

Planning Commission Staff Report

March 25, 2020



Applicants:

Jeff Anderson

Owners:

Arrowhead Ranch LLC

Location:

East of Arrowhead Trail Road

Zone:

R-1-7.5

Size:

67.48 Acres

ATTACHMENTS:

1. DRC Redlines
2. Annexation Agreement
3. Land Use Map

REQUEST

Request for preliminary plan approval of the proposed Arrowhead Ranch Subdivision arranged on Utah County Parcel 30:009:0071.

Remanded at March 11th meeting to create more connection to the north (at least three roads), establish mechanism to guarantee open space, and increase lot size consistency with bubble map. (See recommendation section)

BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This parcel was annexed into Payson City as part of the DAE Annexation and is subject to the terms and conditions of that annexation. (included in packet) At the time of annexation, conditions outlined the size of lots, general location of those lots, and other planning and development specifications, such as trails, street grid, and open space.



Land Use Map showing approximate locations for housing types

The annexation agreement required a mix of “targeted” lot sizes, with sizes of 10,000 sq ft, 9,000 sq ft, 7,500 ft. and multi-family housing at 10 units/acre. This is otherwise displayed as a net density of 4.35 (low density), 4.83 (medium density), and 5.81 (high density) units per acre for the single-family homes. The lot sizes are consistent with Payson’s standard residential zones—R-1-10, R-1-9, and R-1-7.5, that utilize the same lot sizes, respectively. The multi-family housing component is in line with Payson City’s RMF “Residential Multi-Family” zone. The only area delineated for application of two-family homes is the area designated as “high density single family residential”, which states that the area “will target 7,500 square foot single family lots, as well as 4,500 square foot twin home lots.”

Annexation Agreement, Specific Plan 5.1

APPROVAL PROCESS

To develop the property as proposed, the applicant is required to obtain preliminary plan and final plat approval. The applicant seeks preliminary plan approval at this time.

Annexation Agreement Requirements:

In addition to the land use requirements listed above, the road system “must provide proper connectivity through the grid system” and the development shall include active transportation facilities including “trails, bike lanes, commuter routes, transit locations, and recreation facilities.” *Annexation Agreement IV “Transportation, Circulation, and Access”*

The development “will include parks, active recreation, and open space to accommodate the needs of the additional residential development” and “the size of the parks and open space will need to be consistent with the level of service adopted by the Payson City Council.” The parks and open space area may not include wetlands and storm water basins to satisfy minimum open space requirements. *Annexation Agreement IV “Parks and Open Space”* Additionally, the in the Specific Plan 7.2, the following language is provided regarding active transportation:

7.2 Pedestrian Traffic

As the project develops, a complete streets philosophy will be implemented. This philosophy will ensure that the network of streets will safely and comfortably accommodate all users, including motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Typical roadways will include sidewalks, bicycle lanes, appropriate street widths and speeds, and access points that comply with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements.

The annexation agreement does not relieve the applicants from their obligation to follow Payson City Code and all other relevant development regulations. *Annexation Agreement VII*. Additionally, the recorded annexation agreement and its exhibits constitute the entire agreement. *Annexation Agreement, VIII*.

General Plan

The annexation agreement operates as the area specific plan, called the Arrowhead Ranch Specific Plan. This specific plan is an update to the general plan that guides development in this area. Any development shall be consistent with this plan.

Standard of Review

A request for subdivision approval that satisfies the minimum requirements of the zone (traditional subdivision), or a project that is consistent with a previous approval granted by the land use authority (i.e. overlay), is an **administrative action (or ministerial act)**. At this stage, the planning commission cannot change the rules. The land use authority is responsible to ensure the project satisfies any previous approvals and all applicable ordinances. If these requirements are met, there is no discretion to deny the application. The Planning Commission shall compare the proposal with the requirements of the annexation agreement to determine whether the proposal has meet the annexation requirements.

Review

As outlined in the most recent redlines, staff has concerns with multiple items (please consult redlines). While many of the utility and engineering comments have been addressed since issuance of the redlines, several significant planning, fire, and streets comments remain unaddressed.

- Fire code access requirements not met
- Trails unaddressed
- Location of bike lanes and complete-street design: This is not shown in the design.
- Grid connecting to neighboring properties: Staff is concerned that the access points to neighboring properties may not work for those properties, as staff is unaware of the location of wetlands on neighboring properties. This is part of the reason why a local grid is so important. The high number of connections ensure connectivity where lots of natural barriers exist.
- Lot size inconsistency with the annexation agreement: The applicant is seeking approval from City Council to reduce the number of 9,000 and 10,000 sq ft lots in favor of lots that target 7,500 sq ft lots and twin home lots that target 4,500 sq ft. The planning commission and city council will have to determine whether the proposed lot sizes is consistent with the agreement.
- Open space exclusive of wetlands and storm drainage requirements: this has not been shown.

- All other redlines (as shown in the attached redlines)

RECOMMENDATION

Since the prior Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has submitted a concept plan that more closely approximates the land use types as shown on the annexation land use map. Staff has reviewed this with DRC staff and determined that it will not materially affect the layout of utilities in a way that would require a review in addition to our current review schedule.

Staff has concerns with the completeness of the information submitted and its fulfillment of the annexation agreement. As of the time of this staff report, the applicant has not provided any architectural details—either written or illustrated. If the Planning Commission would like to review those guidelines before forwarding a recommendation to Council, staff suggests that the project be remained. However, if Planning Commission would support that review happening at the City Council level, staff would be supportive of the Planning Commission recommending approval of the preliminary plan contingent on the applicant addressing all redlines and providing the required information with time for staff to review, provide comments, and have those comments addressed, **prior to review and approval by City Council**. Details needed prior to City Council would also include a detailed process of how the open space will be dedicated. The planning commission, following a public hearing to receive public input, may:

1. Recommend approval of the proposed preliminary plan contingent upon the satisfaction of staff suggestions. Staff would suggest this if the applicant is willing to meet all conditions and the corrective steps are clear and mutually understood and wouldn't affect the layout of the project.
2. Remand the proposed preliminary plan back to staff for further review. This action should be taken by the planning commission if it is determined that there is not enough information provided by the applicant for the planning commission to formulate a well-informed decision or that the applicant is willing to take corrective measures.
3. Deny the proposed preliminary plan and/or final plat. This action should be taken if the planning commission determines that the applicant is unwilling or unable to satisfy the annexation agreement and/or other development codes and regulations.

The planning commission should include findings that indicate reasonable conclusions for their decision.