
SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 7, 2005

SUBJECT: Proposed ordinance pertaining to Petition No. 400-00-52 – amending zoning regulations to locate parking lots behind buildings and establish pedestrian-oriented design standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zoning districts.

AFFECTED COUNCIL DISTRICTS: If the ordinance is adopted the proposed amendments will affect Council Districts citywide

STAFF REPORT BY: Janice Jardine, Land Use Policy Analyst

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT. AND CONTACT PERSON: Community Development Department, Planning Division
Doug Dansie, Principal Planner

NOTICE REQUIREMENTS: Newspaper advertisement and written notification 14 days prior to the Public Hearing

The Administration has provided the following information in response to the Council's action on December 7, 2004:

- A. A summary of the Council's discussion and the Administration's response.
- B. An ordinance with the changes requested by the Council (changes are highlighted in purple/blue).
- C. A draft 'public information brochure'.
- D. A copy of a letter from the Planning Director to the President of the Vest Pocket Business Coalition responding to the issues that have been raised by the Coalition.

The Administration's transmittal letter notes that the information brochure will be finalized after adoption of an ordinance. They intend to use Planning's regular mailing list and a mailing list from Building Services and Licensing Division (400 customers) to inform the development community of the proposed changes and the ordinance effective date.

On December 7, 2004, the Council discussed the proposed text change and held a public hearing. The Council closed the public hearing and adopted a motion expressing the intent to adopt an ordinance and requested that a new ordinance be prepared with the changes identified by the Council. Changes included:

- A. Community Council and Business Advisory Board notification. (Provide notice for Planning Commission action. This would not include presentation to the Community Council.)
- B. Property to be posted with a sign giving notice of the Planning Commission public hearing. (This would not include Administrative decisions.)
- C. Delineate pedestrian access to buildings through parking lots over a certain size.
- D. Provide an Administrative exception for parking lot setbacks for new construction.
- E. Revise purpose statements to address all means of transportation/mobility.
- F. Establish an implementation or ordinance effective date.
- G. Change the section that refers to compatibility with the architecture of the existing building to include the phrase "*or the surrounding architecture*".

POTENTIAL OPTIONS AND MOTIONS:

1. **["I move that the Council"]** Adopt an ordinance amending the City Zoning Ordinance regulations to locate parking lots behind buildings and establish pedestrian-oriented design standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zoning districts.
2. **["I move that the Council"]** Not adopt an ordinance amending the City Zoning Ordinance regulations to locate parking lots behind buildings and establish pedestrian-oriented design standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zoning districts.

WORK SESSION SUMMARY:

Issues discussed at the Council Work Session on December 7, 2005 are summarized below:

- A. Consider allowing buildings to be setback farther in areas that have substandard sidewalks or consider allocating funding to improve the sidewalks. Evaluate widths of sidewalks in areas where this change will be applied in relation to Federal guideline(s) and accessibility. Generally, sidewalk standards in the public way are not addressed in the Zoning Ordinance. Proposed changes would not preclude addressing the sidewalk width and accessibility issue. *Planning staff indicated they would provide additional information to the Council.*
- B. Eliminate reference to "Walkable Communities". In addition to locating parking lots away from streets, the Walkable Communities concept includes additional elements that focus on pedestrian friendly street frontages and amenities.
- C. Identify differences between the existing conditional use process and the conditional building and site design review process proposed with this change. The proposed conditional building and site design review provides a narrower scope of review criteria for the Planning Director and the Planning Commission and is intended to be less time consuming than the conditional use process. The focus is on the design of the site, not the use.
- D. Establish an implementation timetable to accommodate development projects that are currently in the review/approval process and those that could be submitted in the near future. *Planning staff indicated they would provide additional information to the Council to allow adoption of the proposed ordinance with implementation to take place at some time in the future, possibly 3-6 months after adoption.*
- E. Provide an option to delineate pedestrian access through parking lots to buildings (such as the use of contrasting materials or raised walkways) to differentiate between the pedestrian walkways and the parking lot in order to address potential pedestrian auto conflicts. *Planning staff indicated they would add this as a specific requirement to draw attention to addressing pedestrian access through the parking lot to the building and provide a recommendation for the size of parking lot that would trigger this requirement.*
- F. Provide an outreach process, public information sheet and list of organizations/individuals to be contacted such as property or business owners, contractors, architects, builders, developers, associations, etc.
- G. Address non-complying and non-conforming issue. Buildings designated as non-complying or non-conforming creates problems for property owners in regard to financing and insurance. *Planning staff indicated they would provide language ensure properties would be considered legal conforming as of the ordinance adoption date.*
- H. Provide additional flexibility relating to the setback requirement for parking lots. Proposed changes currently allow the Planning Commission to waive the parking lot setback requirement and consider other design options such as reduced setback, vertical landscaping, walls, etc. *Planning staff indicated they will change this option from the Planning Commission to the discretion of Planning Director.*

- I. Purpose statements should provide more balanced language to address all means of transportation, vehicles are still required by some people. Purpose statements are intended to be used when evaluating proposed development and determining whether the proposal meets the spirit or the purpose statement. *Planning staff indicated they will change the purpose statements to provide equal emphasis on pedestrians and vehicles.*
- J. Planning staff's response to issues identified in the letter to the Council submitted by the Business Advisory Board.
 1. Purpose statements – Intention was to make the purpose statements more pedestrian and transit related.
 2. Increase in parking setback requirements by 20-30 feet from current 5 feet – Currently in the various zones the setback requirements are between 10-15 feet. The proposed change will increase setbacks for parking setback (not building setbacks) by 5 additional feet.
 3. Requiring 40% glass on the front façade – this is something that is used currently in other zones.
 4. Parking structure required to provide a 35-45 feet setback - *Planning staff noted that they could add similar language used elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance to specify the setback “or parking structures to be located behind the principal building”.*
 5. Planning Director authority to waive certain requirements lists different situations in the various zones – There are different provisions depending on the situation allowing either the Planning Director or Planning Commission to waive requirements.
 6. In some cases, the architecture of the existing building detracts or is not compatible with the area. It may be more appropriate to address neighborhood compatibility rather than the architecture of the building - *Planning staff indicated they would change the section that refers to the compatibility with the architecture of the existing building to include the phrase “or the surrounding architecture”.*

The following information was provided previously for the Council Work Session on December 7, 2004. It is provided again for your reference.

- Small group meetings with some Council Members and Planning staff have been scheduled for Thursday, Dec. 2nd and Friday, Dec. 3rd. Additional information may be provided by staff at the Council meeting.

POTENTIAL OPTIONS AND MOTIONS:

➤ MOTIONS:

1. **["I move that the Council"]** Close the public hearing and defer action to a future Council meeting in January. (Council meeting dates for January are the 4th, 11th and 18th.)
2. **["I move that the Council"]** Close the public hearing and express its intent to adopt the ordinance and request that the Attorney's Office, in collaboration with the Planning Division and Council staff, prepare a version with the following amendments:
(The following changes were identified at the October 21st Work Session)
 - a. *Require Community Council notification as part of the public process.*
 - b. *Require that property be posted with a sign giving notice of the Planning Commission public hearing. (This would be consistent with other established processes such as rezonings, conditional uses, variances, etc.)*
 - c. *Require pedestrian access to building entrances through parking lots and include options (such as the use of contrasting materials or raised walkways) to differentiate between the pedestrian walkways and the parking lots.*
 - d. *In the case of properties with multiple street frontages, identify which street frontage would be considered the primary street for building orientation and location.*

e. *Provide a provision to allow requirements to be waived by the Planning Commission or Planning Director based on a specific set of criteria. (This would be provided for requirements in the proposed text that do not currently have this option.)*

3. **["I move that the Council"]** Request that the Administration review and consider making or recommending revisions to other City standards, regulations and master plans including the transportation and engineering public way standards that address traffic circulation, pedestrian/traffic conflicts and public way issues such as adequate pedestrian right of way to accommodate access, ease of movement, mobility and ADA accessibility, and the Urban Design Element to provide more specific design guidelines.
4. **["I move that the Council"]** Request that the Administration make specific changes to the text. *(This would be changes previously recommended by the East Central, Central City and Sugar House Community Councils such as addressing potential pedestrian/traffic conflicts and including criteria to address access to and from trail corridors or open space when appropriate.)* The supported changes would need to be identified by the Council for the motion language to be completed.
5. **["I move that the Council"]** Adopt an ordinance amending the City Zoning Ordinance regulations to locate parking lots behind buildings and establish pedestrian-oriented design standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zoning districts as recommended by the Planning Commission and Administration.
6. **["I move that the Council"]** Not adopt an ordinance amending the City Zoning Ordinance regulations to locate parking lots behind buildings and establish pedestrian-oriented design standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zoning districts.

➤ **OTHER POTENTIAL OPTIONS:**

- A. Some Council Members have expressed interest in seeing a draft information sheet for developers and the general public and an outline for and outreach/education program before the ordinance becomes effective. *(Are Council Members interested in pursuing this?)*
- B. Identify specific areas of concern or interest and request additional information or analysis from the Administration.
- C. Request that the Administration review the ordinance with a group of developers, business and property owners to obtain feedback on the application of the ordinance.
- D. Any combination of the above.
- E. Other options or changes identified by Council Members.

WORK SESSION SUMMARY AND NEW INFORMATION:

The Council discussed this proposal at the Work Sessions on October 5th and 21st. Discussion items are summarized below.

- A. Specific changes to the proposed ordinance noted by Council Members included:
 1. Notification of Community Council Chairs as part of the public process.
 2. Notification include posting the property with a sign providing information regarding pending Planning Commission action.
 3. Requiring a pedestrian access within parking lots that delineate access to the main door.
 4. Include a waiver process for requirements that do not presently have one listed, such as a door facing the street.
- B. Steps that could be taken to inform the development community, business/property owners and the general public of the proposed changes.

- C. Formally request that the Administration make modifications regarding pedestrian amenities in the public way such as sidewalk widths and coordination of bus stop locations.
- D. Review the proposed text changes with the Business Advisory Board and provide recommendations or feedback to the Council prior to the public hearing.
- E. How many businesses would become non-complying with this proposal and the steps that would be necessary to bring a business into compliance with the ordinance?
- F. The steps businesses could take to bring their business models into compliance with the ordinance.
- G. How the proposed changes would apply to properties and new development located on multiple street frontages?

MATTERS AT ISSUE /POTENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION:

- A. The Council requested that Planning staff obtain input from the Business Advisory Board. The Board received a presentation from Planning staff on November 10, 2004. Board members indicated that they would like the opportunity to review the proposed text and follow-up with other business owners. A letter with comments from the Board is attached. The Board's recommendations are primarily focused on integrating vehicle usage into the ordinance's introductory 'Purpose Statements' and related to the financial impact on business owners from increased parking setbacks, and the 40% front façade glass requirement.
- B. Council Members may wish to discuss with the Administration steps or options that could be taken to address issues (summarized below) recently raised by a small business owner.
 - a. Provide an option to address the potential of creating non-complying structures and properties that would not penalize the property owner such as grandfathering development in existence prior to the adoption date of the ordinance.
 - b. Notification of Planning Commission review of projects should include the Vest Pocket Business Coalition and the City's Business Advisory Board as well as community councils.
 - c. Purpose statements should provide more balance in the language since the City is "no where near" being truly transit-oriented, vehicles are still required by some people. When ordinance language is not clear, Administrative staff, community advocates and the general public often rely on the language in the purpose statements to support their position and interpretation.
 Example – from the "Walkable Business District Language for the 9th and 9th" developed by the business owners : "We recognize a business district such as ours is most viable when its offerings are conveniently and safely available to a wide audience, whether their arrival is by foot, bus, bike or car. Our goal is improvement of the district, resulting in an enhanced sense of place, distinct local identity, and efficient, compatible pedestrian and vehicular circulation."
 - d. The terms 'pedestrian-oriented' and 'transit-oriented' are not defined. Many people have differing interpretations on what the terms mean.
 - e. How is a parking structure defined? For example, could a two-car garage be considered a parking structure?
 - f. Throughout the proposed changes, the Planning Director is given the authority to waive the maximum setback requirement for any addition, expansion or intensification that increase the floor area of a building or parking requirement by less than 50%, if the Planning Director finds that the architecture of the addition is compatible with the architecture of the original structure. In some cases, the architecture of the existing building detracts or is not compatible with the area. It may be more appropriate to address neighborhood compatibility rather than the architecture of the building.
 - g. Some of the proposed changes have serious economic implications for small business owners by increasing construction costs or reducing the amount of buildable area. For example:
 - Requiring 40% glass on the front façade of new buildings or for modifications to the front façade of existing buildings.
 - Requiring large landscaped setbacks for parking structures and parking lots that reduces the amount of property that may be used for buildings or required parking.

The following information was provided previously for the Council Work Session on October 5 & 21, 2004. It is provided again for your reference.

- A. The Administration will provide a brief presentation regarding this issue and walk Council Members through the proposed design review process at the Council's Work Session on Tuesday, October 5th. Since receiving the Administration's paperwork in the Council office, Council staff and Planning staff have noted sections of the proposed draft ordinance that need to be revised. The revisions will be reviewed by Council staff prior to the Tuesday, October 5th briefing as they were just completed on Friday. For instance, the Planning Director has noted that the section relating to the Sugar House Business District should be removed and addressed as part of the Sugar House Business District zoning/master plan update currently underway with the Planning Commission.
- B. The Administration's transmittal notes that the current proposal is similar to the original proposal and includes a new chapter relating to building and site design review. The design review process and design criteria are established to provide flexibility in meeting the intent of the code.
 - 1. The design standards apply to over-the-counter permits for projects that meet the criteria included in the ordinance.
 - 2. The design review process is provided for allowed uses that cannot meet the criteria and wish to propose alternative approaches.
- C. The Administration has indicated that this approach is similar to the conditional use concept, except that the conditional use process focuses on land use and this process focuses on design. The proposed amendments have been revised to:
 - 1. Simplify the process when adherence to the technical requirements of the ordinance is not practical.
 - 2. Provide an alternative to the traditional conditional use procedure.
 - 3. Initiate a minimal design review approach.

POTENTIAL OPTIONS:

- A. Identify specific areas of concern or interest and request additional information or analysis from the Administration.
- B. Request that the Administration review the ordinance with a group of developers to get feedback on the application of the ordinance.
- C. Schedule an additional briefing to allow for further discussion.
- D. Request that the Administration revise other City standards, regulations and master plans. These could include revising transportation and engineering public way standards that address traffic circulation, pedestrian/traffic conflicts and public way issues such as adequate pedestrian right of way to accommodate access, ease of movement, mobility and ADA accessibility, and updating the Urban Design Element to provide more specific design guidelines.
- E. Advance the Administration's zoning proposal to a public hearing.
- F. Advance the Administration's zoning proposal to a public hearing and request that the Administration make specific changes to the text. Changes could include those previously recommended by the East Central, Central City and Sugar House Community Councils such as addressing potential pedestrian/traffic conflicts and including criteria to address access to and from trail corridors or open space when appropriate.
- G. Any combination of the above.
- H. Other options identified by Council Members.

SUMMARY:

- A. The Council held a public hearing on December 3, 2002 in conjunction with the Transit Corridor zoning. The Council voted to close the hearing and table action on this issue for further study, input and refinement.

1. Issues discussed at the Work Session briefing prior to the public hearing included:
 - a. Options identified during the Council’s previous briefings and discussion with the Council’s consultants, Frank Gray and Merilee Utter.
 - b. Moving forward with the Administration’s proposed transit zoning on an interim basis while additional review and analysis takes place.
 - c. Allowing additional time for community input.
 - d. Establishing a Council subcommittee to work through the various options and provide recommendations back to the full Council.
 2. Issues identified at the public hearing included:
 - a. The cumulative impacts on the Central City Community by previous commercial and office developments, surface parking lots, condominium and apartment developments that preclude attracting families with children and single-family development.
 - b. The need to focus on the long-term future of the area, 20 to 30 years.
 - c. Support for the recommendations from the East Central, Central City and Sugar House Community Councils such as addressing potential pedestrian/traffic conflicts, creating compatibility or design review and including criteria to address access to and from trail corridors or open space when appropriate.
- B. In May of 2003, at the request of the Planning Director, the Council referred this item back to the Planning Division for additional review. It was noted that the Planning Commission had requested an additional reevaluation.
- C. The Administration’s transmittal notes the consultant for the Council suggested that although the ordinance would work in its present form, the City may wish to consider making the transition to a full fledged performance zoning code to incorporate design elements. The Administration indicates that costs of changing the entire zoning code to a performance based code are prohibitive at this time.
- D. On May 26, 2004, the current proposal was presented at an open house. No comments were received.
- E. The new proposal was not sent to other departments in its present form because all changes relate to procedural issues.
- F. On June 9, 2004, the Planning Commission held a public hearing. Issues discussed included:
 1. The need to allow higher density and encourage more walkable, less auto-dependent zoning.
 2. The need for a more comprehensive master plan to address all transit-related issues.
 3. Requiring bus shelters to be located at commercial nodes.
 4. Requiring additional 4-foot entrance walkways running parallel to structures and the public right-of-way to accommodate space for bus shelters and ADA accessibility.
 5. Coordination with UTA and City Transportation Division to address walkable and ADA friendly elements.
 6. Increasing the involvement of UTA in future ordinance changes.

KEY ELEMENTS:

- A. The proposed changes for parking lots to be located behind buildings will apply to the following zoning classifications:
- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Residential Business | RB |
| 2. Residential Mixed-use | RMU |
| 3. Mixed Use | MU |
| 4. Neighborhood Commercial | CN |
| 5. Community Business | CB |
| 6. Sugar House Business District | CSHBD |
| 7. South State Street Corridor Overlay | SSSC |

- B. The proposed changes apply to new construction, remodeling or a change of existing use that would increase the floor area or required parking by more than 50 percent for commercial and mixed-use zoning districts. The proposed changes include criteria used in other zoning districts in order to maintain consistency in interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission may approve exceptions, a waiver or modifications of the zoning requirements based on findings for a specific set of criteria. Specific requirements include:
1. A maximum building setback for a percentage of the exterior front or face of a building for commercial and mixed-use zoning districts.
 2. Main entrances of buildings to be oriented to the street.
 3. A minimum percentage of glass to be used in buildings at the street level on the exterior front or face of a building.
 4. Parking lots or structures to be located in the rear or side yard areas with a larger landscaped setback than that required for buildings.
 5. Parking lot screening and lighting restrictions.
- C. Planned developments within the zoning classifications referenced above will be subject to **additional** “general conceptual guidelines”. A positive finding for each individual guideline is not required. The planned development “conceptual guidelines” will also apply to development in the Commercial Shopping CS zone when the district is adjacent to more than 60 percent residential zoning (within 300 feet, either on the same block or across the street). Guidelines include:
1. Development primarily oriented to the street, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.
 2. Primary access oriented to the pedestrian and mass transit.
 3. Façade shall maintain detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.
 4. Architectural detailing shall emphasize the pedestrian level of the building.
 5. Parking lots shall be appropriately screened and landscaped to minimize impact on the neighborhood.
 6. Parking lot lighting shall be shielded to eliminate excessive glare or light into adjacent neighborhoods.
 7. Dumpsters and loading docks shall be appropriately screened or located within the structures.
 8. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.
- D. A new chapter has been created entitled *Conditional Building and Site Design Review*. Key elements are summarized below:
1. Purpose Statement: The intent of building and site design review regulations is to provide for the flexible implementation of the specific design requirements set forth within individual zoning districts. The purpose statement of each zoning district provides the philosophical approach to defining that flexibility. This process is intended to supplement the review and administrative procedures which are carried out under this title or other city ordinances and regulations. The design review process is intended to help ensure that newly developed properties and redeveloped properties are designed to encourage pedestrian access, circulation and orientation.
 2. Authority:
 - a. Design review required for uses specified within individual zoning districts prior to issuance of zoning certificates, building permits or certificates of occupancy.
 - b. Planning Commission shall approve design criteria upon consideration of comments received from city departments and determining whether modification of specific design regulations meet the intent of the individual zoning district.
 - c. Planning Commission may modify individual design requirements if the intent of the basic design criteria has been met.
 3. Scope of Application:
 - o Design review approval shall be required for all permitted, conditional and accessory uses when specifically authorized and referenced by individual zoning districts.
 4. Scope of Modifications Authorized:
 - o The Planning Commission through the design review process shall be limited to modification of the specific elements referenced within each zoning district.

5. Application Requirements:
 - Each application for design review shall include the same information as required for site plan review.
6. Standards for Design Review – In addition to standards provided in other sections for specific types of approval, the following standards apply for design review:
 - a. Development primarily oriented to the street, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.
 - b. Primary access oriented to the pedestrian and mass transit.
 - c. Façade shall maintain detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.
 - d. Architectural detailing shall emphasize the pedestrian level of the building.
 - e. Parking lots shall be appropriately screened and landscaped to minimize impact on the neighborhood.
 - f. Parking lot lighting shall be shielded to eliminate excessive glare or light into adjacent neighborhoods.
 - g. Dumpsters and loading docks shall be appropriately screened or located within the structures.
 - h. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.
7. Pre-application Conference:
 - Applicant is encouraged to meet with the Development Review Team regarding the general proposal. No formal application required.
8. Fees:
 - \$300.00 plus \$100.00/acre in excess of one acre.
9. Submission of Final Plans – Review and Approval:
 - a. Planning Commission Review:
 - Application reviewed and processed through the Planning Commission in coordination with the appropriate city departments.
 - If the plan is approved, the Zoning Administrator shall certify approval and state the conditions.
 - If the plan is denied, the Zoning Administrator shall notify the applicant in writing the reasons for denial.
 - b. Appeal of the Planning Commission decision shall be made to the Land Use Appeals Board.
 - c. Amendments or Modifications to approved Design Review:
 - Amendments or modifications shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator and distributed to appropriate departments for review.
 - The Zoning Administrator may waive this requirement if modification of the original design review has no significant impact upon the original proposal and conforms to design concepts approved by the Planning Commission.
 - d. Time Limit on Approval
 - Building permit issuance or use of the land must commence within 12 months from date of approval.
 - Revalidation of the site plan may be granted for an addition 12 months.
 - Written notice requesting revalidation shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator prior to expiration of the original 12 month period.

MATTERS AT ISSUE /POTENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION:

- A. Council Members may wish to discuss with the Administration steps that have been taken to coordinate with City Departments/Divisions and Utah Transit Authority to adjust current policies, regulations and standards that would support the concepts in the proposed amendments. This was discussed at the Planning Commission meeting. Planning staff has previously noted:
 1. Bus stops, sidewalk widths, curb cuts, speed limits, etc. are guided by Administrative policy rather than the Zoning Ordinance.
 2. These items are integral to the success of walkable communities.
 3. It would be appropriate to request a review of the Administrative policies in light of the new zoning requirements.

- B. Council Members may wish to discuss with the Administration how public review and notification will be addressed in the proposed design review process. The Council received a letter from the Liberty Wells Community Council requesting that as part of the design review process, applicants be required to present their plans to affected Community Councils. *The Council consultants, Frank Gray and Merilee Utter, have previously recommended that input be obtained up front, in developing the ordinance, rather than on a case-by-case basis.*
- C. Council Members may wish to discuss with the Administration steps taken to address issues identified by Council Members during previous briefings, recommendations from the Council's consultants (Frank Gray and Marilee Utter), previous changes proposed by the Administration and recommendations from the East Central, Central City and Sugar House Community Councils. The following information was provided for the Council's discussions in 2002 and is provided again for your reference.
1. At the October 3, 2002 Work Session, Council Members discussed the proposed text amendments with consultants Frank Gray and Merilee Utter. Items the Council may wish to be reminded of include:
 - a. Input received from meetings with various groups identified support for a clear, predictable process, easily understandable objective criteria and a clear direction as to what is acceptable and what is not.
 - b. The need to establish design guidelines and a design review process through an area by area evaluation that would ultimately be applicable on a citywide level. This concept would provide a broader range of design criteria rather than one size fits all approach.
 - c. Consider distinguishing pedestrian design guidelines in the same zoning classification with different standards for properties abutting different street classifications. Street classifications include 1) arterial, 2) collector, 3) local, 4) trails.
 - d. For the long term, as the neighborhood or community master plans are created or updated, develop specific guidelines adapted to support the desired development character of each area.
 - e. Establish design guidelines and a design review process that would reduce the need to use the conditional use process, reduce staff and Planning Commission work load eliminating the need for extensive staff analysis, report writing, and Planning Commission public hearings. *The proposal allows for an over-the-counter permit for allowed uses that meet the design criteria included in the ordinance. Allowed uses that cannot meet the criteria and wish to propose alternative approaches may go through a design review process before the Planning Commission similar to the conditional use process.*
 2. Previous recommendations from the East Central, Central City and Sugar House Community Councils.
 - a. Establish density limitations.
 - b. Establish design criteria for the rear and sides of buildings to address architectural features and compatibility.
 - c. Require a public process element as part of the Zoning Administrator approval procedure for building expansion requests.
 - d. Add design criteria for underground garage entrances/exits to assure maximum motorists/pedestrians visibility.
 - e. Add criteria to address access to and from trail corridors or open space when appropriate.

MASTER PLAN AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

- A. The City's 1990 Urban Design Element includes statements that emphasize preserving the City's image, neighborhood character and maintaining livability while being sensitive to social and economic realities. Applicable policy concepts include:
1. Allow individual districts to develop in response to their unique characteristics within the overall urban design scheme for the city.
 2. Ensure that land uses make a positive contribution to neighborhood improvement and stability.

3. Ensure that building restoration and new construction enhance district character.
 4. Require private development efforts to be compatible with urban design policies of the city regardless of whether city financial assistance is provided.
 5. Treat building height, scale and character as significant features of a district's image.
 6. Ensure that features of building design such as color, detail, materials and scale are responsive to district character, neighboring buildings, and the pedestrian.
- B. The Council has adopted housing and transportation policy statements that support creating a wide variety of housing types citywide and changing the focus of transportation decisions from moving cars to moving people. The Council's policy statements have been included in the City's Community Housing Plan and Transportation Master Plan.
1. Housing policy statements address a variety of issues including quality design, public and neighborhood participation and interaction, transit-oriented development, encouraging mixed-use developments, housing preservation, rehabilitation and replacement, zoning policies and programs that preserve housing opportunities as well as business opportunities.
 2. Transportation policy statements include support of alternative forms of transportation, considering impacts on neighborhoods on at least an equal basis with impacts on transportation systems and giving all neighborhoods equal consideration in transportation decisions.
- C. During the Council's recent discussions relating to growth, annexations and housing policy, Council Members have expressed support for developments that promote livable community concepts such as:
1. Pedestrian and bicycle friendly environments.
 2. Compact, transit and pedestrian oriented developments.
 3. Neighborhood anchor areas or commercial and/or business uses that are necessary to the function of residential neighborhoods or are compatible with residential activity.
 4. Local services that are conveniently available or can be provided and are accessible on foot.
- D. The Council's adopted growth policy states: It is the policy of the Salt Lake City Council that growth in Salt Lake City will be deemed the most desirable if it meets the following criteria:
1. Is aesthetically pleasing;
 2. Contributes to a livable community environment;
 3. Yields no negative net fiscal impact unless an overriding public purpose is served; and
 4. Forestalls negative impacts associated with inactivity.
- E. The City's Strategic Plan and the Futures Commission Report express concepts such as maintaining a prominent sustainable city, ensuring the City is designed to the highest aesthetic standards and is pedestrian friendly, convenient, and inviting, but not at the expense of minimizing environmental stewardship or neighborhood vitality.
1. The Plans emphasize placing a high priority on maintaining and developing new affordable residential housing in attractive, friendly, safe environments and creating attractive conditions for business expansion including retention and attraction of large and small businesses.
 2. The Plans also support street designs that are pedestrian friendly and developing a multi-modal citywide transportation system.

CHRONOLOGY:

The Council discussed the proposed transit corridor zoning at several meetings throughout the later part of 2002 including review from consultants Frank Gray and Marilee Utter. Key dates are listed below.

- September 14, 2000 Petition initiated by the Administration
- October 5, 2000 Issue presented to Mayor's monthly meeting with Community Council Chairs
- November 16, 2000 Planning Commission public hearing
- December 2000 – January 2001 Presentation to various real estate organizations

- January 18, 2001 Planning Commission decision
- December 2000 - April 2001 Presentation to Business Advisory Board and various real estate organizations
- January – December 2001 Administration meetings to resolve business and community issues
- November 7, 2001 Historic Landmark Commission meeting
- December 13, 2001 Planning Commission approval of revised text amendments and recommendation to City Council
- Jan. 30, 2002 Historic Landmark Commission meeting
- July 16, 2002 & Sept. 5, 2002 Council Work Session Briefing
- Oct. 3, 2002 Council Work Session Briefing with Consultants Frank Gray and Merrilee Utter
- Oct. 15, 2002 & Nov. 5, 2002 Council Work Session Briefings
- Dec. 3, 2002 Council Work Session Briefing and Public Hearing - City Council action to close the hearing and table action on this issue for further study, input and refinement.
- May 8, 2003 Referred back to the Planning Division at the request of the Planning Director for additional review
- August 5, 2004 Received Administration's transmittal in the Council office
- October 5 & 21, 2004 Council Work Session Briefings
- December 7, 2004 Council Work Session Briefing and Public Hearing – Council action to close the hearing, requested changes to the proposed ordinance and defer action to a future Council meeting

cc: Sam Guevara, Rocky Fluhart, DJ Baxter, Ed Rutan, Lynn Pace, David Dobbins, Orion Goff, Tim Harpst, Louis Zunguze, Brent Wilde, Doug Wheelwright, Kevin LoPiccolo, Cheri Coffey, Doug Dansie, Jan Aramaki, Marge Harvey, Sylvia Jones, Lehua Weaver, Annette Daley, Barry Esham, Gwen Springmeyer

File Location: Community Development Dept., Planning Division, Zoning Ordinance text change, Planning Commission initiated petition, Parking lots to be located behind buildings in certain commercial and missed-us zoning districts (Walkable Communities)