

## Proposition #10

### **County General Plan Central and Southern Planning Area Boundary Change**

Shall the General Plan be modified to realign a portion of the boundary between the Central and Southern Planning Areas making 650 South the boundary between the two areas for this portion, and adding language explaining the basis for the change? The Central Planning encourages less dense zoning, while the Southern Planning allows for denser zoning. The realignment would add approximately 30 acres to the Central Planning Area and add approximately 20 acres to the Southern Planning Area. This boundary change would not affect the current zoning of the property affected without further action by the County Council

For the Zone Change (Yes)

Against the Zone Change (No)

### **Pro Statement**

In response to the referendum petition on the General Plan boundary change between the Central and Southern planning areas, we would like to clear up a few misrepresentations that were put out to the public as signatures were collected for the referendum. First off: The area in question IS NOT in the north fields, as such, it IS NOT a violation or override of the voters' wishes on the rezone of the North Fields, as was portrayed. The area in question is in the Central and Southern planning area. Secondly: This small rezone is not intended as a wholesale rezone of the entire area, as was portrayed by petitioners, which would then march through the North Fields, and it is not a rezone from an RA20, with one building lot allowed, to a rezone of 20 new building lots, which was also portrayed by signature gatherers.

Here are the facts as looked at by the County Council over an extended period, before we voted for the boundary change. We, as a council, are required to review our general plan and zoning periodically and we can make changes to that plan based on that review. When these two planning areas were reviewed in the last county wide evaluation, the committee for these two planning areas recommended that parts of the Southern planning area be rezoned to RA5. The county did change parts of the Southern planning area to RA5, which included some of the property in question, but not all of it.

When the petitioner of the property asked for a rezone of his property which was still in the Central Planning area, the council looked at the boundaries between the two planning areas and recognized that the line dividing the two was very arbitrary and had been made even more so with the changes that were made after the review a few years previous. We asked the petitioner to request a planning area boundary change, which he did. The Council looked very seriously at the two planning areas and the type of land they were. As we looked at the property in question, we verified that the land type and physical constraints are consistent with other areas within the County zoned RA1. The property in question was also more consistent with other property within the Southern area, rather than that in the Central area. The request for this property was to move it from the Central area to the Southern area.

Therefore, the change the Council made was to realign the boundary between the two planning areas with a definite line, using 650 South as the new boundary, rather than zigzagging back and forth as the current boundary does.

With that explanation given, we would encourage the voters of Wasatch County to vote for the proposition, approving this boundary change. This was not an arbitrary change but was done with much thought and evaluation. Please visit with a member of the County Council for a more detailed explanation.

Kendell Crittenden, Wasatch County Council Member

## **Rebuttal of Pro Statement**

The County Councilman who wrote this pro argument is saying, "We are the government. Trust us. Vote for Proposition 10 because we know what we are doing." Do they? Does the County Council understand the unfortunate precedent of having introduced RA-5 zoning (one home per 5 acres) into the Central Planning Zone, which allows only A-20 zoning (one home per 20 acres)?

The County Council did not do a "General Plan review", as stated. That would entail a review of ALL zones, not just a boundary change between the Central and Southern Planning Zones. Also, the County Code only allows any General Plan amendments in November of each year. Yet, the County Council voted on this General Plan amendment in May.

To say this amendment does not affect the North Fields is incorrect. Those highly sensitive lands are in the Central Planning Zone. Finally, to amend the General Plan for the benefit of one landowner, as County Council admits it did, is highly unusual and reckless. The County Council has the duty to act in the best interest of all residents, not just one.

This referendum petition ballot issue empowers the voters to decide the fate of our General Plan. Why have a General Plan if the County Council is going to haphazardly amend it and create an exception? Vote AGAINST Proposition 10 if you want to uphold the General Plan and deny the introduction of higher density into the Central Planning Zone, where the North Fields are located.

Justin Crail, Sponsor

## **Against Statement**

In 2014, the Wasatch County Council attempted to increase the density of the North Fields by rezoning it from one home per 20 acres (A-20) to one home per 10 acres (A-10). At the November 2016 general election, 74% of Wasatch County voters resoundingly rejected this density increase and preserved the existing zoning in the North Fields.

It's 2018, and we need to vote AGAINST Proposition 10 again to overturn this County Council's vote on May 16, 2018 to amend the General Plan by passing Ordinance 18-01. This decision allowed higher density in, and moved the boundary of, the Central Planning Area which includes the North Fields. The specific boundary is between the Central Planning Area and the Southern Planning Area and it would be moved to 650 South, trending east-west, and to Spring Creek Channel, trending north-south.

This boundary change would result in one 20-acre parcel moving into the Southern Planning Area and becoming eligible for one home per 5 acre density (RA-5) and two parcels totally 30 acres moving into the Central Planning Area while retaining their RA-5 zoning. This creates a very dangerous precedent. It introduces RA-5 zoning into the Central Planning Area, which the General Plan identifies as being suitable only for A-20 zoning (one house per 20 acres). It paves the way for any other landowner to argue that one house per 5 acres has already been allowed in the Central Planning Zone, so why can't it be allowed for my parcel as well? Why can't it be allowed for any parcel? This undoubtedly threatens the A-20 zoning in the North Fields.

Since 30 acres is greater than 20 acres, it's easy to incorrectly conclude that there will be a net decrease in density BUT density will increase because the two parcels that moved into the Central Planning Area are already zoned RA-5 and will retain that zoning.

This General Plan amendment was passed for the benefit of one landowner without taking into account whether this action had any benefit to the general public as a whole. This General Plan amendment was

discussed in conjunction with the 20-acre rezone throughout the process, and the County Council had not considered amending the General Plan prior to the rezone application. There are private property rights for landowners to have the ability to apply for a zone change, but it doesn't guarantee the rezone will be granted. The voters in 2016 were clearly in favor of preserving current zoning for this area, and the county council by passing this ordinance did not listen to those voters.\

Voting against proposition 10 will protect the integrity of our zoning areas, reinforce all zoning boundaries throughout the county, and enhance our county's ability to uphold our General Plan. That document is a clear vision developed by 100 Wasatch County citizens that identified the quality of life we cherish, how to preserve it, and what our valley should look like after decades of future growth.

VOTE AGAINST PROPOSITION 10.

Justin Crail, Sponsor

### **Rebuttal of Con-Statement**

Quoting the words of Ronald Reagan, in response to constant misrepresentation made by his opponents. "THERE YOUR GO AGAIN."

Once again, those who are opposed to this boundary change made in May 16, 2018 want to suggest that this change was made in the North Fields. Anyone familiar with this area would recognize that it's not the North Fields.

The ordinance was passed to provide a definitive boundary between these two planning areas. The opponents would have you believe that once the General Plan was written, it's never to be changed. It is just that, a GENERAL Plan, a guide used for future planning. We are required to review, and perhaps change, the General Plan, as was done county wide in 2006. At that time, the committee who looked at these two planning areas recommended that the southern portion of the Central Planning area should be changed to RA5, to promote growth and to provide a buffer between Heber City density and lower density in the county. Some of that area was rezoned at that time, including some of the land in this ordinance.

The county council looked at this area once again in 2017, when the zone changed petition was submitted. As we studied it, we felt that is WAS in the best interest of the public to clean up the line, making a more definitive boundary for the future.

Look at the maps, talk to the county council and vote YES to this proposition approving the boundary change.

Kendall Crittenden, Wasatch County Council Member