

2/28/2017 The Westside Planning Committee, after considering comments received at the stakeholders' meeting held 2/16/2017 and online at Open City Hall concerning draft policy statements, amended and approved the policy statements herein.

# Westside Development Policies

As Recommended by the Westside Planning Committee

## Purpose

The purpose of these policies is to guide development in southwest Provo in order to promote a smart, sustainable, vibrant community that offers a high quality of life for current and future residents while respecting Provo's agricultural heritage.

## Policies

1. Preserve Provo's agricultural heritage and support agriculture for as long as farmers choose to farm:
  - a. Approve the creation of a Provo Agricultural Commission to support local commercial and non-commercial agriculture.
  - b. Request that the Provo Agricultural Commission identify obstacles to the success of current and prospective farmers, including non-traditional farmers, and recommend ways to remove these obstacles.
  - c. Request that the Provo Agricultural Commission explore tools for agricultural preservation. These tools may include: conservation easements, transfers of development rights, community land trusts, a privately funded farmland trust fund, and Utah's "Agricultural Protection" Program.<sup>1</sup>
  - d. Encourage the Provo Agricultural Commission to improve the productive use of agricultural land.
  - e. Encourage Development-Supported Agriculture<sup>2</sup> and Agritourism<sup>3</sup> to help preserve Provo's agricultural heritage.
  - f. Encourage our state lawmakers to increase funding for the LeRay McAllister Fund.<sup>4</sup>
  - g. Protect agricultural operations from the impact of residential encroachment.
  - h. Identify agricultural land owners, have their properties listed on developmental maps to better avoid encroachment onto agricultural lands.

**Comment [1]:** From Phil Rash: I would still argue for a broader purpose. Perhaps it could be something to the effect- "The purpose of these policies is to guide development in West Provo as it occurs in order to promote a smart, sustainable, vibrant community that offers a high quality of life for current and future residents". Several of the policies already address farmers and farming quite directly. Agricultural preservation is, by all accounts very important and is captured in the specific policies, however, there are more non-farmers living on the west side than farmers. It seems that the overarching purpose of west side planning shouldn't focus on agricultural preservation per se.

From Sarah McNamara: I agree with Phil's broader purpose here.

**Comment [2]:** from Phil Rash: We've heard from several residents that access to water for irrigation seems to be an issue for those who wish to farm. In fact, a few people indicated that they abandoned farming because they no longer had access to water. I won't pretend to know much about this issue but this seems important. Does there need to be a policy that somehow protects agricultural water rights?

**Comment [3]:** from Terry Herbert: I think that the property's west of Lakeview road (3110w) should be left open to home building. Someone may want to continue to farm while living there.

<sup>1</sup> Utah Code Title 17 Chapter 41- a law that helps preserve vital food-producing land.

<sup>2</sup> Development-supported agriculture (DSA) is a movement in real estate development that preserves and invests in agricultural land use.

As farmland is lost due to the challenging economics of farming and the pressures of the real estate industry, DSA attempts to reconcile the need for development with the need to preserve agricultural land.

<sup>3</sup> Agritourism involves any agriculturally based operation or activity that brings visitors to a farm or ranch.

<sup>4</sup> The LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund is an incentive program providing grants to encourage communities and landowners to work together to conserve their critical lands. The fund targets lands that are deemed important to the community such as agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, watershed protection, and other culturally or historically unique landscapes.

2. Preserve and Create Quality Usable Open Space

- a. Update and utilize the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to provide developed parks and open space that satisfy a range of leisure and recreational needs.
- b. Preserve and develop natural amenities for sustained enjoyment by the community. Examples include the Provo River and banks, the Provo River Delta, Utah Lake shoreline, and wetlands.
- c. Provide parks and trails of different uses and sizes.<sup>5</sup>
- d. Encourage agritourism as a means to provide agriculturally themed open space.
- e. Useable neighborhood open space should be an integral part of neighborhood design or combined to serve larger areas than the immediate development.

3. Encourage Sustainable Residential Development Patterns

- a. Establish ordinances to require a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and designs to accommodate various stages of life.
- b. Detached single-family homes should be the predominant housing type and the use of other types should augment and not detract from the single-family feel of the area.
- c. Housing types should be mixed without barriers separating types or densities.
- d. The scale and style of residences should enhance the surrounding area, regardless of housing type.
- e. Create design standards for important road corridors in southwest Provo.
- f. The overall density of the area should average four units to the acre.

4. Promote Development of Commercial Amenities and Employment Opportunities in Appropriate Locations

- a. Regional commercial uses may be located adjacent to the I-15 or within the Airport Related Activities district.
- b. Neighborhood and Community Shopping zones may be located at or adjacent to arterial or collector streets.
- c. Design, scale and intensity of commercial zones or properties should transition to adjacent residential uses to minimize impact on the residential use.

5. Create a Robust Transportation Network

- a. Update the Transportation Master Plan to accommodate the changing needs of southwest Provo.
- b. The planned collector road network should be built as development occurs. No development should interrupt the collector road network.
- c. Update the Provo City Major & Local Street Plan to include a network of proposed local streets to ensure connectivity in between the land between collector and arterial roads.

**Comment [4]:** from Beth Alligood:  
While changing the language to not specifically say multi-family dwellings, I am still against multifamily dwellings. In the SW Area meeting the feedback from the neighborhoods was larger family homes and agricultural preservation being the top things by a wide margin. Compromise is about both parties giving to find a middle ground. There is an understanding that all future houses built cannot all be R1.10 housing. A mixed housing type of R1.10, R1.8, R1.6 and LDR single family residences is an acceptable compromise. It is not a downtown area, it is not an area next to a university, it is not an area next to any major shopping centers. It is farmland, it is a quiet side of town that families can enjoy, it is a place that, from the other policies, we are looking to preserve as open space and to stay farmland. Apartments and condos do not typically fit in an area like that. While we do want to designate transit routes, there is no guarantee that enough transit will come to even sustain apartments and condos.

<sup>5</sup> Examples include neighborhood parks, pedestrian, equestrian, and bike trails, community/school gardens, a regional sports park, a farm-themed park, and the Provo Beach concept.

- d. Utilize Complete Streets Policies to ensure all modes of transportation are considered.
- e. Utilize the Transportation Master Plan to identify corridors that should have sufficient right-of-way to accommodate public transit.
- f. Lakeview Parkway is to be maintained as an arterial roadway with limited access.

6. **Require Proper Integration and Sequencing of Development**

- a. The full block should be considered when rezoning away from agricultural uses
- b. Conceptual Integrated Development Plan for the entire block should be required for zone change applications.
- c. Discourage rezoning of land that is surrounded by agricultural zoning.<sup>6</sup>
- d. Development may be limited or deferred depending on the availability of adequate municipal infrastructure (such as sewer, storm drainage, water, etc.).

7. **Restrict Development in Wetlands and other Environmentally Sensitive Areas**

- a. Land south and west of the Lake View Parkway up to Center Street (excepting the airport protection area) should be preserved for open space and agricultural uses.
- b. No development should occur in flood-prone areas unless the risks can be mitigated. Plans for mitigation should be reviewed for adequacy by the Provo City Engineer and any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed to protect people, property or significant natural features. Mitigation plans should not adversely affect adjacent properties.

**Comment [5]:** from Phil Rash:  
 Although I am generally in agreement with this section, I don't know that one can draw a hard line on sequencing of development. Landowner "C" may wish to sell or develop long before landowner "B"-- perhaps years before. Can we or should we really say that owner "C" must simply wait for a day that might never come? If there is disruption in sequencing, might the developer be required to plan for and pay for necessary infrastructure (correct water line sizes, sidewalks, etc.)? In our last meeting several individuals mentioned that "leapfrogging" already routinely occurs. It seems reasonable that it probably occurs for a reason--sequential development is difficult--and may require some flexibility with a policy that places the extra cost of out-of sequence development on the developer and not the taxpayer.

**Comment [6]:** from Sarah McNamara:  
 What is the reasoning behind point 6.3? Is it to not squeeze farmers out? Is it the complaints by others? Just trying to understand this point. Any insight is welcomed!

---

<sup>6</sup> That is, no leap frog development.