drain, transportation, parks and recreation, and a strategic plan. The proposed completion date is November 2019 with open houses in August 2019. The city's current population from 2016 is 19,480. The projected population for 2050 is 58,500. He reviewed a heat map of Lafayette, Louisiana representing areas of revenue generation and revenue loss. *There are some remarkable things to note right off the top. When we added up the replacement*

cost of all of the city's infrastructure—an expense we would anticipate them cumulatively experiencing roughly once a generation—it came to \$32 billion. When we added up the entire tax base of the city, all of the private wealth sustained by that infrastructure, it came to just \$16 billion. This is fatal. To maintain just the roads and drainage systems that have already been built, the family in that median house would need to have their taxes increase by \$3,300 per year. That assumes no new roads are built and existing roadways are not widened or substantively improved. That is \$3,300 in additional local taxes just to tread water. This does not include underground utilities—sewer and water—or major facilities such as treatment plants, water towers and public buildings. Using ratios we've experienced from other communities, it is likely that the total infrastructure revenue gap for that median home is closer to \$8,000 per year. A study of Fate, Texas, in 2015 showed modest to little revenue generation and areas with substantial loss. Through place-based development projections, net gains were predicted to 2050. He reviewed sprawl cost examples comparing a big box and a downtown mixed use. If all annual property tax revenue were paid by adjacent property owners to repair and resurface a road at a cost of \$354,000, it would take 79 years for the city to recoup the costs. It's great for cities when developers install infrastructure and the population increases. At some point, the population plateaus, and the infrastructure gets older and older. Then there is no new growth to maintain infrastructure, which is a challenge for cities.

Robert Mills excused (8:13 p.m.)

The question is how to maintain a rural character while still bringing in new residents. The General Plan update addressed different scenarios. Residents were not in favor of sprawl and wanted to keep the agricultural feel. He reviewed nodal development for Payson and how to transition going forward to the kind of development requested by residents. Nodal development can't be done overnight. Discussions need to include what nodes to do first and the resources needed to complete them. Currently, Payson has development going in all directions and needs to determine the priority areas.

Jill Spencer stated some of these nodal areas need significant infrastructure upgrades or even new systems. The city needs to determine the most logical area to focus on from development and land use as well as considering the limited resources and finances. The General Plan consultants are focusing on a 10-year period infrastructure need. Two difficult questions are when do you breach the railroad tracks to go west and when do you cross over into Spring Lake. Leapfrog development presents challenges with utility extension, serviceability, and costs. The consultants suggested developing this priority map. The General Plan may include an annexation/development element. The node to the south is in the overlap area of Payson and Santaquin so another community may take the opportunity to annex and develop. There needs to be established criteria to address requests for development to determine priority, etc.

8. Commission and Staff Reports

No reports.

9. Adjournment

MOTION: Commissioner Frisby – To adjourn. Motion seconded by Commissioner Marzan. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Kathy Marzan, Tyler Moore. The motion carried.

189 This meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

190

191

192

193

Kim E. Holindrake, Deputy City Recorder

DRAFT