

**Francis City Planning Commission  
Monday, October 24, 2011 7:00pm  
Francis City Community Center**

**REVISED AGENDA**

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of September 28, 2011 meeting
3. Discussion of History and Potential Future Expansion of Public Works Building
3. Complete Review of Land Use Guidelines from General Plan
4. Discussion of Potential Summit County TDR Program and Planning Commission Participation at Council Work Session
5. Other Business at the Discretion of the Chairman, as may be properly brought before the Commission.

I certify that this notice has been posted in three (3) public places and on the Utah State Public Notice Website.  
Attested by Susan Moses.

**In Compliance with the Americans Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this hearing should notify Susan Moses at (435) 782-6236 at least three (3) days prior to the meeting.**

# Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

## FRANCIS CITY Planning Commission Meeting

Monday October 24, 2011

Recreational Building 2319 South Spring Hollow Road Francis, UT

The Francis City Planning Commission convened in regular session Monday, October 24, 2011  
In the Francis City Recreation Building.

### **PRESENT:**

Chair: Peter Swisher  
Co-Chair: Julie Keyes  
Commissioner: John Barclay  
Commissioner: Bryan Betournay  
Commissioner: Brain Purvis

City Planner: Alison Weyher  
Secretary: Susan Moses

### **NOT PRESENT:**

Commissioner: Kristie Bair  
Commissioner: Dorothy Sullivan

### **Others Present:**

### **OPENING**

Peter Swisher called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

*Brian Purvis motioned to approve the minutes for September 28, 2011. John Barclay seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.*

# Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

## **Up Date:**

Alison Weyher stated at the City Council meeting October 13, 2011 the City Council determined that the City Recorder was not functioning in an appropriate manner. She had working for two weeks and it became apparent she was not grasping the fundamentals of the job. She was let go. Alison Weyher was appointed as City Recorder until the first of the year; Alison will be in the office on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

## **Discussion and History and Potential Future Expansion of Public works building**

Alison Weyher stated that Mayor Snelgrove's main purpose when he came to visit with us at the last meeting was to thank all of you for your efforts and the time you put in. She added the Mayor had been thinking of the old concept of expanding the Public Works building, which was talked about after the new office building was defeated and there was discussion about buying another used trailer at the joint Planning Commission/Town Council meeting there was talk about expanding the Public Works Building and adding another bay. The Mayor brought it up here and it created somewhat of an uproar with the City Council and Alison started hearing about it the next day. Alison stated she thought the Planning Commission was clear in Peter's comments that we were not overly enthusiastic about this and anything we did would be part of a feasibility study and would require an amendment to the Parks Master Plan and it would be a six months process at the minimum. Alison stated she was asked to document the history of how the Public Works Building came to be and how much money we have spent on it over the years. Findings:

1. Discussion on the Public works building – or a building to store the trucks, backhoe and salt was first raised at the March 18, 2008 town council meeting.
2. Over the course of the next few months, further discussion was held regarding the potential location, (the first idea was by the arena so the building could be accessed from SR 35)At the April 15, 2008 meeting bids were discussed, including requiring a concrete slab and electricity. It was suggested the doors be 12 to 14 feet high.
3. At the November 2008 Council meeting discussion was held about installing the concrete and a roof. Lee Snelgrove talked about the need to install one bay for salt storage. John Keyes proposed locating the building on the Evva Atkinson property recently purchased by the Town.
4. December 2008 plans were drawn and made available.
5. Mayor Bergen proposed opening the budget in January 2009 to provide funding after bids were received.

## Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

6. In January 2009 bids were received that were over the \$40,000 allocated. Lee Snelgrove and John Keyes were authorized to meet with the bidders to negotiate a price for the footings and foundations for the entire building and the building over the salt bay.
7. In fiscal year 09-10 additional funds were allocated and the building was completed.
8. Finish work continued on the inside 2010 through 2011

By the next Council meeting Alison will have the cost of the building reconstructed. She stated there has been a public process through out, and bids were issued and accepted on two different occasions. Added it appears it was funded within the budgets and budget opening.

Peter Swisher stated he wanted to make it clear that the Planning Commission is here in an advisory capacity only. Added it is not appropriate for us to be planning this, it is appropriate for an idea to be brought to us and we make comments on that idea, and do so at the direction of the City Council. We can discuss here, but he does not want to go forward without direction from the Council.

Bryan Betournay asked what the problem was. Alison Weyher answered the concern was that the Mayor brought it to the Planning Commission before he took it to the Council. Some of the Council members thought it should have been taken to the Council first. Alison Weyher explained that projects start with the Planning Commission, for example lot-line-adjustments come to the Planning Commission first.

Peter Swisher stated he appreciates the Mayor coming to the Commission and ask us for our opinion, to see if it was something to move forward on. But now would like direction from the Council. Asked if based on what the Council said is there any more discussion we need to have at this point or is this something that needs to wait.

Alison Weyher stated we could do several things, we could send a letter to the City Council asking for formal direction on adding another bay onto the Public Works Building. Or could have further discussion and then say if you want us to look at this then we think you ought to look at a feasibility study, look at cost, and look at timing.

Brian Purvis commented this is not a policy making body, the Council is. Added Planning would be the second phase. If the Council decides they want to do this and ask us to step in and help plan it that would be our role. Not to decide whether or not to do it.

Alison Weyher will write a letter to the City Council and Peter Swisher will sign it.

## Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

Alison Weyher stated everyone should have a copy of the revised Residential section we went over last month added she has made all of the changes, asked the Commission to read through it at home.

### **Complete Review of the Land Use Guidelines from the General Plan**

Alison Weyher stated she has crossed out items she feels are unnecessary and added comments that are in italics.

Alison Weyher read through Commercial Land Use Elements (see attachment).

Peter Swisher asked if in the 2<sup>ND</sup> paragraph about and appropriate buffers do we want add language about being visually appealing. Added we don't want something to happen like in Salt Lake where a house gets surrounded by a 12 feet cinder block wall.

Alison Weyher responded that the next sentence down talks about "buffers include but not limited to: increased setbacks, landscaping" we could include landscape buffers.

Peter Swisher commented it needs to be something that is reasonably appealing. Added that would all depend on what they are putting in.

Bryan Betournay commented it is not saying you have to put up a fence, but increase setbacks and landscaping, that helps.

Julie Keyes asked if you are putting in a business next to residential, wouldn't you have to get the approval from that residence first. Alison Weyher answered no.

Julie Keyes commented if you work together then "appropriate" would work. Asked if we could put something like appropriate agreeable, or agreed upon, instead of allowing the business to decide without the resident having any say even though they were there first.

Peter Swisher commented "if I was a business owner I would read this and say cool I can put up a chain link fence and call it good, because it is an appropriate buffer". Added for the residential owner next door that is appropriate.

Julie Keyes stated that in a lot of cases, the residence was there before it was zoned commercial. Added existing residents should have some say in that process.

## Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

Brian Purvis commented the problem with that is this is supposed to be a guideline and that would be establishing code and that has to go into the zoning code and that would be the purview of the council.

Peter Swisher stated he would like to put something in the guideline like, do something appropriate. Added chain link fence probably not appropriate.

Julie Keyes suggested adding something like appropriate buffers to transition between residential and commercial.

Alison Weyher stated there is always going to be conflict between residential and commercial that butt up against each other.

Brian Purvis recommended vague language is okay as long as it gives a general idea of what the expectation is. Added in the end it is going to be that give and take process of negotiation.

Alison Weyher asked if the Planning Commission wants the gravel pits to turn into the industrial section of Town. Added some of the concerns are the access issues. Access is difficult; it is either down Spring Hollow Road or up from Lower River Road. Lower River Road has restrictions placed on it from Summit County because it is a County road. It is a difficult area to get to. Industrial areas require a fair amount of truck traffic and Spring Hollow road is not particular well suited for large trucks. Asked if it would be better to look at moving the industrial area to a different part of town.

Brian Purvis commented all of the negative that were described apply to most of the roads in the town.

Peter Swisher asked is there a better place in town for industrial and if there is not, why are we focusing on industrial.

Brian Purvis stated there is a State requirement that you have an industrial zone.

Peter Swisher asked if there was a ratio we have to have. Alison Weyher answered no, added the way we come to having industrial areas is the gravel pits, they need to be in the industrial zone.

Peter Swisher opinioned when the grave/pits run out, that may be the time to have our industrial foot print shrink.

John Barclay commented in Michigan one of the gravel pits that was reclaimed was turned into a golf course.

Alison Weyher stated you could turn the gravel pits back to residential or a golf course, added there was some interest from Victory Ranch at one time in purchasing that property and turning

## Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

it into a golf course. Added we might want to think about another area, where there is manufacturing or heavy duty commercial space. Optioned a good spot might be at the intersection of Pace Road and SR 32 across from Lambert Lane, the reasons that makes sense is it is off of SR 32, it is close to Kamas, straight to SR 248 so you do not have to bring the truck traffic through Francis. Added at this point and time while it is in our annexation declaration area it is not in Town.

Peter Swisher asked do we want to promote industrial use or do we do it if and where it makes since and otherwise just do the minimum.

July Keyes commented it is driven by what the industrial thing is; we need to determine that when they come with a plan, does it fit for where it is at.

Brian Purvis commented we currently have an industrial zone that meets our necessary requirements. Added if that changes we can revisit it.

The consensus of the Planning Commission:

1. Commercial Land Uses
  - A. leave 2<sup>ND</sup> paragraph as is with "appropriate buffers"
  - B. Take out Policy 8
  
2. Industrial Land Uses
  - A. Change to read "The purpose of the industrial zone is to provide locations where a variety of manufacturing, industrial processing and warehousing may be conducted."
  - B. *Industrial*
    1. Change Town of Francis to Francis City.
    2. Take out "Much of the property zoned for industrial development is suitable for transitional uses such as mining and construction related activities. Properties used for gravel mining will be highly suitable for industrial uses once the property is properly mined and reclaimed."
  
3. The goal of the Industrial Zone is:
  - A. Goal 1 - Change to read "To promote businesses and environmental clean industrial development in harmony with the community's overall rural and modern image and identity as reflected in the Community Vision Statement."
  - B. Take out Policy 9

Alison Weyher passed out handout on medium income (see attachments). Alison Weyher stated the area median income for a family of four in Summit County is \$99,000. Added we will look at this when we talk about Housing Elements.

## Francis City Planning Commission Meeting October 24, 2011

---

### Discussion of Potential Summit county TDR Program and Planning Commission Participation at council Work Session

Alison Weyher stated the County is doing a Transfer Development Rights (TDR) study, they have hired a consultant, and the consultant is required to meet with each of the communities in Summit County. Passed out handouts on notes from Town meetings and article in Park Record. (see attachments) Alison Weyher commented they have not been well received. Alison stated additional density does not do use any good at all because we can create our own density, we can zone however we want. Jon Jansen will meet with the City Council and Planning Commission in a work session on November 10 at 6:00 pm before the Council meeting.

*Julie Keyes motioned to adjourn. Bryan Betournay seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. Adjourned at 8:20.*

These minutes were X approved as presented. \_\_\_\_\_ Approved as amended at the meeting held on November 21, 2011.

---

Peter Swisher, Chair

---

Susan Moses, Secretary

## REVISED Residential

Residential Land Uses include a range of residential classifications including very-low and low density, moderate density, and high density development. Density is expressed in dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). Zoning regulations may allow a limited number of non-residential uses, such as neighborhood parks and some home premise occupations. Other uses in residential areas including schools, places of worship, and governmental buildings require conditional use permits. Special care should be taken to provide adequate transitions between various land uses. Condominium developments require conditional use approval.

*AG-5 Residential - Very Low Density 1 DU/5 AC:* This category provides areas on the outer fringe of Francis City where residential uses may be harmoniously integrated with agricultural pursuits.

*AG-1 Residential – Low Density 1DU/1AC:* This category provides for a rural lifestyle where homeowners are able to raise and maintain livestock with small barns and other outbuildings. It recognizes the equestrian nature of the Town and provides an appropriate zone for such activities.

*R-1 Residential 2 DU/AC:* This category provides areas for the encouragement and promotion of an environment for family life by providing for the establishment of one-family detached dwellings on landscaped individual lots. Density calculation shall be made after the required easements and rights of way have been platted from the original acreage.

*R-2 Residential* This category provides for smaller lots which may be used for landscaped single family lots, two-family dwellings, condominiums, town homes and open space. All multi-family housing units require a Conditional Use Permit. (Minimum lot size 10,000 sq. ft.)

The Goals of the Residential Land Use areas of Francis are:

**Goal 1 To provide for residential areas in Francis that support and complement the unique historic and rural quality and character of the City, and meet the existing needs of the community.**

- Policy 1      Avoid establishment of land uses which would adversely impact existing residential areas, by creating increased traffic, noise, visual disharmony, etc., by providing adequate screening and buffering of any adjacent commercial or industrial development including parking and service areas.
  
- Policy 2      Encourage creative approaches to housing developments that maintain and protect natural resources and environmental features.
  
- Policy 3      Maintain and enhance the appearance and quality of existing residential neighborhoods.

10/20/11

Policy 4 Priority should be extended to existing agricultural uses including animal husbandry, versus new residential developments.

Policy 6 Flag lots may be allowed in established areas in accordance with the Development Code to provide access to landlocked parcels.

**Goal 2 To promote and encourage high quality, well planned residential development with open space in the Town.**

Policy 1 Develop and implement standards and policies that promote attractive and well planned residential subdivisions in areas where there are existing public services.

Policy 2 Enforce ordinances which require land owners to keep their property free of weeds, junk vehicles and equipment, unsightly buildings, trash and other debris.

Policy 3 Strongly discourage subdivision of land that results in areas of residential development too small or too isolated to be adequately, economically and conveniently served by Town services.

Policy 4 Insure that adequate pathways and trails are provided in all subdivisions to provide linkages throughout the community.

---

10/20

**Commercial Land Uses** Commercial areas provide appropriate locations where a combination of business, commercial, entertainment, and related activities may be established and maintained offering a variety of goods and services to the people who visit, live, and work in Francis. Commercial use areas should be located along major arterial streets for high visibility and traffic volumes.

Whenever commercial uses are adjacent to established or future residential areas, special care must be taken to ensure ~~privacy and to protect personal property~~ *appropriate buffers*. Methods of protecting residential areas by providing transitions and buffers between residential and commercial areas include, but are not limited to: increased setbacks, landscaping, restricted land uses, diversion of traffic, controlled noise or light, height limitations, hours of operation and transitional land uses such as minor offices or high density residential uses.

**C-1 General Commercial** This category includes areas set aside primarily for the accommodation of retail commercial uses. This designation is generally located close to major arterial streets, providing convenient access for major traffic volumes without hazard and without traversing through residential areas. This designation should not be applied to internal areas of residential neighborhoods. This zone should be overlaid over existing residential areas along major rights-of-way, so that older homes may be converted to businesses which preserve the visual heritage and historic buildings along State Road 32. It should in no way force out the current residential uses along these streets, however new residential developments should be discouraged within the C-1 zone *require Conditional Use Permits*.

THE GOAL OF THE COMMERCIAL ZONE IS:

**Goal 1 To encourage the establishment of a central business district with low impact businesses, which will enhance the Town's sales and property tax revenues and provide the highest quality goods and services for local residents.**

**Policy 1** Expand the range of retail and commercial goods and services available within the community.

**Policy 2** Provide for adequate access, parking, traffic circulation, noise buffering, and other operational conditions within commercial areas.

Policy 3 Improve the image and appearance of commercial corridors, especially along State Road 32.

Policy 4 Carefully limit any negative impacts of commercial facilities on neighboring land-use areas, particularly residential development.

Policy 5 Formulate thoughtful, commercial site design and development standards, including guidelines for landscaping and signage, to express the desired overall image and identity as outlined in the Community Vision Statement.

Policy 6 ~~Encourage~~ Require safe and convenient pedestrian access to shopping and service areas.

~~Policy 7 Encourage commercial development that is complementary to the existing historical structures in the community by encouraging developers to work with the historic preservation committee.~~

Policy 8 Develop a secondary commercial zone that will take advantage of tourist traffic and offer opportunity for the development of additional jobs for Francis residents.

~~Industrial Land Uses provide for employment and manufacture of materials which are essential to the economy of Francis. The purpose of the industrial zone is to provide locations where a combination of research and development, manufacturing, industrial processing and warehousing may be conducted.~~  
variety

~~Industrial~~ This category is designated for areas where manufacturing firms can engage in processing, assembling, manufacturing, warehousing, and storage; and for incidental service facilities and public facilities to serve the manufacturing area. This designation is intended to encourage sound development, by providing and protecting an environment for such development, subject to regulations necessary to assure the orderly growth of the Town of Francis City, and the protection of residential and commercial land uses from noise and other disturbances. ~~Much of the property zoned for industrial development is suitable for transitional uses such as mining and construction related activities. Properties used for gravel mining will be highly~~

~~suitable for industrial uses once the property is properly mined and reclaimed.~~

~~???????Do we want the gravel pits to turn into industrial developments?~~

The goal of the industrial Zone is:

**Goal 1 To promote quality businesses and environmentally clean industrial development which will provide a diversified economic base and will complement local retail, and commercial, and industrial establishments in harmony with the community's overall rural and modern image and identity as reflected in the Community Vision Statement.**

- Policy 1 Promote the preparation of master planned areas to discourage small lot or piece-meal site development and encourage better access to properties.
- Policy 2 Encourage high quality, aesthetically pleasing development of the industrial areas which should include incorporating major landscape features.
- Policy 3 Identify those areas most appropriate for industrial development in future growth areas.
- Policy 4 Establish and enforce standards with respect to noise, air quality, odor, visual and other forms of environmental concerns.
- Policy 5 Provide space for manufacturing and processing uses within the Town in appropriate locations and discourage uses from locating within the industrial district which may thwart the use of the land for industrial purposes.
- Policy 6 Encourage industries that broaden the tax base and improve the economic base of the community.
- Policy 7 Discourage the undesirable mixture of incompatible commercial, industrial and residential uses.
- Policy 8 Develop design standards and setback regulations which will enhance the gateway entrances to the Town. Such standards should require attractive landscaping which improves the Highway corridor. Building design should be aesthetically pleasing.
- Policy 9 ~~Develop standards for rehabilitation and mining of natural resources, which protect the residents of Francis Town and future economic development of industrial land.~~

SPECIAL USE AREAS

Special use areas include land use classifications that are distinct from the other three major groups. These uses include public and quasi-public uses.

In some cases the City does not control the location of special uses, such as schools or major transmission lines, and the State and Federal Government can preempt local land use authority. However, the City can work with other jurisdictions and agencies on decisions regarding land use. Any negative impacts, including visual impacts, should be mitigated whenever possible.

### SENSITIVE LANDS

The sensitive lands category is an overlay district where environmentally sensitive areas such as watersheds, wetlands, natural springs, aquifers, recharge zones, wildlife habitat, or steep slopes may be protected. The purpose of the district is to protect sensitive areas, to minimize soil and slope instability, erosion, downstream siltation and to preserve the character of the hillsides and the Provo River.

### PUBLIC FACILITIES

The Public Facilities designation is for land uses that have a public or quasi-public nature such as parks or schools.

### Land Use Map

Area Median Income for a family of 4 in Summit County is \$99,000

Family Size	80% AMI
1	\$54,440
2	\$63,360
3	\$71,280
4	\$79,200
5	\$85,536
6	\$91,872
7	\$98,208
8	\$104,544

2011 —

## Notes from Town Meetings

### Oakley meeting – Sept. 15, 2011

Is it possible to re-establish rights if a property is surrounded by actual development? – not without a unique legislative action – probably condemnation and rezoning – need to manage impacts of adjacent growth

Can certain areas be designated as receiving sites only? – Yes

System needs to go both ways

Will the increased densities from a TDR program change the lifestyle of the community? They do not have to.

Can developers get increased density anyway? Consultant recommends against this.

Looks like only the County gets a benefit —

Projections are not realistic

TDR could be premature – not much current demand

How about a real estate transfer tax?

There is a County trust issue

May not want to participate until a system is set up through an ordinance

May want the County to help with infrastructure upgrades to accommodate growth

Make sure other techniques are used to, such as conservation easements

May need to limit the number of transfers allowed in the Town

It would be useful to know what the capacity of each town's sewer and water system is (is this available?)

### Coalville City TDR discussion – September 26, 2011

Consider a system with 3 sub-areas: North Summit, South Summit, West Summit. Most believe the land value differences are too extreme to create an equitable system, without doing this. The idea of setting a distance limit for transfers, meaning you can only send them 5 miles or ten miles was discussed but setting up a 3 "district" system might negate the need for a distance limit.

City may not get as much benefit from a County to City transfer.

Too much density is contrary to City plans. Coalville might want to set a limit on how much they are willing to accept each year. They considered for a moment where within their community would they place additional density. That is a step that would need to happen if Coalville is willing to participate.

They are concerned about areas like Hoytsville (unincorporated to the south) that doesn't have any infrastructure. Hopefully such areas would not become receiving areas.

County needs to participate in infrastructure needs within a City to make the TDR system more palatable.

Cities need incentives to participate.

We spent a fair amount of time educating on system components. By the end of the discussion I thought all understood that TDR is another option for property owners that they do not have now. It is not an imposition, more like a new property right.

Distrust of County commitment/past trends was raised again.

Mayor is very familiar with a TDR system in Baltimore.

## **Kamas TDR discussion, September 27, 2011**

Again the City struggles with what is in it for them. Generally they would want some dollars and assistance with infrastructure.

They suggested that the County send their growth to Echo, Hoytsville, Wanship, Peoa, and Woodland. We discussed that the implication of that would change in a significant way what the unincorporated land near their boundaries would look like. It would look more developed.

It is not clear how much they share in the desire to maintain open space throughout the County. It appears they want to deal with what happens in their borders and that the County should deal with the areas beyond.

County mistrust continues.

They don't agree with the Utah State study and respond that they were not asked to be involved.

They expect Kamas to become the commercial hub for South Summit. I mentioned that commercial usually follows residential growth, but they see growth happening in Oakley and Francis which will lead to more shopping in Kamas.

We discussed the issue of increased density. The concept of the City dictating where would be a good receiving site and how many units it could handle seemed OK for a moment but then most felt that receiving any new units would be contrary to the best interests of Kamas.

We discussed the issue of design and how TDR ordinances can suggest what is acceptable design. The WVC ordinance does that because we did not want to see the higher density projects be just another ordinary project. I think they understood that TDR can be set up in a way that the resulting development enhances the community.

## **Henefer TDR discussion, October 4, 2011**

Overall a good discussion with the Council and audience.

Most people do not know anything about TDR so we should have more articles/PR on the subject. Planning jargon is a problem.

As part of a greater program it could have an important role. The greater program should include clustering, conservation easements, and land or development rights purchases.

They think that much of their wetlands are irrigation induced – which means they could be de-listed after years of not irrigating. In other words, many of the fields could be developed at a later date.

Loss of taxes – TDR provides a means where increased development elsewhere helps to offset a loss of tax revenue at the sending site.

Accountability – County does not have a good track record but an ordinance could result in a higher degree of trust/accountability. Getting an ordinance that works for each community will be very difficult.

TDR as a voluntary option to farmers and ranchers could be useful.

The phrase “we have decided” is very irritating (I did not say that) and hopefully that does not mean the west side has decided for the east side. They really don't like the idea that the west side wants the east side to preserve their land. This tends to suggest that more than one system could be useful.

Loss of any private property rights should not be allowed. Saying that one area has to be preserved as opposed to providing a system for voluntary preservation, would be a problem.

The County's zoning strategy of one unit per 40 acres needs to be rethought. Greater allowance for some additional units should be considered with a TDR program. Zoning that allows a home on 10 acres, for example would not detract significantly from the idea of preserving rural character.

There are concerns that the County is trying to avoid establishing more infrastructure that they have to finance and maintain. The issue of growth in towns versus the County was discussed at length. Should Jeremy ranch, Pinebrook, and other unincorporated communities/developments be forced to form their own town?

US 40 area already has significant infrastructure.

Subscriptions	<b>PARK CITY</b> SERVING SUMMIT COUNTY SINCE 1880 <b>PARK RECORD.com</b>	Search or Place a Classified
---------------	---	------------------------------

### Towns untrusting of county government

### County looks to trade density with cities

**Sarah Moffitt, The Park Record**  
The Park Record

Posted: 10/21/2011 04:47:50 PM MDT

Subscriptions	<b>PARK CITY</b> SERVING SUMMIT COUNTY SINCE 1880 <b>PARK RECORD.com</b>	Search or Place a Classified
---------------	---	------------------------------

At Tuesday's Council of Governments' meeting, the East Side representatives made sure the Summit County Council heard them loud and clear when they said they were not interested in participating in a County Courthouse program allowing development rights to be shifted between landowners.

Recently, the county representatives and a consultant have been meeting with representatives from Oakley, Coalville, Henefer, Kamas, Francis and Park City to discuss the possibility of transferring development rights (TDR) between cities and the county. Transfers of development programs allow a resident who wants to keep their undeveloped open to sell their development rights to another resident who wants more buildings on their land.

"TDR give landowners a tool and allows density in one place and open space in another," said County Councilmember Chris Robinson. "The rub has come in figuring out how you should be able to do it. Can Park City trade density with North Summit, even though the open space won't benefit the same region that is getting the increased density?"

Cities have expressed frustration at the county's concept of placing increased development in the towns and extra open space in the unincorporated parts of the county.

"The concept of entering into TDR discussions with the county did not go over well in Henefer," said Henefer Mayor Randy Ovard. "We did not see the value in it, if we want more density or open space as a town, we will just do it ourselves."

Ovard added that he suspects the county's motivation behind partnering with the cities is to control development and growth.

"The county has had to maintain the infrastructure for a large area of development in the Basin because it is all unincorporated and too dense. They don't want the East Side to develop like that. Their TDR plan is in response to the burden of the unincorporated towns," he said.

Coalville Mayor Duane Schmidt said all six towns expressed hesitation with entering into development programs with the county due to distrust.

"There is really no benefit to the cities by trading open space for density with the county," Schmidt said. "The county wants to move development to where there is already infrastructure. But the resources it would use, such as water and sewer, are very valuable. So pretty much the county's density is eating up the city's resources, where is the value in that for us? We would be seeing increased density, no improvement, potentially growth we don't want, and less open space."

Schmidt said the county has not followed through on some of its promises to help Coalville with infrastructure, contributing to his distrust of the County Courthouse.

While the county would like to see growth happen in the cities, transferring development rights would probably only work if it was limited to the unincorporated areas of the county, said Robinson.

[Contact Us](#) | [Advertising](#)



[Contact Us](#) | [Advertising](#)



[ [Close Window](#) ] [ [Send To Printer](#) ]