

FRUIT HEIGHTS FORWARD

General Plan - April 2023




Table of Contents

1 Background & Introduction	1
1.1 Organization of the Plan	1
1.2 Setting and History of Fruit Heights.....	1
1.3 Demographic Profile.....	2
1.4 Public Involvement.....	5
Plan Advisory Committee.....	5
Project Website	5
Public Meetings.....	6
1.5 Community Vision & Guiding Principles	6
Guiding Principles	7
2 Land Use	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Existing Land Use.....	8
2.3 Environmental Conditions.....	12
2.4 Future Land Use.....	12
Overview.....	12
Proposed Land Uses	1
2.5 Golf Course Futures.....	18
2.6 Community Design Considerations	20
2.7 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures	22
3 Transportation and Streets	24
3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 Existing Conditions.....	24
Assets, Challenges, & Opportunities	24
Key Opportunities.....	36
3.3 Transportation Goals.....	38
3.4 Transportation Network.....	40
Mountain Road Main Street	40
Other Major Street Corridors.....	40
Off-Street Trails	44
On-Street Trails.....	44
Desired Future Trail Connections	45

Future Street Alignments	45
Golf Course Site	45
Sidewalk Gaps.....	46
Major Street Crossings.....	46
Regional Bike Connections.....	47
3.5 Additional Policy Areas for Consideration.....	47

4 Moderate Income Housing 48

4.1 Introduction.....	48
4.2 Housing Strategies and Recommendations	48
Strategy 1: Rezone for Densities	49
Strategy 2: Accessory Dwelling Units	49
Strategy 3: Zone for Higher Density or Moderate-Income Residential Development	49
Strategy 4: Zoning Incentives.....	49
Strategy 5: Impact Fees	50
Additional State Support	50
Additional Recommendations	50

5 Economic Development..... 51

5.1 Analysis of Taxable Sales.....	51
Historic Taxable Sales	52
Sales Leakage Analysis	54
5.2 Market Analysis.....	56
Existing Market Conditions	56
General Growth Within the City and Region.....	62
Supportable Commercial Zoning	64
Additional Redevelopment Options and Tax Generation Scenarios	66
Barriers to Entry.....	68
5.3 Additional Economic Development Financing Tools	70
5.4 Cost Benefit Scenario Analysis Tables	72

6 Parks, Open Space & Trails..... 74

6.1 Introduction.....	74
Public Input: Parks, Open Space & Trails.....	74
6.2 Parks & Open Space	74
Existing Parks	74
Community Parks	74

Neighborhood Parks	75
Local Parks	75
Special Use Facilities	78
Existing Park Needs & Service Levels	78
Meeting Existing & Future Park Needs	79
Park Standards & Amenities	83
Open Space	87
Recommendations for Parks & Open Space.....	88
6.3 Trails	89
Existing Trails & Trailheads	89
Proposed Trails & Trailheads.....	89
Recommendations for Trails	90
6.4 Priorities, Construction Costs & Potential Funding Sources	90
Establishing Priorities	90
Probable Costs.....	92
Establishing Funding Priorities.....	93
Existing Funding Sources	93
6.5 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures	98
Parks & Open Space Goals & Policies	98
Trails Goals & Policies	99
Other Goals & Policies	100

7 Water Use & Conservation 101

7.1 Introduction	101
Water System Basics.....	101
Water Use	103
7.2 Outdoor Water Use & Sustainable Landscaping.....	104
7.3 Future Water Requirements.....	105
7.4 Water Conservation Plan.....	106
Local Conservation Efforts	106
Regional Collaboration and Conservation Efforts	107
Water Rates	108
Additional Water Conservation Measures.....	109
7.5 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures	110

Appendix A: Public Engagement Summary114

Appendix B: Moderate–Income Housing Report 129

Appendix C: Funding Sources for Parks, Open Space, and Trails Projects 143

Acknowledgements

Advisory Committee

Brandon Green	City Manager
Megan Townsend	Wasatch Front Regional Council
Diane Anderson	City Council
Eileen Moss	City Council
Kevin Paulsen	Planning Commission
Curtis Tanner	Planning Commission
Darcie Trimble	Citizen Representative
Steve Trimble	Citizen Representative

Fruit Heights City Council

John Pohlman	Mayor
Diane Anderson	Council Member
Gary Anderson	Council Member
Eileen Moss	Council Member
George Ray	Council Member
Florence Sadler	Council Member
Julia Busche	Council Member (Former)
Jeanne Groberg	Council Member (Former)

Fruit Heights Planning Commission

Carrie Carroll	Chair
Brian Bare	Commissioner
Clark Moss	Commissioner
Kevin Paulsen	Commissioner
Justin Wright	Commissioner
Sam Brady	Commissioner (Former)
Curtis Tanner	Commissioner (Former)
Jeff Oyler	City Planner

Planning Team

LANDMARK DESIGN

Mark Vlasic, AICP, ASLA, PLA	Principal-in-Charge
Sam Taylor, ASLA, PLA	Project Manager
Corinne Bahr	Planner

TOWNSHIP + RANGE

Tim Sullivan	Principal
Sophie Bellina	Planner

LEWIS, YOUNG, ROBERTSON & BURNINGHAM (LYRB)

Fred Philpot	Vice President
Logan Loftis	Analyst
Spencer Foster	Analyst
Kate Werrett	Analyst

Funding Provided By:



* The Fruit Height General Plan was adopted by the City Council on April 11, 2023.

1 Background & Introduction

Fruit Heights is known as the “City of Good Neighbors,” a reputation coupled with its ideal location has made the City a very attractive and desirable place to live. As such, the City has experienced significant growth and change in recent years, and now approaches a “build-out” condition. Although the previous General Plan has been a useful tool through much of this period, it has also become outdated and requires an update to clarify the vision and goals for guiding the next chapter of the City’s growth and development.

Updating the General Plan provides an opportunity for the citizens of Fruit Heights to take a look at the community today, to determine what works or requires improvement and to peer into the future and plan for anticipated changes. A General Plan typically has a life of five to ten years, although it establishes a future vision for twenty years or more. Following adoption, associated zoning ordinances, development guidelines and other implementation tools should be revised and adjusted in order to be in alignment with the updated plan.

1.1 Organization of the Plan

The *Fruit Heights General Plan* documents existing conditions and analyzes pertinent issues and ideas, presenting a clear vision for future growth and other improvements in Fruit Heights. The plan is divided into six elements or chapters as follow:

1. **Background & Introduction**
2. **Land Use**
3. **Transportation & Streets**
4. **Moderate Income Housing**
5. **Economic Development**
6. **Parks, Open Space, & Trails**
7. **Water Conservation**



Each chapter provides specific ideas and recommendations, concluding with a series of goals, policies and implementation measures that address how the vision will be achieved as part of an informed and consistent decision-making process.


1.2 Setting & History of Fruit Heights

Fruit Heights is nestled in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains overlooking the Great Salt Lake. Once an agricultural enclave, it is now largely a bedroom community offering sweeping vistas and a central location. Access to the greater Wasatch Front area is provided by US-89, which bisects the City, while the neighboring cities of Farmington and Kaysville provide most business services to the community.

Fruit Heights owes not only its name but existence to the orchards which once were the staple of the community. Orchards were a key part of early Mormon settlements, with the Latter-Day Saint faith placing both practical and theological emphasis on the production of fruit. As such, orchards were abundant throughout the Wasatch Front in the early years of settlement. Over time, experience taught farmers that mountain benches were ideal places to grow fruit, as the foothills had well-drained soil and regular breezes that kept cold air pockets away.

“You have to know the past to understand the present.” CARL SAGAN

The upland benches of unincorporated “East Kaysville” eventually became known for their cherry and peach orchards, but the challenge with growing on the bluffs was providing adequate irrigation to the farms. Residents of the area decided to incorporate as a city in order to bond for an irrigation system, and named the new town Fruit Heights in 1939. With the development of a new water and irrigation system, Fruit Heights strengthened its position as a agricultural community. However, following WWII the area began to change with an increased demand for suburban housing, and the orchards have since largely been replaced by residential neighborhoods. Today the City is nearly built out and has become a community beloved by the people who call it home.



Originally constructed as a cherry processing plant (left), the Rock Loft was an important community gathering place for many years (right).

1.3 Demographic Profile

In order to understand existing conditions and future needs, it is essential to have clear a snapshot of the Fruit Heights demographic profile. The following is a summary of key demographic characteristics, including population, age and household composition, which are some key conditions for understanding trends and needs over time¹.

Population

Fruit Heights has experienced an increase in population during the past decade, marginally surpassing the State on an annual percentage increase during the same period. Both Davis County and the City have experienced high growth rates, but the City population increase in terms of actual people is relatively small compared to the County. The City has grown by approximately 1,262 persons for a total of 6,205, or an average annual growth of 2.30 percent, from 2010 to 2020. **Table 1.1** shows a comparison of similarly sized and neighboring communities.

Historic and future population projections are shown in **Figure 1.1**. Based on current trends, it is estimated that the City will have a population of approximately 9,000 by the year 2050. While this population estimate is not necessarily an absolute target, it is useful for


¹ Demographic information sourced from the U.S. Census Bureau and Wasatch Front Regional Council.

Table 1.1 – Historic Population

CITY	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2020 AAGR
Centerville	15,216	15,362	15,554	15,819	16,104	16,387	16,727	17,013	17,221	17,404	16,884	1.42%
Clearfield	30,112	29,904	30,086	30,278	30,361	30,299	30,483	30,683	31,016	32,118	31,909	0.69%
Farmington	18,275	17,723	18,722	19,600	20,440	21,223	21,983	22,616	23,208	25,339	24,531	2.99%
Fruit Heights	4,943	4,981	5,057	5,191	5,353	5,625	5,840	5,992	6,100	6,172	6,205	2.30%
Kaysville	27,300	26,728	27,353	27,928	28,480	29,213	29,799	30,328	30,961	31,494	32,945	2.06%
West Bountiful	5,140	5,223	5,259	5,296	5,353	5,394	5,436	5,504	5,578	5,627	5,917	1.08%
Davis County	294,532	301,124	306,664	311,886	317,646	323,374	329,292	334,977	340,621	355,481	362,679	1.76%
State of Utah	2,763,885	2,809,828	2,856,535	2,904,018	2,952,290	3,001,365	3,051,255	2,993,941	3,043,708	3,205,958	3,271,616	1.72%

projecting future needs and demands for growth, development, City-provided services and infrastructure.

Figure 1.1 – Fruit Heights Population: 2000–2050



Age

A comparison of the median age illustrates that city residents are older than the County and State on average. As indicated in Figure 1.2, the age profile of the City has shifted from 2010 to 2020, indicating a shift to an older population, with significant increases in the 35 to 44 age ranges, and similar decreases in the 45 to 54 ranges. Concurrent with this increase has been a significant drop in the 15 to 34 year age range, and for young children under five years. The population shift to an older residential base highlights the amenities and housing options available within the City, as the population age and educational attainment offers the City an increase in income levels and buying power in online sales.

Household Size

Household size is typically correlated to the age characteristics of the community. Larger household sizes are often found in communities containing higher proportions of young families with more children. In the case of Fruit Heights, household size slightly decreased over the past decade, dropping from 3.61 persons per household on average in 2010 as compared with 3.02 per household in 2020. Fruit Heights has a smaller average household size than the county (3.25) yet larger than the nation (2.60).

Figure 1.2 – Age Distribution as % of Total




FIGURE 1.3: HOUSEHOLD MEDIAN ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME





FIGURE 1.4: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AS % OF TOTAL




Household Income

Household income is expressed as median adjusted gross income (MAGI), which represents a household's total gross income less specific tax deductions. As indicated in Figure 1.3, the Fruit Heights MAGI has been consistently much higher than Davis County and Utah. The MAGI in Fruit Heights is in fact higher than the majority of other cities in the State, ranking fifth of all Utah cities.

Education

According to the US Census 2019 American Community Survey 2016-2020 five-year estimates, approximately 68 percent of Fruit Heights' adult population holds an associate degree or higher, compared to 49 percent in Davis County and 45 percent in the State of Utah. This indicates that educational attainment and achievement is highly valued and is one of the key reasons for the higher than average incomes in the city.

FIGURE 1.5: HISTORIC UNEMPLOYMENT RATE



Employment

Since employment data for Fruit Heights is difficult to isolate, comparable data for Davis County serves to illustrate the local conditions. As of December 2021, the unemployment rate in Davis County was 2.1 percent, which is the lowest rate since 1990 (see Figure 1.5). This is indicative of the positive economic conditions that have prevailed for much of the past decade, with periods of higher unemployment rates were marked by economic downturns. Fruit Heights' current unemployment rate is comparable to the region and much lower than the national average unemployment rate of 3.9 percent.

Summary

The positive population growth in Fruit Heights during the past decade is likely to continue during the next 30 years, during which time the city is expected to grow by an additional 2,000-3,000 residents. The community is aging, with the percentage of seniors in the community increasing and the number of young children decreasing. Fruit Heights' average household size is also declining as the community continues to mature. The City's relatively high median income is likely to continue to keep pace with positive economic growth, which correlates with locally high educational attainment and low unemployment rates.

As the City continues to develop it will be important to maximize opportunities for a city approaching buildout. A key goal of a maturing city such as Fruit Heights is to apply a balanced approach for meeting the needs of its population with a wide range of ages and needs.

1.4 Public Involvement

Engaging the public is an important step for ensuring the General Plan accurately reflects existing and future needs while providing a clear future vision for how the City will grow and change. As summarized below and detailed in *Appendix A*, the engagement process that was applied provided multiple opportunities for the public to comment, identify issues and provide feedback as the plan was developed.

Plan Advisory Committee

A Plan Advisory Committee was established during the early stages of the project to review progress and provide guidance as the plan was formulated. The committee included representatives of the City Council and Planning Commission, local business and development community representatives, and other community representatives and residents. The Plan Advisory Committee provided critical input and direction as the plan was developed.

Project Website

A project website was established at the commencement of the project, providing access to background information, project documentation, ideas and updates. The website included information on meeting dates and times, and provided copies of presentation materials, notes and survey results. The website also included an email list sign-up, comment tools and contact information, updates on plan progress, draft plan documents and links to Social Pinpoint™, an interactive mapping tool.

Public Meetings

The planning process included a two-part **Public Engagement Process** conducted at the beginning of the process to sample public opinions and input concerning land use, transportation and parks, a **Public Workshop** to present alternative concepts for the plan, and a **Draft Plan Open House** at the end of the process to receive public input prior to the commencement of the formal plan adoption process.

Public Engagement Process

A **Public Open House** was held at City Hall on November 18, 2021, followed by a six-week online engagement period, which utilized an **Interactive Mapping Tool** and a short **Questionnaire** on the project website to help gauge preferences and document ideas related to land use, transportation and parks, open space, and trails in Fruit Heights. The input received was wide-ranging, identifying several “hot button” topics and concerns, and providing a general consensus for how the future city should operate and function. The detailed results are provided in *Appendix A*, and the Top 5 key topics that emerged are summarized below:

1. Preservation of Open Space

A key concern indicated by many residents was the need to preserve the remaining open space in the community, particularly in the foothills. Preserving the City’s remaining agricultural land was also desired.

2. More Commercial

A commonly expressed desire was for additional commercial uses within the community. Examples of suggested uses include gas stations, grocery stores, and cafes/restaurants. Many desired these uses for convenience so they do not have to travel to other communities, while others desired commercial uses to help enhance the local tax base.

3. Traffic & Road Safety

There was significant concern about traffic, speeding, or dangerous road conditions. Comments identified problematic intersections, unsafe pedestrian conditions, and excessive speeding.

4. Park or Trail Improvements

Some residents expressed a need for park or trail improvements, including enhancements such as additional trash bins, restrooms, and dog amenities, such as dog bag stations and designated off-leash areas.

5. City Beautification

Some comments expressed a desire for improved beautification in the City, particularly through enhanced landscaping along existing right-of-ways and along the edges of major roads and intersections.

Public Workshop

A **Public Workshop** was held at City Hall on March 16, 2022 to present alternative concepts for land use and transportation considerations in the city. Ideas surrounded the creation of community and neighborhood centers, and traffic treatments for Mountain Road. Residents submitted feedback via a short questionnaire.

Draft Plan Open House

A **Draft Plan Open House** was held at City Hall on February 16, 2023 to allow the public to review the plan and provide comment prior to adoption.

1.5 Community Vision & Guiding Principles

Based on the input provided by the public involvement process and further discussions with the Plan Advisory Committee and City staff, it is clear that Fruit Heights residents want to preserve the small-town atmosphere of the city. For many, this is the primary reason they chose to live here. There is a desire to minimize the impacts of growth while also strengthening community identity through the formation of a central city center or gathering place.

Based on the input that was received, a set of **Guiding Principles** was established that address the opportunities and challenges of future growth and change in Fruit Heights. These were streamlined to encapsulate the **Community Vision** and priorities of the city, and are presented on the following pages.

Guiding Principles

1. Preserve and enhance the small-town character and peaceful lifestyle using carefully considered zoning ordinances, preserving environmentally sensitive lands, and providing high-quality open space.



2. Locate small-scale neighborhood commercial and mixed-use development - comprised mostly of local businesses - in central community areas to increase the availability of goods and services to the local population.



3. As the largest undeveloped area in the City, provide a future strategy for the redevelopment of the golf course into a town center should the facility ever change ownership or use.



4. Provide a range of housing options (mixture of types and densities) while respecting the scale and character that currently exists in Fruit Heights.



5. Develop a well-connected transportation system that minimizes traffic congestion, incorporates multiple modes of transport (bus, bicycle, walking, etc.) and prioritizes pedestrian safety.



6. Link existing parks and public spaces, residential areas, natural and open space areas, drainages and waterways to create a comprehensive system of parks and trails.



2 Land Use

2.1 Introduction

A clear land use vision is critical to guide growth and development and to maximize the City's investment in infrastructure. The ideas contained in the following pages clarify community desires and aspirations, translating them into clear policies to guide future growth and change.

As Fruit Heights City is nearly built out, the new land use vision aims to maximize the potential of the little undeveloped land that remains. It balances the public voices that were heard and the ideas they expressed to establish a clear future land use plan, and concludes with specific goals, policies and implementation measures to ensure the integrated land use vision is achieved.

Public Input: Land Use

As described in the previous chapter, maintaining a clear land use vision is essential to ensure Fruit Heights retains the community atmosphere beloved by its residents. The results of public input process indicated that people are particularly concerned that the small-town feel and scale of Fruit Heights is threatened by the pace of growth in the region.

In particular, residents are concerned by the disappearance of open space in the community, as previous agricultural lands have gradually been developed into residential neighborhoods. By contrast, residents also desire additional commercial services within the community, with an emphasis on small-scale, locally focused businesses. There is also some concern that the City is becoming a less affordable place to live, limiting viable housing options for future generations to live here. The future land use vision must strike a balance between these concerns.

2.2 Existing Land Use

Existing land use patterns in the City are primarily reflective of its foothill topography. Steep slopes and natural drainages have dictated the placement of roads and buildings over time, and land use patterns also reflect the distinct eras of growth and development that have taken

place over the years, transforming the farms that dotted the landscape into subdivisions and housing developments that now predominate.

Map 2.1 illustrates these existing patterns, providing an overview of how past growth and development trends affect where future planning opportunities lie.


Table 2.1 details existing land uses in the City, which covers an area slightly less than 1,500 acres. The bulk of developed land consists of single-family residential neighborhoods, interspersed with civic uses such as City Hall, parks and churches. The city currently has 23 acres of commercial uses located at Cherry Hill and the Rock Loft area on Mountain Road. The Davis County Golf Course occupies 170 acres within the City, and natural open space land a similar amount. Only 129 acres of agricultural, vacant, or undeveloped uses remain, which are projected to develop in the near future as single-family residences.

Table 2.1: Existing Land Use


Land Use	Total Acres	% of Total
Single Family Residential	677	46.0%
Multifamily Residential	13	0.8%
Manufactured Homes	11	0.7%
Commercial	23	1.5%
Religious	23	1.5%
Parks	47	3.2%
Natural Open Space	168	11.4%
Golf Course	170	11.6%
Agriculture/Open or Vacant Land	129	8.8%
Utilities/Transportation	14	0.9%
Roads	74	5.0%
Total	1,466	100%

MAP 2.1 - EXISTING LAND USE

- Commercial
- Single Family Residential
- Multifamily Residential
- Manufactured Homes
- Religious
- Utilities/Transportation
- Parks
- Open Space
- Golf Course
- Agriculture
- Vacant/Underutilized
- City Boundary



MAP 2.2 - EXISTING ZONING




- OSC
- OSR
- A-1
- R-S-12
- R-1-12
- R-1-10
- R-1-08
- R-3
- C-1
- C-2
- City Boundary



0 0.5
Miles



MAP 2.3 - GEOLOGIC HAZARDS



0 0.5 Miles



2.3 Environmental Conditions

There are few environmental constraints to development within the city – most of the land in the city is not encumbered by steep slopes or significant geological or hydrological constraints. Map 2.3 summarizes geologic hazards. However, the remaining vacant land on the eastern bench will prove more challenging for development, as this area is burdened by steep slopes, fault lines, and limited water resources without additional infrastructure. Likewise, a significant portion of the city is located on the alluvial flood plain associated with Bair Canyon, although the likelihood of flooding within this zone is considered minimal. Most of the Bair Creek stream corridor is already preserved as dedicated open space, and remaining privately held sections would be best preserved rather than being developed due to their sensitive nature.

2.4 Future Land Use

Overview

As indicated at the beginning of this section, the primary purpose of this plan is to establish a clear yet realistic land use vision to guide future decision-making. Map 2.4 illustrates the Future Land Use for Fruit Heights, as envisioned during the next 20-50 years. This map is accompanied by Table 2.2, which details the amount and percentage of land within the city dedicated to envisioned future uses.

The plan seeks to strike a balance between the provision of future growth and safeguarding the unique “sense of place” in Fruit Heights. It envisions the preservation of single-family residential neighborhoods as the primary form of development. Open space is primarily preserved in the foothills and along Bair Creek, linked together by a connected network of trails and bikeways. Activity centers are located at important points within the city to provide goods, services, and housing options relevant to Fruit Heights and its neighbors in terms of size and scale to meet future needs. Chief among these activity centers is a re-imagining of the Davis County Golf Course as a town center, which would help establish a distinguished and diverse community retail and service center consisting of small-scale commercial, residential, civic, and open

space uses are combined as part of a great downtown that enhances the community (see *Section 2.5* for details).

Proposed Land Uses

The following pages describe the proposed future land uses shown on Map 2.4. Future land uses generally encourage existing use patterns and neighborhoods to remain, while introducing specific residential and commercial districts to meet long-term needs through build-out. Single-family residential land uses are envisioned to remain for much of the City, with transitional areas buffering these neighborhoods from the activity centers and helping to provide a range of housing options to meet future needs.

The land use vision indicates the location of key public facilities and future park, trail and open space system as suggested to serve the needs of the city (see *Chapter 6: Parks, Open Space and Trails* for details).

Table 2.2: Future Land Use Acreages for Map 2.4

Land Use	Total Acres*	% of Total
Single Family Residential	947	64.5%
Multifamily Residential	50	3.4%
Manufactured Homes	11	0.7%
Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential	24	1.6%
Commercial	40	2.7%
Civic/Religious	28	1.9%
Parks	52	3.5%
Open Space	176	12%
Cemetery	50	3.4%
Utilities/Transportation	14	0.9%
Existing Roads	74	5.0%
Total	1,466	100%

*Up to 30% of the total acreage of future land uses may be used for infrastructural uses such as roads, utilities, schools, etc.


MAP 2.4 - FUTURE LAND USE

MIXED USE & COMMERCIAL CENTERS

-  RETAIL-ORIENTED
-  RECREATION-ORIENTED
-  NEIGHBORHOOD-ORIENTED

LAND USES

-  COMMERCIAL
-  MIXED USE
-  MIXED RESIDENTIAL
-  TRANSITIONAL RESIDENTIAL
-  SF RESIDENTIAL/EXISTING USE
-  CIVIC
-  PARK/OPEN SPACE
-  NATURAL OPEN SPACE
-  CEMETERY
-  PRIMARY CORRIDOR
-  KEY INTERSECTION/NODE
-  COMMUNITY TRAIL NETWORK
-  CITY BOUNDARY



Activity Centers

Activity centers provide energy for the community - they are places for people to access goods and services, recreate, or gather and celebrate together. Depending on their use, they may be described as a destination, a retreat, or a hangout. They provide both economic and social vitality to the City, and enhance the sense of place by serving as community landmarks. The underlying land uses for activity centers are primarily commercial or mixed use, but the nuances of each type of activity center are described as follows:

Retail-Oriented Center

Retail-oriented centers are intended to primarily feature small-scale retail businesses that provide goods and services to both local residents and pass-through traffic on US-89 and Main Street. These centers may include businesses such as grocery stores, convenience stores, pharmacy, and specialty/boutique retailers. Restaurant and other food service businesses are also encouraged, but should generally be pedestrian-oriented.



Recreation-Oriented Center

Recreation-oriented centers focus specifically on supporting recreational users within the associated area. These centers may include recreational businesses themselves, such as Cherry Hill or a climbing gym, or may contain supporting businesses such as bicycle shops and other small-scale outdoor product retailers, restaurants, or other recreational professional services.



Neighborhood-Oriented Center

Neighborhood-oriented centers are specifically intended to provide a meaningful destination for residents of the adjacent neighborhood within walking distance from home. They should be small and local in nature, with an emphasis on local eateries or boutique retail, but may also include civic and park uses as well.



Mixed Use

The Mixed Use category permits residential development within a commercial district in an effort to establish a vibrant activity center. These areas will typically feature attached residential units located over ground floor retail, but may take other forms as well. Mixed use developments in Fruit Heights should be intimate, properly-scaled and walkable neighborhoods, and supported by adjacent residential and open space areas. This land use category is primarily associated with activity centers within the future golf course redevelopment, which is described in greater detail in *Section 2.5*.

Commercial

Commercial-only areas are located at key points along Mountain Road, with Cherry Hill being an exception. As described on the previous page, they are associated with activity centers, and each area's commercial uses should target the focus of its corresponding center.

Mixed and Multifamily Residential

This land use type is aimed at providing an array of affordable housing options based on the economic, lifestyle, and life-cycle needs of residents. Mixed residential areas provide a mix of owned and rented units, both attached and detached. Multifamily units may be developed as townhomes or as part of larger apartment complexes, but should be diverse and distinct in their architectural design, and complimentary to the surrounding neighborhoods in which these developments are located. Generally, mixed residential areas should be located adjacent to mixed use activity centers within the future golf course redevelopment, which is described in greater detail in *Section 2.5*. Other existing multifamily residential areas in the City should remain.



Transitional Residential

Transitional Residential areas are intended to provide a buffer between mixed residential areas and existing single-family neighborhoods. Units may be developed as single-family patio homes or similar types, utilizing smaller lot sizes and limiting heights to one or two stories. Generally, these areas are located within the future golf course redevelopment, which is described in greater detail in *Section 2.5*.



Single-Family Residential

The Single-Family Residential land use category supports and preserves existing single-family residential development in place per current zoning. Future infill development should be consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.



Civic and Public Facilities

Existing civic uses, including City Hall, churches and other similar uses are maintained in current locations in the near term. Eventually, should the golf course redevelop, the City may elect to relocate City Hall to a civic-designated area within that space.



Parks & Open Space


Existing parks should be maintained, enhanced and developed as recommended in *Chapter 4: Parks, Open Space and Trails* of this plan.

Natural open space, including critical environment along Bair Creek and along the East Bench, should be maintained and preserved as legacy uses for future generations wherever possible.



Cemetery

The City recently acquired roughly 100 acres of open space on the East Bench with the intention of developing a city cemetery. Due to the physical constraints of this property, the future cemetery should be located in the lower half of the property to avoid issues with steep slopes and water access. The cemetery should also consider using strictly water-conserving landscapes as an aesthetic rather than traditional lawns, in order to reduce infrastructure and maintenance costs.



2.5 Golf Course Futures

The Davis County Golf Course occupies approximately 150 acres of land on the west side of Fruit Heights City. It is a significant recreational resource and one of the largest open spaces within the city limits. It should be noted that **the City has no intentions of actively pursuing a change of land use for the golf course.** However, the City does acknowledge that with the ongoing complications of drought in the region and the potential fluctuations of participation in the sport, a redevelopment plan should be in place in the event that the County decides to change the use of this property.

A concept vision for a potential redeveloped golf course is depicted in Map 2.5. This plan allocates a portion of the site for redevelopment, while preserving nearly 40-percent of the existing open space, in an effort to strike a balance between the City's goals for increasing the availability of commercial uses and affordable housing options and maintaining the pastoral and open character of the community. **Note that this concept is a reflection of current issues during the writing of this plan. Should market conditions change in the future and the City's housing and economic goals have been met otherwise, the priority for this site should be the preservation of open space.**

Golf Course Vision and Land Uses

The land use plan in Map 2.5 envisions the creation of two activity centers to anchor the site at each end, with the primary center located along Main Street as a retail-oriented center and the secondary center located along Nicholls Road as a recreation-oriented and civic-use center, due to its adjacency to Nicholls Park. See *Section 2.4* for detailed descriptions of the activity center types.

A central park/open space corridor is a key element of the plan, with additional open space located at the edges of the site providing a buffer between the existing adjacent neighborhoods. A multi-use trail system runs the length of the open space corridor, connecting residential and mixed use neighborhoods together as part of a walkable and bikeable community. The trail system also makes important connections to the Bair Creek Trail, crossings over US-89, and parallel runs to Main Street to connect other neighborhoods in the City with the new town center.

Mixed Use Centers

These areas will typically feature attached residential units located over ground floor retail, but may take other forms and uses as well. Mixed use centers should be properly-scaled and in character with the rest of the City, reaching heights of no more than three to four stories. Traditional architectural forms and materials are encouraged. First floor retail should feature outdoor pedestrian amenities, including small plazas, outdoor dining areas, wide sidewalks, site furnishings and trees, with parking located to the rear and between buildings.




Mixed Residential

Mixed Residential areas are aimed at providing an array of affordable housing options based on the economic, lifestyle, and life-cycle needs of residents. They should provide a mix of attached and detached units across a range of types and forms, including condominium, townhomes and compact single-family dwellings. They also provide shared amenities such as parking, open space, gathering areas, and recreation facilities. Buildings should be a maximum of three stories and utilize traditional architectural forms and materials.



MAP 2.5 - GOLF COURSE REDEVELOPMENT



- BUFFER OPEN SPACE
- PRIMARY OPEN SPACE
- TRANSITIONAL RESIDENTIAL
- MIXED RESIDENTIAL
- MIXED USE CENTERS
- CIVIC CENTER
- PRIMARY CORRIDOR
- MULTI-USE TRAIL
- KEY INTERSECTION/NODE
- CITY BOUNDARY

ACREAGES

MIXED USE CENTERS	24 ac
MIXED RESIDENTIAL	38 ac
TRANSITION RESIDENTIAL	40 ac
CIVIC CENTER	5 ac
OPEN SPACE	63 ac
TOTAL	170 ac



Transitional Residential

Transitional Residential areas serve as buffers between mixed residential areas and existing single-family neighborhoods. Units may be developed as single-family patio homes or similar products, with smaller lot sizes and limited to one or two stories. The low scale and size of these areas feather the new development seamlessly with existing residential uses.



Open Space

Open Space areas should provide both developed and natural open areas for residents within the new development and community at large. The primary open space areas within the central corridor are envisioned to be more developed, providing recreational amenities and gathering areas to the neighborhood. They may also include space for community gardens or orchards as a nod to the historic roots of the city.

Buffer open space areas are intended to be less developed and more natural in character. They should be landscaped with trees and waterwise plantings, and feature secondary trails and sitting areas.



Civic Center

The civic center is envisioned to be the central civic hub for Fruit Heights City, ultimately becoming the new home to City Hall. Other potential future uses in this area could include city services such as a fire/police station, library, or recreation center.



2.6 Community Design Considerations

Creating a compelling land use vision goes beyond the delineation of boundaries on a map. The following tools and concepts are presented for possible consideration to help ensure Fruit Heights grows in a manner that matches the land use vision. These tools can help ensure the identity and allure of the community is preserved as it continues to develop and grow. It should be noted that the application of each tool will need to be carefully considered and adjusted to meet specific needs and established traditions.

Corridor Treatments

Special streetscape improvements should be provided along key corridors, including Mountain Road, for example. Special street treatments should be developed for each roadway, providing a unified yet distinct streetscape treatment for the City. Streetscapes should incorporate street trees, landscape treatments, lighting and similar enhancements that distinguish each as an attractive passageway.



Key corridors within the City core should be enhanced with unified elements such as street trees, lighting, banners and other enhancements.

Community Gateway Enhancements

Clear indications that one has arrived in Fruit Heights should be established at key entrances into the City. A variety of methods and forms can be used, including enhanced landscaping, coordinated signage, unique landforms and landscape art.



Community gateways can be enhanced by signage and landscaping along the roadway

Community Node Enhancements

Special urban design treatments should be developed for nodes at each activity center in the community. Each activity center should be treated as a special district and should receive special design attention, helping residents and visitors understand the identity and function of each, while also clarifying a sense of arrival. Design inputs should go beyond wayfinding and enhanced signage, incorporating great public spaces,

beautiful and engaging landscape treatments, and special design details that reinforce the unique characteristics that define each destination.



Highway Beautification

Special consideration should be given to beautifying sections of US-89 as it passes through the City. These improvements provide a positive impression of the City to those traveling, help to reinforce the sense of place, direct views and provide visual buffers, or reduce highway noise in residential neighborhoods. Interstate exits should be given special treatment to enhance the sense of arrival in the city. Waterwise plantings and groupings of small trees beautify on/off ramps and can showcase the artistic expression of the community. Public art may also enhance these points if desired.

Maintaining Views and Viewsheds

First impressions often establish one's perception of a place. Special efforts should be made to improve the key view corridors in Fruit Heights, particularly along key roadways, carefully controlling building setbacks and heights, and coordinating development in a manner that acknowledges the importance of key viewsheds to the west in particular.

Under most circumstances the use of trees and vegetation can soften and buffer undesirable views, while framing desirable ones. Vegetation can also visually unify the built and natural environments. For example, regularly-space street trees can unify neighborhoods within the City under a common theme.

2.7 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures

Goal 1: Preserve and protect Fruit Heights' atmosphere by limiting change in functioning neighborhoods.

Policy 1.1: Preserve single-family neighborhoods by restricting development to models that fit the existing character of the neighborhood.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Preserve existing ordinances and codes that support single-family dwellings in established neighborhoods.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Establish detailed guidelines and educational information regarding the benefits of new residential models as the City reaches buildout.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure zoning and land use decisions are consistent with the Land Use Plan Map and the adopted policies and goals.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* General Plan amendments, while occasionally necessary and desirable, should be based on changing circumstances and should benefit the community at large.

Policy 1.2: Carefully integrate new development with existing uses in established neighborhoods.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Protect historic structures in order to maintain the sense of history and special qualities of historic areas.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Protect good housing and reuse existing structures where possible. Well-maintained homes within and along the edges of new development areas should be maintained. Preserving such structures can help provide a feeling of stability amidst change as other less attractive structures and areas are redeveloped.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure new buildings match the scale of existing uses. When existing structures cannot be retrofitted or transformed, new buildings should be developed in a manner that is sympathetic to the scale of established structures and patterns.

Goal 2: Establish activity centers as distinct and vibrant neighborhood gathering and business places

Policy 2.1: In the event that the Davis County Golf Course is redeveloped, establish a distinct City Center on the site to serve as the new “heart of the community”.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Modify existing ordinances and codes to allow for mixed-use development in the Golf Course area, as detailed in the future land use maps. Consider the implementation of a form-based code to guide future development in achieving a form, scale and style that are appropriate for Fruit Heights.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Connect the area to other neighborhoods utilizing a robust system of parks, greenways and trails/sidewalks. The addition of new pedestrian-friendly streets, pathways, plazas and parks will provide options for accommodating expanded and diverse City Center events.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Relocate City Hall and other civic uses to this activity center to be centrally-located and support civic and cultural events.

Policy 2.2: Leverage Highway 89 and Main Street by implementing and strengthening commercial opportunities at interchanges and frontages.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Modify existing ordinances and codes to allow for a small commercial node at the 200 North exit.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to support Cherry Hill node as a recreation-oriented center and regional asset. Modify existing ordinances and codes as required to allow land use flexibility and support a diversity of symbiotic businesses.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Modify existing ordinances and codes to allow for mixed use commercial development along Main Street as part of golf course redevelopment.

Policy 2.3: Implement and strengthen smaller activity centers along Mountain Road to serve local neighborhoods.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* In the event of a City Hall relocation, modify existing ordinances and codes to allow for small scale mixed-use commercial development as a neighborhood-oriented center.

- b. *Implementation Measure:* Modify existing ordinances and codes to allow for an expanded commercial node at Mountain and Green Road as a recreation-oriented center.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Connect activity centers along Mountain Road with recommended street improvements as outlined in the transportation chapter.

Goal 3: Ensure land uses are compatible and/or utilize adequate buffers to enhance compatibility.

Policy 3.1: Provide land use transitions and development buffers between incompatible land uses.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Limit land use transitions to a single step in density (low density to medium density, for example - not low density to high density).
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Buffer commercial uses from nearby and adjacent residential uses through the use of transitional land uses and/or physical barriers (tree rows, walls, fences, berms, etc.).
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure commercial uses that are allowed in residential zones are incidental to the main residential or agricultural use and do not negatively impact the area.

Goal 4: Provide a range of housing options and price points that help ensure Fruit Heights is an affordable place to live.

Policy 4.1: Coordinate and align Land Use and Housing Policies

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Allow and encourage new residential development models that meet the future needs of the community.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure land use standards appropriately address and implement moderate income housing needs.

Goal 5: Ensure civic, school, park, open space, utility and other non-residential uses are provided in a manner that meets the established land use vision and future needs.

Policy 5.1: Ensure public facility needs are being adequately met.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Follow recommendations in the Parks and Open Space element to ensure existing and future needs are met.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Essential road, transit, trail and other transportation facilities should be maintained and extended to meet the transportation needs of the community.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Cooperate with Davis School District officials and other public service providers to locate and reserve appropriate sites for schools and other public services, as needed.

Goal 6: Improve Fruit Heights view corridors and viewsheds.

Policy 6.1: Create a coordinated program of streetscape and right-of-way improvements.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Prepare a landscape master plan for each key corridor, identifying special enhancements.

Goal 7: Improve the sense of entry into the community.

Policy 7.1: Develop key entry nodes as one enters the community along the major road corridors.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Transform existing entry nodes into attractive city entryways with the addition of coordinated and enhanced signage, landscaping, etc.

3 Transportation and Streets

3.1 Introduction

A robust transportation network is critical to moving people around the City. This transportation chapter provides goals and strategies for a comprehensive multi-modal transportation system in a way that reflects and implements the community vision for Fruit Heights.

3.2 Existing Conditions

Assets, Challenges & Opportunities

This assessment identifies citywide transportation general conditions, assets, challenges, and opportunities for Fruit Heights within the context of the General Plan. It is broken down into the following categories:

- Street network
- Traffic
- Walkable and livable community
- Bikes and micromobility
- Transit
- Transportation Demand Management
- Activity centers

By understanding what components of the system are working, those that present problems, and the general conditions, opportunities emerge for strategies that will ultimately make up the General Plan's Transportation Element.

Street Network

The Fruit Heights street network is built around three key city corridors – Mountain Road, 400 North, and Nicholls Road. There are some key supporting corridors, including Green Road, Lloyd Road, and 1800 East. Local streets generally branch off one of these corridors. Main Street is a key corridor that forms an edge to the community but, because of large land uses like the Davis Park Golf Course and Cherry Hill, doesn't connect very directly to the core of the community.

The U.S. 89 highway corridor plays a major role in the community. It provides the community's main link to the greater Wasatch Front region at Mountain Road/Main Street and at 400 North. With the grade separation of U.S. 89, these links are even more important. But U.S. 89 is also a barrier to the street network as it bisects the city – existing links across the highway are a critical part of the network in connecting residents and visitors to community destinations.


Natural topography plays a large part in the Fruit Heights network, especially in the far eastern part of the city, where steep slopes restrict the ability to connect streets and provide a barrier to making future connections along hillside contours.

Street connectivity is an evolving issue for Fruit Heights. Apart from the larger connectivity issues of U.S. 89 and natural topography, as well as larger land uses like the Davis Park Golf Course, there are smaller opportunities to continue to connect the network.

Assets

- Mountain Road as a low traffic potential "Main Street" through Fruit Heights
- Nicholls Road link under U.S. 89
- Plans to connect key streets

MAP 3.1 - STREET NETWORK



STREET NETWORK

- Major streets - number of lanes in each direction
- Freeway interchange
- Vehicle underpass
- Pedestrian/bike underpass
- Planned/potential street link
- Existing trail
- Planned/potential trail

Challenges

- Vulnerable residents using Mountain Road: Elderly walking, kids on foot and on bikes
- Perception of traffic having increased in volume or speed
- Key disconnections throughout the community

Opportunities

- Manage and create a vision for three key gateway streets – Mountain, Nicholls, 400 North
- Traffic enforcement
- Lloyd Road as a key connector west of 89 – connect to U.S. 89/Green Road
- 1800 East connections
- Trail corridors as well as street corridors – Bair Creek and Shoreline

Traffic

Similar to the street network, traffic patterns are relatively simple in Fruit Heights. By far the majority of traffic that comes through town is on U.S. 89, followed by Main Street, which receives much less volume at the edge of the City. The traffic volumes on the City's major surface streets are even lower in comparison, as shown on Map 3.2. Traffic delay is and does not project to be an issue in Fruit Heights; the traffic issues have more to do with the relationship of moving motor vehicles to quality of life.

A high-level traffic volume and level of service analysis was conducted as part of this planning process, based on current and project volumes on major streets. The maps on the following pages show existing volumes (Map 3.2); existing levels of service (Map 3.3); projected traffic growth (Map 3.4); and projected levels of service (Map 3.5).

Assets

- Generally, there are low levels of traffic on City streets. U.S. 89 and, to a lesser degree, Main Street, carry many times more traffic than any of the City streets.
- All of the corridors running through the City (including state highways) are well under capacity. The maximum utilization is U.S. 89 and 400 North, at about two-thirds capacity.
- All of the corridors running through the City are projected to be comfortably under capacity in 2050, and apart from U.S. 89 and 400 North, projected to be at or under about half capacity, even with some traffic growth over the next few decades.
- The City has excellent vehicular links to the regional network for each of the three main corridors – Mountain Road, 400 North, Main Street.

Challenges

- The Wasatch Front Regional Council predicts significant traffic growth by 2050, especially on Nicholls Road, where traffic is anticipated to triple. However, these changes will not come close to reaching capacity because numbers will remain comparatively small. Nicholls Road is 1,900 to 5,600 AADT, and will likely present issues with neighborhood livability rather than traffic mobility and delays.
- The biggest traffic issue may be managing parking and regional access of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and Fruit Loops Mountain Bike Park.
- There are some places with dangerous left turns onto busy streets, such as along the Main Street corridor.


Opportunities


- The healthy existing and future capacity on these major streets creates the opportunity for traffic calming and creation of more of a human scale.
- Ensure future functionality of the vehicular links to U.S. 89 interchanges.
- Ensure future functionality of the links to Main Street/S.R. 273.

MAP 3.2 - EXISTING TRAFFIC

EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Existing average annual daily traffic (AADT) for the street
XX,XXX





FRUIT HEIGHTS GENERAL PLAN MAP 3.3 - EXISTING TRAFFIC PERFORMANCE


EXISTING TRAFFIC LEVEL OF SERVICE
(VOLUME/CAPACITY)


- > 125% of capacity
- 100% - 125% of capacity
- 75% - 100% of capacity
- 50% - 75% of capacity
- < 50% of capacity

MAP 3.4 - PROJECTED TRAFFIC GROWTH

PROJECTED TRAFFIC COLUME GROWTH

XX% Projected traffic growth form now until 2050 for the street





Walkable and Livable Community

Fruit Heights is generally comprised of neighborhoods that are easy to walk around. As shown in Map 3.6, the street network is fairly well connected – there are some smaller areas where a cul-de-sac pattern reduces connectivity at a pedestrian scale, yet these same features create a lifestyle typically valued by residents. Streets, for the most part, have sidewalks, and the community has several trail corridors that are an important part of its walkability. Large land uses and transportation facilities form the largest barriers to walking in the community.

Assets

- The only major roadways to cross are the U.S. 89 corridor and Main Street at the City's edge. The three key gateway corridors (Mountain Road, Nicholls Road, and 400 North) are all smaller roadways that are not free of danger nor are they major barriers.
- There is a simple yet comprehensive trail corridor framework for the community – a “T” created by Bair Creek and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This trail framework connects the community internally and also to the surrounding area – Bair Creek connects to Burton Lane in Kaysville and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail runs north and south to neighboring cities.
- A key part of the Bair Creek corridor is the U.S. 89 grade-separated crossing, which enables easy pedestrian travel across the highway barrier at a key location.
- The pedestrian bridge over US 89 in the south end of town is a major asset for the pedestrian network.
- Future plans and grant to implement the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and link it to the Bair Creek corridor.


Challenges

- There are several areas without sidewalks in Fruit Heights, including key corridors such as Green Road and part of Nicholls Road.
- The lack of person-vehicle space is out of balance on key corridors, especially Mountain Road.
- There are longer barriers formed by larger properties and disconnected streets throughout the city, in addition to the U.S. 89 barrier and Bair Creek barrier.

- Implementing the extension of the Bair Creek trail corridor from U.S. 89 to Mountain Road faces challenges regarding private property.
- It is challenging to keep the Bair Creek trail, if built, maintained and safe, especially given the negative perception of some residents.
- General lack of crosswalks throughout the City across its major roadways.
- People driving through neighborhoods to access recreation such as Bonneville Shoreline Trail and Fruit Loops creates potential conflict for the community.
- Parks and trailheads have limited parking.

Opportunities

- Establishing crosswalks across Mountain Road – such as at Green Road
- Redesign of Mountain Road to re-balance the pedestrian-motorist design, both through dedicated pedestrian space and traffic calming features.
- Because of limited parking at Nicholls Park, increased pedestrian access, especially given the barrier crossings of U.S. 89 and the golf course opportunities.
- More parking strategically placed throughout the city to minimize impacts to community livability.
- Better direct connectivity from city gateways on major streets to trailheads.
- Complete Bonneville Shoreline Trail and consider it part of city walking network as well as a connection to Kaysville and Farmington.
- First-last mile connections to park-and-ride lot and bus stops.
- Better pedestrian environments at bus stops.
- Address sidewalk gap areas, especially on key streets and connections.
- Make planned street connections such as Lloyd Road and 1800 East.
- Address gateways on major corridors



FRUIT HEIGHTS GENERAL PLAN

MAP 3.6 - PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

-  Side of the street without a sidewalk
-  Area generally without sidewalks
-  Pedestrian barrier
-  Key node
-  Crosswalk leg
-  Existing trail
-  Planned trail
-  Community trail corridor spine

Bikes and Micromobility

Fruit Heights offers both advantages and drawbacks for cycling for transportation. On one hand, its small scale and neighborhood character make bicycling to a neighbor's house or a park a logical mode choice. On the other hand, the city's steep slopes make bicycling a challenge for many would-be riders.

The existing bike network in Fruit Heights is shown in Map 3.7. Trail corridors along Bair Creek and the Bonneville Shoreline present great opportunities for bicycle "trunk" lines that cross the breadth of the community. These corridors are designed more toward recreational cycling but may also accommodate bicycle transportation and community connections.

Mountain Road is also a major bicycling opportunity due to its central location in the community, and the benefit of combining a better pedestrian environment, traffic calming and bicycling. In addition, Mountain Road constitutes the area's key north-south designated bike connections for the adjacent communities of Layton and Farmington.

In general, it will be important to connect bike infrastructure in Fruit Heights to these adjacent communities. Most of the connection opportunities are to the west to Kaysville – 400 North links into Kaysville's 200 North and downtown Kaysville, Green Road links into a wide network of Kaysville neighborhood bike corridors; and Nicholls Road links across Main Street to the Burton Lane corridor, which provides a rare non-interchange crossing to I-15.

In addition, innovations in the broader realm of "micromobility" can appeal to Fruit Heights residents. These include electric scooters and e-bikes.

Assets

- Generally smaller streets in town
- US 89 crossing at Bair Creek
- Planned and existing connections in Kaysville and Farmington

Challenges

- Steep slopes

- Lack of existing bike infrastructure

Opportunities

- Address requests to designate bike lanes / signage
- Focus on ability to access Farmington or Layton FrontRunner
- Link to neighboring communities' bike infrastructure
- E-bikes

Transit

Although Fruit Heights' land use composition is generally not supportive of quality transit service, the community does have some good transit in place and there are opportunities to increase access to it.

Assets

- Despite being such a small community, Fruit Heights has two major bus routes running through and alongside it – 470 and 455 – as shown in Map 3.8.
- Fruit Heights is not far from FrontRunner in Layton and Farmington.


Challenges

- Land use pattern is not conducive for transit.
- A potential future golf course redevelopment could have a land use pattern more conducive to transit ridership.
- Access to Park and Ride.
- More direct bus access to FrontRunner
- Street connectivity issues – first-last mile for bus stops.
- Complaint with bus service is too many transfers.

Opportunities

- Golf course redevelopment – density, employment, walkability
- Street connections to improve first-last mile
- Crosswalks on Mountain Road and potentially Main Street
- Bus stop improvements – potential signature stop on Mountain Road
- Improved connections to FrontRunner

MAP 3.7 - BIKE NETWORK



EXISTING AND PLANNED BIKE NETWORK IN ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS

Recommended Improvements


- Shared-use Path
- Path & Shared Lane
- Sidewalk
- Separated Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Bike Lane
- Bike Lane & Shared Lane
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Shared Lane

- Grade-Separated Crossing
- Full Traffic Signal
- Hybrid Beacon or TOUCAN
- RRFB
- Intersection Improvement
- Traffic Calming
- Trailhead
- Bike Parking
- Existing Paths & Bike Lanes

MAP 3.8 - TRANSIT NETWORK

TRANSIT NETWORK

-  UTA 30 minute route
-  UTA Commute route
-  Stop on both sides of the street
-  Stop on one side of the street
-  Park & Ride lot



Activity Centers

Fruit Heights does not have a traditional downtown, nor a substantial commercial center. It does have a series of opportunities for a town center and smaller centers as long-term development goals.

Assets

- There do seem to be centers of the community – City Hall, the Green/Mountain node, and Nicholls Park.

Challenges

- No current town center
- Lack of uses that usually form a town center – retail, restaurant, office, and local services.

Opportunities

- Potentially underutilized sites such as golf course
- Enhance Mountain-Green area as a town center, increase Bair Creek/Mountain Road/Bonneville Shoreline nodes and connectivity
- How can recreational parking support a town center/community gathering place?
- How can Cherry Hill and surrounding uses support the transportation network?
- What can happen around the Park and Ride to support community, transit, walkability, livability?

Key Opportunities

The following is a summary of the strongest transportation opportunities for Fruit Heights:

Create a vision for the three key gateway streets – Mountain Road, Nicholls Road, 400 North – including all modes and placemaking/gateways.

Calm traffic by creating a human scale for these corridors through both long- and short-term solutions.

Implement planned key street connections, including Lloyd Road and 1800 East.

Strengthen the Bair Creek corridor (potentially including alternatives like Green Road) as a major east-west active transportation corridor – not just as a hiking trail but with paved trails for transportation as well.

Address sidewalk gap areas, especially on key streets and connections such as Nicholls Road, Country Road, and 1800 East.

Stripe crosswalks, especially along Mountain Road.

Address one of the city’s major traffic issues, **regional access to trails and parks**, by creating more parking for parks and trails, strategically placed throughout city and paired with better direct connectivity from city gateways on major streets to trailheads.

Address awkward links with major streets such as at Lloyd/Main and Nicholls/Main and make these regional network connections more navigable.

Complete Bonneville Shoreline Trail and consider it as part of city active transportation network as well as connecting to Kaysville, Farmington and Bair Creek corridor.

First-last mile connections to park-and-ride and bus stops, as well as better pedestrian environments at bus stops.

Designate bike facilities to link to neighboring communities’ bike infrastructure.

Enhance the Mountain-Green area as an activity center, increase Bair Creek/Mountain Road/Bonneville Shoreline nodes and connectivity.

Potential golf course redevelopment opportunity – both community connections to activity center and density, employment, walkability that can support transit.


Promote working from home, reduce traffic demand.

FRUIT HEIGHTS GENERAL PLAN

MAP 3.9 - URBAN DESIGN

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS

-  Primary community spine
-  Potential activity center
-  Community trail corridor
-  Sense of barrier
-  Area of stress
-  Trail corridor
-  Planned trail
-  Historic resources
-  Community gateway
-  Area of potential future change



3.3 Transportation Goals

Link the community with small multi-modal connections

For a built-out community such as Fruit Heights, small changes in the transportation network can make a big difference – especially those that broaden the transportation choices available to Fruit Heights residents, employees, and visitors. Several opportunities to make feasible, cost-effective connections exist throughout the community, from crosswalks to trail links to new street connections, all helping to support the broader vision of a more connected accessible community.

Enhance and add connections across the U.S. 89 barrier

While U.S. 89 provides quick access to the regional freeway network, it also poses a barrier to people moving around the community. The current highway grade separation project adds two quality connections across the highway – at Nicholls Road and at Bair Creek in a trail connection under the freeway. This plan leverages these new and other existing crossings by thoroughly integrating them into the network, while also envisioning the potential for future crossings.

Complete a connected trail network

Trails are a major opportunity to improve the Fruit Heights quality of life and enhance the transportation network. By building off two major trail corridors with regional importance – Bair Creek and Bonneville Shoreline Trail - the trail network can become a framework for place improvements as well – establishing a long-term vision for a series of places that convey Fruit Heights' sense of place and community gathering locations.

Add active transportation facilities

Like many Wasatch Front communities, Fruit Heights has the opportunity to add better facilities for walking, bicycling, and rolling (collectively known as active transportation). The City can add sidewalks to several streets currently missing them on one or both sides, and add dedicated space for bikes and other micro-mobility on its major streets. Active transportation facilities should connect to those of the surrounding communities of Kaysville, Farmington, and Layton.

Maintain and improve access to transit service

For a small community, Fruit Heights has notable transit assets – high frequency service on both Davis County trunk lines (455 and 470) and a park and ride lot. While transit will not likely play a major role for most residents, improving access to transit will help broaden their options.

Slow traffic on major community corridors

Major streets running through Fruit Heights such as Mountain Road must balance vehicular access to the community with quality of life within it. Small changes to major streets can establish an environment where traffic moves slower, pedestrian crossings are safer and easier, and the street is more pleasant to live along.

Support activity centers with streets and public spaces


The future land use plan (see *Chapter 2: Land Use*) proposes a series of enhanced and new activity centers throughout Fruit Heights that are envisioned as small-scale places centered around recreation, civic destinations, and limited commercial uses for the community to gather, hold events, and connect with each other. The transportation network should support these activity centers and community places by providing residents access via a variety of modes, while maintaining the quality of life for residents of surrounding neighborhoods.

Prepare for and leverage golf course opportunity

The Davis County Golf Course presents a major opportunity for Fruit Heights if the County decides to seek a new use for the property. While this transition may not occur in the horizon of this General Plan, it is important for Fruit Heights City to prepare for the opportunity if it occurs. Transportation and streets are a major part of supporting the future land use plan's vision for a mixed-use center with residential, commercial, and other uses by providing walkability and access to the site from the surrounding area.

Maintain regional vehicular connections

Fruit Heights relies heavily on its connections to the regional highway network – primarily interchanges with US 89, but also to S.R. 273/Main Street. This plan prioritizes maintaining these connections, increasing safety, minimizing traffic delay, and, where possible, streamlining the links from the community to the highways.



FRUIT HEIGHTS GENERAL PLAN

MAP 3.10 - NETWORK CONCEPT

COMMUNITY TRAIL NETWORK

Fruit Heights has the unique opportunity to assemble safe, comfortable, attractive trail corridors that run through and connect the entire community, and also extend to neighboring communities. Bair Creek and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail form a "T" that links many of the community's parks and connects across U.S. 89.

- Off-street trail
- On-street trail
- Future desired connection

FILL SIDEWALK GAPS

Several streets throughout Fruit Heights do not have sidewalks - these streets are identified in the map.

- Streets with no sidewalks

IMPROVE ROADWAY CROSSINGS

Roadways running through Fruit Heights pose barriers to people entering and moving around the community. The City can preserve and enhance existing crossings and consider new ones.

- Desired new crossing
- Enhanced existing crossing

MAKE STREET EXTENSIONS

Fruit Heights City has identified a set of streets to extend to increase the overall connectivity of the City's street network.

- New street extension

MOUNTAIN ROAD MAIN STREET

Mountain Road has the potential to be the "Main Street" of Fruit Heights. It could be a slow-moving, easily crossable street with more trees and landscaping, and streetscape elements.

NEW STREET CONNECTIONS IF LAND USE CHANGES

Transforming the land use in key areas of Fruit Heights open up opportunities for new connections for the community in the form of streets or paths.

TRANSIT STOPS & ACCESS

- Preferred stop location

3.4 Transportation Network

Mountain Road Main Street

Mountain Road is essentially the Fruit Heights Main Street – it is a central corridor and a gateway to the community. While Mountain Road is not envisioned to be a Main Street in the traditional sense of a commercial corridor, it can be a street that connects many of the community’s activity centers, allows for travel by all transportation modes, is a link rather than a barrier, and conveys the Fruit Heights sense of place.

Objectives for Mountain Road are to slow traffic; allow for more pedestrian and bike movement along and across the street; link together the trail network; and convey the city’s identity. **Figure 3.1** demonstrates the long-term vision of how these improvements can work together and fit into the existing Mountain Road environment. These objectives may be achieved through the following improvements, which range from near-term to long-term.

- Convert the existing sidewalk to a multi-use pathway.
- Add planted median chicanes to slow traffic and green the street.
- Install crosswalks at key crossing locations, such as: Nicholls Road, Green Road, at City Hall, and at the proposed trail connection to Bonneville Shoreline Trail near Manning Orchard. This creates a semi-regular spacing of pedestrian crossings that helps establish a human scale to the community.
- “Bulb-outs” – extensions of the pedestrian realm at the pedestrian crossings. In the long-term these can be extensions of the curbs.
- Bike facilities in the roadway: Mountain Road is wider in the segment north of Green Road, which allows for dedicated bike lanes in the existing roadway, without removing on-street parking. South of Green Road, bicycling in the roadway will need to be within the general-purpose lanes, with shared lane (“sharrow”) markings. However, a recommended multi-use path provides a separated facility for those wanting to ride more slowly, apart from traffic.
- Near-term low-cost improvements – many of the recommended improvements can have a temporary stage, such as bulb-outs and island chicanes painted with inexpensive, flexible delineator posts.

- Landscape and streetscape improvements – regular street trees where possible, lighting, and street furniture at activity centers.
- Long-term sidewalk on the other side of the multi-use path, to complete the set of pedestrian facilities on the street.



Temporary low-cost improvements are a great way to test ideas before investing in permanent infrastructure

Other Major Street Corridors


As Fruit Heights is primarily built out, the community’s major streets are already established. However, within these existing streets are many opportunities for improvements to achieve transportation goals. The following are recommendations for other major street corridors.

Nicholls Road

Nicholls Road is a key connector for the City. As one of the few streets that connects the community nearly from west to east, it should be a priority for accommodating all modes of transportation.

- West of U.S. 89, Nicholls Road fronts Nicholls Park. Along this segment, the street lacks a sidewalk on both sides for much of its length. A priority should be to add a multi-use pathway on the north side of Nicholls Road along the park, linking with the park’s existing pathway network, the U.S. 89 bridge, and the Bair Creek trail network and its U.S. 89 crossing.
- The future of the south side of Nicholls Road depends on the future of the Davis County golf course that partially fronts onto the street. If the golf course does redevelop along the lines of the concept recommended by the future land use plan, a sidewalk along Nicholls should be implemented, as part of a robust pedestrian gateway to the new mixed-use, walkable development. The pedestrian link between the site’s trail network and the Bair Creek corridor and Nicholls Park is especially important, with the need for a marked, shortened crossing of Nicholls Road.

Figure 3.1: Mountain Road Main Street Concept



- Between Mountain Road and U.S. 89, Nicholls Road currently lacks a sidewalk on the north side for some of its length. Although the street has a consistent sidewalk on the south side, due to the importance of this corridor to walking, a sidewalk should be added on the north side where missing.
- Where Nicholls Road meets Mountain Road is a key node for the community. Consistent with the concept for Mountain Road, this node should include crosswalks and bulb-outs that will shorten crossings and slow traffic. This is also a recommended location for a bus stop because of the pedestrian and bicycle access.

Green Road

Green Road is an important link in the current trail network, providing a bypass of the Bair Creek segment that is envisioned for a trail but is currently private property without an easement.

- Between U.S. 89 and Mountain Road, Green Road should be considered for an on-street trail. The existing north side sidewalk could be widened to a 8-to-10-foot trail, or a trail could be added to

the south side, which currently does not have a sidewalk, although the street right-of-way does include some space outside the existing roadway. This trail would do a better job accommodating walking, jogging, biking, scooting, and rolling between the Bair Creek trail and Mountain Road.

- The intersection of Green Road and Mountain Road is a key node for the community. Consistent with the concept for Mountain Road, this node should include crosswalks and bulb-outs that will shorten crossings and slow traffic. Green Road and Mountain Road form a node at the center of a proposed Town Center shaped around a few commercial uses, historic buildings, and a potential trailhead and park spaces. This is also a recommended location for a bus stop because of the pedestrian and bicycle access. **Figure 3.2** demonstrates what this intersection could look like.
- East of Mountain Road, Green Road presents an important opportunity for the trail network to continue east to link to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and the Bair Creek corridor. With future street connections planned to intersect at the extension of Green

Figure 3.2: Green Road/Mountain Road Node Concept



Road east of Mountain Road, this is a good corridor for an on-street trail connection up the hill to the north-south corridor that is an extension of 1800 East. From here, a trail improvement is planned along Bair Creek to link to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

Lloyd Road

Lloyd Road is Fruit Heights' most important internal north-south street west of U.S. 89 – an important connection that must be maintained and enhanced for all modes.

- The north and south segments of Lloyd Road should be linked across Nicholls Road and Bair Creek – see Future Street Alignments.
- Along the south segment of Lloyd Road, an on-street trail (a very wide sidewalk built to accommodate bikes and other active transportation modes) or two-way protected bike lane should be considered for the east side along the U.S. 89 soundwall, as it provides a very important link. The side of the road along the sound wall provides a major opportunity for a bikeway or trail as there are very few vehicle conflicts – this type of facility could occupy the current shoulder area.
- The pedestrian bridge across U.S. 89 from Mountain Road at City Hall lands at Lloyd Road – this connection should be strengthened, for example with a marked crossing of Lloyd Road if the soundwall side pathway is implemented.
- The southern end of Lloyd Road, where it meets Main Street, very close to U.S. 89 interchange, is challenging for all modes, although the recent road project allowed for a signalized left turn onto Main Street or entry onto US 89. If the current Cherry Hill property is redeveloped in the future, however, the City should consider routing Lloyd Road through the redevelopment at the base of the hill so it meets Main Street further northwest, potentially forming a four-way intersection with 1075 West that could be signalized to create safer turns and other movements for all modes, as well as a community gateway.
- North of Nicholls Road, a link from Lloyd Road to the street network north of Bair Creek is an important connection that has recently been completed.

Country Road

Country Road is an important link for the west side of Fruit Heights. Despite its local neighborhood street character, it runs through the entirety of west Fruit Heights and provides a link into downtown Kaysville.

- Country Road is missing sidewalks on both sides for several blocks. Either a sidewalk or on-street trail should be considered for this stretch.
- Country Road aligns with a location that could be explored for a future bridge across U.S. 89 and connection to Mountain Road.

400 North

400 North is a short corridor in Fruit Heights but it is important due to its interchange with U.S. 89; its connection to Mountain Road; its connection to Kaysville and an Interstate 15 interchange; and the Fruit Heights Park and Ride.

- A short on-street trail connection along 400 North from the Park and Ride and across the freeway to Mountain Road (and its recommended on-street trail) should be considered to link these corridors and destinations.
- A trail extension eastward from Mountain Road to the planned street alignment of 1800 East is recommended.

1800 East

New street links are planned on the far eastern end of Fruit Heights that extend the 1800 East corridor to link the whole extent of the City. With most of the corridor consisting of a new street, the City should capitalize on the opportunity to create an on-street trail. In particular, this trail could be built as a “pedestrian promenade” capitalizing on the views and trail access of the area. In addition to the pathway, the promenade could include shade trees, seating, lighting and other amenities such as play areas and pavilions.

Off-street Trails

Fruit Heights has two valuable major trail corridors – the Bair Creek Trail and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail – which both provide local and regional connections and a place to recreate. However, both will require major enhancements in the future for their full potential to be realized. The recent U.S. 89 project has also created a new trail corridor opportunity along the east soundwall, providing a quality trail link for the east side of Fruit Heights.

Bair Creek Trail

The vision for Bair Creek is to have a trail along the entire length of the creek, from Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the east to Main Street in the west – and even connecting into the Burton Lane corridor in Kaysville. The new tunnel under U.S. 89 is a major piece of this corridor and makes it all the more important for active transportation, recreation, and community connection.

However, many of the segments of this corridor pose challenges and may require near-term bypasses, especially the segments between U.S. 89 and Mountain Road, and Mountain Road and the future 1800 East alignment. Still, the long-term vision remains. Due to these challenges, the City may want to consider a separate detailed plan or visioning process for the Bair Creek corridor, potentially even undertaken in coordination with Kaysville City.

Bonneville Shoreline Trail

The Bonneville Shoreline Trail is a major regionwide trail corridor that runs along the far east end of Fruit Heights. While it does not present the same levels of transportation value as Bair Creek due to its elevation, it still is a significant part of the network. The City has developed an alignment for the trail shown in Map 3.10: Transportation Network Concept.

U.S. 89 Trail

UDOT plans to work with Fruit Heights City to build a multi-use pathway directly to the east of the new U.S. 89 soundwall. This great opportunity for the community will create an important connection for

the off-street trail network, providing links throughout the east side of Fruit Heights.

On-street Trails

On-street trails are an emerging type of active transportation facility that seek to provide the separated multi-use trail experience where the opportunity lies along a street. In Fruit Heights, on-street segments are likely needed to link together the city's trail network and connect community destinations.

In addition, on-street trails can be used to provide dedicated pedestrian space on streets that do not have sidewalks – including on some of Fruit Heights' major streets like Mountain Road and Green Road.

From a design perspective, on-street trails often have to adapt to the available opportunity. They can be either asphalt or concrete, can be as narrow as 8 feet and as wide as 12 feet, should be signed as multi-use, should ideally have some type of buffer from moving traffic (although there often isn't space) and need to have highly visible and marked road crossings.

See specific street corridor summaries above and the Transportation Network Concept (Map 3.10) for recommended location details.



On-street trails have the benefit of providing space for multiple modes of active transportation within the street right-of-way.

Desired Future Trail Connections

To complete the network of trails that connect and provide recreational opportunities for Fruit Heights, a few future connections are recommended through existing private property – should an opportunity emerge for a connection to be made in those locations.

These include:

- Upper Bair Creek – both between U.S. 89 and Mountain Road and between Mountain Road and 1800 East
- A potential trail easement through or alongside Manning Orchard or any future redevelopment on the site
- Lloyd Road connector
- 400 North extension eastward

Future Street Alignments

A key part of the Network Concept is providing strategic street connections in locations where future development will likely occur.

- **1800 East corridor:** The most comprehensive set of new streets are an extension of the currently short segment of 1800 East along the eastern edge of Fruit Heights. This corridor can achieve what many other foothill communities along the Wasatch Front struggle to do – connect residential streets in the higher hills along a north-south alignment, and take pressure off the nearest major street, which in this case is Mountain Road.
- **Lloyd Road:** Similar to 1800 East on the east side, Lloyd Road provides a template to connect residential streets in the west side of Fruit Heights. The key link to create is from the current end of Lloyd Road south of Nicholls Road to north of Bair Creek.

These new street linkages should be designed to serve all street users to a higher degree than many other Fruit Heights minor collector-level streets, to avoid the need for future retrofits.

Golf Course Site

The future land use plan's vision for the existing Davis County golf course site (*see Chapter 2: Land Use*) should part or all of it become

available for redevelopment is a mix of uses, with an emphasis on a range of types of housing, strategic community-serving commercial, open space, and walkability. The street and pathway network is critical to this vision, and to the transportation, recreation, and public space aspects of a future redevelopment.

The golf course site concept presents a potential street and trail network, meant to embody the following transportation principles for a future project or series of projects:

- **Walkability:** Above all, the redevelopment should be walkable, meaning it fosters an environment that is hospitable to people in balance with motor vehicles. Motor vehicles should be accommodated, but in a way that they have a secondary presence in the redevelopment's public spaces. Walkability also means quality pedestrian facilities, safe street crossings, accessibility to destinations, and buildings and public spaces that are complementary to the pedestrian realm.
- **Connectivity:** The site should seek to make connections within the site and externally to the surrounding community. It should not be isolated from the surrounding area.
- **Activity Centers:** Two potential activity centers are proposed for the golf course site should it be redeveloped. The first is a retail-oriented (primary) center along Main Street. The second is a recreation- and civic-oriented center across from Nicholls Park on Nicholls Road. The transportation network should support these centers in both cases, from the standpoint of connections, walkability, and parking.
- **Main Street frontage:** The site has the potential to front onto Main Street; this segment of the site is recommended for commercial uses and a retail oriented mixed-use center. The City should work with UDOT to explore creative Main Street concepts to allow for a walkable frontage – such as a local access lane with on-street parking, a wide sidewalk, and a bike facility.
- **Parking:** Parking should be not over-provided; should be shared among complementary uses; and should be designed to support walkability.
- **Trail network:** Due in part to its location along the Bair Creek corridor and Nicholls Park, the site has the opportunity to create important trail connections.

If undertaken correctly, a redeveloped golf course site can be an important part of the citywide transportation network, making connections for all users in an area currently blocking connections within and into the community.

Sidewalk Gaps

Many streets in Fruit Heights are completely missing sidewalks – and in a few other cases, missing a sidewalk on one side. Retrofitting sidewalks onto neighborhood streets can be challenging for a range of reasons – there often isn’t room, residents must either give up on-street parking or part of their yard (which is often technically part of the right-of-way but treated as part of the yard) and there can be challenging implications for street construction and drainage.

Consequently, the Plan recommends being both strategic and opportunistic about retrofitting sidewalks. The City should strategically invest in sidewalks on key connections – primarily those identified above in the “other major street corridors” while looking for opportunities to implement sidewalks on other streets as they come up – i.e. during street reconstruction, or redevelopment or property opportunities.

Major Street Crossings

Fruit Heights has few major street corridors, but those it has, especially those that run north-south, present significant barriers for the community. This section identifies existing crossings and recommended enhancements for them, as well as potential new crossings and crossing improvements. The crossings are listed by each of the three corridors that present a barrier – Main Street, U.S. 89, and Mountain Road.

Main Street

Main Street, though it runs along the edge of Fruit Heights, presents the most formidable surface street to cross in the community. Currently, the Fairway Circle intersection and the U.S. 89 interchange offer marked, signalized crossings – and at Nicholls Road, an intersection within Kaysville City. However, these are long crossings of a relatively high-speed road and could be improved.

- Main Street crossing at Fairway Circle: The City should evaluate whether this is the best location for a signal and crossing from

its perspective – on the north (Fruit Heights) side it leads only to a short cul-de-sac. Hidden Valley Drive could be a better signal location for Fruit Heights. At either location, the City should work with UDOT and Kaysville City to shorten the crossing and make crossing people more visible to motorists.

- Future recommended Main Street crossing at golf course site: If the Davis County golf course does become available for redevelopment, and a redevelopment concept similar to that within this Plan is pursued, the City should work with UDOT and Kaysville City on the potential to add another signalized intersection and pedestrian crossing to the Main Street corridor, at the primary entry to the redeveloped site.

U.S. 89

As it is now a grade-separated freeway, U.S. 89 offers crossings at rare locations – and these crossings present different challenges and opportunities than busy at-grade roadways: at interchanges, crossing active transportation users must contend with high-speed traffic and different sight angles, at 400 North and Main Street. Fruit Heights now has a number of crossings away from interchanges that provide important connections for the community.

- Nicholls Road
- 400 North
- Main Street
- City Hall pedestrian bridge
- Bair Creek pedestrian tunnel
- In the future, the City could consider a pedestrian bridge connecting the east side of the city with Country Way, which connects directly to downtown Kaysville.

Mountain Road

Mountain Road does not present a barrier on the order of Main Street or U.S. 89, but the community views Mountain Road in some ways as the core of the community and feels that traffic along it creates a barrier rather than a link. It also has no marked crossings. The concept for the Mountain Road “Main Street” presented previously includes marked crossings with elements such as high-visibility striping and curb bulb-

outs. These types of crossings are envisioned to be installed at the following locations:

- Green Road
- Nicholls Road
- Carrie Drive
- Bair Creek
- Manning Orchard
- City Hall
- 400 North

Installing regularly marked, shortened crossings along the Mountain Road corridor will significantly contribute to the corridor being slower and more friendly to walking and bicycling, and will help lend the Mountain Road “Main Street” a sense of place.

Regional Bike Connections

As Fruit Heights is small in size, any connections for bicycling will be most useful if they connect to planned or existing active transportation corridors in adjacent communities. The following are key corridors to which Fruit Heights can connect with bicycling improvements:

- Kaysville Center Street Bike Boulevard connection: A Bike Boulevard is planned for Center Street in central Kaysville, which aligns with Country Road. This regional connection is part of what is driving a recommended on-street trail for Country Road and potential future U.S. 89 crossing at Country Road.
- Burton Lane Pathway connection: Kaysville also is planning a pathway along Burton Lane, which aligns with the existing/planned Bair Creek trail corridor for Fruit Heights.
- Lloyd Road-1075 West connection: 1075 West is envisioned as a key bike connection for Farmington and Kaysville; there is an opportunity to extend the recommended on-street trail on Lloyd Road across Main Street to 1075 West. A potential future realignment of Lloyd Road with 1075 West – if an opportunity with the Cherry Hills property arises – would make this connection easier and safer.

3.5 Additional Policy Areas for Ongoing Consideration

Trails and Parking

One of the city’s major traffic issues is regional access to trails and parks. The City should explore creating more parking for parks and trails, strategically placed throughout the city and paired with better direct connectivity from city gateways on major streets to trailheads. The vision for an expanded, more connected trail network is intended to complement a more dispersed, comprehensive parking strategy.

First-last Mile

One important aspect of the vision for a more connected pedestrian network and quality walking environments and crossings is the ability of Fruit Heights residents, workers, and visitors to access transit stops. This is known as the “first and last mile.” Improved connections to bus stops along the Mountain Road corridor, the Main Street corridor, and the Fruit Heights Park and Ride through better routes, safer crossings located at bus stops, and improved waiting environments at bus stops will help alleviate first-last mile barriers.

Travel Demand Management

Travel demand management (TDM) refers to a broad set of strategies intended to reduce private motor vehicle trips. TDM strategies generally focus on programs, policies, and other non-infrastructure efforts seeking to alter the demand for motor vehicle trips. Some of these strategies include subsidies of transit passes, carpool programs, shuttles, bike programs, and work from home promotion.

4 Moderate Income Housing

4.1 Introduction

Utah Code 10-9a-403 requires that municipalities include within their General Plan a Moderate-Income Housing element. This chapter should be reviewed and updated on an annual basis. The moderate-income housing element should include the following:

1. Provide for a realistic opportunity to meet the need for additional moderate-income housing within the next five years.
2. Three or more moderate-income housing strategies (as defined in Utah Code) for implementation.
3. An implementation plan.

When drafting the moderate-income housing element, the planning commission should facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing, including moderate income housing to meet the needs of people of various income levels living, working, or desiring to live or work in the community; and to allow people with various incomes to benefit from and fully participate in all aspects of neighborhood and community life.

4.2 Housing Strategies and Recommendations

To qualify for State transportation funding, the State requires municipalities to select three housing affordability strategies to implement in their community. In addition, the legislature is giving priority funding designation to those communities that adopt two additional strategies. Fruit Heights City has selected the following strategies for implementing moderate-income housing in the community.

- **Rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate income housing (Strategy A).**

- **Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones (Strategy E).**
- **Zone or rezone for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers (Strategy F).**
- **Implement zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments (Strategy J).**
- **Reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing (Strategy L).**

Strategy I: Rezone for Densities

Fruit Heights has rezoned for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate income housing (Strategy A).

Fruit Heights City has created an R-3 zone which allows for Multiple Family Residential Zones (see Map 2.2). The R-3 zone allows up to 10 units per acre. Medium density residential - single family small lots and attached units or townhomes/condominiums limited to duplexes, tri-plexes, four-plexes, five-plexes, or six-plexes are permitted in the R3 zone subject to certain provisions. Multiple family residential is also allowed in the R3, this zoning designation will provide ample density for affordable housing units to be built. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) also allow, if approved, greater densities (or multiple family units) greater than the underlying zone.

Implementation

- Work with the Planning Commission and City Council on approving and adopting either a new zoning classification or modifying the existing R-3 zone creating new incentives to allow higher density projects. (January 2024).

- Collect information regarding current home prices to measure the impact of the R-3 zone on the affordability of recently developed residential units and in surrounding areas (Summer 2024).

Strategy 2: Accessory Dwelling Units

Fruit Heights has created or allowed for, and reduced regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zone (Strategy E).

In 2022, Fruit Heights amended City code to allow for the interior ADUs as permitted use in any zone that is primary for single-family residential users. The City created an “Accessory Dwelling Unit” section in their municipal code (Adopted 8/2/2022) to assist in providing reasonable regulations for supplementary living accommodations in internal ADUs located in residential areas of the city. Fruit Heights City allows internal accessory dwelling units as a permitted use on any lot which exceeds 8,000 square feet. This covers between 80 and 90 percent of all zoning in the City.

See Title 10: Accessory Dwelling Units: <https://www.fruitheightscity.com/201/Municipal-Code>

Implementation

- Monitor the number of applications received and approved for accessory apartment dwellings biannually (June and December each year) to assess the effectiveness of the City’s new code.

Strategy 3: Zone for Higher Density or Moderate-Income Residential Development

Fruit Heights has plans to zone or rezone for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers (Strategy F).

Fruit Heights City’s General Plan, Zoning Map, and Transportation Plan encourage development around transit corridors and commercial centers accessed by Main Street, US-89, and I-15.

The City has identified a number of vacant parcels that it will consider as locations to implement a new zoning classification that targets higher density housing. Incentives geared to encourage higher density may include higher density, deed restrictions, and waiver of impact fees.

Implementation

- The City will identify areas on the zoning map that can be considered for higher density zoning. The City will meet with current land owners to assess interest. The City will also consider whether or not to actually rezone some property to a new zoning district (January 2024).

Strategy 4: Zoning Incentives

Fruit Heights has implemented zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments (Strategy J).

Fruit Heights City has adopted an R-3 zone which will allow for higher density, multi-family units and smaller single family units on reduced lot sizes. The city is also considering an evaluation of other zoning incentives such as density incentives to facilitate the creation of moderate-income housing.

Implementation

- Work with developers to modify public infrastructure and lot size requirements (Winter 2023).
- Hold a work-session with Planning Commission and City Council to identify density incentives for new development in the City (October 2023).
- Create a toolkit and resource guide for developers that includes guidance based on work-session feedback (Spring 2025).

Strategy 5: Impact Fees

Fruit Heights has plans to reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing (Strategy L).

Fruit Heights City charges an impact fee for parks, water, stormwater, and roads. Fruit Heights City will review its impact fees associated with development and identify ways in which these fees can be reduced and/or waived to help encourage more moderate income housing within the city.

Implementation

- Review impact fees with development community to identify criteria in which fees can be reduced/waived to promote more incentives for moderate income housing (October 2023).
- Establish attainable goals and objectives based on impact fee review that can be integrated into the City's 2023 Moderate Income Housing Report (December 2023).

Additional State Support

The City could benefit from additional training related to MIHR requirements and data collection. In addition, training related to the 24 identified strategies and how to implement these strategies could be beneficial.

Additional Recommendations

Numerous programs are available to encourage the development and preservation of affordable housing at all income levels. Homeownership programs are well established, and support should continue and expand. The Home Program and HOME Investment Partnership Act are important resources for moderate and low-income homeowners, and CDBG funds can also be used to assist homeowners. In addition, the Utah Housing Corporation provides homeownership assistance through below market loans (FirstHome), down payment and closing cost assistance, and lease to-own housing supported by Low Income Housing Tax Credits (CROWN). Further, HUD has special loans for the construction of rental and cooperative housing for the elderly and handicapped. In addition, funds are available under the Olene Walker

Loan Fund and the McKinney Fund (with emphasis on transitional housing).

Financial Resources for Affordable Housing Development

Potential funding sources for housing include revenue from the general fund, CDBG grants and RDA affordable housing pass through. The general fund is essentially drawing upon the existing resources of the community and reallocating some of these resources to promote affordable housing. This could include earmarked sales tax or other revenue to provide development subsidies for deed-restricted affordable housing. The CDBG funds currently will give up to \$50,000 down payment assistance if you meet county LMI criteria which right now is \$80,000 for a family of 4. The loan is paid back with no interest accruing at the sell of the home. Other current funding opportunities include the Rocky Mountain Home Fund which gives a 4% interest loan to workers in the service industry (police, fire, school teachers, health care workers), SB 240 just passed this year which gives first time home buyers a \$20,000 down payment assistance grant, some restrictions apply.

Preservation of Housing Stock

The preservation and rehabilitation of the current housing stock (rental and owner-occupied) will also be an important way to help keep housing affordable. The City should set a goal to rehabilitate a number of housing units before the year 2025. There are 86 house trailers in two mobile home parks in the City. All of those units meet the affordable housing definition. The City does not have any restrictions on replacing or updating those units. There are various programs available to the City to assist with home rehabilitation efforts. The HOME consortium and the Home Programs will be important to help people under 80 percent of HAMFI preserve the quality of their home investments. Additionally, CDBG funds can be obtained to manage and invest into low- and moderate-income areas. While infrastructure is important for community building, some portion of the CDBG budget should be targeted toward housing programs.

5 Economic Development

5.1 Analysis of Taxable Sales

Taxable sales within Fruit Heights provide an important metric to assess the general economic health of the City. A sales gap (or “leakage”) analysis is used to identify economic development opportunities for a community by evaluating the total purchases made by residents inside and outside the community (hence, the term “leakage” for sales lost outside the community). This type of analysis first identifies sales

within the State of Utah for each major NAICS code category and then calculates the average sales per capita in each NAICS category. Per capita sales in the City are compared to average per capita sales statewide in order to estimate what portion of resident purchases are being made within City boundaries, and what amount is leaving the City. The resident purchases being made outside of the City represent an opportunity to recapture some of these lost sales. The analysis divides taxable sales into three major categories: retail sales, industry sales and sales related to services.

Table 5.1 – Historic Taxable Sales

NAME	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Centerville	\$330,465,935	\$350,256,499	\$375,299,223	\$388,613,836	\$401,856,510	\$422,613,145
Farmington	\$118,534,250	\$160,063,322	\$196,298,262	\$239,099,616	\$299,847,158	\$351,360,902
Fruit Heights	\$13,766,677	\$13,980,326	\$14,315,253	\$15,508,204	\$16,934,153	\$16,905,236
Kaysville	\$179,426,850	\$181,316,886	\$195,696,885	\$212,371,407	\$221,056,615	\$256,547,093
South Weber	\$18,579,070	\$19,805,085	\$21,484,529	\$23,894,436	\$24,837,221	\$28,666,839
West Bountiful	\$241,794,640	\$252,868,845	\$249,460,781	\$279,928,743	\$292,842,650	\$292,141,305
Davis County	\$3,599,416,451	\$3,784,536,059	\$4,001,709,854	\$4,268,195,167	\$4,550,828,027	\$4,897,829,423
State of Utah	\$41,387,390,797	\$44,097,026,745	\$47,531,179,930	\$49,404,045,506	\$51,709,162,594	\$53,933,277,032

NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2010 – 2021 AAGR
Centerville	\$441,060,523	\$455,797,096	\$473,300,816	\$505,867,076	\$538,284,090	\$632,451,804	6.08%
Farmington	\$419,931,469	\$477,107,780	\$508,762,514	\$554,402,629	\$522,278,132	\$706,687,615	17.56%
Fruit Heights	\$18,383,710	\$20,275,136	\$22,252,382	\$24,759,899	\$32,366,115	\$39,077,530	9.95%
Kaysville	\$301,136,466	\$339,390,749	\$305,837,094	\$382,524,441	\$477,070,528	\$534,187,032	10.43%
South Weber	\$32,936,740	\$37,222,558	\$42,679,792	\$46,909,625	\$68,228,974	\$71,258,186	13.00%
West Bountiful	\$298,513,246	\$300,340,660	\$294,691,896	\$306,193,604	\$338,649,677	\$380,304,516	4.20%
Davis County	\$5,141,617,253	\$5,483,477,603	\$5,689,029,606	\$6,043,510,784	\$6,665,893,431	\$7,905,448,281	7.41%
State of Utah	\$56,502,434,145	\$61,031,691,837	\$64,982,524,088	\$68,910,384,257	\$74,730,705,784	\$90,105,221,730	7.33%

Historic Taxable Sales

Total taxable sales for the City increased by an average of 9.95% percent from 2010 through 2020. Three communities have experienced double digit increases. A comparison of tax data for similarly sized cities (relative to population) shows a positive trend in taxable sales growth for all communities (see **Table 5.1**). Fruit Height's taxable sales per

capita (**Table 5.2**) is midrange of the benchmark comparison cites and ranks 8 out of the 8 communities.

Retail Taxable Sales

Fruit Height's greatest retail strength is Non-Store Retailers (see **Table 5.3**), accounting for 43 percent of total taxable sales in 2021, followed by General Merchandise, Clothing and Accessories Stores, Miscellaneous Retail Trade, and Sporting Goods.

Table 5.2 – Historic Taxable Sales Per Capita

NAME	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	RANK
Centerville	\$21,718	\$22,800	\$24,129	\$24,566	\$24,954	\$25,790	\$26,368	\$26,791	\$27,484	\$29,066	\$30,712	\$37,680	2
Farmington	\$6,939	\$8,984	\$10,483	\$12,160	\$14,640	\$16,537	\$19,075	\$21,062	\$21,896	\$21,825	\$21,371	\$28,524	3
Fruit Heights	\$2,785	\$2,807	\$2,831	\$2,988	\$3,163	\$3,005	\$3,148	\$3,384	\$3,648	\$4,012	\$5,216	\$6,416	8
Kaysville	\$6,888	\$6,784	\$7,154	\$7,604	\$7,762	\$8,782	\$10,106	\$11,191	\$9,878	\$12,146	\$14,929	\$16,199	6
South Weber	\$3,255	\$3,368	\$3,546	\$3,845	\$3,889	\$4,365	\$4,871	\$5,378	\$5,962	\$6,355	\$8,941	\$8,770	7
West Bountiful	\$47,042	\$48,414	\$47,435	\$52,857	\$54,706	\$54,160	\$54,914	\$54,568	\$52,831	\$54,415	\$59,163	\$63,842	1
Davis County	\$12,221	\$12,568	\$13,049	\$13,685	\$14,327	\$15,146	\$15,614	\$16,370	\$16,702	\$17,479	\$19,004	\$21,524	5
State of Utah	\$15,575	\$16,240	\$17,183	\$17,559	\$18,092	\$18,576	\$19,164	\$20,385	\$21,338	\$22,252	\$23,715	\$26,994	4

Table 5.3 – Retail Spending by Percent of Total

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
General Merchandise	4.6%	3.6%	4.9%	4.8%	4.5%
Building Material & Garden Equip	0.8%	1.3%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%
Food & Beverage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Motor Vehicle	0.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%
Non-Store Retailers	16.5%	26.0%	36.7%	46.1%	43.0%
Miscellaneous Retail Trade	4.7%	2.4%	2.7%	2.1%	2.0%
Electrical & Appliance	2.4%	2.7%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%
Sporting Goods	7.2%	5.6%	2.5%	4.6%	1.2%
Clothing & Accessories	3.7%	3.4%	3.4%	3.9%	3.9%
Other	59.9%	54.0%	46.0%	36.1%	43.1%

Services Taxable Sales

Accommodation represents the largest spending category in Services, as shown in **Table 5.4**. Industries in the Accommodation subsector include 7211-Traveler Accommodation and 7212-RV (Recreational Vehicle) Parks & Recreational Camps.

Industry Taxable Sales

Each of the industry taxable sales categories, excluding Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting and Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction, have a negative AAGR from 2017 through 2021. Utilities sales represent the largest spending category in 2021, as shown in **Table 5.5**.

Table 5.4 – Services Spending by Percent of Total

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Accommodation	26.1%	23.7%	19.9%	10.5%	15.1%
Admin Support, Waste Mgt & Remediation	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation	9.4%	6.9%	5.3%	4.7%	7.6%
Educational Services	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Finance & Insurance	4.2%	2.3%	2.3%	1.7%	1.4%
Food Services & Drinking Places	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%
Health Care & Social Assistance	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Management of Companies & Enterprises	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Other Services, Except Public Admin	2.7%	1.9%	1.5%	0.9%	0.6%
Professional, Scientific, & Tech Services	4.1%	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.4%
Public Administration	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Real Estate, Rental, & Leasing	5.4%	5.6%	4.9%	4.0%	2.7%

Table 5.5 – Industry Taxable Sales by Percent of Total

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction	1.6%	1.3%	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%
Information	24.5%	19.0%	13.3%	10.4%	8.6%
Manufacturing	7.1%	6.9%	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%
Mining, Quarrying, & Oil & Gas Extraction	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Transportation & Warehousing	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Utilities	44.4%	36.7%	26.6%	19.9%	16.0%

Sale Leakage Analysis

Table 5.6 provides a general overview of leakage and retention by major category. Negative numbers estimate the approximate leakage of taxable sales from Fruit Heights to other communities. When leakage is occurring, the capture rate is below 100 percent, indicating the City is not collecting the average sales expected based on a per capita basis relative to the State average. Positive numbers indicate that Fruit Heights City is attracting more than the State average relative to that category, suggesting shoppers from outside the City are attracted to the area for certain types of purchases or that there is a high concentration

of this type of spending. This is reflected in the capture rate as a number above 100 percent.

The City is leaking in all major categories relative to State average spending. The per capita spending in Fruit Heights is approximately \$6,416, compared to the State per capita spending of \$42,149. The total taxable sales leaking to other communities is estimated at \$217.7 million. Assuming a sales tax levy of 0.5 percent based on point of sale, this equates to a loss of approximately \$1 million in tax revenues.

Table 5.6: Retail Sales Leakage

	FRUIT HEIGHTS DIRECT TAXABLE SALES	PER CAPITA SPENDING	UTAH INCOME ADJUSTED PER CAPITA SPENDING	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA SALE LEAKAGE	ESTIMATED LEAKAGE
Retail						
Building Material & Garden Equip	\$251,716	\$41	\$2,911	1%	(\$2,870)	(\$17,479,224)
Clothing & Accessories	\$1,037,280	\$170	\$1,150	15%	(\$980)	(\$5,967,424)
Electrical & Appliance	\$295,333	\$48	\$708	7%	(\$660)	(\$4,017,246)
Food & Beverage	\$4,043	\$1	\$2,787	0%	(\$2,786)	(\$16,971,325)
Furniture & Home Furnishing	\$438,780	\$72	\$721	10%	(\$649)	(\$3,953,989)
Gas Station	\$0	\$0	\$780	0%	(\$780)	(\$4,749,489)
General Merchandise	\$1,180,331	\$194	\$4,134	5%	(\$3,940)	(\$23,999,819)
Health & Personal	\$380,893	\$63	\$338	18%	(\$276)	(\$1,678,665)
Miscellaneous Retail Trade	\$531,316	\$87	\$1,134	8%	(\$1,047)	(\$6,378,356)
Motor Vehicle & Parts Dealers	\$70,667	\$12	\$4,581	0%	(\$4,570)	(\$27,834,586)
Non- Store Retailers	\$11,377,624	\$1,868	\$3,247	58%	(\$1,379)	(\$8,402,446)
Sporting Goods	\$315,864	\$52	\$770	7%	(\$718)	(\$4,371,784)
Wholesale Trade-Agents & Brokers	\$73,562	\$12	\$65	18%	(\$53)	(\$324,769)
Wholesale Trade-Durable Goods	\$2,014,704	\$331	\$3,153	10%	(\$2,823)	(\$17,192,878)
Wholesale Trade-Nondurable Goods	\$158,893	\$26	\$519	5%	(\$493)	(\$3,000,725)
Total Retail	\$18,131,006	\$2,977	\$26,999	11%	(\$24,023)	(\$146,322,724)
Industry						
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting	\$3,000	\$0	\$19	3%	(\$19)	(\$113,478)
Construction	\$105,823	\$17	\$708	2%	(\$690)	(\$4,205,675)
Information	\$2,274,393	\$373	\$1,339	28%	(\$966)	(\$5,884,250)
Manufacturing	\$324,756	\$53	\$1,942	3%	(\$1,889)	(\$11,505,900)
Mining, Quarrying, Oil & Gas Extraction	\$7,000	\$1	\$164	1%	(\$163)	(\$990,814)
Transportation & Warehousing	\$6,000	\$1	\$84	1%	(\$83)	(\$508,231)
Utilities	\$4,250,000	\$698	\$1,170	60%	(\$473)	(\$2,878,712)
Industry Total	\$6,970,972	\$1,144	\$5,427	21%	(\$4,283)	(\$26,087,059)

Table 5.6: Retail Sales Leakage Continued

	FRUIT HEIGHTS DIRECT TAXABLE SALES	PER CAPITA SPENDING	UTAH INCOME ADJUSTED PER CAPITA SPENDING	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA SALE LEAKAGE	ESTIMATED LEAKAGE
Services						
Accommodation	\$4,000,000	\$657	\$1,224	54%	(\$568)	(\$3,458,326)
Admin Support, Waste Mgt & Remediation	\$88,303	\$14	\$173	8%	(\$158)	(\$962,949)
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	\$2,000,000	\$328	\$515	64%	(\$186)	(\$1,134,520)
Educational Services	\$19,394	\$3	\$61	5%	(\$58)	(\$352,927)
Finance & Insurance	\$367,710	\$60	\$177	34%	(\$116)	(\$707,533)
Food Services & Drinking Places	\$90,000	\$15	\$3,056	0%	(\$3,041)	(\$18,522,826)
Health Care & Social Assistance	\$7,000	\$1	\$80	1%	(\$79)	(\$483,020)
Management of Companies & Enterprises	\$30,000	\$5	\$12	41%	(\$7)	(\$43,285)
Other Services-Except Public Admin.	\$151,553	\$25	\$961	3%	(\$936)	(\$5,700,651)
Professional, Scientific & Tech. Services	\$899,409	\$148	\$846	17%	(\$698)	(\$4,250,772)
Public Administration	\$0	\$0	\$144	0%	(\$144)	(\$874,380)
Real Estate, Rental, & Leasing	\$704,382	\$116	\$991	12%	(\$875)	(\$5,329,183)
Services Total	\$8,357,751	\$1,372	\$8,238	17%	(\$6,866)	(\$41,820,373)
Other						
Other	\$5,617,801	\$922	\$1,484	62%	(\$562)	(\$3,420,635)
All Taxable Sales						
Total	\$39,077,530	\$6,416	\$42,149	15%	(\$35,733)	(\$217,650,791)

In **Table 5.7**, a comparison of communities of similar size and those slightly smaller than Fruit Heights shows capture rates in a similar range, apart from one. Of the comparable cities, West Bountiful has the highest capture rate, due to the retail densities within the community relative to the city's population (primarily driven by the presence of a Costco Wholesale). Factors that will influence a community's capture rate include total population, proximity to major freeways or roadway, population within a 360-degree trade area, geographic isolation, and competitive market sites. These factors will be explored further in the market analysis.

Table 5.7: Taxable Sales Capture Rates Comparison

	CENTERVILLE		FARMINGTON		KAYSVILLE		SOUTH WEBER		WEST BOUNTIFUL	
Population	16,785		24,775		32,976		8,125		5,957	
	PER CAPITA LEAKAGE*	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA LEAKAGE*	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA LEAKAGE*	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA LEAKAGE*	CAPTURE RATE	PER CAPITA LEAKAGE*	CAPTURE RATE
Total	\$2,585.50	107.37 %	(\$1,775.83)	94.14%	(\$13,868.19)	53.88%	(\$21,414.82)	29.05%	\$34,496.36	217.55%

*Income Adjusted

5.2 Market Analysis

Existing Market Conditions

The following section will address existing market conditions within the City including property taxation, land uses and zoning, historic average annual daily trips on major City roadways, an illustration of competitive market sites, projected growth within Fruit Heights, supportable commercial zoning and potential barriers to future economic growth.

Property Tax Comparison

Utah’s municipal tax rate setting process is designed to achieve budget neutrality. An entity’s prior year budgeted revenue serves as the baseline for current year certified tax rate calculations. According to the Utah State Tax Commission:

The county assessor and State Tax Commission provide valuation information to the county auditor, including changes in value resulting from reappraisal, new growth, factoring and legislative adjustments. The State Tax Commission and the county auditor calculate certified tax rates and the county auditor provides taxing entities with valuation and certified tax rate information. The certified tax rate provides a taxing entity with the same amount of property tax revenue it received in the

previous tax year plus any revenue generated by additional growth in its taxable value. When this information is received, taxing entities compute and adopt proposed tax rates. If an entity is proposing a property tax revenue increase, it may only adopt a tentative or proposed tax rate. The exact requirements to increase property tax revenue vary depending on whether the entity is a calendar year or a fiscal year entity. These procedures are discussed in more detail in Standard 10.9 “Truth in Taxation”.¹

In order to adopt a tax rate that exceeds the Certified Tax Rate, an entity must go through what is known as the “Truth-in-Taxation” process. Truth-in-Taxation statutes require that entities proposing a tax increase must advertise the increase and hold a public hearing. The Certified Tax Rate or the proposed rate, if adopted, is applied to all taxable value within the boundaries of the taxing entity. For a historic overview of Utah’s property tax system see: <https://propertytax.utah.gov/media/historic-overview.pdf>.

¹ Source: Utah State Tax Commission, <https://propertytax.utah.gov/standards/standard10.pdf>, p.4

Table 5.8: Tax Rate Comparisons

	POPULATION	RANK	2022 TAX RATE	RANK	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
Bountiful	45,438	1	0.000889	12	0.000967	0.000789	0.000814	0.000880	0.000832	0.000890	0.000957	0.000946	0.001063	0.001094	0.001093
Centerville	16,785	9	0.001247	8	0.001197	0.001158	0.001192	0.001275	0.001354	0.000983	0.001088	0.001072	0.001141	0.001165	0.001173
Clearfield	32,238	5	0.001307	5	0.001437	0.001437	0.001437	0.001607	0.001745	0.001800	0.001800	0.001800	0.001800	0.001800	0.001800
Farmington	24,775	6	0.001182	10	0.001607	0.001491	0.001640	0.001765	0.001942	0.002132	0.002226	0.002127	0.002290	0.002269	0.002283
Fruit Heights	6,091	11	0.001600	3	0.001950	0.001950	0.001887	0.002027	0.002117	0.002295	0.002369	0.001863	0.002023	0.002054	0.002071
Kaysville	32,976	4	0.001281	6	0.001663	0.001589	0.001589	0.001589	0.001589	0.001717	0.001782	0.001826	0.000999	0.001028	0.001035
North Salt Lake	22,300	7	0.000934	11	0.001141	0.001233	0.001284	0.001355	0.001450	0.001622	0.001517	0.001541	0.001613	0.001637	0.001637
Roy	39,358	2	0.001484	4	0.001733	0.001959	0.002123	0.002358	0.002650	0.002051	0.002202	0.002285	0.002430	0.002389	0.002263
South Ogden	17,541	8	0.002408	1	0.002650	0.002700	0.002700	0.002900	0.002900	0.002570	0.002696	0.002852	0.002962	0.002979	0.002871
South Weber	8,125	10	0.001273	7	0.001522	0.001403	0.001441	0.000769	0.000815	0.000881	0.000941	0.000954	0.000993	0.000998	0.000927
Syracuse	33,331	3	0.001689	2	0.001653	0.001593	0.001512	0.001512	0.001573	0.001573	0.001639	0.001659	0.001787	0.001832	0.001821
West Bountiful	5,957	12	0.001199	9	0.001301	0.001363	0.001315	0.001449	0.001566	0.001684	0.001806	0.001788	0.001946	0.001951	0.001997

The total Fruit Heights' tax rate is made up of levies by Davis County, the County Library, Davis School District, Fruit Heights City, Davis County Mosquito Abatement District, the Central Davis County Sewer District, Multicounty Assessing, and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. As shown in **Figure 5.1**, the Davis County School District has

historically accounted for approximately 61 percent of the tax rate. The Fruit Heights City municipal tax rate as a percent of the total tax rate has fluctuated historically between 14.1 percent and 19.5 percent as shown in **Figure 5.2**.

Figure 5.1: Historic Total Tax Rate for Fruit Heights





Figure 5.2: Fruit Heights Tax Rate as a Percent of Total Tax Rate



Land Use and Zoning Analysis

The distribution of land uses in the City illustrate a concentration of residential development, with over 90 percent of the market value and

93 percent of the improved square footage attributed to residential property types (including condos). There are approximately 57 acres of vacant land, primarily in residential and agricultural zones.

Table 5.9: Distribution of Land Use Types within the City

ROW LABELS	IMPROVED SQUARE FEET (SF)	ACREAGE	CURRENT VALUE (\$)	% OF TOTAL SF	% OF TOTAL ACREAGE	% OF TOTAL \$
2 Houses	11,273	12.34	\$5,294,241	0.3%	0.9%	0.4%
Permit Value	5,298	3.04	\$2,097,239	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Ranch 1 Story	5,975	9.30	\$3,197,002	0.1%	0.7%	0.2%
Amusement Park	1,676	5.51	\$1,764,662	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Barn	780	0.42	\$161,281	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pavilions	896	5.09	\$1,603,381	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Common Area	4,928	32.97	\$648,822	0.1%	2.5%	0.0%
Clubhouse	4,928	20.34	\$634,214	0.1%	1.5%	0.0%
(blank)	-	12.63	\$14,608	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Condo Residential	30,118	-	\$9,492,000	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Townhouse One Story	20,126	-	\$6,866,000	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%
Townhouse Two Story	9,992	-	\$2,626,000	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Crops	8,172	53.04	\$4,279,354	0.2%	4.0%	0.3%
Detached Garage	1,485	3.92	\$13,697	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Ranch 1 Story	6,687	9.55	\$2,455,272	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%
(blank)	-	39.57	\$1,810,385	0.0%	3.0%	0.1%
Duplex	6,138	1.25	\$2,632,000	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Duplex One Story	6,138	1.25	\$2,632,000	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Exempt Church	110,366	22.08	\$17,910,116	2.6%	1.7%	1.3%
Church	105,230	18.73	\$17,230,044	2.5%	1.4%	1.2%
Pavilions	5,136	2.85	\$680,070	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%
(blank)	-	0.50	\$2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt Government	29,921	383.51	\$31,593,335	0.7%	29.2%	2.2%
2 Story Split	1,578	0.65	\$492,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clubhouse	11,572	12.15	\$600,000	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%
Light Commercial Utility	1,890	1.82	\$737,998	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Office Building	3,702	3.22	\$2,318,004	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Ranch 1 Story	4,227	5.99	\$2,043,864	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%
Service Garage	5,772	0.50	\$1,113,348	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Shed - Equipment or Garage	1,180	1.72	\$529,693	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
(blank)	-	357.47	\$23,758,428	0.0%	27.2%	1.7%
Exempt Other	-	0.06	\$190,343	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
(blank)	-	0.06	\$190,343	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grazing	3,093	7.92	\$1,230,779	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%

Table 5.9: Distribution of Land Use Types within the City Continued

ROW LABELS	IMPROVED SQUARE FEET (SF)	ACREAGE	CURRENT VALUE (\$)	% OF TOTAL SF	% OF TOTAL ACREAGE	% OF TOTAL \$
Detached Garage	936	0.87	\$358,966	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Ranch 1 Story	2,157	2.92	\$842,000	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
(blank)	-	4.14	\$29,813	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Irrigated	2,660	15.59	\$1,341,333	0.1%	1.2%	0.1%
Barn	2,660	11.22	\$946,872	0.1%	0.9%	0.1%
(blank)	-	4.37	\$394,461	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Multi Housing	106,335	4.88	\$28,095,979	2.6%	0.4%	2.0%
Clubhouse	2,366	0.05	\$389,028	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Condo	103,969	-	\$24,234,000	2.5%	0.0%	1.7%
(blank)	-	4.83	\$3,472,951	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
PUD – Attached	92,288	1.10	\$28,616,000	2.2%	0.1%	2.0%
Townhouse One Story	15,078	0.62	\$7,391,000	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%
Townhouse Two Story	77,210	0.48	\$21,225,000	1.9%	0.0%	1.5%
PUD – Detached	177,682	15.66	\$62,050,765	4.3%	1.2%	4.4%
2 Story	112,891	7.09	\$35,755,000	2.7%	0.5%	2.5%
Permit Value	3,610	0.49	\$766,765	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Ranch 1 Story	61,181	8.07	\$25,529,000	1.5%	0.6%	1.8%
Recreational	-	13.58	\$6,173,320	0.0%	1.0%	0.4%
RV Parks *CODE	-	13.58	\$6,173,320	0.0%	1.0%	0.4%
Res on Commercial Zone	3,640	0.83	\$1,031,683	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Bi Level	1,810	0.43	\$658,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Single Wide	1,830	0.40	\$373,683	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Retail	13,412	3.01	\$2,312,089	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Office Building	3,128	0.28	\$397,695	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Retail Store	10,284	2.73	\$1,914,394	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Retail Mix	1,612	0.84	\$367,951	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Ranch 1 Story COMM	1,612	0.84	\$367,951	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Single Family Residential	3,556,196	672.36	\$1,197,552,045	85.3%	51.2%	84.0%
1.5 Story Fin	3,982	0.37	\$1,229,000	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
2 Story	1,525,440	212.50	\$445,531,474	36.6%	16.2%	31.2%
2 Story Split	88,772	14.37	\$25,013,000	2.1%	1.1%	1.8%
Bi Level	204,580	45.89	\$69,445,000	4.9%	3.5%	4.9%
Permit Value	5,235	1.50	\$1,535,979	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Ranch 1 Story	1,635,065	375.21	\$622,644,130	39.2%	28.5%	43.7%
Single Wide	1,692	0.23	\$304,732	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 5.9: Distribution of Land Use Types within the City Continued


ROW LABELS	IMPROVED SQUARE FEET (SF)	ACREAGE	CURRENT VALUE (\$)	% OF TOTAL SF	% OF TOTAL ACREAGE	% OF TOTAL \$
Split Level	91,430	19.53	\$31,182,000	2.2%	1.5%	2.2%
(blank)	-	2.75	\$666,730	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Trailer-Park	96	10.85	\$5,121,000	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Mobile Home Parks	96	10.85	\$5,121,000	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Vacant Commercial	-	2.95	\$1,023,511	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
(blank)	-	2.95	\$1,023,511	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Vacant Residential Subdivision	-	11.75	\$7,458,766	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%
(blank)	-	11.75	\$7,458,766	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%
Vacant Res/Agriculture Non-Subdivision	-	34.91	\$7,621,795	0.0%	2.7%	0.5%
(blank)	-	34.91	\$7,621,795	0.0%	2.7%	0.5%
Vacant W/Outbuilding(s) only	8,300	7.45	\$2,173,548	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%
Barn	1,721	1.30	\$402,248	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Detached Garage	5,078	3.89	\$940,824	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%
Misc Add-On	1	0.68	\$337,512	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Shed - Equipment or Garage	1,500	0.45	\$161,430	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
(blank)	-	1.13	\$331,534	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Grand Total	4,167,906	1,314.42	\$1,425,975,437	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Davis County Parcel Database, 2021

Competitive Market Sites


There are several competitive market sites within and surrounding Fruit Heights. These locations include neighborhood scale retail along I-15 and Highway 89. Several Entertainment options are in the area, including Cherry Hill in Fruit Heights, and both Lagoon and Station Park which are in Farmington.

Figure 5.3: Competitive Market Sites



A two-mile buffer of the competitive market sites illustrates limited growth potential within the central portion of Davis County. Future commercial growth will continue to follow rooftops which are shifting concentration toward the west.

Figure 5.4: Competitive Market Sites



General Growth Within the City and Region

The City's population is projected to continue to increase through 2050, reaching approximately 7,883 persons according to an analysis of 2020 Traffic Area Zone ("TAZ") data compiled by the Wasatch Front Regional Council. **Table 5.10** displays regional population projections. However, the population in Davis County will shift from a concentration on the east side of the valley to the west.

Figure 5.5: Illustration of Population Growth by Traffic Area Zone (TAZ) Data in Davis County (2022 – Left, 2050 – Right)




Table 5.10: Davis County Population Projection

CITIES	POPULATION				GROWTH (2022–2050)		EMPLOYMENT				GROWTH (2022–2050)	
	2022	2030	2040	2050	ACTUAL	%	2022	2030	2040	2050	ACTUAL	%
Bountiful	49,783	50,754	52,834	55,535	5,752	11.6%	22,838	23,460	23,815	24,690	1,852	8.1%
Centerville	18,896	19,664	20,734	22,221	3,325	17.6%	10,414	11,893	13,459	14,469	4,055	38.9%
Clearfield	31,814	33,432	35,999	39,774	7,960	25.0%	28,966	31,067	35,113	37,868	8,902	30.7%
Clinton	22,958	23,499	24,824	25,914	2,956	12.9%	5,405	6,061	5,975	6,861	1,456	26.9%
Farmington	23,711	26,821	31,279	34,794	11,083	46.7%	16,877	20,761	25,162	30,233	13,356	79.1%
Fruit Heights City	6,597	6,932	7,410	7,883	1,286	19.5%	1,121	1,207	1,286	1,191	70	6.2%
Sunset	32,639	33,800	36,262	39,133	6,494	19.9%	10,313	11,205	12,152	12,074	1,761	17.1%
Layton	5,913	5,994	6,246	6,498	585	9.9%	3,199	5,119	7,635	9,559	6,360	198.8%
City of North Salt Lake	92,144	104,091	121,059	135,222	43,078	46.8%	40,132	46,691	52,798	57,710	17,578	43.8%
South Weber	18,807	20,232	21,596	22,845	4,038	21.5%	18,540	19,487	21,059	21,925	3,385	18.3%
Kaysville	6,036	6,482	7,380	8,227	2,191	36.3%	1,196	1,693	2,269	3,047	1,851	154.8%
Syracuse	32,208	39,018	46,682	51,203	18,995	59.0%	8,401	12,934	17,545	22,123	13,722	163.3%
West Bountiful	5,398	5,515	5,839	6,187	789	14.6%	4,495	5,729	7,320	9,198	4,703	104.6%
West Point	9,675	11,953	14,895	17,341	7,666	79.2%	1,631	2,265	2,592	3,152	1,521	93.3%
Woods Cross	12,506	12,540	12,837	13,366	860	6.9%	8,881	10,001	11,144	12,454	3,573	40.2%
Total	369,085	400,727	445,876	486,143	117,058	31.7%	182,409	209,573	239,324	266,554	84,145	46.1%

Source: WFRM Traffic Area Zone Data


Employment is also expected to increase in Fruit Heights. However, the total growth is marginal compared to the County. Future employment data indicates that Davis County will experience a shift in the location of the workforce. South Weber, Sunset, and Syracuse will all see a significant increase in the percentage of total employment. It is important to note that this data represents employment populations within a community and not the amount of workforce living within a community.

Table 5.11: Projected Employment

CITIES	EMPLOYMENT				GROWTH (2019–2050)	
	2022	2030	2040	2050	ACTUAL	%
Fruit Heights	1,121	1,207	1,286	1,191	70	6.2%
Total Davis County	182,409	209,573	239,324	266,554	84,145	46.1%

Source: WFRC Traffic Area Zone Data

Figure 5.6: Proportionate Share of Employment By Community, 2019 and 2050



Supportable Commercial Zoning

To determine the supportable commercial zoning within Fruit Heights, this analysis evaluates future taxable sales growth, per capita spending by sector, and general commercial zoning ratios. Using two different methodologies, this analysis provides an estimate of supportable acreage by the following categories: general retail, industry, services, and total commercial acreage.

The first methodology employed in this analysis utilizes estimated per capita spending of \$6,416 in Fruit Heights. Assuming a new population of 1,711 residents within the City, the total supportable commercial zoning is estimated at approximately 37.38 acres. This assumes a median sales volume of \$275 per square foot of gross leasable area (GLA) and a floor

area ratio (FAR) of 0.11. The sales volume per square foot was estimated using the 2021 taxable sales divided by the 2021 commercial building square footage.

Employing an alternative methodology produces higher supportable acreage. Within similarly sized communities, an average of 0.025 acres per capita can be found. However, this average includes a high of 0.071 in Lindon and a low of 0.003 in Alpine. Some communities have a much higher sales capture rate, resulting in higher commercial acreages. Using the average of 0.025 acres per capita, the total supportable acreage is estimated at 42.7 acres, based on new population growth (0.025 multiplied by 1,711 persons), which is only slightly higher than the supportable acreage based on per capita spending.

Table 5.12: Supportable Commercial Zoning Based on per Capita Spending

Analysis Based on State Per Capita Spending	General Retail	Industry	Services	Other	Total
Fruit Heights Per Capita Spending	\$2,977	\$1,144	\$1,372	\$922	\$6,416
New Population	1,711	1,711	1,711	1,711	1,711
Total New Spending	\$5,093,113	\$2,347,745	\$1,958,190	\$1,578,075	\$10,977,123
Median Sales Volume Per SF of GLA	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$275
Supportable SF	18,520	8,537	7,121	5,738	39,917
General Commercial Floor to Area Ratio	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
Acres Supportable (Based on State per Capita Spending)	27.64	1.60	0.00	8.13	37.38

Table 5.13: Comparison of Commercial Acres Per Capita from Selected Cities

	2019 POPULATION	ZONED COMMERCIAL ACREAGE	INDUSTRIAL ACREAGE	TOTAL	COMMERCIAL ACREAGE PER CAPITA	INDUSTRIAL ACREAGE PER CAPITA	TOTAL PER CAPITA
Kaysville	31,494	241	122	363	0.008	0.004	0.012
Highland	18,957	191	-	191	0.010	-	0.010
North Salt Lake	20,402	351	1,239	1,590	0.017	0.060	0.078
Alpine	10,477	26	10	36	0.002	0.001	0.003
Cedar Hills	10,209	22	-	22	0.002	-	0.002
Lindon	10,912	427	349	776	0.039	0.032	0.071
Payson	19,842	213	169	381	0.011	0.008	0.019
North Ogden	19,392	64	7	71	0.003	0.000	0.004
South Ogden	17,063	259	-	259	0.015	-	0.015
Centerville	17,404	228	124	352	0.013	0.007	0.020
Woods Cross	11,340	153	260	413	0.013	0.023	0.036
						Average	0.025

Additional Redevelopment Options and Tax Generation Scenarios

The above analysis provides a general analysis of potential supportable commercial acreage. Redevelopment and development scenarios within the City are limited due to the city being substantially built out. Two options for development/redevelopment are the City's Golf Course and the US 89 interchange at 400 North. This section provides a fiscal impact analysis relative to the redevelopment of the City's Golf Course and the intersection at 400 North. This scenario assumes a higher development scenario based on land use assumptions and tax increment participation levels. **Table 5.14** shows the total revenues and expenses generated by the development in one year and over 20 years. The revenues calculated in this analysis consist primarily of property and sales tax revenues. The expenditures are comprised of general government expenses, which can be found in more detail in Table 5.19 at the end of this chapter. The methodology to determine expenditures was determined using the City's current expenditures divided by the assessed value of the area,

creating an expense per unit of value. The analysis assumes inflation at three percent per year for growth in expenses and a variable to fixed cost ratio of 20 percent. The net benefit is calculated using total revenues minus total expenditures. As shown below, the proposed community redevelopment will create a net benefit to the City. The net benefit at one year is estimated at \$1.3M while the net benefit over 20 years is \$30M. These represent the net benefit based on high-level assumptions, with only the inclusion of property and sales tax revenues in the calculation of net benefit. These developments fit within the supportable commercial acreage analysis totals described above.

Table 5.15 incorporates the total revenues and expenses generated by the higher development scenario above in addition to Fruit Heights' 2020 revenues and expenditures to calculate an added yearly revenue value. The added yearly revenue is \$1.36M, which is only slightly higher than the net benefit from property and sales tax revenues alone. Thus, other revenues are not anticipated to contribute substantively to the net benefit of the development scenario. The Future Land Use and Golf Course Redevelopment Maps are illustrated in *Chapter 2: Land Use*.

Table 5.14: Total Revenue and Expenses Related to Golf Course and 400 N Higher Development Scenarios

	1 YEAR	OVER 20 YEARS
	GOLF COURSE	
Property Tax Generation	\$534,678	\$10,693,552
Sales Tax Generation	\$472,719	\$12,702,147
TOTAL	\$1,007,397	\$23,395,699
	400 NORTH	
Property Tax Generation	\$72,088	\$1,937,028
Sales Tax Generation	\$376,639	10,120,435
TOTAL	\$448,727	\$12,057,464
	TOTAL REVENUE AND EXPENSES	
Added Revenue Total	\$1,456,124	\$35,453,162
Added Expense Total	\$(156,403)	(\$4,454,193)
NET BENEFIT	\$1,299,721	\$30,998,970

Table 5.15: Higher Development Added Yearly Revenue

All 2020 Revenues	\$2,222,350
All 2020 Expenditures	(\$2,160,195)
Added Revenue	\$1,456,124
Added Expenses	(\$156,403)
Added Yearly Revenue	\$1,361,876

It is likely that commercial growth will develop around existing neighborhood scale retail, which provides personal services, food services, gas and lodging and general retail purchases. It is expected that the area will continue to see development in small scale office development as well, as shown in the comparison of average retail development requirements in **Table 5.16**. With a population estimated to grow to just under 9,000 residents by 2050 and competition from neighboring communities, expansion will be limited to neighborhood scale developments.

Two preferred locations for commercial development include the redevelopment of the Golf Course and the interchange at 400 North, as discussed in previous sections. Such options as small neighborhood scale retail shopping and restaurants are likely options for retail development

in these areas. All future development should maintain the City's small-town identity. An increase in neighborhood scale commercial or other commercial development within existing commercial areas is limited or unlikely as the City is primarily built out.


The City's ability to stimulate future development may be limited by population and competition from adjacent markets such as Farmington, Layton, Syracuse, and South Ogden. Focusing on small scale and local services will meet the requests of citizens and provide local growth. The US Census Bureau's estimate of retail e-commerce sales as percent of total quarterly retail sales continues to rise, increasing from nearly four percent in 2009 to over 14 percent in 2022. The aftermath of the 2020 global pandemic has also resulted in a pattern of increased online sales.

Table 5.16: Typical Retail Development Requirements

TYPE OF CENTER	LEADING TENANT	TYPICAL GROSS LEASABLE AREA (GLA)	GENERAL RANGE IN GLA	USUAL MINIMUM SIZE IN ACRES	APPROXIMATE MINIMUM POPULATION REQUIRED
Neighborhood	Supermarket	60,000	30,000 – 100,000	3 – 10	3,000 – 40,000
Community	Supermarket, drugstore/pharmacy, discount department store, mixed apparel	180,000	100,000 – 400,000	10 – 30	40,000 – 150,000
Regional	One or two full-line department stores	600,000	300,000 – 900,000	10 – 60	150,000 or more
Super Regional	Three or more full-line department stores	1,000,000	600,000 – 2,000,000	15 – 100 or more	300,000 or more

Urban Land Institute, Retail Development, 4th ed.

Figure 5.7: Retail E-Commercial Sales



Official retail sales numbers by the Census Bureau show a steady growth in sales from non-store retailers like Amazon, eBay, QVC and Alibaba. This will likely result in a shift from location-based retail to online purchases. Fruit Height's lack of developable land and adjacency to other cities which already host distribution centers make it unlikely to attract distribution centers that service this type of retail spending. Lower population levels or continued sales leakage will result in less commercial acreage within the community. However, if the City were to allow for greater densities, resulting in an increase in buying power and capture rates, the area could see higher levels of commercial development. Methods to promote increased commercial development include:

- Allow for more residential development and population growth;
- Provide development incentives;
- Promote niche markets that will capture sales from surrounding communities;
- Remove barriers to entry; and,
- Promote other types of commercial development (industrial, tech, office, etc.).

It is important to note that with increased population and development there will be an increase in public safety and other government service expenses.

Commercial Zones

The land use map includes the commercial zones that have been identified in the City's overall land use map (*see Chapter 2*). These areas include locations where commercial and mixed uses could be expanded. While these areas provide opportunities for the consideration of commercial expansion, the City should evaluate the costs and benefits of any proposed commercial developments related to their specific project elements. Concentrating commercial development in the designated areas will help maintain the City's small-town identity while offering areas with mixed use vibrancy.

Barriers to Entry

Some commercial development may be impacted by factors that serve as barriers toward unconstrained commercial growth within the community. These barriers may include City ordinances, development costs, or geographic challenges. Future commercial development in the City may be hindered by these types of barriers. The following paragraphs discuss some of the barriers to entry that may exist within the City.

Land Cost

A barrier to entry may be the cost of land. A comparison in **Table 5.17** of greenbelt land within Davis County may illustrate the land value disparity. Within Davis County, the average cost of land per acre is approximately \$56,369 per acre. Within the City, the market land value is approximately \$157,944 per acre which is the fourth highest in the County. The County data may be impacted by higher ratios of undevelopable, exempt, government, forest or other lower valued lands that are not as prevalent within a City. The comparatively higher land costs may be cost prohibitive for some types of development.

Development Cost: Impact Fees

Many communities within Utah assess impact fees to offset the cost of needed infrastructure related to growth. Total impact fees vary from community based on level of service, age of infrastructure, proportional allocation of buy-in to new facilities, and the inclusion of financing mechanisms and inflation. While impact fees can be a barrier to limiting economic growth, municipalities have tools to mitigate this impact. These include waiving or reducing impact fees, establishing redevelopment areas to fund infrastructure, or allowing development to provide information that may result in a reduced fee.

Location

The City is located at the crossroads of two major roadways: I-15 and Highway 89. Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) along these roadways range from 38,000 trips on Highway 89 and to 124,000 trips on I-15. Proximity to a regional transportation network allows communities to attract larger developments like distribution centers or industrial centers, which in turn stimulate job growth and spending. The proximity

Table 5.17: Comparison of Market Land Values

CITY	ACRES	GREENBELT VALUE	MARKET VALUE	MARKET VALUE PER ACRE	RANK
Bountiful	80.50	\$19,085	\$14,023,810	\$174,209	3
Centerville	679.07	\$31,955	\$28,041,308	\$41,294	13
Clearfield	92.02	\$55,472	\$17,167,353	\$186,561	2
Clinton	243.19	\$105,408	\$24,547,820	\$100,941	9
Davis County	11,739.17	\$1,178,424	\$345,427,039	\$29,425	15
Farmington	583.69	\$109,456	\$79,691,526	\$136,531	6
Fruit Heights	99.59	\$34,575	\$15,729,626	\$157,944	4
Kaysville	503.50	\$163,044	\$69,909,978	\$138,848	5
Layton	1,353.97	\$728,949	\$156,342,968	\$115,470	8
North Salt Lake	802.21	\$14,247	\$30,959,042	\$38,592	14
South Weber	624.91	\$208,186	\$40,794,471	\$65,281	12
Syracuse	571.46	\$258,291	\$57,180,993	\$100,061	10
West Bountiful	325.72	\$31,177	\$65,918,229	\$202,377	1
West Point	1,503.92	\$678,422	\$111,859,898	\$74,379	11
Woods Cross	328.92	\$51,756	\$43,404,013	\$131,959	7
Grand Total	19,531.82	\$3,668,448	\$1,100,998,073	\$56,369	

Source: Davis County Assessor's Office Annual Report, 2021, https://www.daviscountyutah.gov/docs/librariesprovider16/default-document-library/annual-report-2021.pdf?sfvrsn=4c3d0653_0

to Farmington and Layton with their established regional shopping opportunities increases the potential for sales leakage.

Lower Population and Rooftops

While the City's population is projected to continue to increase its population through 2050 and add approximately 1,286 new residents, the population in Davis County will shift from a concentration on the east side of the valley to a more central and westward concentration, with Syracuse and West Point experiencing substantial growth. The less dense development within the City will result in slower growth in spending within the City, while other areas of the County will experience higher taxable sales due to their higher populations.

5.3 Additional Economic Development Financing Tools

There are a wide variety of tools and incentives available to help achieve economic development goals. Below is a brief description of several resources available to the City.

Redevelopment Areas – Tax Increment Financing

Tax increment financing (TIF) is the most widely used tool for economic development in the State of Utah. The creation of CRAs, or historically URA, EDA or CDAs, provides a source of financing redevelopment through the creation of tax increment. Redevelopment agencies negotiate with taxing entities to share a portion of the property tax that is generated by new development in a certain area for a specific length of time.

Tax Increment Revenue Bonds

Tax Increment Revenue Bonds allow redevelopment agencies to pledge tax increment funds to repay the debt service. The projected tax increment is often discounted by the bond market, as the tax increment is the only source to repay the bonds, and project areas have little to no tax increment at the beginning of a new project. These bonds are generally more difficult to sell, due to the risk of repayment.

Revolving Loan Funds and Grants

A revolving loan fund is a source of money from which loans are made for small business development projects. A loan is made to a business and as repayments are made, funds become available for future loans to other businesses. This tool is mainly used to finance local, expanding, or small businesses within the community.

The funds used to create a revolving loan fund may have rules governing the program design. For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has specified rules for Community Development Block Grants. Matching grants or revolving loan funds have been very successful in various communities throughout Utah. Dilapidated areas within the City may benefit from creating a revolving loan fund that would encourage the upgrade of facades and other building renovations.

Most businesses see increased traffic from improvements to their properties.

Community Development Block Grants

Community Development Block Grants can be used for development in parts of the community that qualify as low- and moderate-income areas. These funds may also be used for projects that remove impediments of access for elderly and the disabled.

Business Improvement Districts

A business improvement district (BID) is a public-private partnership that allows for additional taxes to be collected from businesses within a designated area. The taxes generated by a BID are used for public improvements based on the concept that well-maintained public spaces will increase commerce. BIDs are managed by nonprofit corporations created by the district. BIDs allow businesses to share the costs to increase business activity within the community through joint ventures including 1) joint marketing, 2) ad campaigns, 3) events in the district area, and 4) planning for parking and facility improvements. The City may contribute through facilitation of meetings at municipal buildings, advertising on municipal websites, etc.

Sales Tax Incentives

For strong retail anchors, the City may offer a sales tax incentive for a period of time. The City should consider sales tax incentives on a case-by-case basis. This should only be considered for a major tax-generating retailer or to retain a current major tax-generating business.

Special Assessment Bonds

Special Assessment Bonds allow a governmental entity to designate a specific area which will be benefited by public improvements and levy a special assessment, like a tax lien, to finance the public improvements. This assessment is then used to repay the debt service. Usually, only the property owners receiving the benefit from the improvements are assessed the costs.

Special Assessment Bonds may not be created if 50 percent or more of those liable for the assessment payment protest its creation. These bonds usually have a higher interest rate than the other bonds discussed

in this section. All improvements must be owned by the issuer and repayment cannot exceed twenty years. The main advantage to these bonds is: 1) no bond election required, 2) only benefited owners pay for the improvements, and 3) limited risk to the City.

Municipal Building Authority Lease Revenue Bonds (MBA)

Cities, counties, and school districts are allowed to create a non-profit organization solely for the purpose of accomplishing the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, and financing the cost of a project on behalf of a public body that created it. Normally, MBA bonds are used to construct municipal buildings, however MBA bonds have been used to finance parks and recreation facilities as well. The legal limitation on MBA bonds issued is 40 years.

Sales Tax Revenue Bonds

Sales tax revenues can be utilized as a sole pledge for the repayment of debt. These bonds do not require a bond election and are often used for the acquisition and construction of any capital facility owned by the issuing entity. The bond market usually requires a higher debt service ratio of at least two or three times the revenue to debt.

5.4 Cost Benefit Scenario Analysis

High Cost Benefit Analysis

Table 5.18: Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Benefit Revenues

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
REVENUES	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10	YEAR 11
400 N Property Tax	\$72,088	\$74,251	\$76,478	\$78,772	\$81,136	\$83,570	\$86,077	\$88,659	\$91,319	\$94,058	\$96,880
400 N Sales Tax	\$376,639	\$387,938	\$399,576	\$411,564	\$423,911	\$436,628	\$449,727	\$463,219	\$477,115	\$491,429	\$506,172
Golf Course Property Tax	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678
Golf Course Sales Tax	\$472,719	\$486,901	\$501,508	\$516,553	\$532,050	\$548,011	\$564,452	\$581,385	\$598,827	\$616,792	\$635,295
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,456,124	\$1,483,767	\$1,512,240	\$1,541,567	\$1,571,774	\$1,602,887	\$1,634,933	\$1,667,940	\$1,701,938	\$1,736,956	\$1,773,025

Table 5.18: Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Benefit Revenues Continued

	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	TOTALS	NPV @ 4%
REVENUES	YEAR 12	YEAR 13	YEAR 14	YEAR 15	YEAR 16	YEAR 17	YEAR 18	YEAR 19	YEAR 20		
400 N Property Tax	\$99,786	\$102,780	\$105,863	\$109,039	\$112,311	\$115,680	\$119,150	\$122,725	\$126,407	\$1,937,028	\$1,266,688
400 N Sales Tax	\$521,357	\$536,997	\$553,107	\$569,701	\$586,792	\$604,395	\$622,527	\$641,203	\$660,439	\$10,120,435	\$6,618,093
Golf Course Property Tax	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$534,678	\$10,693,552	\$7,266,443
Golf Course Sales Tax	\$654,354	\$673,985	\$694,204	\$715,030	\$736,481	\$758,576	\$781,333	\$804,773	\$828,916	\$12,702,147	\$8,306,361
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,810,175	\$1,848,440	\$1,887,853	\$1,928,448	\$1,970,261	\$2,013,329	\$2,057,688	\$2,103,378	\$2,150,439	\$35,453,162	\$23,457,584

Table 5.19: Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Benefit Expenditures

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
EXPENDITURES	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10	YEAR 11
Legislature	\$3,001	\$3,102	\$3,206	\$3,315	\$3,428	\$3,544	\$3,665	\$3,791	\$3,921	\$4,057	\$4,197
City Manager	\$11,193	\$11,569	\$11,960	\$12,365	\$12,785	\$13,221	\$13,673	\$14,141	\$14,628	\$15,133	\$15,656
Treasurer	\$5,123	\$5,296	\$5,475	\$5,660	\$5,852	\$6,052	\$6,258	\$6,473	\$6,696	\$6,927	\$7,166
Deputy Recorder	\$5,723	\$5,916	\$6,115	\$6,323	\$6,537	\$6,760	\$6,991	\$7,231	\$7,479	\$7,738	\$8,005
Attorney	\$4,199	\$4,341	\$4,487	\$4,639	\$4,797	\$4,960	\$5,130	\$5,306	\$5,488	\$5,678	\$5,874
City Hall	\$962	\$994	\$1,027	\$1,062	\$1,098	\$1,136	\$1,175	\$1,215	\$1,257	\$1,300	\$1,345
Emergency Preparedness	\$172	\$178	\$184	\$190	\$197	\$203	\$210	\$218	\$225	\$233	\$241
Non - Departmental	\$18,762	\$19,394	\$20,049	\$20,728	\$21,432	\$22,162	\$22,920	\$23,706	\$24,521	\$25,367	\$26,245
Elections	\$495	\$512	\$529	\$547	\$565	\$585	\$605	\$625	\$647	\$669	\$692
Planning & Zoning	\$6,555	\$6,776	\$7,004	\$7,242	\$7,488	\$7,743	\$8,007	\$8,282	\$8,567	\$8,862	\$9,169
Police	\$14,380	\$14,864	\$15,366	\$15,886	\$16,426	\$16,985	\$17,566	\$18,168	\$18,793	\$19,442	\$20,115
Fire Protection	\$15,928	\$16,465	\$17,021	\$17,597	\$18,195	\$18,815	\$19,458	\$20,125	\$20,817	\$21,536	\$22,281
Building Inspection	\$1,793	\$3,635	\$3,806	\$3,986	\$4,176	\$4,375	\$4,585	\$4,806	\$5,038	\$5,283	\$5,541
Roadways	\$14,434	\$14,920	\$15,424	\$15,947	\$16,488	\$17,050	\$17,633	\$18,237	\$18,864	\$19,515	\$20,191

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
EXPENDITURES	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10	YEAR 11
City Parks	\$11,950	\$12,352	\$12,769	\$13,202	\$13,650	\$14,115	\$14,598	\$15,098	\$15,617	\$16,156	\$16,716
Youth Recreation	\$100	\$103	\$106	\$110	\$114	\$118	\$122	\$126	\$130	\$135	\$139
Contributions & Transfers	\$41,633	\$43,035	\$44,488	\$45,995	\$47,558	\$49,178	\$50,859	\$52,602	\$54,412	\$56,289	\$58,238
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$156,403	\$163,451	\$169,018	\$174,794	\$180,785	\$187,002	\$193,453	\$200,149	\$207,101	\$214,318	\$221,814

Table 5.19: Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Benefit Expenditures Continued

	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	TOTALS	NPV @ 4%
EXPENDITURES	YEAR 12	YEAR 13	YEAR 14	YEAR 15	YEAR 16	YEAR 17	YEAR 18	YEAR 19	YEAR 20		
Legislature	\$4,343	\$4,494	\$4,652	\$4,815	\$4,985	\$5,161	\$5,344	\$5,535	\$5,733	\$84,288	\$54,797
City Manager	\$16,200	\$16,765	\$17,352	\$17,961	\$18,594	\$19,251	\$19,935	\$20,645	\$21,383	\$314,410	\$204,401
Treasurer	\$7,415	\$7,674	\$7,942	\$8,221	\$8,511	\$8,812	\$9,125	\$9,450	\$9,788	\$143,915	\$93,560
Deputy Recorder	\$8,284	\$8,572	\$8,872	\$9,184	\$9,507	\$9,843	\$10,193	\$10,556	\$10,934	\$160,763	\$104,514
Attorney	\$6,078	\$6,290	\$6,510	\$6,739	\$6,976	\$7,223	\$7,479	\$7,746	\$8,023	\$117,963	\$76,689
City Hall	\$1,392	\$1,440	\$1,491	\$1,543	\$1,597	\$1,654	\$1,712	\$1,773	\$1,837	\$27,009	\$17,559
Emergency Preparedness	\$249	\$258	\$267	\$276	\$286	\$296	\$307	\$318	\$329	\$4,836	\$3,144
Non - Departmental	\$27,157	\$28,104	\$29,087	\$30,108	\$31,169	\$32,271	\$33,417	\$34,607	\$35,845	\$527,052	\$342,641
Elections	\$716	\$741	\$767	\$794	\$822	\$851	\$882	\$913	\$946	\$13,903	\$9,039
Planning & Zoning	\$9,488	\$9,818	\$10,162	\$10,519	\$10,889	\$11,274	\$11,675	\$12,090	\$12,523	\$184,132	\$119,706
Police	\$20,814	\$21,539	\$22,293	\$23,075	\$23,888	\$24,733	\$25,611	\$26,524	\$27,472	\$403,939	\$262,605
Fire Protection	\$23,055	\$23,859	\$24,694	\$25,561	\$26,461	\$27,397	\$28,369	\$29,380	\$30,431	\$447,445	\$290,888
Building Inspection	\$5,813	\$6,100	\$6,401	\$6,720	\$7,055	\$7,409	\$7,781	\$8,175	\$8,589	\$111,067	\$70,403
Roadways	\$20,893	\$21,621	\$22,377	\$23,163	\$23,979	\$24,827	\$25,708	\$26,624	\$27,577	\$405,473	\$263,602
City Parks	\$17,296	\$17,899	\$18,525	\$19,176	\$19,851	\$20,554	\$21,283	\$22,041	\$22,830	\$335,679	\$218,228
Youth Recreation	\$144	\$149	\$154	\$160	\$166	\$171	\$177	\$184	\$190	\$2,799	\$1,819
Contributions & Transfers	\$60,261	\$62,362	\$64,543	\$66,809	\$69,163	\$71,609	\$74,151	\$76,793	\$79,540	\$1,169,520	\$760,316
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$229,599	\$237,687	\$246,090	\$254,823	\$263,900	\$273,336	\$283,149	\$293,354	\$303,969	\$4,454,193	\$2,893,911

Table 5.20: Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Net Benefit

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10	YEAR 11
TOTAL REVENUE MINUS EXPENDITURES	\$1,299,721	\$1,320,317	\$1,343,222	\$1,366,773	\$1,390,989	\$1,415,885	\$1,441,480	\$1,467,791	\$1,494,838	\$1,522,638	\$1,551,211

Table 5.20 Fruit Heights General Plan Scenarios High Cost Net Benefit Continued

	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	TOTALS	NPV @ 4%
	YEAR 12	YEAR 13	YEAR 14	YEAR 15	YEAR 16	YEAR 17	YEAR 18	YEAR 19	YEAR 20		
TOTAL REVENUE MINUS EXPENDITURES	\$1,580,576	\$1,610,753	\$1,641,763	\$1,673,625	\$1,706,361	\$1,739,992	\$1,774,539	\$1,810,025	\$1,846,471	\$30,998,970	\$20,563,673

6 Parks, Open Space & Trails

6.1 Introduction

Parks, trails and open space are vital components of the Fruit Heights community form and identity. The park, trail and open space system provides places to gather and recreate, visual and physical relief from the built environment, and places of respite and connection to the natural environment. The system should enhance the health and well-being of the community, creating a complete and unified city in the process.

This plan examines the existing system while looking into the future to ensure the park, trail and open space system continues to meet the needs of Fruit Heights' residents. It also provides policy guidance and specific implementation ideas for allocating resources to ensure the City not only meets current needs but those for the next ten years and beyond.

Public Input: Parks, Open Space & Trails

Parks and Open Space

Parks and open space are a vital aspect of the beautiful atmosphere that is highly-valued by the people that live in Fruit Heights. Residents surveyed during the public engagement process indicated that they are generally satisfied with the current parks and open spaces available. Most prefer additional investment in current facilities over expansion of the system. However, concern was expressed that some neighborhoods in the community currently lack reasonable access to parks. Most residents desire added amenities to existing parks, such as more shade, furnishings, or athletic courts such as pickleball.

Trails

Residents who participated in the public engagement process generally desire a stronger trail system that links the City's neighborhoods to parks and open spaces such as the nearby foothills. Residents expressed interest in both separated recreational trails such as the Bair Creek and Bonneville Shoreline trails, as well as sidewalks within neighborhoods and along key corridors.

6.2 Parks & Open Space

This section examines the current state of parks and open space in Fruit Heights City. It addresses the number, size, features and distribution of existing facilities, which helps determine how current needs are being met and what is needed to ensure future needs will be met during the next ten years through build-out.

Existing Parks

Fruit Heights City is fortunate to have a range of parks, open space, trails and similar amenities. Together, these features are the basis upon which the parks and recreation needs of the community are met. Table 6.1 provides a detailed inventory of existing parks and their amenities that contribute to the City's recreation system. Map 6.1 illustrates the location of existing parks and open space in the City, as well as private parks and other sites and facilities that contribute to the parks and open space profile of the city.

To summarize, there are presently approximately 16.6 acres of park land that serve the community. The following is a description of each park type in descending order of size.

The assessment concludes with a review of **Open Space** in the community. It should be noted that the City does not own or manage private or church-owned parks, and as such has limited ability to claim such facilities as elements of the public system. Furthermore, it should be clear that while local and neighborhood parks are intended to primarily serve the needs of residents in adjacent and nearby neighborhoods, the entire system of City-owned parks (Community, Neighborhood, and Local) are public facilities that are open to all residents and visitors.

Community Parks

Community Parks typically serve the City at-large, providing a large specialty feature with a community-wide draw. They also typically include sports fields and sport courts, playgrounds, pavilions, walking

trails, restrooms, trees, large open grassy areas, picnic areas and seating. Baseball, softball, soccer and football programs are often hosted at this type of park.

Community Parks are typically between **10 to 25 acres** in size. Fruit Heights has a single Community Park (Nicholls Park) that is 12-acres in extent.

Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood Parks range from approximately **three to ten acres**, providing amenities intended to meet the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods and the City as a whole. They typically feature sport courts and/or sport fields, perimeter walking paths, trees, open grass areas, a playground, a pavilion, picnic areas, seating areas and a restroom. Harvey Park is Fruit Heights' single park of this category at 4-acres in size.

Local Parks

Local Parks are typically **less than three acres** in size and usually have limited amenities. Due to their small size, these parks provide limited amenities, but may include features such as open lawn areas, picnic tables, benches and trees. A playground or sport court are also typical features for these types of parks.

Local Parks usually serve the immediate residential neighborhood, helping to fill gaps where a larger Neighborhood or Community Park may not be available or accessible within a reasonable walking distance. Since these types of parks tend to be expensive to maintain and burdensome over time, they should be used sparingly within the community, in situations where land is limited or where access to larger parks is not available.

There are two Local Parks in Fruit Heights: Creekview Park (0.3 acres) and Ellison Farms Park (0.3 acres).



Public Park Acreage



Number of Public Parks



Playgrounds



Restrooms



Baseball/Softball Fields



Multipurpose Field



Pavilions/Shelters



Basketball Court

Table 6.1: Existing Park Amenities Inventory

PARK NAME		ACRES	Restroom	Pavilion	Multipurpose Field	Baseball/Softball Field	Tennis Court	Pickleball Court	Volleyball Court	Basketball Court	Playground	Tables	Trailhead	Parking Stalls
COMMUNITY PARKS														
1	Nicholls Park	12.0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	Y	89
Subtotal - Community Parks		12.0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	6		89
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS														
2	Harvey Park	4.0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	N	27
Subtotal - Neighborhood Parks		4.0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		27
LOCAL PARKS														
3	Creekview Park	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	N	0
4	Ellison Farms Park	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	N	0
Subtotal - Pocket Parks		0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		0
TOTAL PARK LAND		16.6	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	10.0		116
PRIVATE PARKS														
	Private Parks	0.3												



Nicholls Park



Harvey Park




Creekview Park



Ellison Farms Park

MAP 6.1 - EXISTING PARK DISTRIBUTION



Special Use Facilities

Special Use Facilities in Fruit Heights help meet non-traditional park and recreation needs. These include the Davis County Golf Course and Fruit Loops Mountain Bike Park. Special Use Facilities are not included in the Level-of-Service analysis that follows, since the facilities serve a specialized niche and provide only limited services.

Other Land Maintained by the City

The City maintains additional land that does not fill traditional park and recreation needs. These sites include detention basins, roadway landscaped areas and civic building grounds. Such uses are also not included in the Level-of-Service analyses as they provide little to no recreational opportunity.

The Role of Private Parks in Meeting Needs

Private parks can provide an additional layer for meeting the community's recreation and leisure needs. Since private parks and fields are not owned or otherwise controlled by the City, they are not included in the acreage for the Level-of-Service analyses. Nevertheless, they can be considered as potential sites for meeting needs in areas where service gaps exist and where vacant land is not available for siting or developing a public park, which would require negotiations and agreements to be reached with the owners of each park.

Existing Park Needs & Service Levels

To determine whether existing parks in Fruit Heights City meet community needs, two different analyses were undertaken. The first is a **Level-of-Service (LOS) Analysis**, which examines park acreage in relation to population. The second is a **Distribution/Service Area Analysis**, which evaluates the distribution of parks within the City and help identify areas where service gaps exist.

Existing Level-of-Service Analysis

Level-of-Service (LOS) Analysis was developed by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) to assist communities in evaluating whether the amount of park land is sufficient for meeting park needs. The LOS is a ratio calculated by dividing the total acres of park

land by the population and multiplying by 1,000. The resulting figure represents the number of park acres provided for every thousand residents.

The LOS Analysis originated as a benchmark for determining park needs, allowing a community to compare its performance with that of other communities and nationally-established minimum standards. While helping to evaluate a minimum standard of parks, the method has fallen out of favor as a standard benchmark in recognition that such comparisons do not reflect the unique conditions and goals of individual communities. This is especially true in the Intermountain West, where many communities such as Fruit Heights have nearby access to significant amounts of state and federal public lands or publicly-owned open space that help meet recreation needs. As a result, the LOS Analysis is now most useful as an internal planning tool to help a community gauge past and current supply of park land and determine the vision for future park land provision as the City continues to grow and mature.

Only Local Parks, Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks were used to calculate the Existing LOS for Fruit Heights. The Existing LOS was determined by dividing the acreage of these parks (16.6) by the 2020 population (6,101) and multiplying by 1,000 to reflect the number of park acres per 1,000 residents ($16.6 / 6,101 \times 1,000 = 2.7$). This results in an **Existing LOS of 2.7 acres of park land for every thousand residents** in Fruit Heights.

Civic buildings, local schools, private parks, and other properties owned and managed by the City such as retention basins were excluded from LOS calculations because they are either owned and/or managed by others or they do not meet traditional park needs.



Existing Level of Service



Distribution Analysis

In addition to determining the existing Level-of-Service, the distribution of parks and their corresponding service areas were analyzed to understand the spatial and locational characteristics of Fruit Heights's park system. The goal of this analysis is to provide **residents with parks that are within a reasonable distance from their homes, and preferably within walking distance if feasible.**

Map 6.1 illustrates the distribution and service areas of existing and approved parks. Each park type was assigned service radii according to park type/size as follows: **Local Parks** (1/4-mile radius), **Neighborhood Parks** (1/2-mile radius), **Community Parks** (1-mile radius). Special use parks and other recreation facilities were not assigned service radii for reasons previously indicated. Fruit Heights has a generally good distribution of parks, with most areas being served within a short drive of any park within the community. However, from a pedestrian perspective, additional parks could be located within the northeastern quadrant of the City to offer neighborhoods park services within walking distance.

Meeting Existing & Future Park Needs

This section addresses the acreage and distribution of parks needed to meet existing and future park needs.

Future Level-of-Service for Parks

As previously indicated, comparing the existing LOS with national standards has fallen out of favor in recent years. Likewise, comparing existing LOS in Fruit Heights with those of other communities provides only limited rationale for establishing a desired LOS. As previously stressed, Fruit Heights is unique in its needs and access to public lands, and the LOS it provides is a function of those unique attributes. Nevertheless, such comparisons can be helpful for gauging where the City stands in relation to similar communities in the region, some of which may have similar goals, visions and needs. As illustrated in Table 6.2, the Existing LOS in Fruit Heights City hovers near the lower ranges when compared to a selection of other communities along the Wasatch Front region.

Table 6.2: Level-of-Service Comparison

Location	Level-of-Service (LOS) Acres per 1,000 Residents
Fruit Heights	2.7
Brigham City	8.0
Draper	3.8
Kaysville	3.7
Mapleton	4.9
Orem	2.8
Salem	4.3
Sandy	6.0
Saratoga Springs	3.7
Spanish Fork	5.9
Springville	4.5

While this comparison can provide a general sense of where the community stands, it is important to note that many communities do not calculate LOS in a consistent manner. For example, some communities include acreage that does not meet traditional park needs, natural open space, undeveloped park land, or they may simply have established a different approach or have different priorities than Fruit Heights. As a result, the established ratios are not directly comparable and are primarily beneficial for confirming that there are no fatal flaws as the City moves forward with the acquisition and development of new parks.

Future Level of Service

Generally, as communities mature and develop over time there is a natural tendency for the LOS to decrease, largely due to the lack of remaining open land as a city approaches buildout. Such will be the case with Fruit Heights, and it is therefore recommended that a **Future LOS of 2.7**



be maintained into the future in order to continue to provide adequate parks for the community. Note that giving priority to filling existing distribution gaps as part of this process will help provide equitable access to parks as the City continues to develop.

Level-of-Service must be balanced with filling gaps and the reality that vacant land for new parks may not always be available in areas where they are needed. Fortunately, some vacant land remains of the appropriate size in neighborhoods where local parks are needed. **It is therefore recommended that the proposed parks shown on Map 6.2 are acquired in the general locations indicated as soon as possible, whether through direct purchase or as part of agreements with developers.**

Meeting Needs During the 10-Year Planning Horizon

As remaining areas of the community develop, Fruit Heights should acquire and develop the parks proposed in this plan according to the general sizes and distribution indicated on Map 6.2.

Carrying the Future LOS of 2.7 acres per 1,000 people forward to meet park need through the 10-year planning period results in a total of 20.3 acres of public park land required by 2030 to meet needs during the next ten years ($7,500 / 1,000 \times 2.7 = 20.3$). As there are 16.6 acres of existing public park land today, this will require the addition of 3.7 acres over the next 10 years to maintain the level-of-service.

Meeting Needs Through 2050 and Beyond

The projected 2050 population requires a total of 24.3 acres of public park land by that year ($9,000 / 1,000 \times 2.7 = 24.3$) to meet park needs. Subtracting 16.6 acres of existing developed public park land and the 3.7 acres recommended to be acquired by 2030, **only 7.7 acres of additional park land is required to meet LOS needs between 2030 and 2050** ($24.3 - 16.6 - 3.7 = 7.7$).

Park Acres Needed Through 2030



Park Acres Needed Through 2050



Moving forward beyond 2050, the City should continue to periodically examine where gaps in the system exist and to add additional parks whenever needed or possible. **If the opportunity arises in the near term to acquire more park, trail or open space land through development agreements and park dedications, the City should secure those properties to ensure needs continue to be met in the future.** This is a time-sensitive consideration, as land costs often rise at rates faster than the funds available for purchasing them.


In acquiring new properties, it is recommended that new Local Parks to be developed are as large as possible, as smaller parks of this category tend to provide minimal amenities and are difficult to maintain and operate. The City could alternatively focus on consolidating proposed Local Parks as Neighborhood Parks, since larger parks provide the highest cost benefit and operational cost efficiency. Furthermore, they serve the surrounding neighborhoods and community with more usable and desirable amenities than Local Parks.

Fruit Heights may also want to explore repurposing a portion of the golf course to help meet long-term parks and open space needs should the opportunity arise for redevelopment in the future (see *Chapter 2: Land Use*).



Nicholls Park

MAP 6.2 - PROPOSED PARK DISTRIBUTION



-  Proposed Parks
-  Existing Parks
-  Local Park Service Area - 1/4 Mile Radius
-  Neighborhood Park Service Area - 1/2 Mile Radius
-  Community Park Service Area - 1 Mile Radius
-  Cemetery
-  Open Space
-  Streams
-  Trails
-  City Boundary

0 0.5 Miles



A Note About Level of Service (LOS) & Impact Fees

The LOS discussion in this document is related specifically to planning for future parks. The intent is to understand the level of service currently existing in the community, and to determine the means for maintaining that level of service or establishing a more appropriate level of service for the future.

LOS is based on a quantity (acres, miles, numbers) per a determined number of persons (population), and results in a ratio of facilities to population. For example, the parks ratio is typically expressed as the number of acres of park land per 1,000 persons.

It is important to distinguish this discussion of LOS for planning purposes from the LOS typically used in determining impact fees. Impact fees are a means of charging new development its proportionate share of the cost of providing essential public services. While a LOS for planning is used to establish a standard or guideline for future facility development, an impact fee is used to assess new development for the actual cost of providing the service. For example, if there are five-acres of parks in Fruit Heights for each 1,000 residents at present, new development cannot be charged at a rate for ten-acres of park land for each 1,000 residents. Fruit Heights may elect to provide a higher LOS in the future because its current residents desire a higher level of service, but it cannot require new development to pay for the higher LOS. Utah law is clear on this point, as follows:

“A local political subdivision or private entity may not impose an impact fee to raise the established level of service of a public facility serving existing development.” UC11-36-202(1)(a)(ii).”

The Parks & Recreation Element should complement a *Capital Improvements Plan*, *Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP)*, and *Impact Fee Analysis (IFA)*. The IFFP is designed to identify the demands placed upon the existing facilities by future development and evaluate how these demands will be met by the City, as well as the future improvements required to maintain the existing LOS. The purpose of the IFA is to proportionately allocate the cost of the new facilities and any excess capacity to new development, while ensuring that all methods of financing are considered. While the IFFP and IFA will serve as a companion to this document, information may differ due to the specific requirements related to the calculation of impact fees as defined in Utah Code 11-36a – the Impact Fee Act.

It should be noted that although cities cannot exact park improvements from developers and charge impact fees, they can evaluate both options and select that which best meets the needs and provides the highest public value.

Park Standards & Amenities

Establishing development standards for each park type is essential to ensuring that existing and future parks meet the needs and desires of the community. The following standards provide a general indication of the basic amenities and features to be provided for each park type. It should be noted that these standards are not intended to be prescriptive or to suggest that every individual park should look and function exactly the same as other comparable parks. Rather, they should be applied to help ensure that every park meets the basic needs for the intended purpose, while also ensuring that each park will be unique, responding to the specific setting and requirements, and incorporating unique features and design themes.

Park Standards

Future parks should be located and sited in a carefully considered and thoughtful manner, whether developed by the City or a developer. When possible, future parks should be located in close proximity to open space areas, incorporate unique topographic features, be adjusted as necessary to accommodate specific amenities, and have easy access to collector roads and regional trail systems, and include adequate parking for the intended facilities.

Another consideration to keep in mind is that as the City's population matures, it will require that future parks be designed and developed in a flexible manner to meet the needs of the widest range of users and age groups, each of which have unique demands and desires. In order to help assure these actions are achieved in a cost-effective manner, the minimum standards which follow are recommended for meeting existing and future park needs and expectations.

Existing parks should be upgraded to meet the minimum requirements for the designated type. Where acreage would qualify a park for a "higher" park type, amenities should be added to bring the park up to the higher standard as space allows. Future parks should be designed from the outset with features and amenities that meet the minimum standards.

Local Park Standards

Local Parks are less than 3 acres in size, and should include the following amenities:

- Trees
- Picnic table(s), bench(es) and site furnishings
- Grassy play area(s)
- A covered shelter, pavilion or shade structure OR a small playground, sport court or activity area



Neighborhood Park Standards

Neighborhood Parks are 3 to 10 acres in size, and should include the following amenities:

- Trees
- Picnic tables and benches
- A drinking fountain
- Grassy play area(s)
- Playground(s)
- Small/Medium Pavilion(s)
- A Restroom
- Sport court(s) (basketball, volleyball, pickleball and tennis)
- Sports field(s) (baseball, soccer, football and similar sports)
- Connections to other parks, open spaces, recreation amenities and community destinations by multipurpose trails, bike lanes, or routes
- Perimeter walking trail(s) where appropriate
- Off-street parking area(s) where appropriate



Community Park Standards

Community Parks are 10-24 acres in size and should include all of the amenities and features in Neighborhood Parks plus the following:

- At least one large pavilion
- At least one specialty recreation feature, such as a sports complex, an aquatics facility, recreation pond, splash pad or arboretum
- Two or more restrooms, depending on size and needs
- Off-street parking adequate for all amenities



Park Amenities

Individual amenities, paired with overall design and setting, contribute to each park's character and function. In Fruit Heights, based on public feedback and the analysis described below, the park system would greatly benefit from additional amenities and should be a top priority for parks.

The provision of park amenities has been analyzed using a system-wide Level-of-Service (LOS) Analysis and on a park-by-park basis. This two-pronged analysis helps us understand deficiencies and needs both systemically and for specific park sites.

Amenity Level-of-Service

Similar to the LOS recommendations provided for parks, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) provides LOS standards for individual park amenities. These standards were used as a starting point for assessing existing amenities, then **adjusted to reflect the unique needs of Fruit Heights**. Table 6.3 identifies the total quantity of

existing amenities in parks, which are then compared to the population, indicating the total surplus or deficit which exists (surpluses are indicated in black text, deficits in **red**).

This analysis indicates that Fruit Heights currently provides an adequate number of baseball fields, playgrounds, pavilions and restrooms. On the other hand, the park system could benefit from additional multiuse fields and athletic courts of all types. If these deficits are filled in the near term, Fruit Heights will have adequate amenities to meet the needs of the growing populace beyond 2030.

As shown in Table 6.4, between 2030 and 2050, the need for additional amenities will continue to grow. Specifically, there will be a need for an additional playground, multipurpose field, and baseball field.

Amenity Deficiencies by Park Standards

The recommended park standards establish the minimum standard for parks by type for both new and existing parks. Table 6.5 indicates which existing parks in the City lack specific amenities according to those

Table 6.3: 2022 Amenity Levels-of-Service and Deficiencies

Amenity	Quantity of Existing Amenities	Existing Amenity Level of Service (pop. per amenity)	Suggested Level of Service (LOS)*	Quantity Required to Meet Suggested LOS for 2021 Population	2022 Amenity Surplus or Deficit
Baseball/Softball Fields	3	2,033	2,500	3	0
Basketball Courts	1	6,101	5,000	2	-1
Multipurpose Fields	1	6,101	2,500	3	-2
Pavilions	4	1,525	5,000	2	2
Pickleball Courts	0	-	5,000	2	-2
Playgrounds	3	2,033	2,500	3	0
Restrooms	2	3,050	5,000	2	0
Sand Volleyball Courts	0	-	10,000	1	-1
Tennis Courts	0	-	5,000	2	-2

*Based on modified NRPA standards

Table 6.4: 2050 Amenity Levels-of-Service and Deficiencies (Beyond 2020 and 2030 Needs)

Amenity	Quantity of Existing Amenities	2050 Amenity Level of Service (pop. per amenity)	Suggested Level of Service (LOS)*	Quantity Required to Meet Suggested LOS for 2050 Population	Quantity Required for Needs Between 2022 and 2030	2050 Amenity Surplus or Deficit
Baseball/Softball Fields	3	3,000	2,500	4	0	-1
Basketball Courts	1	9,000	5,000	2	1	0
Multipurpose Fields	1	9,000	2,500	4	2	-1
Pavilions	4	2,250	5,000	2	0	2
Pickleball Courts	0	9,000	5,000	2	2	0
Playgrounds	3	3,000	2,500	4	0	-1
Restrooms	2	4,500	5,000	2	0	0
Sand Volleyball Courts	0	9,000	10,000	1	1	0
Tennis Courts	0	9,000	5,000	2	2	0

*Based on modified NRPA standards

Table 6.5: Amenities Required to Meet Park Standards

Park	Amenities Missing as Required by Standards
Nicholls Park	Multipurpose Field, Sport Courts (3), Perimeter Walking Path
Harvey Park	Sport Courts (1–2), Perimeter Walking Path
Creekview Park	Playground or Picnic Shelter, Benches, Trees
Ellison Farms Park	Picnic Shelter, Benches, Trees



Ellison Farms Park

standards. While it is recommended that all existing parks meet these standards, the City should apply some subjective input to ensure the that modifications and enhancements are feasible and desirable. It is also recommended that input and review from the neighborhood and community are solicited through planning and design for each park.

Open Space

Natural and undeveloped open space is an essential component of a comprehensive, balanced parks and recreation system. This is particularly true in Fruit Heights, which is graced by the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains at its edge and Bair Creek running through its heart. Public input clearly supports access to and close proximity of open space as one of the key reasons people choose to move here and is one of the essential and most valued aspects of Fruit Heights identity and character.

Open Space also provides a host of ecological benefits. It helps purify soil, water, and air and can absorb and deflect noise, wind, and visual disturbances. It can also help store storm water and absorb carbon and reduce urban heat. It provides wildlife habitat and contribute to a pleasing aesthetic. These and other benefits of a generous open space system help make Fruit Heights a healthier community.

There is no standard Level of Service (LOS) for providing open space. Open space is typically acquired on a case-by-case basis where opportunities arise. Priority should be placed on acquiring land that expands the existing City-owned open space system and which preserves key natural drainages throughout the community. The preservation of natural drainages can help mitigate storm water storage and conveyance, in addition to serving as key trail corridor connections for the City's trail network.

Additionally, the acquisition of key agricultural lands may be an option for open space that not only provides the visual and environmental benefits of preservation, but also maintains connections to Fruit Heights's agricultural and pioneer heritage. Agricultural land can be maintained in variety of ways, including as working farms. Programs offered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Utah State University Extension Service such as the Century or Heritage Farms Programs

and Agricultural Conservation Easements provide opportunities for enhanced conservation.

Agricultural land can also be converted into educational working farms such as Wheeler Farm in Murray, Utah, and they can also include wedding, reception or other event venues or community gardens, which can further enhance the viability of preserving open space in an income-generating manner. Agricultural land can be converted into natural open space over time. Such natural/agricultural open spaces can also serve as short-term "holding sites" and eventually be developed into more formal programmed parks over time.

Considering the public's interest in preserving open space, the City should contemplate using a combination of open space acquisition tools as described on the following page.



Bair Canyon



Bair Creek Open Space

Park & Open Space Acquisition Tools

Conservation Subdivisions

Allow a higher level of development/density on a smaller area of land in exchange for open space

Zoning and Development Restrictions: Sensitive Lands Overlay

Zoning tool requiring additional regulation of unique resources and sensitive lands

Fee Simple Title (Outright Purchase)

Purchase and hold as publicly-owned park land (most expensive option)

Purchase and Sellback or Leaseback

Purchase land, remove/restrict development rights then lease/sell land back

Open Space Dedication Requirements or In-Lieu Fees

Require developers to provide park land for new developments or offer the option to instead pay fees, construct facilities or establish private parks

Conservation Easements

Remove the right to develop land through donation, purchase or transfer of rights

Land Banking

Purchase and hold land to be developed or sold at a future date

Proactive Property-Owner Negotiation

Negotiate with property owners to provide optimal open space

Recommendations for Parks & Open Space

Fruit Heights generally has sufficient park amenities to meet most of the needs of the current population. However, as the City approaches buildout and the population grows, providing additional parks and park amenities will be important to maintain the current level of service. This will include providing new parks in gap areas and upgrading existing parks with additional amenities to meet demands.

Any new parks should be developed at the upper end of the size ranges in the park standards where possible to help fill gaps in service areas and to ensure the efficient use of maintenance resources and the best recreational value for the City's parks. It is strongly recommended to acquire land as soon as possible, even if it has to remain as natural open space until it can be developed at a later date, because land costs rarely decrease.

The amenities that are currently lacking should be implemented as described in the Amenity Deficiency Assessment (Tables 6.3 and 6.5). As new parks are developed in the future, the amenities in the 2030 and 2050 LOS analyses (Table 6.4) should be incorporated into the design of those parks accordingly.

As opportunities to acquire open space arise, Fruit Heights City should first verify they are linked with other open spaces and parks and are large enough to be considered viable and usable community assets. Open space should generally help expand the existing Bair Creek trail corridor, preserve other natural drainages and key natural resources, preserve critical habitat or agricultural lands, and provide greater connections to parks, neighborhoods, and the Wasatch Mountains. Special recreational uses such as trails and trailheads should be considered for open spaces on a case-by-case basis.

Finally, to encourage knowledge, use and stewardship of the municipal park, open space and trail system, a comprehensive Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan should be developed and implemented. This will not only help make residents and visitors aware of what the City has to offer, but can also provide use, management and branding opportunities for these valued community assets.

6.3 Trails

Trails are an essential recreational amenity that provide connections between home, work, play and important destinations as well as with transit and services. Trails are a primary method for the public to access and enjoy local parks and open space. Trail facilities serve a wide range of uses (walking, running, and cycling) and user groups (individuals, families, weekend warriors, youth, seniors, commuters and casual recreationists).

Existing Trails & Trailheads

The City currently has two important recreational unpaved trail corridors - the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and the Bair Creek Trail. Each of these trails is only partially developed, needing additional segments to complete the alignments. Existing trailheads are located at the mouth of Bair Canyon, Fruit Loops Mountain Bike Park, and Nicholls Park.

Proposed Trails & Trailheads

Trails

The Proposed Trail Concept shown on Map 6.3 illustrates a network of trail alignments based on the active transportation analysis made in *Chapter 3: Transportation and Streets*. The suggested routes are conceptual in nature, with detailed alignments to be determined with the acquisition and development of each route. Exact trail mileage is not provided due to the conceptual nature of the suggested alignments.

Regional Trails

Regional trails link neighborhoods within City and connect Fruit Heights to adjacent communities and destinations beyond its borders. Proposed regional trails will connect to Kaysville and Farmington. Ideally, regional trails are separated from adjacent roadways where possible. The Bonneville Shoreline Trail is Fruit Heights' one existing Regional Unpaved Trail, which is planned to be completed within the City's limit. Other major planned trails, the Bair Creek Trail and U.S. 89 trail, may be connected to the paved regional trail system as they are completed.

Typical characteristics of **Regional Unpaved Trails** include the following:

- Fulfill primarily recreation functions.
- Support hiking, mountain biking, trail running where appropriate.
- Provide longer, extended routes than local trails.
- Are publicly-owned and permanent.
- Are unpaved natural surfaces and are separated from roadways.
- Include trailheads and access points with restrooms, parking, signs and lighting.

Typical characteristics of **Regional Paved Trails** include the following:

- Fulfill both recreation and transportation functions.
- Support biking, walking and skateboarding/in-line skating.
- Provide safe routes to schools and connections with employment areas, recreational sites, community destinations and centers.
- May include landscaping, fences, signs, benches and other features for enhanced comfort and safety.
- Are publicly owned and permanent.
- Where possible, are paved with soft shoulders and separated from adjacent roads. May be a bike lane and/or wider sidewalk where separation is not possible, such as Main Street.
- Incorporate wider sidewalks, ramps, access points and other features as necessary to maximize use and accessibility.
- Include trailheads and access points with restrooms, parking, signs and lighting.

Multi-use Off-Street Trails

Off-street trails are fully separated from roadways and may follow river, rail or other open space corridors. Their primary purpose is to support recreational trail use but also provide a finer grain of transportation connectivity. These trails often link with the regional trail system. Map 6.3 proposes this trail type for the Bair Creek and U.S. 89 segments until they can be reasonably integrated into the regional system, as well as new trails and linkages within any future redevelopment of the golf course area.

Typical characteristics of **Off-Street Trails** include the following:

- Support biking, walking and skateboarding/in-line skating.
- May include landscaping, fences, signs, benches and other features for enhanced comfort and safety.
- Are permanently protected.
- Are paved or unpaved with soft shoulders and are separated from or adjacent to roads.
- Incorporate ramps, access points and other features to maximize use and accessibility.

On-Street Trails/Bike Lanes

On-street trails are located within the street right-of-way and provide the separated multi-use trail experience where the opportunity lies along a street. Bike lanes primarily tend to fulfill transportation functions, connecting major destinations and serving experienced bicyclists that are comfortable sharing the road with vehicles.

Bike Lanes typically consist of on-street striped bicycle lanes as described below, but alternative options are available where roadway width may prohibit full bicycle lanes.

- On-Street Striped Bike Lanes – paved, striped bicycle lane adjacent to the traffic lane on the roadway, a minimum of 4' in width, designed to meet AASHTO standards.
- On-Street Signed Bike Routes or Sharrows– paved travel path located on the existing roadway which is signed or painted for joint use. Specifically, bicyclists travel with vehicular traffic and share the roadway.

Trailheads

The City should also consider locating and/or improving trailheads along Regional and Off-Street trails as appropriate. These help provide critical amenities to trail users, such as parking, restrooms, information kiosks and bike repair stations. Parks may also serve as trailheads if they are connected with the City's trail network.

Recommendations for Trails

The City should prioritize the acquisition and development of trail alignments for Regional and Off-Street trails as shown on Map 6.3. Some trail development will work hand-in-hand with open space acquisition along key natural corridors. As routes are created and a system begins to take shape, the City should implement appropriate trailheads and wayfinding signage to support the trail system.

6.4 Priorities & Potential Funding Sources

As described in the preceding sections, a number of improvements and actions are required to ensure existing and future needs related to parks, open space, and trails in Fruit Heights City are met. The following is a summary of the specific projects, probable costs and implementation tasks.

Establishing Priorities

Park and Open Space Priorities

Meeting Park Needs by 2030

Maintaining the LOS of 2.7 forward to meet park needs through the 10-year planning period requires 3.7 acres of additional public park land required by 2030. Ideally this acreage would be located in neighborhoods lacking walking access to parks.


Meeting Park Needs at Build-Out

With a projected population of 9,000 in the year 2050, Fruit Heights will need an additional of 7.7 additional acres to meet future park needs.

Adopting Minimum Standards and Upgrading Existing Parks

In order to meet recreational needs and to bring existing parks up to proposed standards, Fruit Heights needs to construct two pickleball courts, two tennis courts, two multipurpose fields, two walking paths, one basketball court and one volleyball court.

MAP 6.3 - PROPOSED TRAIL NETWORK



- Existing Unpaved Hiking Trail
- Existing Unpaved Regional Trail
- Existing Off-Street Trail
- Existing On-Street Trail/Bike Lane
- Proposed Unpaved Regional Trail
- Proposed Off-Street Trail
- Proposed On-Street Trail/Bike Lane
- Existing Parks
- Proposed Parks
- Cemetery
- Open Space
- Streams
- City Boundary

0 0.5 Miles



To ensure existing and future parks meet community needs, the minimum park standards presented in Section 3.2 should be adopted as official City policy. New parks should include amenities and features to meet the minimum park standards, and surrounding neighbors and other community stakeholders should be consulted during design to ensure new parks meet the needs of the neighborhood and community.

Open Space Acquisition

Fruit Heights should continue to secure additional open space as opportunities arise, expanding the existing network to help connect parks, trails and open spaces, and preserving the unique natural drainages, foothills and agricultural lands that form the framework of the open space system.

Trails Priorities

Developing the Trail Network

The City should continue to develop the recreational trail network as proposed, focusing on segments that complete regional trails. New trailheads should be constructed and existing trailheads upgraded to provide necessary amenities for trail users.

System-wide Priorities

Wayfinding and Signage

A comprehensive *Wayfinding and Signage Plan* is also recommended to expand the knowledge and use of the City's parks, open space and trails.

Probable Costs

An analysis of probable costs of park and trail improvements is useful in planning and strategizing for implementation of these facilities at a high level. Note that individual projects will have unique costs of their own which will need their own analysis. Also, many funding sources are available to finance of parks and trails, and should be utilized as part of a broad approach to implementation. These funding sources will be detailed in this chapter and *Appendix B*.

Table 6.6: Probable Costs for Upgrading Existing Parks and Meeting Amenity Levels-of-Service Needs

Amenity	Total Amenities Required to meet LOS and Park Standards	Probable Costs	Unit	Total
Pickleball Court	2	\$50,000	Each	\$100,000
Tennis Court	2	\$60,000	Each	\$120,000
Multipurpose Field	2	\$80,000	Each	\$160,000
Sand Volleyball Court	1	\$40,000	Each	\$40,000
Basketball Court	1	\$50,000	Each	\$50,000
Walking Path	2	\$90,000	Each	\$180,000
Total				\$650,000

Table 6.7: Probable Costs for Parks and Open Space

Item	Probable Cost
Meeting Needs by 2030	
Develop additional amenities needed by 2030	\$650,000
Develop 3.7 acres of City-owned park land by 2030 to meet LOS needs	\$2,405,000
Subtotal 2030 Needs	\$3,055,000
Meeting Needs by Build-out in 2050	
Acquire and develop an additional 7.7 acres of park land by 2050 to meet LOS	\$5,005,000
Subtotal Build-out Needs	\$5,005,000
GRAND TOTAL	\$8,060,000

Note: All costs assume \$250,000 per acre acquisition cost and \$400,000 per acre development cost

Park and Open Space Costs

Table 6.6 summarizes the costs required to construct the additional amenities needed by 2030 to meet amenity LOS needs. Table 6.7 illustrates the costs required to meet amenity levels of service and the costs to acquire and develop parks through 2030 and build-out in 2050. As indicated in Table 6.7, \$8,060,000 is required to meet amenities LOS requirements and park standards, fill gaps, and meet needs through anticipated build-out.

Trail Costs

Table 6.8 summarizes the costs required to develop the trail network as shown on Map 6.3. Exact mileage is not provided as trail alignments are conceptual, and it is assumed that on-street bicycle lanes will be constructed with roadway development projects, therefore costs for those are not included here. The total cost for multi-use trail system improvements is roughly \$1,725,000.

Establishing Funding Priorities

Establishing funding priorities for parks, open space, and trails is a challenge for communities with limited resources and diverse needs. Key considerations when prioritizing specific projects follow. One of the key steps is to establish budgets for the acquisition of land as soon as possible in order to avoid escalating acquisition costs over time.

Table 6.8: Probable Costs for Trails

Item	Miles/ Quantity	Unit Cost	Probable Cost
Proposed Multi-Use Paved Trails (cost per mile)	~6	\$250,000	\$1,500,000
Proposed Multi-Use Unpaved Trails (cost per mile)	~1	\$100,000	\$100,000
Enhanced Crossings	~5	\$25,000	\$125,000
GRAND TOTAL			\$1,725,000

Table 6.9 is an Action Plan that summarizes short, medium and long-term implementation actions and priorities. Section 1 of the table addresses recommended capital facility improvements and operations and maintenance, while Section 2 addresses the policy actions that are described in *Section 3.6: Goals and Policies*. In order to meet future needs, it is critical that the suggested improvements be made according to the corresponding 2030 and 2050 schedules.

Project Prioritization Considerations

- Do they help fill a critical need or service gap?
- Do they address health and safety concerns?
- Do they support on-going maintenance of existing facilities (thereby protecting existing resources and investments)?
- Do they meet future needs in clear and logical phases?

Existing Funding Sources

The following are some of the key funding sources currently available for implementing the plan recommendations.

- **General Funds** - funds that come through government levies such as property and sales taxes that are appropriated as the City sees fit.
- **Park Impact Fees** - impact fees assessed with new development and redevelopment to provide comparable level of service for parks as the City grows.
- **Bonds** - debt obligations issued by government entities.

Though not an exhaustive list, a number of various bonds, special assessments, service districts, grants, partnerships and other funding options and sources that are available to help implement the plan vision are detailed in *Appendix B*.

Table 6.9: Action/Implementation Plan

		Immediate Implementation	Short-Term Implementation 2022–2030	Medium-Term Implementation 2030 – 2050	Medium to Long-Term Implementation 2050+
	Capital Facility Improvements				
	Parks and Open Space				
1	Utilize 2.7 acres per 1,000 population as the future level of service through build-out.				
2	Upgrade existing parks to meet standards and amenity levels of service.				
3	Develop 11.4 acres of park land to meet needs by 2050.				
4	Develop and install City-wide wayfinding and signage system for the parks, open space, recreation and trails system.				
5	Acquire additional open space with a focus on expanding existing open space areas, protecting natural drainages and preserving agricultural land.				
	Policy Actions				
	Parks and Open Space				
6	As the community grows ensure that the recommended LOS is maintained.				
7	Pursue Neighborhood Parks (3 acres or larger) in the future if possible to meet the needs of the community while minimizing the maintenance demands associated with smaller parks.				
8	Adopt the minimum development standards for parks detailed in this plan as a City policy.				
9	Design and develop all new parks with amenities and features that meet the established standards, enlisting the professional services of a landscape architect or other qualified designer and allowing and encouraging public input on the design.				
10	Update annual budgets to ensure funding for operation and maintenance of City parks and other land the City maintains is sufficient to meet needs.				
11	Establish an annual budget for maintenance and park upgrades.				
12	Protect the City's investment in sports fields by resting fields on a regular basis to prevent damage by overuse.				

Table 6.9: Action/Implementation Plan (continued)

		Immediate Implementation	Short-Term Implementation 2022-2030	Medium-Term Implementation 2030 - 2050	Medium to Long-Term Implementation 2050+
13	Continue to maintain an up-to-date inventory of all parks, park facilities and parkways, documenting and implementing improvements according to a feasible schedule.				
14	Apply design standards for all parks in a way that helps reduce maintenance requirements while promoting use of public parks and recreation amenities.				
15	Increase the variety of amenities in parks to promote better use of parks.				
16	Provide amenities and facilities to help residents “self-maintain” their parks and park facilities (trash receptacles, animal waste containers, hose bibs, pet clean-up stations, etc.)				
17	Increase the amount of shade, particularly around park amenities, by planting more trees.				
Trails					
18	The Planning Commission should provide planning and implementation oversight of the City’s trail system.				
19	Install the proposed trail network by buildout, including other trail system improvements.				
20	Make trail maps available to the public in print and online formats.				
21	Develop an accessible network of pedestrian supportive infrastructure, including sidewalks, curb ramps, and trails near existing parks and other high-use destinations.				
22	Continually evaluate system-wide trail needs as part of future planning initiatives, focusing on closing gaps, developing trailheads, and improving connections with existing and future neighborhoods, destinations, parks and recreation facilities, and transit stops.				
23	Require development projects to finance through impact fees and/or install bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and trails as appropriate.				
24	Coordinate with the Davis School District on a Safe Routes to School program with an emphasis on trail linkages.				

Table 6.9: Action/Implementation Plan (continued)

		Immediate Implementation	Short-Term Implementation 2022-2030	Medium-Term Implementation 2030 - 2050	Medium to Long-Term Implementation 2050+
25	Install a safe system of trail lighting and emergency response stations along paved trails where appropriate.				
26	Ensure that maintenance routines include the control of weeds (particularly thorny species), the removal of trash and debris, and selective plowing of key routes to facilitate winter trail use.				
27	Promote an "Adopt a Trail" program to encourage trail user assistance in maintaining the trail system. Encourage participants to become involved in all aspects of trails development, through maintenance and long-term improvements.				
28	Provide a bicycle and pedestrian network that is safe and attractive to all users, including women, children and the elderly.				
29	Ensure that the Wayfinding and Signage System provides clear information to users about how to access trails and proper trail behavior, including allowed uses and other regulations.				
Other					
30	Utilize drip irrigation, moisture sensors, central control systems and appropriate plant materials and soil amendments to create a more sustainable parks and recreation system.				
31	Utilize industry best practices to make sure plants are water-wise, regionally-appropriate and as low maintenance where appropriate to reduce maintenance and water demands.				
32	Balance the use of manicured lawn in active fields and open lawn areas with more natural open space around the perimeter of parks and along trail corridors to reduce the maintenance and irrigation requirements for these more passive landscape areas.				
33	Enhance the visual quality of parks, open spaces, trail corridors, gateways, and streetscapes through the planting of trees and vegetation.				

Table 6.9: Action/Implementation Plan (continued)

		Immediate Implementation	Short-Term Implementation 2022-2030	Medium-Term Implementation 2030 - 2050	Medium to Long-Term Implementation 2050+
34	Develop new and retrofit existing streets and rights-of-way with vegetated park strips to enhance the urban forest and help separate vehicular traffic from pedestrian and cycle movements.				
35	Develop a tree ordinance that defines the types of trees that should be planted in park strips that are appropriate for the climate and avoid infrastructure damage as a result of heaving of sidewalks and underground utilities.				
36	Strategically plant trees within parks and open spaces to provide shade, reduce noise, screen views and beautify.				
37	Adopt ordinances to restrict development on lands constrained by sensitive environmental conditions to protect public health, safety and welfare.				
38	Enhance natural open spaces with appropriate improvements that enhance the integrity and user knowledge of those spaces. The addition of interpretive signage, outdoor education facilities and similar improvements are particularly appropriate.				
39	Enhance historic landscapes and open space features through the addition of interpretive signage, historic markers and preservation of historic sites that will educate the public about nature, history, and culture and enhance the open space draw of the city.				
40	Ensure natural open spaces are accessible while retaining ecological integrity.				
41	Work with property owners near and adjacent to Bair Creek as part of creating a fully-connected and unified Bair Creek trail and linear open space.				
42	Aggressively acquire land for future parks as soon as possible to ensure limited finances can be leveraged when land is less expensive.				
43	Locate any future parks in close proximity to other public destinations and trails.				

6.5 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures

Parks & Open Space Goals & Policies

Goal 1: Assure that Fruit Heights Residents Have Adequate Access to Parks.

Policy 1.1: Maintain the recommended Level of Service (LOS) for parks of 2.7 acres per 1,000 population in the future.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure development of 3.7 acres of approved parks to meet needs by 2030.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Develop an additional 7.7 acres of park land to meet needs between 2030 and 2050.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* As the community grows ensure that the recommended LOS is maintained.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Develop and implement a Wayfinding and Signage System for the City so residents and visitors have ample information about available facilities and amenities.

Policy 1.2 Upgrade existing parks to meet minimum park standards and amenity levels of service requirements and develop new parks with at least the minimum required amenities.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Upgrade existing parks to meet the minimum requirements for amenities and features where possible.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Adopt the minimum development standards for parks detailed in this plan as a City policy or ordinance.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Design and develop all new parks with amenities and features that meet the established standards, enlisting the professional services of a landscape architect or other qualified designer and allowing and encouraging public input on the design.
- a. *Implementation Measure:* Aggressively acquire land for future parks as soon as possible to ensure limited finances can be leveraged when land is less expensive. This may be acquired in part by negotiation through annexation.

Policy 1.3: Promote functional and comprehensive park and open space networks well planned and designed.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Encourage developers to work with Fruit Heights City to ensure parks and open spaces are integrated in remaining future residential developments.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Promote functional parks and open spaces that provide recreational opportunities whenever possible.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Connect park and open space networks with a trail system or other natural corridors.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure public accessibility (with pedestrian connections) to City parks and open spaces to ensure they are not reserved for residents of a particular neighborhood.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Encourage the dedication of larger land parcels for parks and open spaces.
- f. *Implementation Measure:* Incorporate a wide range of park and open space types in addition to well-distributed specialty sites such as courtyards, plazas, amphitheaters and community gardens.

Goal 2: Continue to Maintain a High Standard of Maintenance for Fruit Heights's Parks in the Future.

Policy 2.1: Continue to improve the best management and maintenance procedures to protect the City's park and recreation investments.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Establish an annual budget for maintenance and park upgrades.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Protect the City's investment in sports fields by resting fields on a regular basis to prevent damage by overuse.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Update annual budgets to ensure funding for operation and maintenance of City parks and other land the City maintains is sufficient to meet needs.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to maintain an up-to-date inventory of all parks, park facilities and parkways, documenting and implementing improvements according to a feasible schedule.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Apply design standards for all parks in a way that helps reduce maintenance requirements while promoting better long-term use of public parks and recreation amenities.

- f. *Implementation Measure:* Increase the variety of amenities in parks to promote better use of parks.
- g. *Implementation Measure:* Provide amenities and facilities to help residents “self-maintain” their parks and park facilities (trash receptacles, animal waste containers, hose bibs, pet clean-up stations, etc.)
- h. *Implementation Measure:* Increase the amount of shade, particularly around park amenities, by planting more trees.

Goal 3: Increase the Amount and Variety of Natural Open Space in the City.

Policy 3.1: Expand Fruit Heights’s open space system as part of a flexible and opportunistic approach.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Acquire open space as opportunities arise, focusing on natural open lands, drainage corridors and agricultural lands.

Policy 3.3 Prohibit the development of property where ecological hazards exist and encourage conversion to public open space.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Adopt ordinances to restrict development on lands constrained by sensitive environmental conditions to protect public health, safety and welfare.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Enhance natural open spaces with appropriate improvements that enhance the integrity and user knowledge of those spaces. The addition of interpretive signage, outdoor education facilities and similar improvements are particularly appropriate.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure natural open spaces are accessible while retaining ecological integrity.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Work with property owners near and adjacent to Bair Creek as part of creating a fully-connected trail and linear open space.

Trails Goals & Policies

Goal 4: Implement the Recommended Trail Facilities

Policy 4.1: Assure that Fruit Heights’s Trail System Meets Public Needs and Expectations

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Task the Planning Commission with the development of the trail system described in this plan, including proposed trail alignments, trail standards, trailheads, trail crossings, and lighting and safety improvements.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Install the proposed trail network by build-out, including other trail system improvements.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Make trail maps available to the public in print and online formats.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Develop an accessible network of pedestrian supportive infrastructure, including sidewalks, curb ramps, and trails near existing parks and other high-use destinations.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Develop ordinances to ensure neighborhood trails are linked with parks and open spaces.
- f. *Implementation Measure:* Integrate Safe Routes to School with the trail plan to ensure children have safe walkable routes to school
- g. *Implementation Measure:* Continually evaluate system-wide trail needs as part of future planning initiatives, focusing on closing gaps, developing trailheads, and improving connections with existing and future neighborhoods, destinations, parks and recreation facilities, and future transit stations.

Policy 4.3 Maintain trails as safe, attractive and comfortable amenities for the community.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Coordinate with the Davis School District on a Safe Routes to School program with an emphasis on trail linkages.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Work with Davis School District, the Fruit Heights Police Department, the Utah Department of Transportation, Davis County, local developers and neighborhood groups to identify and clearly mark appropriate trails and routes.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Install a safe system of trail lighting and emergency response stations along paved trails where appropriate.

- d. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure that maintenance routines include the control of weeds (particularly thorny species), the removal of trash and debris, and selective plowing of key routes to facilitate winter trail use.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Promote an “Adopt a Trail” program to encourage trail user assistance in maintaining the trail system. Encourage participants to become involved in all aspects of trails development, through maintenance and long-term improvements.
- f. *Implementation Measure:* Provide a bicycle and pedestrian network that is safe and attractive to all users, including women, children and the elderly.
- g. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure that the Wayfinding and Signage System provides clear information to users about how to access trails and proper trail behavior, including allowed uses and other regulations.

Other Goals & Policies

Goal 5: Promote Water Conservation, Urban Forestry and Similar Practices to Help Ensure Fruit Heights Parks and Recreation System is Sustainable and Resilient

Policy 5.1: As new parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and trails are developed, utilize the most up-to-date technologies to conserve water and other resources in public parks and associated facilities.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Utilize drip irrigation, moisture sensors, central control systems and appropriate plant materials and soil amendments to create a more sustainable parks and recreation system.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Utilize industry best practices to make sure plants are water-wise, regionally-appropriate and as low maintenance where appropriate to reduce maintenance and water demands.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Balance the use of manicured lawn in active fields and open lawn areas with more natural open space around the perimeter of parks and along trail corridors to reduce the maintenance and irrigation requirements for these more passive landscape areas.

- d. *Implementation Measure:* Acquire water shares within local canals to convert parks being irrigated on culinary water to secondary water.

Policy 5.2: Promote the planting of appropriate trees and vegetation along city roadways, bike lanes, trails, parks, open spaces and gateways into the city.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Enhance the visual quality of parks, open spaces, trail corridors, gateways, and streetscapes through the planting of trees and vegetation.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Develop new and retrofit exiting streets and rights-of-way with vegetated park strips to enhance the urban forest and help separate vehicular traffic from pedestrian and cycle movements.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Develop a tree ordinance that defines the types of trees that should be planted in park strips that are appropriate for the climate and avoid infrastructure damage as a result of heaving of sidewalks and underground utilities.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Strategically plant trees within parks and open spaces to provide shade, reduce noise, screen views and beautify.

Goal 6: Preserve and enhance historic public open spaces and landmarks to the greatest degree possible.

Policy 6.1: Preserve historic agricultural, cultural and open space landmarks and structures as feasible.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Enhance historic landscapes and open space features through the addition of interpretive signage, historic markers and preservation of historic sites that will educate the public about nature, history, and culture and enhance the open space draw of the city.

Goal 8: Work with federal, state and county agencies and private property owners to gain public access to the lands they manage or own that is within or adjacent to Fruit Heights City.

Policy 8.1: Work with federal agencies to secure and maintain public trail access to forest lands of the Wasatch Mountains.

7 Water Use & Conservation

7.1 Introduction

Utah is among the fastest growing yet driest states in the nation. By 2065, the state population is expected to double, increasing demand and stretching finite water resources even further. The current drought is at a level unseen for many years and has reached historic levels in some areas.



Water conservation is an issue that touches everyone. Ensuring we continue to have enough water for the future is a major concern for state and local leaders, water providers, and the public. The use and preservation of water resources has emerged as a major concern for state leadership, as indicated by S.B. 110: Water as Part of the General Plan, a law adopted in 2022 that requires municipalities and counties to amend their general plan to consider how land use planning impacts water use.

As the Fruit Heights community is anticipated to grow by at least 25% by 2040, water use challenges are both a function of meeting the needs of the existing population and expected population growth while satisfying the anticipated demands, maintaining and improving the current distribution system, and achieving the city's water conservation goals.

This chapter describes water system basics and provides a snapshot of current and future water use in Fruit Heights. It also outlines existing and proposed water planning goals and strategies and recommends additional goals and policies that will reduce water demands as part of current and future developments.

Water System Basics

By law, water in Utah belongs to the public and the right to divert water and decide how it is used is determined by the state. Each year, more than five million acre-feet of water is diverted from Utah's natural water systems and delivered to agricultural, residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial customers. Of that, 82-percent goes to agricultural uses with the remaining amount distributed to other uses through water delivery systems.

A community water delivery system typically consists of one or more water sources, storage facilities, and distribution systems within a service area. In order to operate efficiently and effectively, each component must be planned and designed to operate under the wide range of demands placed on the system by users. Responding to daily and seasonal variations in demand and providing sufficient capacity for fire protection and other emergency situations are critical system requirements.

Where Does the City Get its Water From?

A water right is permission from the state to divert and beneficially use a certain amount of water. The potable water sources used in Fruit Heights include two sources: a potable water well that is owned and operated by the City, and wholesale water purchased from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD). In 2019, Fruit Heights provided culinary water to approximately 6,200 residents through 1,780 connections. Water for outdoor and landscape needs is provided and managed by the Hights Creek Irrigation Company, Benchland Irrigation Company, and a small Special Improvement District covering 60 connections that is managed by the City¹. Table 7.1 summarizes the number of culinary water connections, and Table 7.2 summarizes the volume of water sources by source.

¹ Fruit Heights City Corporation, *Water Conservation Plan*, August 2020. Jones & Associates Consulting Engineers.

Table 7.1: Number of Connections (December 2019)

Connection Type	Total
Residential/Domestic	1,767
Commercial	3
Institutional	10
Industrial	0
TOTAL	1,780

Source: Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (August 2020)

Table 7.2: Existing Water Source (December 2019)

Source	Volume (Acre-Feet)
Wells	42.72
Wholesale	745.00
TOTAL	787.72

Source: Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (August 2020)

Table 7.3: Potable Water Use

Year	Inflow Total (AF)	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Institutional	Total (AF)	% Difference
2005	245.35	245.35	0	0	0	245.35	0%
2006	373.67	374.00	0	0	0	374.00	-0.09%
2007	524.28	524.26	0	0	0	524.26	0%
2008	569.04	562.62	0	0	0	562.62	1.13%
2009	501.54	501.54	0	0	0	501.54	0%
2010	432.51	416.11	0	0	0	416.11	3.79%
2011	416.53	403.00	0	0	0	403.00	3.25%
2012	0.00	410.20	4.00	0	1.10	421.30	0%
2013	452.26	453.32	0	0	0	453.32	-0.23%
2014	541.17	435.72	5.50	0	0	441.22	18.47%
2015	490.30	418.50	5.80	0	0	424.30	13.46%
2016	436.90	431.30	5.60	0	0	436.90	0%
2017	469.53	408.37	21.77	0	2.48	432.62	7.86%
2018	451.01	371.99	22.05	0	1.41	395.45	12.32%
2019	448.05	325.67	43.76	0	1.61	371.04	17.19%

Source: Utah Division of Water Rights Water Records/Use Information (2019)

Water Use

People use water at their homes, at their workplaces, to produce things, and for recreation. Gallons per capita per day (GPCD) is the standard practice measurement used among water professionals to represent water use for an area. GPCD includes residential water use, commercial water use, institutional water use, and system losses, and is calculated by dividing total annual water use by the resident population. Water supply and use numbers are often reported in Acre Feet Per Year (ACFT).

Culinary Water

Table 7.3 shows the potable water inflow versus the water outflow for each type of use from 2005 through 2019². This analysis shows an average loss (deficiency) of 5.13% per year in the distribution system between 2005 and 2019. If, however, the years where the data indicates a negative loss (more outflow than inflow) are eliminated, the average loss between 2005 and 2019 is 6.45%. Further analysis indicates that between 2005 and 2013 the average loss was less than 1% and between 2014 and 2019 was 11.55%. The increase can be attributed to more accurate accounting over time, better and more consistent metering, and improved reporting of water use. Water loss can be attributed to fire hydrant use, meter errors, and system leaks. A primary Fruit Heights water use goal is to reduce losses even further as additional improvements are made to the water infrastructure.

2 Ibid

Table 7.4: Gallons Per Capita Per Day (GPCD) by Use Type

Source	Volume (Acre-Feet)
Residential	46.90
Commercial	6.30
Institutional	0.23
Industrial	0.00
TOTAL	53.43

Source: Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (August 2020)

Irrigation Water


Fruit Heights had 60 connections utilizing culinary water for landscaping and outdoor needs prior to 2004. These were converted to non-potable irrigation water sources as part Special Service District established by the city in 2005. Today irrigation water in Fruit Heights is wholly serviced through non-potable irrigation water sources and systems operated and monitored by Hights Creek Irrigation Company, Benchland Irrigation Company, and the small Fruit Heights Special Service District. In the future the city will continue this practice, prohibiting the use of culinary water for landscape and outdoor water needs.

Per Capita Water Use

Per capita usage is a standardized method to measure water use by drinking water suppliers, represented as an average per person usage for all uses per day. It is used to determine conservation potential and track the results of conservation program implementation, as well as to provide a measuring stick between different water suppliers.

Table 7.4 illustrates the gallons per capita per day (GPCD) by type of connection in 2019, and Figure 7.1 compares the GPCD between 2000 and 2019, indicating a consistent decrease in water use in Fruit Heights since 2005, and significant drops since 2018.

Figure 7.1 – Fruit Heights Water Use Per Capita Per Day



7.2 Outdoor Water Use & Sustainable Landscaping

In Utah, outdoor residential water use is the largest single category of municipal water use, averaging 45% of statewide municipal use. For this reason, many communities are focused on promoting water-efficient landscaping — including Fruit Heights, even though the City is not directly responsible for the distribution and management of the secondary system which is used in the City.

Positive improvements have also been made as part of on-going efforts to meter all secondary water connections by the irrigation water suppliers. And even though water-efficient landscapes are not specifically addressed in Fruit Heights city code, educational brochures regarding a variety of water-conserving and water-wise landscape information are promoted on the City website. As pointed out in these materials, sustainable landscaping and water efficient landscapes are achieved through seven principles³:



1. START WITH A PLAN

For a landscape design to be water-conserving, it needs to use water efficiently. The planning stage is the optimal time to decide which water efficiency strategies will be used.



2. SOIL PREPARATION IS THE FOUNDATION OF A QUALITY LANDSCAPE

Soil is the most basic component of a quality landscape and impacts the growth rate, health, and appearance of plants.



3. PRACTICAL TURF-AREAS REDUCE OVER-IRRIGATION

Water-efficient landscaping does not require the elimination of all turfgrass. In fact, turfgrass can be a practical and beneficial component of a water-wise landscape if best practices are followed.

The use of turfgrass becomes problematic when it is over-irrigated, used in areas that are challenging to irrigate such as steep slopes or odd-shaped and narrow spaces, and when it is placed in areas where it isn't useful.



4. PROPER PLANT SELECTION AND PLACEMENT SAVES WATER

Selecting the right plant for the right place is critical to creating a water-efficient landscape. Proper placement provides shade, privacy, beauty, efficiency, and can even decrease yard maintenance.



5. MULCH RETAINS MOISTURE

Mulch covers the soil and prevents crusting, compaction, and moisture loss. Mulching around trees, shrubs, and flower beds can result in a ten-fold reduction in evaporative water loss from soil.


³ Principles of Water Wise Landscaping.” Utah State University Extension Center for Water-Efficient Landscaping. Retrieved September 20, 2022, from <https://extension.usu.edu/cwel/principles>



6. EFFICIENT IRRIGATION IS CRITICAL TO CONSERVE WATER

Grouping plants with similar water needs (hydrozoning) is the first step in developing an efficient irrigation plan. Once plants are properly zoned, develop an irrigation schedule that will apply the

appropriate amount of water based on each zone's unique needs.



7. PROPER LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE KEEPS PLANTS HEALTHY AND HELPS TO CONSERVE WATER

Landscape maintenance is one of the most important components of a beautiful and lasting landscape. The main activities


required to maintain a water-wise landscape are irrigation and irrigation system maintenance, weed control, fertilization, pruning, and pest and disease control.

The city's ordinances have not been significantly modified since the adoption of the Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan in 2020, which identified specific recommendations for conserving water in the city.

7.3 Future Water Requirements

Future water requirements in Fruit Heights are calculated assuming water use patterns and per-capita water use both remain relatively constant. According to the Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (August 2020), Fruit Heights will require between 545-793 acre-feet from a reliable water supply to meet the projected needs of a projected buildout population in 2042. As illustrated in Figure 7.2, the City has an annual reliable water supply of 745 acre-feet, which is sufficient for meeting these water needs through 2050 according to this scenario.

Figure 7.2 – Projected Water Supply and Use Through 2050



Source: Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (August 2020)

The population projections contained in this plan indicate much higher rates of likely growth, and a potential buildout population between 7,883 and 9,000 by 2050. Meeting the water needs of this greater number of users would require that up to 25% more water is available by 2050, or nearly 1,000 acre feet. Since this is significantly higher than the reliable water sources currently available, Fruit Heights may need to acquire additional water from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, and apply additional water conservation measures to help slow the need for additional sources.

Since the city is estimated to be more than 80-percent developed at present, it should consider land use and landscape development policies and practices that complement established local water conservation goals and anticipated future growth, including those addressed in *Chapter 2: Land Use*. Quality land use policies and practices address variables such as lot size and development density, while landscape development policies addressing sustainable landscape design and irrigation efficiency will greatly influence future water requirements and consumption rates.

7.4 Water Conservation Plan

In 1998, the Utah Legislature passed the Water Conservation Act, which was amended again in 2022, requiring water agencies with more than 500 culinary water connections to submit water conservation plans to the Utah Division of Water Resources and update the plans every five years. The purpose of a water conservation plan is to provide information regarding existing and proposed water conservation measures that will help conserve water in the state so that adequate supplies of water are available for future needs. Water conservation plans include water use reduction goals as well as implementation strategies. The current Water Conservation Plan was updated and adopted in 2019.

Local Conservation Efforts

Examples of measures that encourage water conservation at the municipal-level include education, incentives for appliance and landscape retrofits, secondary water meters, smart irrigation timers, water rates and pricing, fines and penalties for excessive water use, and restrictions to water only on specific days.

Current Fruit Heights Water Conservation Measures

The following is a description of local conservation measures from the current Water Conservation Plan (2020).

1. **All culinary water connections are currently metered.**
2. The City is **installing updated residential meters** that record 40 days of usage. The new meters allow the City to obtain readings daily (if needed) and detect possible leaks on each service as well as obtain accurate data for the water budgets.
 - City employees monitor the water use and meters are read monthly. Users work with the City to identify the issue(s) so that it can be repaired in a timely manner.
 - “Zero Consumption” readings are investigated every other month and faulty meters are replaced where necessary.
3. The City **provides water conservation education and public outreach** through:
 - Providing conservation tips on City’s Website.

- Disseminating conservation information in the City newsletter.
- Providing a copy of the Annual Consumer Confidence Report with a utility bill.
- Supporting the Davis County Water Fair for elementary school students.

4. Smart Sprinkler Pilot Program

- The City has partnered with Orbit Irrigation and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District to provide residents with smart sprinkler controllers. These controllers connect to local weather stations to optimize irrigation by auto-adjusting to weather and soil conditions.
 - In order to participate, residents must sign up, purchase the \$20 controller, perform a water audit on their lawn, allow data to be collected, and attend an in-person smart water presentation.
 - Weber Basin Water Conservancy District will collect the data and use it to determine how effective timers are compared to meters.
5. The City **maintains memberships in supporting organizations** such as American Water Works Association, Water Environment Federation and The Rural Water Association that educate our personnel and keep up to date on source protection, public education and current regulations.
 6. The City **requires secondary water use** on all outdoor settings.
 7. The **current water pricing and billing system was updated and adopted** by resolution in July 2019. The new pricing and billing is adequate to cover expenses in the water enterprise account and is tiered so as to discourage excessive water use. The City may consider additional water pricing and billing system updates as needed.
 8. The City **continues to complete infrastructure projects** identified in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Additional Fruit Heights Water Conservation Measures to be Considered

1. **Establish a 10-year Conservation Goal** that reduces outdoor use by 20% and indoor use by five-percent. It is anticipated that this goal can be achieved by continuing existing water conservation measures

and additional public education efforts. Ultimately, the goal should reduce future water use while maintaining a financially viable water delivery system.

2. **Additional Public Education** through a more comprehensive program could encourage efficient watering of lawns and gardens, landscaping with drought-resistant plants, use of low-flow plumbing fixtures, and other water-saving practices. Public education about efficient landscape irrigation may help reduce culinary water used for irrigation even with secondary water systems providing service to nearly all of Fruit Heights City.
3. **A Water Conservation Committee** consisting of community leaders, City staff, and residents could be established to assist with the public education program, identify water use concerns, and recommend water conservation measures.
4. **Additional Metering at City Facilities** may help identify potential water use concerns and opportunities for water conservation.
5. **Analysis of Metered Use Individual Connections** can be analyzed and compared to water use metered at the water sources. Analysis of metered use at individual connections can help determine if water loss is occurring through non-metered connections, faulty meters, or undetected leaks. This analysis can also help homeowners understand and evaluate their own water use for water-saving opportunities.


Regional Collaboration and Conservation Efforts

Local water suppliers have the best information regarding their own systems, challenges, and opportunities. Since water exists and flows freely across political boundaries, joint planning efforts between local, regional, and state entities is also important. Fruit Heights can work with other suppliers and entities to establish policies and partnerships that allow for a comprehensive regional approach to water-supply management which will promote water-use efficiency programs, ensure that plans provide for adequate water supplies and maximize water conservation and reuse, and communicate with the public the importance of water conservation as it relates to quality of life.

Utah's Regional M&I Water Conservation Goals Report⁴ presents a suite of regional goals and practices for residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial water use. The report's purpose is not to provide a detailed water conservation plan for all regions in the state, but to guide the state's water industry in planning future infrastructure, policies, and programs consistent with Utah's semiarid climate and growing demand for water. Local water suppliers, communities, and businesses are encouraged to adapt and refine these recommendations, as well as implement others, in their own water conservation efforts and in pursuit of the regional goals.

⁴ Utah Division of Water Resources. (2019, November). *Utah's Regional M&I Water Conservation Goals*. Retrieved December 8, 2022, from <https://conservewater.utah.gov/regional-water-conservation-goals>

Figure 7.3 – Water Conservation Regions



The Utah Regional Municipal and Industrial (M&I) Water Conservation Goals Report proposes nine water conservation regions including a timeline and projected GPCD reductions for each. Fruit Heights falls within the Weber River Region, which has a goal to reduce GPCD by 20% by 2030, 26% by 2040, and by 30% by 2065. When considering all regional efforts together, the resulting water use for the entire state is projected to be 202 GPCD by 2030 (a 16% reduction from 2015), 188 GPCD by 2040 (a 22% reduction from 2015), and 179 GPCD by 2065 (26% reduction from 2015). Meeting the initial 2030 goal will save nearly 165,000 acre-feet of water annually across the state.

Recommended Regional Practices

In addition to regional water conservation goals, the Regional M&I Water Conservation Goals Report also recommends a variety of water conservation practices. Some of these have already adopted by Fruit Heights, and others should be considered for future implementation or partnering efforts.

GENERAL PRACTICES

- **Water conservation education:** Continued emphasis and funding of education and outreach must be fundamental components of any water conservation plan, and these efforts must evolve and innovate to be more effective than in the past.
- **Conservation pricing:** While most Utahns have a desire to save water, efforts to do so will be limited unless financial incentives exist to help motivate action. It is recommended that water suppliers examine and update their existing water rate structures to identify ways of encouraging continued conservation.

INDOOR PRACTICES

- **Fixture and appliance conversion or new installation:** Conversion of toilets, faucets, and shower heads to high efficiency options has been shown to be one of the most cost-effective conservation practices available. In addition to reducing water volume with each use, new fixtures also reduce leakage.
- **Indoor Leak repair and changing indoor water use habits:** To achieve long-term water conservation, all regions will need to make

at least some progress in reducing indoor leaks and changing indoor water use habits.

OUTDOOR PRACTICES

- **Improved irrigation efficiency:** While significant improvement has been made in irrigation efficiency over the last few decades, additional potential still exists. Examples include secondary meters, controllers that increase efficiency by adjusting irrigation schedules based on weather and landscaping needs, and drip irrigation systems.
- **Water-wise landscaping:** Efficient use of water in community landscapes reduces water waste and enhances the community's environmental, economic, recreational, and aesthetic principles.
- **Lot size and density:** It is recommended to work closely with water suppliers to implement guidelines that encourage and respond to market demand for smaller lot sizes.

Water Rates

Designing an appropriate rate structure is a complex task. Rate design is a process of matching the costs of operating the water system to the unique economic, political, and social environments in which the City provides its service. The cost of delivering the service must be evaluated and understood. Each water system has unique assets and constraints. Based on the characteristics of the system, and past capital and operating costs, revenue requirements can be estimated.

The City routinely studies and evaluates water rates for both culinary and secondary water. As part of those evaluations, the City considers several factors including the following: revenue and rate stability, equity and fairness, affordability, water conservation, and simplicity. Based on this analysis it was determined that a tiered rate structure would help to promote water conservation, help reduce peak water usage, and help keep the water system sustainable.

Additional Water Conservation Measures

In order to effectively meet future water needs in Fruit Heights, additional and more specific water conservation measures will be required, as follow:

- **More Stringent Water Rate Structure:** The current culinary water rates may need to be increased to help promote additional conservation. As part of the investigation, a different rate schedule could be designed to provide additional price incentives for efficient water use to show the customer how much water is needed each month and provide funding for water conservation assistance and education. This type of rate schedule is called “Target Billing”. The targeted rate schedule would be designed to meet revenue requirements while creating funding for the water conservation program from fees paid by those who waste water. Water users who use water indiscriminately and fall into the most expensive tier would experience a substantial charge for the last block of water.
- **Meter Replacement, Leak Detection Program, and Water Service Replacement:** Over time, all meters become less accurate in recording actual flows. This leads to lost revenue to the City and inaccurate data to citizens. The City should also consider performing leak-detection testing for all water lines prior to new overlays of asphalt; performing annual leakage surveys to identify sub-surface leaks on main pipelines and services, especially in older areas of the water system, and replacing galvanized steel water service lines with copper and polyethylene pipe.
- **Plumbing Fixture Replacement:** Incentives to exchange old high water-use toilets and shower heads for new ones that are more efficient can be provided through city cost sharing using revenues generated by penalty tiers in the rate schedule. While it is difficult to calculate meaningful estimates of the benefits and costs of such programs on the water-use rate, there is ample evidence in the literature that such programs are effective. The Division of Water Resources estimated in 1995 that such programs could reduce residential indoor water use by 33-percent. Many of the city’s homes and businesses have been built since 1992 when plumbing codes were revised to require low water-use toilets and low flow showerheads in new construction.
- **Additional Public Education:** The City can expand its public education efforts to provide a more comprehensive program that encourages efficient watering of lawns and gardens, landscaping with drought-resistant plants, use of low-flow plumbing fixtures, and other water-saving practices. Public education about efficient outside irrigation may help reduce culinary water used for irrigation even with secondary water systems providing service to nearly all of Fruit Heights City.
- **Water Conservation Committee:** A water conservation committee consisting of community leaders, city staff, and residents could assist with the public education program, identify water use concerns, and recommend water conservation measures.
- **Additional Metering at City Facilities:** Metering water use at city parks and facilities may help identify potential water use concerns and opportunities for water conservation.
- **Analysis of Metered Use Individual Connections:** When sufficient data is available, water use metered at service connections can be analyzed and compared to water use metered at the water sources. Analysis of metered use at individual connections can help determine if water loss is occurring through non-metered connections, faulty meters, or undetected leaks. This analysis can also help homeowners understand and evaluate their own water use for water-saving opportunities.

7.5 Goals, Policies & Implementation Measures

Goal 1: Strive to maintain the City's per capita water use of 72 gallons per capita per day.

Policy 1.1: Keep the per capita water below the 2014 level of 72 gallons per person per day.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Measure and analyze water savings every five years by using the data that is submitted to the Utah Division of Water Rights.

Goal 2: Maintain a financially viable water system

Policy 2.1: Promote sustainable water use and sustainable landscaping principles and methods

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Revise existing landscape development ordinances to ensure they reflect local and regional water conservation efforts.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Consider requiring single family and similar uses to apply measurable water conservation targets.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Develop educational brochures, online resources and social media to improve public understanding of water needs and encourage water conservation targets.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Maintain the ten-year water conservation goal through 2032 to reduce future water use while maintaining a financially viable water delivery system. This includes reducing outdoor use by 20-percent and indoor use by five-percent.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Support meeting these targets by maintaining existing water conservation measures and introducing additional public education efforts.

Goal 3: Upgrade and Replace Water Infrastructure on a scheduled basis

Policy 3.1: Ensure older infrastructure is replaced with newer improvements and thus help reduce loss and unaccounted for water.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to implement projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan that support this policy.

Policy 3.2: Adopt a system audit and leak detection and repair program.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Implement a system audit to determine locations where better metering is needed by 2025.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to implement a leak detection program throughout the city to discover leaks in the distribution system.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Inspect locations with suspected leaky water pipes as well as locations within the city with older infrastructure.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Make repairs on an as needed basis and as funds permit.

Goal 4: Establish a clear and realistic vision for existing and future water resources, rights and systems in Fruit Heights.

Policy 1.1: Protect and enhance the culinary drinking water system to meet future needs.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Ensure access to the culinary water system is available for anticipated growth and development in the city.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Educate the public on how much water is needed for their landscapes.

Policy 1.2: Maintain strong relationships with water providers to ensure future water needs are met.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Coordinate and discuss changes and needs with water providers on a regular basis.

Goal 5: Adopt Water Use Targets that meet local needs while reducing unnecessary consumption of water resources

Policy 2.1: Promote sustainable water use and sustainable landscaping principles and methods citywide

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to adopt land use policies and implement planning practices that complement established local and regional water conservation efforts.
- b. *Implementation Measure:* Revise existing landscape development ordinances to ensure they reflect local and regional water conservation goals and targets.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Consider requiring single family and similar uses meet measurable water conservation targets.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Increase conservation of water resources by enhancing established awareness and education programs.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Develop educational brochures, online resources and social media to improve public understanding of water needs and encourage water conservation targets.
- f. *Implementation Measure:* Adopt and meet the ten-year water conservation goal through 2033 to reduce future water use while maintaining a financially viable water delivery system. This includes reducing outdoor use by 20-percent and indoor use by five-percent.
- g. *Implementation Measure:* Support meeting water conservation targets by coordinating with water providers, maintaining existing and implementing future water conservation measures, and introducing additional public education efforts.

Goal 6: Support Concepts and ideas Contained in the Fruit Heights Water Conservation Plan (2020)

Policy 6.1: Review and update the City Water Conservation Plan (2019) on a regular basis

Policy 6.2: Implement Water Conservation Measures identified in the updated plan.

- a. *Implementation Measure:* Expand public education efforts to provide a more comprehensive program and support for implementing

efficient watering of lawns and gardens, landscaping with drought-resistant plants, low-flow plumbing fixtures, and similar water saving practices.

- b. *Implementation Measure:* Provide incentives for appliance and landscape retrofits, secondary water meters, smart irrigation timers, funding permitting.
- c. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to disseminate educational materials to the community, including information about rebates and incentives.
- d. *Implementation Measure:* Work closely with water providers to ensure water rates are an effective tool for reducing indoor and outdoor water use.
- e. *Implementation Measure:* Implement fines and penalties for excessive water use, and limit seasonal water only on specific days, as needed.
- f. *Implementation Measure:* Continue to require all new water connections to be metered to further water conservation efforts.
- g. *Implementation Measure:* Replace and upgrade leaky and aging water lines as part of a scheduled process as fund permit.
- h. *Implementation Measure:* Establish a system for the timely identification and repair of water leaks.
- i. *Implementation Measure:* Establish a Water Conservation Committee consisting of community leaders, city staff, and residents to assist with public education programs, identify water use concerns, and recommend water conservation measures.
- j. *Implementation Measure:* Meter water use at city parks and facilities to identify potential water use concerns and opportunities for water conservation.
- k. *Implementation Measure:* Analyze and compare metered water use at individual connections to help determine if water loss is occurring through non-metered connections, faulty meters, or undetected leaks. This analysis can also help homeowners understand and evaluate their own water use for water-saving opportunities.

Policy 6.3: Implement water conservation measures that encourage water conservation

Goal 7: Support Collaborative Regional Water Use and Preservation Practices

Policy 7.1: Implement the concepts and practices for residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial water use as contained in the Utah Regional Municipal and Industrial (M&I) Water Conservation Goals Report.

- a. Implementation Measure:* Emphasize and fund education related to the M&I report.
- b. Implementation Measure:* Ensure the M&I Water Conservation Goals Report evolves and innovates to promote better effectiveness.
- c. Implementation Measure:* Support ongoing review and improvements to local water rate structures to identify ways of encouraging continued conservation.
- d. Implementation Measure:* Continue programs to convert toilets, faucets, and shower heads to high efficiency.
- e. Implementation Measure:* Implement programs to repair indoor leaks and change indoor water use habits.
- f. Implementation Measure:* Implement improved secondary meter systems for outdoor water applications that increase efficiency by adjusting irrigation schedules based on weather, landscaping needs, and drip irrigation systems.
- g. Implementation Measure:* Update and enhance established codes and guidelines to ensure the use of water in landscapes reflects state-of-the-art principles.
- h. Implementation Measure:* Revise city codes and ordinances that support market demands for water-conserving smaller lot sizes.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Appendix A: Public Engagement Summary

Public Open House

A public open house was held in the early stages of the planning process to help identify needs, desires and issues and inform plan concepts and ideas. The meeting was held at City Hall on November 18, 2021, and later enhanced by additional assessments including:

- A project website hosting a comment form, project updates, and links the public engagement platform Social Pinpoint
- Social Pinpoint, which included an Interactive Online Mapping Tool and an Online Questionnaire

Social Pinpoint received 546 visits by 144 unique users with 32 of those users leaving comments or participating in the questionnaire. A total of 47 comments were submitted via Social Pinpoint, the project website, email or phone.

Key Topics

Table 1 shows the overall ranking of comment topics from the public engagement process. Input included written comments received through the project website and email, verbal comments received by phone, and comments through Social Pinpoint's interactive mapping tool and questionnaire.

Top 5 Topics

1. Preservation of Open Space

Eight comments stated the need to preserve the remaining open space in the community, particularly in the foothills. Preserving the City's remaining agricultural land was also desired. Overall, these comments received 20 likes and 0 dislikes.

2. More Commercial

Twelve comments expressed desire for additional commercial uses within the community. The most popular suggested uses was a gas station, followed by a grocery store then cafes/restaurants. Many desired

these uses for convenience, so they do not have to travel to other communities, while others desired commercial uses to help support the community's tax base. These comments received 19 likes and 6 dislikes.

3. Traffic & Road Safety

Nine comments voice concern over speeding, traffic, or dangerous road conditions. Comments included problematic intersections, unsafe pedestrian conditions, and excessive speeding. These comments received 13 likes and 0.

4. Park or Trail Improvements

Six comments expressed a need for park or trail improvements. Some of these improvements included additional trash bins, restrooms, and dog amenities, such as dog bag stations and off-leash areas. Overall, these comments received 14 likes and 1 dislike.

5. City Beautification

Three comments stated a desire for improved beautification in the City, particularly through landscaping along the right of ways or major roads and intersections. Overall, these comments received 13 likes and 0 dislikes.

Most Controversial Topics

The following topics had the lowest ratio of likes to dislikes, indicating these topics are controversial among participating stakeholders:

- **City Cemetery:** Eight comments voice a need for a city cemetery. The comments received 4 likes and 3 dislikes, creating a like to dislike ratio of 5:3. Proponents desired a place within the city to bury their dead while opponents would like to see city resources be spent elsewhere.
- **Skate Park:** Two comments expressed a desire for a skate park. These comments received 1 like and 6 dislikes, creating a like to dislike ratio of 1:2.

- **High Density/Affordable Housing:** Two comments expressed a desire for affordable or higher density housing. These comments received 2 likes and 3 dislikes, creating a like to dislike ratio of 4:3.

Questionnaire Takeaways

Fifteen stakeholders took part in the online questionnaire. The following summarizes the key take-aways from the results:

- The majority of people live in Fruit Heights for its **clean and safe neighborhoods**, followed by its quality schools, proximity to family, and community atmosphere.
- **Preserving single-family neighborhoods** was the most important objective for the future of the City, followed by Preserving open space, reducing traffic, and maintain community identity.
- Most respondents were either **somewhat satisfied or neutral** regarding how the City has grown and developed in recent years.
- **Small retail** (gas station, grocery, restaurants) and a **City Cemetery** were the most desired facilities in the City.
- **Sidewalks and trails** were overwhelmingly the most needed transportation update for respondents, followed by traffic calming.
- According to respondents, the most needed housing types within the community are **55+ communities, small-lot single-family, and accessory dwelling units**.
- Having access to **businesses/services within walking or biking distance was not very important** to the majority of respondents. However, having **parks within walking distance was extremely important**.
- Respondents were mostly **somewhat satisfied with the city's parks, trails, open space, and recreation system**. When asked to explain their answer many desired additional amenities. The most **desired amenities were athletic courts** (particular pickleball), **natural open space, and trails**.

Table A.1: Key Topics from Public Engagement

KEY TOPICS	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	NUMBER OF LIKES	NUMBER OF DISLIKES	TOTAL SCORE
Preservation of Open Space is Important	8	20	0	28
More Commercial Desired (gas station (21), grocery store (5) restaurants (2), café (2))	12	19	6	25
Traffic & Road Safety Concerns	9	13	0	22
Park/Trail Improvements Desired (dog bags, trash bins, bathrooms, off leash dog area)	6	14	1	19
Beautification desired	3	13	0	16
More Sports Courts Desired (pickleball (12), basketball (2), tennis (1))	5	7	0	12
Concerns about the impacts of future growth especially on utilities & the environment	2	8	0	10
City Cemetery Desired	8	4	3	9
Limit growth / retain community atmosphere	3	5	0	8
Road Maintenance/improvements (pot holes, lighting, signage)	3	2	0	5
Transit Improvements needed	1	3	0	4
Large Community Recreation Facilities Desired (Rec Center/Pool Desired/Ice Rink/ Splash Pad)	4	0	0	4
Growth has been well-manage	3	0	0	3
Additional trail connections desired (Bair Canyon)	1	2	0	3
Setback exceptions to allow more single family housing	2	1	0	3
Love trails (foothills, The Hollow, Bair Creek)	3	0	0	3
LDS Temple Desired	2	1	1	2
High Density or affordable Housing	2	2	3	1
Skate Park Desired	2	1	6	-3

Website/Email/Phone Comments

The following comments were received via the project website's comment form, email, or phone call.

1. As part of our future city plans, I hope you are earnestly trying to find a way for a city cemetery. I've heard comments occasionally, but no communication from the city about progress. Could we have a progress update please. Thank you
2. My wife, kids, and I like to get out and walk and visit our local Ellison Farms Park between Broken Fence Ln. and East Country Rd. almost every day and have two related concerns.

Most important, when walking to the park from Homestead Ln, is the dangerous speed at which people drive on N Country Lane between 200N and E Country Road, particularly at the curve between Homestead Ln and Broken Fence Ln. Our neighbors have witnessed my wife and kids with stroller have to run out of the way, almost getting hit on several occasions crossing N Country Lane and it is incredibly dangerous. The city has been contacted on two occasions and while you did bring out speed signs with an orange cone and placed them in the middle of the street, it is only a temporary solution and they would often get hit and run over. When they recently paved the street I was hoping they would put in a crosswalk at either Homestead or Broken Fence but to no avail. Would you be able to help by bringing in a crosswalk or installing permanent speed limit signs that provide drivers an actual speed alerting them to when they are speeding??

The other item is the Ellison Farms Park itself. We have learned this is an older neighborhood without many young kids and it shows that the play area and sand are in terrible condition. In fact I believe the sand area is a safety hazard as there are several holes and gaps around the edges and play equipment. The play equipment itself isn't too bad but is there any way to get the play area sand/base refurbished and/or replaced with soft pads or rubber??

3. I have lived in Fruit Heights for 35 years and it is a great place to live. My main concern with our city is the way people drive on Mountain Road. It is being used as a highway, which hopefully will change as Highway 89 is finished, but I have my doubts. I think that we need either some roundabouts or speed bumps to force people to slow down. The difference between 25mph and 35mph is almost twice the distance required to stop. I have a young daughter and it scares me so much to think about her playing the street.
4. Sorry to miss the questionnaire; here are our responses-

My wife and I moved to Fruit Heights 18 months ago to be near family and get away from the hustle and bustle of the East Coast. We like the area very much and would like it to stay the same (limit change; limiting/reducing traffic impacts). We are concerned with further development and are very sad to see the loss of agricultural lands to developers.

We are opposed to the bridge that is being planned for the end of 1800 E. Bear Creek is a hidden gem and we like it the way it is; light traffic compared to Flag Rock or Adams Canyon and that's fine. The old water tanks are unsightly, but we would prefer not to expand the parking lot or change trail access.

I'd like to add that we don't want any motorized vehicles (ATV, motorbike, etc.) on any of the recreational areas in Fruit Heights. For example, not in Fruit Loops, or near firing range; none but on pavement is our preference. Fruit Heights doesn't have many facilities, services, businesses, or amenities, but that's okay. Everything we need is 5-10 minutes away and there's little to no need to expand these things.

Regarding transportation, all the work on 89 started before we got here are we are excited to have the project finalized. It has been challenging with changes and poor lighting. It will be nice to have the sound walls and lighting completed.

Regarding needed housing, I repeat that we are concerned with further development and are very sad to see the loss of agricultural lands to developers.


We like Nicholls Park and visit the Wasatch Range fire roads and trails daily; wilderness park is nice. Seems like plenty of options to us.

5. I would like to see Fruit Heights webpage be updated often to increase community communication. We have not had reliable communication in the past. With a new mayor, it is a great time to improve. Please take a look at Farmington and Centerville's webpages for great examples. Thank you


Website Questionnaire

A 13-question online questionnaire was hosted on the Social Pinpoint page. Fifteen responses were received. A summary of the results follows:


1. Why do you choose to live in Fruit Heights? What do you like most about living here?



2. What objectives are most important to you for the future of the City?



3. How satisfied are you with the overall growth and development of the City in recent years?



Explain your answer:


- Compared to other nearby cities the growth has been managed well. That being said some more affordable housing in strategic locations should be included in the plan. Cherry Heights is a good example of a successful option.
- Fruit loops has had a very negative impact
- I think Brandon Green is amazing and really has his finger on the pulse of this area. He has been sensitive to the feelings of the majority.
- I think that Fruit Heights has expanded as much as it should. I don't want to see every possible open space filled with people and houses. So far the expansion has been managed well, but the addition of high capacity housing will not help our city.
- Limited growth has been pleasing
- There are many things I like about living in Fruit Heights. However, increasing property taxes at the same rate is not something that is sustainable. Do not put in a cemetery. But do allow more commercial/businesses to be built; to help alleviate property tax increases.
- There is nothing too notable that I am dissatisfied about.
- Would like to see land set aside for pocket parks as land is developed.

4. What, if any, facilities, services, businesses, or amenities would you like to see in Fruit Heights that are currently not available?

station
possibly
cemetery
small
coffee
store
residents
fruit
court
height

- A cemetery!!! A pool. The pool SHOULD have gone in next to the City Hall. But went to "The Heights" homes instead. Grrrrr.
- A cemetery has been part of the existing plan for years. The cemeteries that neighboring cities are nearly full and in the case if Kaysville are not accessible to Fruit Height residents. I know many of our Fruit Height residents would like to be buried and where we have lived our lives. I feel this is a very important improvement and a good use of city property and should be elevated to the top portion of the list.
- City Cemetery
- Gas station, community rec, basketball court, pickleball court
- I miss the Bun Basket. It was nice to have a small eating establishment nearby. Some sort of small cafe or even a gas station convenience store would help bring some tax revenue to our city
- I would like to see a grocery store like Smiths, and possibly a gas station.
- I would love to see a local coffee shop of some kind added to either the Rock Loft or possibly at the north end of the city where the nursery used to be.
- Restaurants, gas stations, retail, coffee shop.
- Youth sports or collaborate with another city to get the reduced resident rate


5. Which, if any, of the following types of transportation updates are needed in Fruit Heights?




6. What housing types are needed to accommodate City residents in various life stages now and in the future?




7. How important is it to have access to businesses/ services (retail, grocery stores, restaurants, etc.) within walking or biking distance from your home?



8. How important is it to have public parks within walking distance of your home?



9. How satisfied are you with the parks, trails, open spaces, and recreational facilities and programs provided in Fruit Heights?




Explain your answer:

- I would like for one of the parks to have a pickle ball court.
- N/A
- The City of Fruit Height is not a dog friendly environment. I find this attitude and position to be very intolerant. Other neighboring cities have stations where pet poop sacks and garbage receptacles are supplied. There should be more parks and open space developed with if not a dedicated dog park parks opened up to responsible dog owners. Some cities allow dogs in parks on specific days of the week including in some instances off leash times. Very progressive and a great service for many residents that own dogs.
- The Hollow is AWESOME!!!
- The Nicholls trail is wonderful, as is Nicholls Park. The area around the city building is nice. I love the open areas to the east of the city as well as the trail system on the foothills and into the canyons.

- The photographers using the walking trails by Nicholls park make me crazy! Please do something about this! When I was coaching race cats, we were holding a race & a photographer literally put a couch in the middle of the trail. Blocking it entirely! This isn't a rarity.
- Would love pickleball at castle park
- Would love to see more recreational facilities. Basketball, pickleball, tennis, skate park.

10. What recreation facilities would you most prefer to see incorporated into new and existing parks and open spaces?



11. Do you have any additional comments or concerns regarding Fruit Heights' future?



- Change and growth are ok. We appreciate the thought and work.
- Fruit Heights is a wonderful city and I hope with the rapid growth it will remain that way. I am impressed that the City is working with Landmark a professional consultant company with planning expertise.
- I'd love to NOT have that massive housing development go in on the mountain. It will forever change the look and feel of being close to the mountains.
- Is it possible to use the emergency services provided by Farmington city, rather than Kaysville? Kaysville recreation will no longer give Fruit Heights residents "resident" priority, or pricing when you sign up to do activities with them. And yet, we're patronizing Kaysville businesses, & paying to use their EMS. If Kaysville doesn't appreciate these things, I'd like to see some changes made.
- I would love to see a grocery store like Smiths in our community. We are in need of ADU approval for external units!
- Let's keep it small

- More timely repair of potholes and road damage if a road is not immediately slated for repaving.
- The development in north Fruit Heights is going to cause a lot of problems for the city, with culinary water being used outside (what even, when we're already struggling with water??), already occurring erosion, and the area being prone to wildfires. Additional issues will occur with the increased traffic on the roads, especially since Mountain Road is already an unpatrolled free for all, especially north of the Rock Loft. An absolutely horrible idea meant to line the pockets of one or more of the council members, 100%.
- Traffic is the worst problem in our city. People drive on Mountain Road like it is the highway. This may change as the Davis County Sheriff's Office discards the paramedic program in 2023, which will provide more law enforcement, but the problem is with the people of our city. I run, walk, bike, and walk my dog on Mountain Road all of the time and it is a scary thing to see how fast people drive on that street. Roundabouts or speed bumps might be the best answer because then people will always have to slow down, even when there isn't a cop there to make them slow down.

Interactive Map Comments

“I have a Concern”

1. This road is quite dark at night, seems that a light is out or we need to add another public street light or two.
2. Turning left from 400 north onto country lane is hazardous and needs a turning lane.
3. I am wondering if that commercial area, so close to the interchange, would snarl traffic. If it could not affect safety or efficiency, then I would support it.
4. I always worry that I am going to hit this fire hydrant. It would be nice if it was further off the road.
5. What can we do to get a trash bin of some sort here. People that use the bike park have nowhere to put trash so it goes wherever. Also the trash truck turns around in the bike park parking lot so it would be no big deal to pick one more bin up.
6. This piece that is to be proposed to annexed is a concern. Most of it is very steep and it goes way above the existing build line of basically all of Fruit Heights. I believe that this is a piece that Fruit Heights should try to exclude from the proposed Rock Loft Estates Development. Most of it will be difficult to build on, snow plow, etc. It blocks existing access to the BST and would block the lower PST. You won't regret not annexing this in 10-20 years.
7. This intersection can be very dangerous, especially during rush hour. Although it is not part of Fruit Height city boundaries, a majority of residents use this route to enter the city. Encouragement from Fruit Heights, to add a stop light here would be very beneficial for its residents.

“I have a Question”


1. Where is the gifted property that was supposed to be a park?
2. Where is the future cemetery? Is that still in the plan? If it is, What is stalling this?

3. Can we beautify this empty area?
4. For the Cherry Heights neighborhood it can be extremely difficult and dangerous to turn going southbound due to increasing population and traffic. Is a stop light at this intersection or Lloyd's and main in the works?
5. i like the thought of having a trail that goes from 89 to Bair Canyon but how is that possible with it crossing private land?
6. What's the plan here? Is the road going to be extended and homes added?

“I have an Idea/Suggestion”

1. Add an additional UTA bus stop here. The distance between the nearest bus stops is a lengthy walk.
2. Doggy bag holder stand? There is already a trash can near this little walking trail, and having dog bags available encourages their use!
3. How about a splash pad in the summer and skating rink in the winter?
4. Cemetary, temple or church
5. doggy bag holder stand? Having them available encourages their use and allows for easier clean up. Would be nice near the City Hall, and each nature trail, and up by the hiking/biking trails on the Front.
6. Forget about a cemetery! In time, like ALL cemeteries, they fill up and force people to find solutions to bury the dead elsewhere anyway...The cost to pay employees to maintain these areas could be better spent elsewhere...not to mention the potential for crime and poor pet care...aka dog poo not picked up by careless pet owners. If still desired, maybe a place for cremations would be a solution...
7. During busy times, this area is terrible to make a left turn heading south bound. A round about may be a possible solution to this problem?!?

LOCATION-BASED PUBLIC COMMENTS



8. Cemetary or church
9. UDOT owns this land. After surplus, this would be a perfect service station location.
10. Possible commercial at the new Hwy 89 interchange?
11. High density housing possibility
12. I know a cemetery has been discussed. How many acres of land is needed? There aren't very many land owners left in Fruit Heights that own large plots of land. It would be interesting to hear what the city's future plans are for the location of a Fruit Heights cemetery. Ward's have a few acres, Barkers and Manning's still have large undeveloped areas. Unsure of any other locations.
13. If progress and moving forward is the only option. Is there a way to make the road/parking lot/etc going across Bair Canyon pretty and useful for those who want to enjoy it? But make it less enjoyable for vehicle entrance and exit. That way it add the second exit/entrance for both north and south sides but also keeps most the traffic to the other roads.
14. It would be nice to have bathrooms here.
15. Dead End street sign. / No East Wilderness Park Access Sign. With the new developments going in there has been so much traffic on this road and it is not a thru street. People are looking for the animal shelter and East wilderness park, both of which are not accessible by this road.
16. A skate park would be a nice addition to Nichols Park
17. Allow setback exceptions for this particular piece of land, to encourage a new home to occupy this land.
18. A continuation of S Orchard Rd connecting to Green Rd would allow for the creation of multiple single family homes.
19. Plant trees along highway boarder, and extend the grass area of Fruit Heights city hall.
20. Allow possible reduced setback requirements to allow more single family housing to be built.


21. Possible LDS Temple location?
22. A pickle ball court added to this park would be a nice addition.
23. This area is already commercial, and seems to have sufficient space to fit another smaller building. Possibly could build a compact gas station, and could mirror the rock loft's build style. This would also pay homage to the old service station across the road.
24. Keep zoned Agriculture for as long as possible. When ready to develop, only allow Single Family Residential.
25. A grocery/gas station like Smiths would be a nice addition to the community.
26. Line the west side of the road with trees to beautify the drive.
27. Keep our mountainsides beautiful, and undeveloped!

“Something I Like”

1. Keep undeveloped. Our culinary water should NOT be used for agriculture as this development would have. Erosion is already a problem. Traffic would require 250 N/ Mountain Road intersection which would be horrible with new 89 N. offramp. Has already shown to be an area prone to wildfires, three times in the past twenty years, alone.

Public Workshop

As the second stage of the public engagement process, a workshop was held at City Hall on March 16, 2022. Approximately 40 people were in attendance. Attendees were presented with multiple concepts and alternatives for future development in Fruit Heights and given dot stickers to express ideas they liked or didn't like. Additional comments were submitted on paper or via the website after the meeting.



Comments Received at Meeting

TOWN CENTERS

- The Town Center would offer a gathering place if there is pedestrian, bike, and e-bike access.
- One main Town Center accessible from all points would accomplish the gathering objective and unifying of our population of all ages.
- “Rec Centers,” as defined in photos, seems to be “out of sorts” for the area. Think “historic, small, quaint, unique.”
- We like the City Center on the Mtn. Road.

CEMETERY

- A cemetery in a small town is unnecessary and I'd prefer a better use of space (NICE outdoors space)
- As we've seen in Kaysville cemetery & Farmington cemetery- they are full. We need a bigger cemetery, so we don't have the same problem. We need it opened ASAP. We've been promised a cemetery for a long time and could use the money you propose spending on bulb-outs and put a road in and get the cemetery open.
- I'd really like to see at least part of the cemetery be reserved for natural burials – no embalmed bodies or cement vaults.

GOLF COURSE FUTURE ALTERNATIVES

- Render #3 of the patio home community is wonderful! Landscaped, well-designed, and encourages the neighborly feel that Fruit Heights is. The other perspective housing (large, modern townhomes) is inappropriate for the space of Fruit Heights. A full focus on maintaining the main feel and architecture of the community is what makes a town great. There are enough surrounding towns that can have high density housing. Fruit Heights is small and should maintain that feel.
- The golf course development on alternative 3 would make a very nice mixed-use area. There could be retail on the 1st floor and apartments/condos above. The larger green space in the middle would make it a desirable area.
- We don't want the golf course closed and more multi-family dwellings put in with increased traffic and crime. We don't need to become Kaysville.
- If you are planning to add a large number of homes east of Mtn. Road and potential high-density housing at the present golf course and children are already being bused to Kaysville, you might consider what land a school could be put on!
- Also, the status of the housing availability and affordability crisis argues for open space and higher density housing if the golf course were to be developed.

OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND TRAILS

- Since our population is aging, focus on walking trails & amenities for them.
- Parks, open spaces, and making sure they are impeccable, maintained, inviting, and above average, will make Fruit Heights truly wonderful and stand amongst bordering towns. Pathways are great.
- What about well, lit, trashcans, wide “bench and breathe” spots, etc?
- Walking/bike lanes in an outdoor community is SO important! The more we can get around outside of our car, improves the lifestyle and community.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Please remember landscaping is important.
- I'd like to start a "Community Cares" program.
- Leave the west side of Fruit Heights alone, we're sick of being the dumping ground!

Comments Received Online

- Please do not allow vacation rentals in Fruit Heights. These ruin neighborhoods with increased traffic, noise, and unruly behavior as vacationers do not have the best interests of the neighborhood in mind. The city of good neighbors has to stay focused on this idea of a close-knit community, not disjointed vacation homes that disrupt the feel of the neighborhood.
- Can a dog park be part of the new plan? There would be room in the green space, and it would have great access from 89. I see a lot of online reviews of other dog parks from people who are stopping as they drive through. It would also be a great way for the dog owners of Fruit Heights to interact.
- I would support option 2 if the neighborhoods adjacent the golf course were tied into the new development by walkways and a through street to Nichols road. Also if the city and not a individual contractor awarded building permits for construction matching the overall concept and design. Lastly that rentals are restricted to only 15% of the total number of units or plots within the city and no short term rentals.
- Please choose whatever option provides the most green, open, recreational space and as few houses and shops as possible.
- This cannot happen!!
- I am not sure any of your options serves the neighborhood well. There are already too many rentals in the area and I don't want to live in an a Vrbo etc.
- The alternatives outlined in this general plan are not acceptable to many of the members in our community. Not only has the majority of the community not been aware of these alternatives until recently, but many disagree with your assessment of the pros and cons. The "Current Direction" pretty explicitly states that "all open land is likely to be developed into single family homes". The Fruit Heights community adamantly disagrees with this direction. Your polls

and public comments so far have been largely misrepresentative of the communities opinions and we feel that this document cannot be accepted as it currently is. Options 2, 3 and 4 all list a pro of "preserving open space." This simply isn't true for s as my of these options. In fact, in the cons of these options "not preserving current open space" should be listed as a negative. You aren't preserving open space any Amy of these, you're eliminating it. You also list "preserving existing single family neighborhoods" as a pro in all of your options when this just isn't the case. No one wants new commercial centers located here and you need to dramatically increase the size of your open space/buffer zones should any of these options be acceptable.

- Please leave the golf course. We love the open spaces and small town feel. We don't care to have more buildings or homes. We have enough of that in neighboring cities. We don't even need a town center. I would guess the majority of people who live in Fruit Heights like the small town charm. Please poll all of the Fruit Heights citizens before making any decisions.

Draft Plan Open House

A Draft Plan Open House was held for the public at City Hall on February 16, 2023. Approximately 40 people were in attendance. Attendees were presented with a summarized version of the plan and invited to submit comments on paper or via the website.

Comments Received

- Regardless of future land use/development, the traffic flow and speed on Mountain Rd is an immediate problem that is not being addressed. Our safety as residents is already precarious as we try to cross the road to a sidewalk, exit or enter our driveways, etc. Please address this issue!
- Horrible idea to sell the golf course. Davis Park is a signature feature of Fruit Heights and has been for years. An amenity to the city. We need to push for a cemetery, that has been talked about for years but nothing happens.
- I appreciate the city going to great extent to plan for the future. Overall it should benefit our citizens. I am strongly opposed to any trail going through private property next to Hights Creek between Hwy 89 and Mountain Road. Thanks for your work.

Appendix B: Moderate-Income Housing Report

A. Introduction

B. Existing Conditions

C. Regulatory Environment

D. Housing Strategies and Recommendations

Introduction

Utah Code 10-9a-403 requires that municipalities include within their General Plan a Moderate-Income Housing element. The moderate-income housing element should include the following:

1. Provide for a realistic opportunity to meet the need for additional moderate-income housing within the next five years.
2. Three or more moderate income housing strategies (as defined in Utah Code) for implementation.
3. An implementation plan.

The requirements related to moderate-income housing are further defined in Utah Code 10-9a-408. This section of Utah Code requires the development of a Moderate-Income Housing Plan (“MIHP”) that provides a description of each housing strategy selected by the municipality and the implementation plan related to these strategies. In order to achieve the objectives of Utah Code related to the moderate-income housing element of the general plan and the MIHR, this report considers the following elements:

- An estimate of the existing supply of moderate-income housing located within the municipality.
- an estimate of the need for moderate-income housing in the municipality for the next five years.
- A survey of total residential land use.
- An evaluation of how existing land uses and zones affect opportunities for moderate-income housing.
- A description of the municipality’s program to encourage an adequate supply of moderate-income housing.
- A selection of strategies from a menu list outlined in state code.

- An implementation plan with timelines and benchmarks for the selected strategies.

“Moderate-income housing” is defined in Section 10-9a-103 as “housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than 80 percent of the median gross income for households of the same size in the county in which the city is located.”

The annual reports submitted to the Department of Workforce Services, due October 1, is tied to the City’s fiscal year and should outline each MIHP strategy selected by the municipality along with an implementation timeline.

This plan is further expanded to include the following elements:

- MIHP strategies and implementation plans.
- A description of each action, one time or ongoing, taken by the municipality during the previous fiscal year (or past years if applicable) to implement the MIHP strategies.
- A description of each land use regulation or decision made by the municipality during the previous fiscal year (or past years if applicable) to support their MIHP strategies.
- A description of any barriers encountered by the municipality during the previous fiscal year (or past years if applicable) in implementing MIHP strategies.
- A description of how the private sector and market have responded to the selected MIHP strategies, including the number of entitled residential units and other relevant data.
- Information regarding the number of accessory dwelling units located within the municipality issued a business license or construction permit.
- Recommendations on how the state can support the municipality in implementing MIHP strategies.

Table B.1 – Historic Population

CITY	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2020 AAGR
Fruit Heights	4,987	5,076	5,299	5,595	5,353	5,625	5,840	5,992	6,100	6,172	6,205	2.21%
Davis County	294,532	301,124	306,664	311,886	317,646	323,374	329,292	334,977	340,621	355,481	362,679	2.10%
State of Utah	2,763,885	2,809,828	2,856,535	2,904,018	2,952,290	3,001,365	3,051,255	2,993,941	3,043,708	3,205,958	3,271,616	1.70%

Source: U.S. Census Population Estimates

Existing Conditions

Historic Population

The U.S. Census Bureau’s Decennial Redistricting Data indicate Fruit Heights City (“City” or “Fruit Heights”) has experienced an average annual growth rate (“AAGR”) in population of 2.04 percent from 2010 through 2020. This growth is higher than the State of Utah and Davis County at 1.70 percent each. The City has grown by approximately 1,114 persons from 2010 through 2020. The global pandemic has caused a delay on the publication of some U.S. Census Bureau data. Due to these delays, 2020 is the most recent information available for many housing and population topics. While the 2021 population information is available, the 2020 population will be used to proportionally align with some details for which 2020 is the most recent data available. Where no correlation is necessary to other data, the most recent data available will be provided. The American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates state that Fruit Heights had a population of 6,205 in 2020. **Table B.1** shows the historic population growth for Fruit Heights, Davis County, and Utah.

Households

The total number of households in Fruit Heights as of the 2020 US Census Bureau American Community Survey was 2,052. Of the total housing units, 96.61 percent were occupied with 3.39 percent unoccupied. Davis County has approximately 96.82 percent housing occupancy rate, compared to the State at 91.82 percent occupancy.

Existing Housing Stock

As of the 2021 U.S. Census Bureau Population Estimates, Fruit Heights (“City”) is home to 6,091 residents. The 2020 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey reports that Fruit Heights has 2,124 housing units in total, of which 2,052 are occupied units (see **Table B.2**). There are many more homeowners than renters in Fruit Heights, with 89.86 percent of homes owner occupied. This is due to the large number of single-family homes in the City, and very few multi-family housing units. The City has 1,844 owner occupied units and 208 renter occupied units. Occupied housing has increased at an annual average growth rate (“AAGR”) of 4.12 percent from 2010 through 2020, with owner occupied housing units growing at 3.23 percent and renter occupied units growing at 22.21 percent.

Table B.2 – Existing Housing Units

	2010	2020	AAGR
Total Housing Units	1,370	2,124	4.48%
Occupied Housing Units	1,370	2,052	4.12%
Owner-Occupied Housing Units	1,342	1,844	3.23%
Renter-Occupied Housing Units	28	208	22.21%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Table B.3 – Occupied Housing Units

TYPE	OWNER OCCUPIED		RENTER OCCUPIED		TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Single Family	1,744	94.6%	68	32.7%	1,812	88%
2 to 4 Units	48	2.6%	16	7.7%	64	3%
5 to 9 Units	0	0.0%	46	22.1%	46	2%
10 or more Units	0	0.0%	49	23.6%	49	2%
Mobile Home & Other	52	2.8%	29	13.9%	81	4%
Total Units	1,844	89.9%	208	10.1%	2,052	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates

As shown in **Table B.3**, 88.3 percent of Fruit Height’s housing stock is single family with 11.7 percent multi-family, mobile home, and other housing types. By comparison, Davis County’s housing stock is comprised of 82.2 percent single family and 17.8 percent multi-family, mobile home, and other housing types. **Table B.4** indicates 99.2 percent of occupied housing units in Fruit Heights have two or more bedrooms, while 75.9 percent of the occupied housing stock has four or more bedrooms. A majority of the housing stock in Fruit Heights was constructed between 1960 and 1999. The largest growth occurred between 1970 and 1989 with the construction of 1,028 residential units, as shown in **Table B.5**.

Table B.4 – Number of Bedrooms Per Housing Unit

	NUMBER OF UNITS	% OF TOTAL
No bedroom	0	0.0%
1 bedroom	16	0.8%
2 or 3 bedrooms	479	23.3%
4 or more bedrooms	1557	75.9%
Total	2,052	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Table B.5 – Construction Year of Housing Units

	NUMBER OF UNITS	% OF TOTAL
2014 or later	181	8.5%
2010 to 2013	169	8.0%
2000 to 2009	205	9.7%
1990 to 1999	386	18.2%
1980 to 1989	544	25.6%
1970 to 1979	484	22.8%
1960 to 1969	121	5.7%
1950 to 1959	18	0.8%
1940 to 1949	0	0.0%
1939 or earlier	16	0.8%
Total	2,124	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Housing Cost Burden

The median adjusted household gross income in Fruit Heights is \$99,400. The median adjusted household gross income has grown at an AAGR of 1.90 percent from 2010 through 2020. The Fruit Heights owner-occupied income in 2020 was \$100,111 while renter-occupied income was \$97,583. The renter-occupied median income decreased at an AAGR of -0.19 percent compared to a 3.06 percent growth rate in median gross rent.

The average monthly housing costs for all owner-occupied housing in Fruit Heights is \$1,612 per the 2020 American Community 5-Year Estimate. Monthly costs for owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage is \$1,966 while those without a mortgage is \$558. The median gross rent in the City is \$1,520. The ratio of the City's median rent to renter income is 18.7 percent as seen in **Table B.6**. This low rent to renter income ratio could be attributed to minimal rental and high-density housing options and an aging population demographic. The ratio of the City's median mortgage to median household owner income is 23.6 percent. Ratios greater than 30 percent indicate the average renter or household owner is burdened by housing costs. Ratios greater than 50

Table B.6 – Housing Cost Burden Ratio

	2010	2020	AAGR
Median Adjusted Gross Income*	\$82,357	\$99,400	1.90%
Median Income	\$102,278	\$98,438	-0.38%
Owner-occupied Median Income	\$102,000	\$100,111	-0.19%
Renter-occupied Median Income	\$118,889	\$97,583	-1.96%
Median Gross Rent	\$1,125	\$1,520	3.06%
Median Owner-occupied w/ Mortgage Cost	\$1,885	\$1,966	0.42%
Median Owner-occupied w/o Mortgage Cost	\$427	\$558	2.71%
Median Rent to Renter Income	11.4%	18.7%	
Median Mortgage to Owner Income	22.2%	23.6%	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates; *Utah State Tax Commission, 2020 Statistics of Income

percent suggest a severe burden. Currently, the overall renter income to rent ratio in Fruit Heights is not considered a burden. However, the ratio is nearing the burden threshold.

The area median income (“AMI”) for Davis County for 2020 was \$87,570. The median family income for a family of four in Davis County (“County”) is \$99,008. **Table B.7** represents the ratio of median rent in Fruit Heights at 100 percent of the AMI income for a family of four in Davis County. Ratios greater than 30 percent indicate a burden based on typical housing costs within the County. Ratios greater than 50 percent suggest a severe burden. At 30 percent of AMI, a family of four is burdened and over the severe burden threshold.

Table B.7 – Davis County Area Cost Burden Ratio

	2010	2020	AAGR
Davis County AMI Family of Four	\$73,886	\$99,008	2.97%
Fruit Heights Median Rent	\$1,125	\$1,520	3.06%
100% of AMI Family of Four	18.27%	18.42%	
80% of AMI Family of Four	22.84%	23.03%	
50% of AMI Family of Four	36.54%	36.85%	
30% of AMI Family of Four	60.90%	61.41%	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2020 ACS 5-Year Estimates

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development annually reviews fair market rents to determine a standard for various housing programs to publish HOME Investment Partnership Program (“HOME”) rent limits. The rent limits for the Ogden-Clearfield HUD Metro FMR Area for 2022 is found in **Table B.8**.

Table B.8 – Ogden–Clearfield HUD Metro Rent Limits

PROGRAM	EFFICIENCY	1 BEDROOM	2 BEDROOMS	3 BEDROOMS	4 BEDROOMS
Low HOME Rent Limit	\$811	\$891	\$1,105	\$1,306	\$1,457
High HOME Rent Limit	\$811	\$891	\$1,105	\$1,535	\$1,839
Fair Market Rent	\$811	\$891	\$1,105	\$1,535	\$1,864
50% Rent Limit	\$880	\$942	\$1,131	\$1,306	\$1,457
65% Rent Limit	\$1,124	\$1,206	\$1,449	\$1,665	\$1,839

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HOME Rent Limits - Utah

Historic Building Permits

The City has issued building permits for 340 units from 2011 - 2021. These include 263 single-family units, 66 condominiums or townhomes, and 11 mobile/manufactured homes. Condominiums or townhomes were constructed sporadically from 2011-2013 and may be an important high density residential option to address moderate income housing needs within the City.

Table B.9 – Residential Building Permits

YEAR	SINGLE FAMILY UNITS	CONDOMINIUMS /TOWNHOMES	MOBILE / MANUFACTURED	TOTAL CONSTRUCTED UNITS
2011	20	14	-	34
2012	47	40	-	87
2013	63	12	-	75
2014	40	-	-	40
2015	23	-	5	28
2016	15	-	-	15
2017	11	-	5	15
2018	13	66	-	79
2019	7	-	-	7
2020	20	-	1	21
2021	4			4
Total	263	66	11	340

Source: Kem C. Gardner Ivory-Boyer Construction Report and Database

Table B.10 – Fruit Heights Housing Gap

SHORTAGE	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS	AFFORDABLE RENTAL UNITS	AVAILABLE RENTAL UNITS	AFFORDABLE RENTAL UNITS – RENTER HOUSEHOLDS	AVAILABLE UNITS – RENTER HOUSEHOLDS	HOUSING MISMATCH
≤ 80% HAMFI	99	95	83	(4)	(16)	12
≤ 50% HAMFI	79	25	4	(54)	(75)	21
≤ 30% HAMFI	4	0	0	(4)	(4)	0

Housing Gap Analysis

The Utah Housing and Community Development Division within the Utah Department of Workforce Services (“DWS”) utilizes American Community Survey data and the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (“CHAS”) to identify the current number of rental households, as well as project the number of units needed over the next five years within different household area median family income (“HAMFI”) levels. The total number of renter households according to CHAS data is 115.

At ≤80 percent HAMFI, there are 99 renter households with 83 units currently available. This suggests a shortage of 16 rental units at the ≤80 percent of HAMFI income level. Furthermore, the City only has a total of 95 affordable units suggesting a shortage of affordable units for this income bracket. This mismatch in available and affordable housing suggests 12 households are living in affordable housing despite their median income being above the ≤80 percent HAMFI threshold. The mismatch is also seen in the ≤50 percent HAMFI category as a 75 unit deficit exists with renters occupying 21 units despite their median income being above the HAMFI threshold. At ≤30 percent HAMFI, there is a deficit of 4 rental units with a housing mismatch of 0 as shown in **Table B.10**.

The current ACS and CHAS data indicate the number of rental units lags behind the number of rental households. The Kem C. Gardner Institute identified this lag citing the period from 2010-2018 where the number of rental households were increasing at a faster pace than housing units.

Historically, the housing units outpaced households. The current inverse relationship is evidence of the housing shortage in the State of Utah. The Fruit Heights gap analysis further identifies a need to provide affordable housing with an emphasis on households at 50 percent and 80 percent of HAMFI.

As the price of rent continues to increase throughout the State of Utah, growth rates project that affordable housing in Fruit Heights is anticipated to shrink over the next 10 years. Units meeting the ≤80 percent HAMFI category requirements are expected to gradually decrease with a rate of 0.82 percent per year. Rates project ≤50 HAMFI units are expected to decrease at a rate of 20.56 percent per year and ≤30 HAMFI units at 100 percent per year. In the next 5 years, there may be no remaining ≤30 HAMFI units in Fruit Heights. These projections may be attributed to the housing crisis throughout the state of Utah and the price of rent continually increasing. **Table B.11** provides the projected population in the three categories – 30 percent, 50 percent, and 80 percent of HAMFI in 5 and 10 years. **Table B.12** provides projected housing availability in the three categories along with the current affordable rental unit housing supply.

Accessory Dwelling Units

The City has not had any accessory dwelling units located within the municipality issued a business license or construction permit.

Available Housing Programs

There are a variety of housing programs available to help maintain and support affordability, which will be increasingly critical as increasing housing costs erode the City’s affordability. Municipalities are encouraged to utilize the programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation and the Department of Community and Economic Development to assist in establishing and maintaining the requirements set forth for affordable housing by Section 10-9a-4.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM

This is a well-established federal entitlement grant program for urban communities seeking to revitalize neighborhoods, improve community facilities, prevent and eliminate slums, aid low to moderate-income families, and promote economic development. The CDBG program is administered by the Davis County Housing authority.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP ACTS

The HOME act was established to develop and support affordable rental housing and home ownership mainly through the rehabilitation of existing units rather than new construction. The program targets low and very low-income households. The grant program is flexible in allowing participating jurisdictions to decide the most appropriate use of money in their communities. The program requires that at least 90 percent of the rental assistance be targeted toward households with incomes no higher than 60 percent of the area median. Participating jurisdictions are required to match 25 percent the federal funds used.

Table B.11 – HUD Fair Market Rents of Ogden–Clearfield Utah

	EFFICIENCY	1 BED	2 BED	3 BED	4 BED
2022	\$811	\$891	\$1,105	\$1,535	\$1,864
2021	\$721	\$812	\$1,021	\$1,432	\$1,707

SECTION 8 HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM

The Section 8 program provides rental payments and assistance to very low income and elderly persons. Rental assistance payments are made directly to private owners who lease their units to assisted families. The tenant is only required to pay 30 percent of his or her monthly-adjusted gross income for rent and the federal government pays the balance of the contract rent to the owner of the rental unit. The contract rent is based on Fair Market Rent established by HUD for the area. The certificates and vouchers are issued by local housing authorities and have a five-year term, which is renewable. Program participants may rent units whose rents exceed the FMR, but the recipient must pay the balance. Applications for this program can be completed through the Davis Housing Authority.

Table B.11 lists the Fair Market Rents applicable in Fruit Heights which is a part of the Ogden–Clearfield metropolitan statistical area. These represent the maximum rents for apartments rented under the Section 8 Voucher program; HUD will reimburse the landlord for up to 70 percent of these amounts.

HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Homeownership Assistance Program is designed to increase home ownership throughout the County. The program is offered to qualified moderate income households on a first come, first served basis and as funding is available. First time homebuyers purchasing their primary residence can receive a \$5,000 zero interest, deferred payment loan. These loans can only be used at the time of closing for down payment, closing costs, or principal reduction toward the first mortgage loan balance.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM

The Supportive Housing Program provides voucher-based rental assistance linked with case management services. This program is offered to high barrier, homeless, disabled, unaccompanied households who do not hold the lease in their own name. WHA holds the master lease on the unit. The program pulls households from a community homeless waiting list that prioritizes individuals based on vulnerability. The goal of the program is to assist homeless individuals strive for self-sufficiency.

SHELTER PLUS CARE

The Shelter Plus Care Program provides voucher based rental assistance linked with case management services. This program is offered to homeless, disabled, unaccompanied individuals who hold the lease in their own name. The program, administered by WHA, pulls individuals from a community homeless waiting list that prioritizes individuals based on vulnerability. The goal of the program is to assist homeless individuals strive for self-sufficiency.

LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS (“LIHTC”)

The federal government has developed a program to encourage the construction, rehabilitation and preservation of rental housing for very low, low and moderate-income households. The LIHTC program is administered by the Utah Housing Corporation (“UHC”), which determines the amount of tax credit available to applicant projects and operations and on the percentage of the project, which will be restricted to low-income tenants. The UHC establishes maximum rents in accordance with HUD standards and future rental increases will be based on increases in the cost of living as reflected in HUD income guidelines. A minimum of 20 percent of the project’s units must be set aside for tenants with income less than 50 percent of the median income for the area or a minimum of 40 percent of the units must be reserved for tenants with incomes less than 60 percent of the area median income. Projects receiving LIHTC must maintain the status as a low-income project for a minimum of 15 years.

The LIHTC program provides a credit equal to nine percent of the construction cost for new construction or substantial rehabilitation for

projects which do not use other federal assistance and a four percent credit for acquisition of existing projects and for those projects which use other federal subsidies (CDBG excluded). Credits are claimed annually for ten years. The credits may be used by the owner of the property or sold through syndication. Kaysville has 144 housing units that are subsidized by the LIHTC program.

SECTION 202 LOANS FOR HOUSING THE ELDERLY

The HUD Section 202 program offers capital advances to finance the construction and the rehabilitation of structures to serve as supportive housing for very low-income elderly persons. It also provides rent subsidies to help make the projects affordable. If the project serves very low-income elderly persons for 40 or more years, the capital advance does not need to be repaid.

OLENE WALKER TRUST FUND

The fund is comprised of State appropriations and federal funds to provide loans at below-market interest rates for the construction of affordable housing. The majority of projects built using this fund are multi-family. While the majority of the fund is used for loans, a small amount (five percent) of the fund is available for grants.

MCKINNEY-VENTO FUND

This fund is administered by HUD and provides assistance for transitional housing. This includes advances or grants for acquisition, rehabilitation of existing structures, annual payments to help cover operating expenses, and technical assistance in establishing and operating transitional housing. Rental assistance for homeless people with disabilities is also offered.

FIRSTHOME

FIRSTHOME is a mortgage program offered by the Utah Housing Corporation. It is geared towards families of modest income with a credit score of 660 or higher who are first time homebuyers. This program offers competitive interest rates that keep the monthly house payments affordable, allowing families with smaller incomes to purchase a home.

UHC'S SUBORDINATE LOAN

These loans are offers from the Utah Housing Corporation that can be combined with any of their loan programs to help families with funds needed to purchase a home. This program is for borrowers who have not been able to save enough money for their down payment and closing costs. This loan provides an additional option to limited income working families who have insufficient funds to purchase a home.

HOMEAGAIN

This Utah Housing Corporation mortgage program targets families of modest income with a credit score of 660 or higher who have previously owned a home. This program, when combined with their Subordinate Loan, gives a family the opportunity to purchase another home with little or no cash investment.

SCORE

SCORE is a Utah Housing Corporation mortgage program designed to assist families of modest income with a credit score of 620 or higher. This program offers families who have recovered from previous credit challenges, a loan that can assist them with the purchase of their home. This program, when combined with their Subordinate Loan, gives a family the opportunity to purchase another home with little or no cash investment.

NOMI

This mortgage program is for families of modest income with a credit score of 700 or higher. Of all their homeownership programs, this mortgage typically has the lowest mortgage payment because it offers a loan without mortgage insurance. This program, when combined with a Subordinate Loan, gives a family the opportunity to purchase another home with little or no cash investment.

STREAMLINE REFINANCE LOAN PROGRAM

This Utah Housing Corporation program is geared toward families wanting to reduce their current mortgage payment with a refinance but do not have the funds to pay off their current UHC Subordinate Loan. For qualified borrowers, UHC will subordinate their existing Subordinate Loan to a new UHC Streamline Refinance.

CROWN

CROWN is a lease-to-own program developed by the Utah Housing Corporation (UHC) to bring home ownership within reach of very low-income households that are willing to make a long-term commitment to the community. CROWN creates permanent home ownership opportunities by utilizing Low Income Housing Tax Credits to construct new, single-family detached homes that are both durable and affordable. Lease payments last until the fifteen-year tax credit period expires. At this point, residents have the option of purchasing the home at a very attractive price through a low-interest UHC mortgage loan. The qualified low-income residents who become homeowners through the CROWN program are also eligible to receive training in the areas of housekeeping, home maintenance, and basic budgeting.

Regulatory Environment

City Zoning

Fruit Heights residents appreciate the lifestyle offered by their community and have the desire to share the community with their children and others while preserving the existing sense of place. The focus of many residential zones is on single family residential units in very low- and low-density areas. All R-1 (residential) and R-3 (multi-family residential) zoning districts provide, or have plans to provide in the future, basic utilities. The R-3 zoning districts allow for higher density than the R-1 districts.

Existing zoning allows residential development as a primary use in several zones. These zones include:

- Agriculture (A)
- Residential-Suburban (R-S-12)
- Residential (R-1-12)
- Residential (R-1-10)
- Residential (R-1-08)
- Multi-Family Residential (R-3)
- Commercial (C-2)

The following existing zones do not allow residential development as the primary use:

- Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)

Table B.12 provides the minimum residential lot sizes for each residential zone per the Fruit Heights City Municipal Code, FHCMC 10-8A-1 – 10-8E-9. The majority of the residentially zoned acreage is zoned R-1-12 which has a minimum lot size of 12,000 SF or 0.28 acres. Based on current vacant land for sale values in Fruit Heights, the average price per square foot for land is \$15.40. Based on vacant land comparables, the land value alone for a 12,000 SF lot is \$187,804. The multi-family zoning district allows for more units per acre. In R-3, after the first unit requirement is met, there can be up to 25 units per acre in Area A or up to 10 units per acre in Area B, or a minimum lot size of 8,000 SF with a land only value of \$120,731.

Analysis of Current Zoning Regulations

New ordinances and development guidelines have been implemented by the City and continue to be modified in anticipation of future redevelopment needs. Particularly, an “Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)” section of the municipal code was recently adopted to provide reasonable regulations for the construction and use of ADUs (Title 10, Chapter 11, Section 21).

Barriers Related to Affordable Housing

Fruit Heights has proactively sought to address affordable housing within the community. During this process, community and city concerns surfaced regarding redevelopment’s potential effect on the city’s small size. Residents and council members express concern that redevelopment could replace existing residential, which would be replaced by higher cost, new housing products. While this isn’t necessarily a direct barrier, the City will continue to evaluate housing options relative to community preference and affordability according to the strategies of this document.

Table B.12 – Minimum Lot Size Requirements by Zone

MINIMUM LOT SIZE	A	R-S-12	R-1-12	R-1-10	R-3
Minimum lot area (SF) 1st dwelling unit	1 acre	12,000	12,000	10,000	8,000
Minimum lot area (SF) for each add. unit	1 acre	12,000	12,000	10,000	8,000
Minimum lot width (FT) at setback	100/100	90/100	90/90	80/100	70/90
Minimum frontage	30'	30'	30'	25'	20'

Housing Strategies and Recommendations

To qualify for State transportation funding, the State requires municipalities to select three housing affordability strategies to implement in their community. In addition, the legislature is giving priority funding designation to those communities that adopt two additional strategies. Fruit Heights City has selected the following strategies for implementing moderate-income housing in the community.

- Rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing (Strategy A).
- Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones (Strategy E).
- Zone or rezone for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers (Strategy F).
- Implement zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments (Strategy J).
- Reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing (Strategy L).

Strategy 1: Rezone for Densities

Fruit Heights has rezoned for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate income housing (Strategy A).

Fruit Heights City has created an R-3 zone which allows for Multiple Family Residential Zones (see Map 2.2). The R-3 zone allows up to 10 units per acre. Medium density residential - single family small lots and attached units or townhomes/condominiums limited to duplexes, tri-plexes, four-plexes, five-plexes, or six-plexes are permitted in the R3 zone subject to certain provisions. Multiple family residential is also allowed in the R3, this zoning designation will provide ample density for affordable housing units to be built. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)

also allow, if approved, greater densities (or multiple family units) greater than the underlying zone.

Implementation

- Work with the Planning Commission and City Council on approving and adopting either a new zoning classification or modifying the existing R-3 zone creating new incentives to allow higher density projects. (January 2024).
- Collect information regarding current home prices to measure the impact of the R-3 zone on the affordability of recently developed residential units and in surrounding areas (Summer 2024).

Strategy 2: Accessory Dwelling Units

Fruit Heights has created or allowed for, and reduced regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zone (Strategy E).

In 2022, Fruit Heights amended City code to allow for the interior ADUs as permitted use in any zone that is primary for single-family residential users. The City created an “Accessory Dwelling Unit” section in their municipal code (Adopted 8/2/2022) to assist in providing reasonable regulations for supplementary living accommodations in internal ADUs located in residential areas of the city. Fruit Heights City allows internal accessory dwelling units as a permitted use on any lot which exceeds 8,000 square feet. This covers between 80 and 90 percent of all zoning in the City.

See Title 10: Accessory Dwelling Units: <https://www.fruitheightscity.com/201/Municipal-Code>

Implementation

- Monitor the number of applications received and approved for accessory apartment dwellings biannually (June and December each year) to assess the effectiveness of the City’s new code.

Strategy 3: Zone for Higher Density or Moderate-Income Residential Development

Fruit Heights has plans to zone or rezone for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers (Strategy F).

Fruit Heights City's General Plan, Zoning Map, and Transportation Plan encourage development around transit corridors and commercial centers accessed by Main Street, US-89, and I-15.

The City has identified a number of vacant parcels that it will consider as locations to implement a new zoning classification that targets higher density housing. Incentives geared to encourage higher density may include higher density, deed restrictions, and waiver of impact fees.

Implementation

- The City will identify areas on the zoning map that can be considered for higher density zoning. The City will meet with current land owners to assess interest. The City will also consider whether or not to actually rezone some property to a new zoning district (January 2024).

Strategy 4: Zoning Incentives

Fruit Heights has implemented zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments (Strategy J).

Fruit Heights City has adopted an R-3 zone which will allow for higher density, multi-family units and smaller single family units on reduced lot sizes. The city is also considering an evaluation of other zoning incentives such as density incentives to facilitate the creation of moderate-income housing.

Implementation

- Work with developers to modify public infrastructure and lot size requirements (Winter 2023).

- Hold a work-session with Planning Commission and City Council to identify density incentives for new development in the City (October 2023).
- Create a toolkit and resource guide for developers that includes guidance based on work-session feedback (Spring 2025).

Strategy 5: Impact Fees

Fruit Heights has plans to reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing (Strategy L).

Fruit Heights City charges an impact fee for parks, water, stormwater, and roads. Fruit Heights City will review its impact fees associated with development and identify ways in which these fees can be reduced and/or waived to help encourage more moderate income housing within the city.

Implementation

- Review impact fees with development community to identify criteria in which fees can be reduced/waived to promote more incentives for moderate income housing (October 2023).
- Establish attainable goals and objectives based on impact fee review that can be integrated into the City's 2023 Moderate Income Housing Report (December 2023).

Additional State Support

The City could benefit from additional training related to MIHR requirements and data collection. In addition, training related to the 24 identified strategies and how to implement these strategies could be beneficial.

Additional Recommendations

Numerous programs are available to encourage the development and preservation of affordable housing at all income levels. Homeownership programs are well established, and support should continue and expand. The Home Program and HOME Investment Partnership Act are important resources for moderate and low-income homeowners,

and CDBG funds can also be used to assist homeowners. In addition, the Utah Housing Corporation provides homeownership assistance through below market loans (FirstHome), down payment and closing cost assistance, and lease to-own housing supported by Low Income Housing Tax Credits (CROWN). Further, HUD has special loans for the construction of rental and cooperative housing for the elderly and handicapped. In addition, funds are available under the Olene Walker Loan Fund and the McKinney Fund (with emphasis on transitional housing).

Financial Resources for Affordable Housing Development

Potential funding sources for housing include revenue from the general fund, CDBG grants and RDA affordable housing pass through. The general fund is essentially drawing upon the existing resources of the community and reallocating some of these resources to promote affordable housing. This could include earmarked sales tax or other revenue to provide development subsidies for deed-restricted affordable housing. The CDBG funds currently will give up to \$50,000 down payment assistance if you meet county LMI criteria which right now is \$80,000 for a family of 4. The loan is paid back with no interest accruing at the sell of the home. Other current funding opportunities include the Rocky Mountain Home Fund which gives a 4% interest loan to workers in the service industry (police, fire, school teachers, health care workers), SB 240 just passed this year which gives first time home buyers a \$20,000 down payment assistance grant, some restrictions apply.

Preservation of Housing Stock

The preservation and rehabilitation of the current housing stock (rental and owner-occupied) will also be an important way to help keep housing affordable. The City should set a goal to rehabilitate a number of housing units before the year 2025. There are 86 house trailers in two mobile home parks in the City. All of those units meet the affordable housing definition. The City does not have any restrictions on replacing or updating those units. There are various programs available to the City to assist with home rehabilitation efforts. The HOME consortium and the Home Programs will be important to help people under 80 percent of HAMFI preserve the quality of their home investments. Additionally, CDBG funds can be obtained to manage and invest into

low- and moderate-income areas. While infrastructure is important for community building, some portion of the CDBG budget should be targeted toward housing programs.

Appendix C: Funding Sources for Parks, Open Space and Trails Projects

- A. Funding Options for Larger Projects
- B. Funding Options for Smaller Projects
- C. Local Funding Sources

Funding Options for Larger Projects

General Obligation Bonds

The lowest interest cost financing for any local government is typically through the levying of taxes for issuance of General Obligation Bonds. General Obligation Bonds, commonly referred to as “G.O. Bonds,” are secured by the unlimited pledge of the taxing ability of the City, sometimes called a “full faith and credit” pledge. Because G.O. bonds are secured by and repaid from property taxes, they are generally viewed as the lowest credit risk to bond investors. This low risk usually translates into the lowest interest rates of any municipal bond structure.

Under the Utah State Constitution, any bonded indebtedness secured by property tax levies must be approved by a majority of voters in a bond election called for that purpose. Currently, bond elections may only be held once each year on the November general election date.

If the recreation improvements being considered for funding through a G.O. bond has broad appeal to the public and proponents are willing to assist in the promotional efforts, G.O. bonds for recreation projects can meet with public approval. However, since some constituents may not view them as essential-purpose facilities for a local government or may view the government as competing with the private sector, obtaining positive voter approval may be a challenge.

It should also be noted that a G.O. bond election, if successful, would only cover the financing of capital expenditures for the facility. Facility revenues and/or other city funds would still be needed to pay for the operation and maintenance expenses of the facilities.

State law limitations on the amount of General Obligation indebtedness for this type of facility are quite high with the limit being four percent of a city’s taxable value. Pursuant to state law the debt must be structured to mature in forty years or less, but practically the city would not want to structure the debt to exceed the useful life of the facility.

Advantages of G.O. bonds:

- Lowest interest rates
- Lowest bond issuance costs
- If approved, a new ‘revenue’ is identified to pay for the capital cost

Disadvantages of G.O. bonds:

- Timing issues; limited dates to hold required G.O. election
- Risk of a “no” vote while still incurring costs of holding a bond election
- Can only raise taxes to finance bonds through election process to pay for physical facilities, not ongoing or additional operation and maintenance expense. This would have to be done through a separate truth-in-taxation tax increase.

Sales Tax Revenue Bonds

Utah State law allows municipalities to issue debt secured by a pledge of their sales tax receipts. Sales tax revenue bonds have been well received in the markets and may be used for a wide variety of municipal capital projects, including recreation facilities. State law limits the amount of sales tax revenue bonds that may be issued by a community. Due to the fact that (1) most cities rely heavily on their sales tax revenues for their operations; and (2) local governments have very little control over the sales tax revenue source; the financial markets will typically only allow an issuer to utilize approximately one-half of the revenues available as a pledge toward debt service as they require minimum debt service coverage covenants of two times revenues to debt costs.

Additionally, due to the reliance on sales tax revenues for the general operations of most communities, existing sales tax revenues would have to be diverted to repay the bonds, unless the City has additional revenue sources that can be devoted to repayment of the bonds, or is anticipating a spike in sales tax revenues due to new large retail businesses locating in the City.

Utah local government sales tax revenue bonds are very well regarded in the bond market and will generally trade within five to fifteen basis points of where the City's General Obligation Bond debt would price.

Advantages of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds:

- Relatively low interest rates
- No vote required

Disadvantages of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds:

- Utilizes existing City funds with no new revenue source identified
- Somewhat higher financing costs than G.O. Bonds

Special Assessment Areas

Formerly known as Special Improvement Districts or (SIDs), a Special Assessment Area (SAA) provides a means for a local government to designate an area as benefited by an improvement and levy an assessment to pay for the improvements. The assessment levy is then pledged to retire the debt incurred in constructing the project.

While not subject to a bond election as General Obligation bonds require, SAAs may not, as a matter of law, be created if 40 percent or more of the property owners subject to the assessment, weighted by method of assessment, within the proposed SAA, protest its creation. Politically, most City Councils would find it difficult to create an SAA if even 20-30 percent of property owners oppose the SAA. If created, the City's ability to levy an assessment within the SAA provides a sound method of financing although it will be at interest rates higher than other types of debt that the City could consider issuing.

The underlying rationale of an SAA is that those who benefit from the improvements will be assessed for the costs. For a recreation facility or similar major project, which is intended to serve all residents of the community, and in this case possibly serve multiple communities, it would be difficult to make a case for excluding any residential properties from being assessed, although commercial property would have to be evaluated with bond counsel. The ongoing annual administrative obligations related to an SAA would be formidable even though State law allows the City to assess a fee to cover such administrative costs. Special Assessment notices are mailed out by the entity creating the assessment area and are not included as part of the annual tax notice and collection process conducted by the County.

If an SAA is used, the City would have to decide on a method of assessment (i.e. per residence, per acre, by front-footage, etc.) which is fair and equitable to both residential and commercial property owners. The ability to utilize this mechanism by cities joined together under an inter-local cooperative would need to be explored with legal counsel. There are several issues that would need to be considered such as ownership of the facility as a local government can only assess property owners within its proper legal boundaries.

Advantages of SAA Bonds:

- Assessments provide a 'new' revenue source to pay for the capital expense
- No general vote required (but those assessed can challenge the creation)

Disadvantages of SAA Bonds:

- Higher financing costs
- Significant administration costs for a Community Assessment area

Note – Due to the costs of administering a Community SAA and given that special assessments cannot be deducted from income taxes, but property taxes can, it seems more rational to seek for G.O. election approval rather than form a Community SAA.

Lease Revenue Bonds

One financing option which, until the advent of sales tax revenue bonds, was frequently used to finance recreation facilities is a Lease Revenue Bond issued by the Local Building Authority (formerly Municipal Building Authority) of the City. This type of bond would be secured by the recreation center property and facility itself, not unlike real property serving as the security for a home mortgage. Lease revenue bonds are repaid by an annual appropriation of the lease payment by the City Council. Generally, this financing method works best when used for an essential public facility such as city halls, police stations and fire stations. Interest rates on a lease revenue bond would likely be 15 to 30 basis points higher than on sales tax revenue bonds depending on the market's assessment of the "essentiality" of the facility.

Financial markets generally limit the final maturity on this type of issue to the useful life of the facility and State law limits the term of the debt to a maximum of forty years. As the City is responsible to make the lease payments, the financial markets determine the perceived willingness and ability of the City to make those payments by a thorough review of the City's General Fund monies.

As this type of bond financing does not generate any new revenue source, the City Council will still need to identify revenue sources sufficient to make the lease payments to cover the debt service.

Creative use of this option could be made with multiple local governments, each of which could finance their portion through different means – one could use sales tax, another could issue G.O. bonds, etc.

Advantages of Lease Revenue Bonds:

- No general vote required
- No specific revenue pledge required

Disadvantages of Lease Revenue Bonds:

- Higher financing costs than some other alternatives
- No 'new' revenue source identified to make up the use of general fund monies that will be utilized to make the debt service payment

Transient Room Tax Revenue Bonds

Transient Room Tax Revenue Bonds are similar to Sales Tax Revenue Bonds and are paid from excise tax revenues governed pursuant to Utah State Code. Without the need for a vote, cities and counties may issue bonds payable solely from excise taxes levied by the city, county or those levied by the State of Utah and rebated to the city or county, such as gasoline taxes or sales taxes.

For all sales and excise tax bonds, there exists in State law a non-impairment clause that restricts the State's ability to change the distribution formula in such a way that would harm bondholders while local governments have debt outstanding.

Tax Increment Financing (Utah Community Development & Renewal Agencies Act (CDRA))

Tax increment financing can be an attractive option to communities, developers and landowners because it provides public assistance and funding for improvements, infrastructure, land write-downs, etc., in partnership with private investment in an area. The purpose is to encourage development to take place in areas that are deteriorating, to create jobs, or to assist with important community projects.

The main steps in establishing a tax increment area include:

- Formation of a Community Development Redevelopment Agency (must only be created once by a community, not for each project)
–this step has already been completed by the City.
- Creation of a project area plan and budget
- Approval of taxing entities

Short-Term Financing

Short-term financing options are obligations that are remarketed or become due over a relatively short period of time. They are issued to provide working capital to pay operating expenses or provide interim short-term financing for capital projects.

There are several tools that can be used under this mechanism including:

- Tax & Revenue Anticipation Note (TRANs)
- Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs)
- Grant Anticipation Notes (GANs)
- Interim Warrants

Social Impact Bonds

Through Social Impact Bonds (SIB), or Pay for Success Bonds, governments collaborate with investors/funders and service providers to improve services for a disadvantaged population. In exchange for funding, a governmental entity sets specific, measurable goals for early prevention programs that will achieve clearly defined outcomes. The investors/funders provide the initial capital support and the municipality makes payments to the program as outcomes are reached.

Creation of a Special Service District

A city, or several cities via inter-local agreement, can create a Recreation District charged with providing certain services to residents of the area covered by the District. A Special District can levy a property tax assessment on residents of the District to pay for both the bond debt service and O&M. It should be noted that the City already can levy, subject to a bond election and/or the truth-in-taxation process, property taxes. The creation of a Recreation Special Service District serves to separate its designated functions from those of the City by creating a separate entity with its own governing body. However, an additional layer of government may not be the most cost effective.

Creative Financing

Non-traditional sources of funding may be used to minimize the amount that needs to be financed via the issuance of debt. The City's approach should be to utilize community support for fund-raising efforts, innovative sources of grants, utilization of naming rights/donations, corporate sponsorships, contracting services, partnership opportunities involving other communities and the private sector, together with cost-sharing arrangements with school districts. To the extent debt must be incurred to complete the financing package, alternative bonding structures, as discussed above, should be evaluated to find the optimal structure based on the financial resources of the City.

Funding Options for Smaller Projects

Private Funding Sources

Private and Public Partnerships

The Parks and Recreation Department or a group of communities acting cooperatively, and a private developer or other government or quasi-government agency may often cooperate on a facility that services the public, yet is also attractive to an entrepreneur or another partner. These partnerships can be effective funding opportunities for special use sports facilities like baseball complexes or soccer complexes; however, they generally are not feasible when the objective is to develop community parks that provide facilities such as playgrounds, informal playing fields, and other recreational opportunities that are generally available to the public free of charge. A recreation center, community center, or swimming/water park is also potentially attractive as a private or public partnership.

Private Fundraising

While not addressed as a specific strategy for individual recreation facilities, it is not uncommon for public monies to be leveraged with private donations. Private funds will most likely be attracted to high-profile facilities such as a swimming complex or sports complex, and generally require aggressive promotion and management on behalf of the park and recreation department or City administration.

Service Organization Partners

Many service organizations and corporations have funds available for park and recreation facilities. Local Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and other service organizations often combine resources to develop park and recreation facilities. Other for-profit organizations such as Home Depot and Lowes are often willing to partner with local communities in the development of playground and other park and recreation equipment and facilities. Again, the key is a motivated individual or group who can garner the support and funding desired.

Joint Development Partnerships

Joint development opportunities may also occur between municipalities and among agencies or departments within a municipality. Cooperative relationships between cities and counties are not uncommon, nor are partnerships between cities and school districts. Often, small cities in a region can cooperate and pool resources for recreation projects. There may be other opportunities as well which should be explored whenever possible to maximize recreation opportunities and minimize costs. To make these kinds of opportunities happen, there must be on-going and constant communication between residents, governments, business interests and others.

Heart of the Community Grant Programs (Project for Public Spaces)

The Heart of the Community Program began in April 2014 and is sponsored by Southwest Airlines. Southwest Airlines has partnered with the nonprofit Project for Public Spaces (PPS) to leverage resources in order to strengthen connections between people and places. PPS is dedicated to building communities through planning, design, and education and aims to revitalize communities by creating spaces for members of the community to gather. The goal is to “capitalize on a community’s assets and potential to create vibrant destinations—such as neighborhood gardens, community markets, and downtown squares.”

Industrial Loan Companies (ILC) or Industrial Banks (IB)

Industrial Loan Companies (ILC) or Industrial Banks (IB) are financial institutions in the United States that lend money for all kinds of consumer and commercial projects. Many of the largest ILCs are located in the State of Utah. ILCs like other commercial banks have community reinvestment requirements (CRA credits, as discussed in this document) that encourage lending within the market areas in which they operate.

Point of Sale Fundraising

Point of Sale Fundraising allows businesses the opportunity to collect voluntary donations from patrons of hotels, restaurants, grocery stores or other service providers at the time they pay for the primary service. Patrons may elect to round up their bill or contribute a self-designated amount to go towards the City designated fund, park or project.

Local Funding Sources

RAP Taxes

Other nearby communities have initiated and voted-in a Recreation, Arts, and Parks tax which has been very effective in raising funds to complete parks, recreation, trails and arts projects. This type of funding is generally administered by a municipality or county, and is distributed based on population.

Park and Recreation Impact Fees

Impact fees can be used by communities to offset the cost of public parks and facilities needed to serve future residents and new development.

Impact fees are especially useful in areas of rapid growth or redevelopment. They help the community to maintain a current level of service as new development puts strain on existing facilities. It assures that new development pays its proportionate share to maintain quality of life expectations for City residents.

Dedications and Development Agreements

The dedication of land for parks and open space has long been an accepted development requirement and is another valuable tool for procuring these amenities. The City can require the dedication of park land through review of projects such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), for example. The City may require developers to provide park land or open space for new developments or offer the option to instead pay fees, construct facilities or establish private parks or open space. The City may only use the dedicated land or fees for acquiring or constructing park or open space facilities.

Special Taxes or Fees

Tax revenue collected for special purposes may be earmarked for park development. For instance, the room tax applied to hotel and motel rooms in the City could be earmarked for parks, recreation and trails development but is generally earmarked for tourism-related projects.

Community Development Block Grants

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) can be used for park development in areas of the City that qualify as low and moderate income areas. CDBG funds may be used to upgrade parks, purchase new park equipment and improve accessibility (Americans with Disabilities Act). Additionally, CDBG funds may be used for projects that remove barriers to access for the elderly and for persons with severe disabilities.

User Fees

User fees may be charged for reserved rentals on park pavilions and for recreation programs. These fees should be evaluated to determine whether they are appropriate. A feasibility study may be needed to acquire the appropriate information before making decisions and changes.

Redevelopment Agency Funds

Generally, Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Funds are available for use in redevelopment areas. As new RDA areas are identified and developed, tax increment funds generated can, at the discretion of the City and other taxing entities, be used to fund park acquisition and development.

Local, State and Federal Programs

The availability of these funds may change annually depending on budget allocations at the local, state or federal level. It is important to check with local representatives and administering agencies to find out the status of funding. Many of these programs are funded by the Federal government and administered by local State agencies.

These include:

- Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative
- Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation Grants
- Utah Forestry, Fire and State Lands Grants
- Utah Division of Water Quality Nonpoint Source Grants
- Utah Department of Agriculture and Food Invasive Species Management Grants
- Utah State Parks Recreation and Trails Program

Land and Water Conservation Fund

This Federal money is made available to states, and in Utah is administered by the Utah State Division of Parks and Recreation. Funds are matched with local funds for acquisition of park and recreation lands, redevelopment of older recreation facilities, trails, accessibility improvements and other recreation programs/facilities that provide close-to-home recreation opportunities for youth, adults, senior citizens and persons with physical and mental disabilities.

TIGER Discretionary Grants

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, “the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 appropriated \$500 million for National Infrastructure Investments otherwise known as TIGER grants. As with previous rounds of TIGER, funds for the FY 2016 TIGER program are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area or a region.

TIGER Discretionary Grants have supported innovative projects, including multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional projects which are difficult to fund through traditional federal programs. Successful TIGER projects leverage resources, encourage partnership, catalyze investment and growth, fill a critical void in the transportation system or provide a substantial benefit to the nation, region or metropolitan area in which the project is located. The 2016 TIGER grant program will continue to make transformative surface transportation investments that dramatically improve the status quo by providing significant and measurable improvements over existing conditions.”

Federal Recreational Trails Program

The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Division administers these Federal funds. The funds are available for motorized and non-motorized trail development and maintenance projects, educational programs to promote trail safety and trail-related environmental protection projects. The match is 50 percent, and grants may range from \$10,000 to \$200,000. Projects are awarded in August each year.

Utah Trails and Pathways/Non-Motorized Program

Funds are available for planning, acquisition and development of recreational trails. The program is administered by the Board of Utah State Parks and Recreation, which awards grants at its fall meeting based on recommendations of the Recreation Trails Advisory Council and Utah State Parks and Recreation. The match is 50 percent, and grants may range from \$5,000 to \$100,000.

In-Kind and Donated Services or Funds

Several options for local initiatives are possible to further the implementation of the master plan. These kinds of programs would require the City to implement a proactive recruiting initiative to generate interest and sponsorship, and may include:

- Fund-raising and volunteer support of Fruit Heights's parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and trails;
- Adopt-a-park or adopt-a-trail, whereby a service organization or group either raises funds or constructs a given facility with in-kind services;
- Corporate sponsorships, whereby businesses or large corporations provide funding for a facility, as per an adopt-a-trail and adopt-a-park program; or
- Public trail and park facility construction programs, in which local citizens donate their time and effort to planning and implementing trail projects and park improvements.