PAYSON CITY

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Payson City Center, 439 W Utah Avenue, Payson UT 84651

Wednesday, October 14, 2020 7:00 p.m.

CONDUCTING Kirk Beecher

COMMISSIONERS Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby (via Zoom, 7:04 p.m.), Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner (via Zoom)

EXCUSED John Cowan, Kathy Marzan

STAFF Jill Spencer, City Planner

Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder

OTHERS Brandon Stocksdale – Community Planner-National Park Service, Chad Knapp – Strawberry Water Users Association, Adam Cowie, Trent Beesley

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.

1. Roll Call

Four commissioners present.

1. Invocation/Inspirational Thought – Invocation given by Commissioner Moore.
2. Consent agenda
   1. Approval of the minutes for the regular meeting on September 23, 2020

**MOTION: Commissioner Morgan- To approve the consent agenda.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Moore. Those voting yes Kirk Beecher, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

1. Public Forum

No public comments.

1. Review Items
   1. PUBLIC HEARING - Request by Michael DeMarco for use of the RMO-1 Overlay to create a Planned Residential Community on Utah County Parcels 08:087:0027, 08:087:0028 and 08:087:0029 located at 532 W, 550 W, and 554 W 100 North in the R-2-7.5, Residential Zone. The applicant is proposing an infill project that consists of three existing dwellings and five new twin home structures. (7:05 p.m.)

**MOTION: Commissioner Morgan- To table item 6.1 the Michael DeMarco Overlay.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Warner. A roll call vote was taken with those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

* 1. PUBLIC HEARING – Request for a recommendation of approval of the Payson Forebay Area Management Plan for property owned by Payson City, commonly referred to as “Forebay”, located in Payson Canyon. The document will serve as an appendix to the Payson City General Plan.

Staff Presentation:

Jill Spencer stated staff has been working with the National Park Service to update the Payson Forebay Area Management Plan. Payson City purchased the property in 2003, and adopted a management plan in 2008. The focus was on conservation instead of recreation use. Over the years, there has been more trails and usage and a need to add recreation facilities. The City applied for the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program through National Park Service to update the management plan.

Brandon Stocksdale stated the National Park Service core duty is to preserve and manage those special places as well as extend the benefits of national parks through conservation and recreation throughout the country. The Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program fills that role as a technical assistance program for cities, counties, federal and state agencies, and nonprofits. The Payson Forebay Area Management Plan project background and purpose included define and manage appropriate recreational opportunities to increase safety, create a diversity of recreational experiences, and improve overall system management. Provide members of the community with designated and safe access to the forebay area and appropriate recreational based infrastructure such as trailheads, pathways, parking areas, signage, and so on.

Jill Spencer noted the city council has discussed the Forebay are a number of times since 2003 regarding the uses, conservation easements, selling portions, etc. The City determined it wants to provide a recreation for many users. Forebay encompasses 500 acres and a lot of typography. A stakeholder committee was organized to address recreation and utility uses as well as addressing complimentary and conflicting uses. It was determined that motorized vehicle use would not be allowed because of safety concerns, which has been already limited by the city council. Many partnerships have been created to promote the educational and historical elements of the area. There are many volunteer groups willing to assist in trail upkeep and area management.

Brandon Stocksdale continued this is a long-term sustainable management plan to manage public access and protect the water shed, habitat, and scenic nature of the area while addressing trespassing through private property and deterring destruction of utilities. Goals have been set to assist these tasks. The process began last fall and included a team of urban planning students with Brigham Young University who assisted with inventory and public outreach. Several entities comprise the stakeholder committee to address to the many facets of the project. The vision is Payson City will promote sustainable management of the Forebay Area by developing appropriate public access points, establishing conservation buffer areas, and implementing a comprehensive recreation improvement plan to improve the public’s safety, access, and facilities. Public open houses were held at Payson City Hall in October and November 2019. Similar foundation tools were used from the U.S. Forest Service Recreation Opportunity Spectrum to define the geographic areas and create expectations for the users. Signage has been added to formalize and protect public access by promoting bike, walk, run, hike, and equestrian uses while excluding uses such as motorized (motorcycles, ATV’s, UTV’s OHV’s), fires or fireworks, overnight camping, and shooting firearms.

Jill Spencer noted there is a lot of work to be done to open access to the property while respecting private property. The key to moving forward is communication. The City is looking at motorized opportunities in the west mountain area, which an application has been submitted with the Bureau of Land Management. The City received a $150,000 through the Utah Recreation Grant and PARC Tax funding to build the parking lot and trailhead for the Forebay area along the Nebo Loop Road.

Chad Knapp stated he cares for the power plant facility in the canyon, which has been there since 1940. He has seen more use in the area over the years. The Friends of Forebay are a very helpful group and let him know of any concerns. He is excited to see a formal plan for positive use in the area.

Adam Cowie stated in 2012 the trail was 1.5 feet wide and is now 5 to 6 feet wide, which depicts significant use in the area. He is appreciative of the plan to provide a framework and manage the Forebay area. The principle users have been mountain bikers, but trail runners and families to the area have increased. The Forebay area is low enough in the canyon to allow access year-round. He thanked the city council for sticking it out on the payments for this property so residents and users have a long-term benefit for generations to come.

**MOTION: Commissioner Morgan - To open the public hearing.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Moore. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

Public Hearing:

No public comments.

**MOTION: Commissioner Moore - To close the public hearing.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Morgan. Those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Beecher stated staff and those involved have done a good job putting this together and essentially the planning commission is saying keep going.

Commissioner Moore stated he loves trail running and go up there a lot with his family.

**MOTION: Commissioner Morgan- To recommend to forward this to the City Council to approve the Payson Forebay Area Management Plan.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Warner. A roll call vote was taken with those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

6.3 ITEM ON REMAND – Preliminary plan approval of the Villages at Arrowhead Park Subdivision, Phases 5-7. (7:43 p.m.)

Staff Presentation:

Jill Spencer stated the Villages at Arrowhead Park, phases 5, 6, and 7, was originally approved with 85 single family lots. In August 2020, the plan was revised to 132 single family lots. The revised 2020 plan includes 116 single family lots. In August, the planning commission concerns included the overall number and size of lots, RV parking and storage/on-street parking, modified setbacks, midblock trail connection, clear view areas, porch forward design, project amenities, and engineering review. The developer modified the plan to include a reduction of lots by 16, increased lot sizes and increased width, no basements, removal of midblock trail access, accommodations for RV parking on some lots, added playground area, modified setback request, and eliminate porch forward option. The reduction in lots allowed increased lot sizes and lot width with 34 lots at 46 feet wide, 30 lots at 48 feet wide, and 52 lots at 50 feet wide. With larger lots, there was no need to reduce the side setback requirement, corner lots maintain the clear view areas, and 84 lots accommodate RV parking. The applicant is requesting preliminary plan approval for phases 5 and 6; phase 7 will be delayed as they discuss issues with the adjacent property owner. This revised plan includes a modified street cross-section, modified RV parking and storage requirement, modified setbacks with reduction in front and rear, and housing products. The clear view area compliance has been addressed. All utilities access from the front yard with a utility layout plan and driveway locations predetermined. Green space and play areas include some manicured and groomed with natural areas as well. There are three builders for the project that will use different materials and designs. Staff is working with the applicant through the redlines and several outstanding items including the extension of the pressurized irrigation main line.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Warner questioned removal of the porch-forward design because discussions tried to get a street scape that didn’t look like a bunch of garage doors up and down the street. Overall, it’s a much better plan than what was shown in August.

Commissioner Frisby stated since phase 7 is on delay, the amenities need to come with phases 5 and 6 to guarantee those amenities. He questioned the reason for the setback modification so the planning commission has a clear justification for future projects.

Trent Beesley clarified porch-forward designs are still included, but not needed because they backed away from the front setback reduction. Porch forward will still meet the front setback. The amenities can be committed with phase 6. Their objective is to balance the demand of the market and the city interests for a pleasing development. Land prices continue to increase and people still want a nice home. The setback modification is a result of meeting the demands of the market and satisfy the city.

Commissioner Beecher stated other places in the valley where a 20-foot setback, both front and rear, is 30% more than what other cities are granting for this type of home. It’s not unusual for this type of product to have a narrower front and rear setback. A good share of the planning commission concerns has been addressed from the last several meetings, and the product meets the city’s needs and requirements.

Jill Spencer clarified with no basements, everything has to be above grade so the building envelope has to be maximized, and people still want a nice home. The planning commission and city council can require 25-foot front and back setbacks, which reduces the house by 10 feet.

Commissioner Morgan stated he’s not a fan of smaller lots, but they have done their due diligence regarding the concerns in the past.

Commissioner Frisby questioned the removal of the center trail.

Trent Beesley stated after the last meeting, they felt the trail created more problems with the distance and size of lots than it resolved. There is a lot of resistance in having two associations when it comes to detached, single-family product. The entire development is just under 100 acres and all falls under a master association, which is about $10 per unit. Anything done in this project, is common to the entire development connected by trail systems. The concern was the center trail would need to be a lot wider for an amenity in a master association.

Commissioner Morgan stated it’s a good trade off removing the trail and increasing the lot sizes.

**MOTION: Commissioner Morgan - To forward the Villages at Arrowhead Park, Phases 5 and 6, to the City Council for approval as long as the preliminary plan requirements are met including modifications to project layout and design (density), alternate cross section, RV parking and storage, and setback requirements along with the housing product, amenities, compliance with city regulation, final plat coming at a later date, and a development agreement that has the amenities with Phase 6.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Moore. A roll call vote was taken with those voting yes – Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

1. Commission and Staff Reports and Training (8:15 p.m.)

Moving forward a quorum will need to be present in the council chambers.

Commission Morgan noted he has had difficulties opening the packet. Staff will work on the issue.

1. Adjournment

**MOTION: Commissioner Moore – To adjourn.** Motion seconded by Commissioner Morgan. Those voting yes Kirk Beecher, Ryan Frisby, Tyler Moore, Kit Morgan, Blair Warner. The motion carried.

This meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Kevin Stinson, Administrative Assistant