



Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

September 12, 2018

PLGPA20180225

The West Side Citizen Advisory Committee requests a General Plan amendment for adoption of a new future Land Use Map that includes Provo City lands west of the I-15 Freeway, and south of the Provo River. Lakewood, Sunset, Provo Bay and Fort Utah neighborhoods. Brian Maxfield (801) 852-6429

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of September 12, 2018:

CONTINUED

On a vote of 5:0, the Planning Commission continued the above noted application to the Commission's next regular meeting as a study item. The Planning Commission asked that the West Side Steering Committee meet before the next Planning Commission meeting to discuss possible changes to the Land Use Map that were suggested to the Planning Commission

Motion By: Shannon Ellsworth

Second By: Robert Knudsen

Votes in Favor of Motion: Shannon Ellsworth, Robert Knudsen, Jamin Rowan, Deborah Jensen, Russ Phillips
Deborah Jensen was present as Chair.

STAFF PRESENTATION

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. Bill Peperone reviewed the process in the development of the proposed Land Use Plan. He also presented comments received prior to the meeting including a recommendation of the Lakewood Chair, Becky Bogdin, to consider moving the Neighborhood Mixed-Use node located on the Parkway at 1100 West, to the 1600 West intersection. Mr. Peperone also mentioned that since the Transportation Master Plan is currently being updated, consideration should be given in both plans to a more curved connection directly joining the future collector shown at approximately 900 South and 2050 West, and the existing 1150 South/1600 West intersection.

CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES

- There are no outstanding departmental issues at this time

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE

- Neighborhood Meetings have been held in the Lakewood, Sunset, Provo Bay, and Fort Utah Neighborhoods.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- The Neighborhood Chairs and/or vice chairs from most of the involved neighborhoods were present and addressed the Planning Commission during the public hearing.
- Most of the West Side Citizens Advisory Committee members were present, and spoke to the resulting land use proposals.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Aaron McCullough, Provo Bay Vice-Chair and Committee Member, emphasized the amount of time put into the plan and that it involved a broad spectrum of people. He also stated his support for higher density in some areas such as along Geneva Road.
- Jonathan Hill, Fort Utah Neighborhood Chair and Committee Member, felt the proposed residential densities clustered around transportation nodes was the right way to go and believes the proposed density is pushing the edge of where people would be upset if it were any higher.
- Tom Halladay, Committee Member, stated that he concurs with a lot of what's been said about the higher density in places like along Geneva Road, with a more rural concept in other areas. He would like to see an allowance for Airport Compatible Industrial/Commercial Uses to be extended further along Center Street.
- Beth Alligood, Southwest Area Council Chair and Committee Member, said she supports and fought to get the MDR area along Geneva Road. She especially likes the proposed trail system and feels overall that the proposed plan is a good plan.
- Becky Bogdin, Lakewood Neighborhood Chair, stated her concerns about the visual impact raising the regional commercial and associated higher density residential would have on the Lakewood Subdivision. As the area east of 500 West attends Franklin Elementary, she stated the school area can't absorb any more apartments.
- David Arnold, Committee Member, emphasized the travel barriers to the east (I-15 and railroad tracks) and that 500 West will eventually need to be widened. He felt the proposed land use was pretty solid and thought the west side did not need to aspire to be the rich side of town. He most like the mixed-use nodes and felt the higher density areas made sense.
- Dixon Homes, Provo City Economic Development Director, stated his concurrence with Mr. Halladay's request to extend the Airport Compatible Industrial/Commercial area further east along Center Street. He stated that we should not shrink the Regional Commercial area to less than now proposed and that the associated residential should be MDR. He also stated the regional commercial should be enlarged to include about 30-40 acres on the south side of the Parkway, across from the other regional commercial area.
- Kelly Watson, representing Bach Homes, stated they have the regional commercial property under contract and the site is not viable for commercial because of neighborhood opposition. They would instead build a mixed residential community that would attract families with 3 & 4 bedroom units.
- George Carter, an area resident and farmer, was very much in favor of getting a grocery store for the area. As a farmer with a large amount of property in the area, he stated that the Parkway had cut off water so that, although they can still grow alfalfa, they can no longer grow shallow root crops like corn. Without the irrigation water, there is no ability to continue farming.
- Marsha Judkins, the State Representative for House District 61, stated her support to maintain agricultural land and spoke how she would like to put funding into the State's McAllister Fund to purchase development rights and allow farming to continue in the area.
- Mac Carter, an area resident and farmer, stated the entire 300-400 acres remaining in agricultural use was nothing compared to the amount of land in real farming areas. He further stated there was no reason to designate agricultural land on the plan if they can keep on farming anyway, as it makes it harder to change later. Mr. Carter also suggested more high density along Geneva Road.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Key points addressed in the applicant's presentation to the Planning Commission included the following:

- Besides changes recommended in the received comments
- Staff will meet with the West Side Advisory Committee next week to have them review suggested modifications.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Russ Phillips spoke about his concerns that the proposed A1.1 area would not allow further lot splits. He wondered if perhaps an RA (Residential Agriculture) designation would be more appropriate for that area, and maybe also include as part of a larger RA area, the land directly to the east and shown as Residential.
- Jamin Rowan commented that he liked the spread of unit types and densities, but wondered why only one MDR area? He stated it seemed like MDR would be more appropriate next to the Regional Commercial and possibly even some of the areas along the Parkway.
- Brian Smith stated that this area of Provo is different from Downtown, and the strength of Provo is that there are different neighborhoods. We need to think of this as creating neighborhood character verses neighborhood density.
- Shannon Ellsworth made the motion to allow a new draft map to be proposed and we (Planning Commission) can study it further at our next study session.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Bill Peperone asked that based on the input received, would the Planning Commission be open to staff reviewing the proposed Land Use Map with the West Side Committee, and make the map the subject of the next study session?



Director of Community Development

See Key Land Use Policies of the Provo City General Plan, applicable Titles of the Provo City Code, and the Staff Report to the Planning Commission for further detailed information. The Staff Report is a part of the record of the decision of this item. Where findings of the Planning Commission differ from findings of Staff, those will be noted in this Report of Action.

Legislative items are noted with an asterisk (*) and require legislative action by the Municipal Council following a public hearing; the Planning Commission provides an advisory recommendation to the Municipal Council following a public hearing.

Administrative decisions of the Planning Commission (items not marked with an asterisk) **may be appealed** by submitting an application/notice of appeal, with the required application and noticing fees, to the Community Development Department, 330 West 100 South, Provo, Utah, **within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Planning Commission's decision** (Provo City office hours are Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).