

A. LOUIS ZUNGUZE  
DIRECTOR  
  
BRENT B. WILDE  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

**SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION**  
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

ROSS C. "ROCKY" ANDERSON  
MAYOR

**CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL**

**TO:** Ross C. "Rocky" Anderson, Mayor      **DATE:** April 4, 2006      *RA*  
**FROM:** Louis Zunguze, Community Development Director      *[Signature]*  
**RE:** Downtown Master Plan

**STAFF CONTACTS:** Alex Ikefuna, Planning Director, at 535-7759 or alex.ikefuna@slcgov.com

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the City Council schedule a briefing to consider options for updating the Downtown Master Plan

**DOCUMENT TYPE:** Briefing

**BUDGET IMPACT:** None

**DISCUSSION:**

**Issue Origin:** Salt Lake City is presently considering updating the Downtown Master Plan. Several major projects are driving this renewed interest, including discussion regarding creation of an arts district, development of a Downtown transportation study, increased need for housing, mall redevelopment, and the relocation of LDS Business College and inclusion of a satellite branch of Brigham Young University in the Downtown area. In all, Downtown Salt Lake City is poised to benefit from approximately \$1.5 billion in planned investment over the next two to five years.

In 1995 the City Council adopted the Downtown Master Plan, modeled on the 1962 Second Century Plan. The plan identified a number of development and redevelopment themes which evolved into specific projects with quantifiable results in the City's Downtown Master Plan. Many of the themes identified in the plan now need to be updated. For example, Downtown transportation issues now focus on how best to expand light rail, rather than on whether or not to implement it. Given the emerging development opportunities, it is critical that the City proceed in a timely and effective manner to update the Downtown Master Plan such that maximum benefit can be accrued from the development opportunities at hand and also continue to build on the success of the 1995 Plan.

- A. Provided a review of the 1995 Downtown Master Plan, outlining policies and accomplishments
- B. Identified and outlined the pros and cons of three potential visioning and planning processes for the Council to consider.

**A. Review of the 1995 Downtown Master Plan**

The 1995 Downtown Master Plan identified 11 areas of focus:

- People Oriented Activities
- Balanced Transportation System
- Salt Palace Expansion/Update
- Consolidated Courts Complex & Civic Center
- Town Square/Block 57
- Memory Grove Extension
- Downtown Zoning Modifications
- Theme Monument
- Gateway Redevelopment Area
- Sports Park/Stadium
- Housing

The Planning Division has reviewed each of the themes, policies, and projects identified in the 1995 Downtown Master Plan and has provided a determination of whether these items have been accomplished or not. Attachment A identifies specific projects and policies that have been implemented in each of these areas with recommendations for the future. It is clear from the review by the Planning Division that the 1995 Plan has been very effective in spearheading the Downtown’s current successes, as evidenced by the Gallivan Plaza, Matheson Courthouse, and transportation upgrades including light rail.

**B. Potential Visioning & Planning Processes for Consideration**

In order to ensure that the Downtown continues to thrive as a major center for commercial, business, and residential development, it is necessary that the City Council determine the direction of future planning for the Downtown area given the current state of the Downtown Master Plan. Attachment B provides details on the benefits and concerns of three differing approaches to consider in updating the Downtown Master Plan.

*Regional/Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT)*

The R/UDAT program is an intensive process that provides a “snapshot” of an area and its immediate concerns. It is designed to provide cities with direction regarding a visioning process. In this process, architects and other design professionals visit a project area for a short period of time and develop a plan to provide vision and goals for future development. The City’s 1988 previous participation in R/UDAT was highly successful, bringing together many divergent groups to create a shared vision. Numerous ideas generated in this process, such as identification of districts within the Downtown area, were incorporated in the 1995 Downtown Master Plan.

The City’s participation in R/UDAT was extremely useful in helping the City determine a direction for areas of future planning. As a result, the City has enjoyed great success in the development of distinct districts within the Downtown, such as Gateway, Main Street, and Trolley Square.

### *1995 Downtown Master Plan Update*

Updating the 1995 Downtown Master Plan can also be accomplished through the standard planning process. Planning staff would compile background information, maps, and demographic information and review existing documents and policies to identify what has been accomplished and what remains to complete. Public input is a vital part of the Master Plan process; as such, stakeholders representing a variety of entities throughout the community would be encouraged to participate. Housing agencies, property owners, advocacy groups, developers, and business owners would be invited to share their views and visions. Staff would conduct Open Houses to gather stakeholder input and then analyze the information gathered, identify land use conflicts, formulate recommended policies, create a Master Plan document draft, present the draft to the public, incorporate comments, and prepare a final draft for review by the Planning Commission and adoption by the City Council.

### *Chamber of Commerce Proposal*

The Chamber of Commerce proposes to initiate a process similar to that of the 1962 Second Century Plan, with an emphasis on the importance of the capitol city's role in the larger region. The Chamber has a strong presence in the Downtown and a unique ability to solicit participation from business stakeholders who have a broader perspective and unique perspective on strategies to ensure ongoing success of the Downtown business district.

**Discussion:** Because the R/UDAT process is designed to provide cities with a starting point for identifying goals and creating an early vision, repeating it now would redirect the City's current development vision rather than update and enhance the direction the City is already moving. Unless the City is uncertain of the direction of future planning Downtown, repeating the R/UDAT process is unlikely to provide the best result.

The Chamber of Commerce is committed to a Downtown planning process. If the Planning Division proceeds with a Master Plan update independent of the Chamber's process, it is probable that neither process will obtain the desired public participation. Two planning processes without careful coordination will likely result in conflicting and confusing visions for the Downtown area.

A partnership between City staff and the Chamber of Commerce would allow the City and community (business and residents) to pool knowledge and reach a shared vision for future development. It would also lessen confusion and frustration for the public by streamlining public input into a single process. Working jointly with the Chamber, City Planning staff would not only realize an unprecedented level of public participation in the updated Downtown Master Plan but share an enhanced understanding of the City's role in regional development.

**Recommendation:** It is apparent that there are advantages to participating with the Chamber of Commerce in formulating an updated Downtown Master Plan. The Chamber is prepared and eager to move forward with the planning process. Participating with the Chamber in this project offers the City a unique opportunity to encourage greater citizen participation and strengthen its

partnership with the business community. While the City cannot rely solely on the Chamber's process to garner information from all concerned groups, creation of a business-community vision for the Downtown would ensure a built-in implementation group and provide the City access to the issues, visions, and goals of a large citizen group who are often reluctant to participate in the public process. Should the City elect to participate with the Chamber of Commerce in the planning process, a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each party will be vital. The Administration considers the Chamber's primary contribution to this collaborative effort to be that of a champion of regional cooperation and a reaffirmation of Salt Lake City's key role as the catalyst for regional economic prosperity and the nucleus for governmental and civic activities Statewide.

**ATTACHMENT A:  
Downtown Master Plan Review**

# MEMORANDUM

451 South State Street, Room 406  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
(801) 535-7757



Planning and Zoning Division  
Department of Community Development

**TO:** Louis Zunguze, Community Development Director  
**FROM:** Alexander Ikefuna, Planning Director  
**DATE:** March 30, 2006  
**SUBJECT:** Downtown Master Plan.

Salt Lake City is presently considering updating the Downtown Master Plan. Several major projects are driving this renewed interest, including: A proposal for an arts district, development of a Downtown transportation study, increased need for housing, mall redevelopment and the relocation of Brigham Young University and LDS Business College to Downtown. The Planning Division has prepared this memorandum to provide a status of the implementation of the current master plan and identify options for the development of an update to the existing plan.

## STATUS OF CURRENT DOWNTOWN PLAN

As identified in Attachment A/Downtown Master Plan Implementation Review, several of the policies of the 1995 Downtown Master Plan have been implemented to varying extent. The Attachment/Review identifies the major policies of the Downtown Master Plan and indicates the extent to which each policy has been implemented. The Review also suggests potential future recommended actions.

## PROCESS OPTIONS FOR UPDATING THE EXISTING DOWNTOWN PLAN

### Background

Over the course of the last 50 years there have been three major Downtown planning processes:

- 1) The *Second Century Plan*, organized by the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce in 1962,
- 2) *Regional / Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT)*, organized by the American Institute of Architects (AIA) in 1988; and,
- 3) The *Downtown Master Plan* adopted by the City Council in 1995.

The *Second Century Plan* focused on eleven major projects to be complete by the year 1985. The projects included the construction of the Salt Palace, Main Street beautification and raising City Creek, among others. Not all were accomplished by 1985; however, all were accomplished in some form by the year 2000.

*R/UDAT* is a program of the American Institute of Architects where architects and other design professionals “visit” a project area for approximately three days and develop a “plan” to provide vision and goals to revitalize the area. This is an intensive process that provides a snapshot of the City and its immediate concerns. The 1988 *R/UDAT* was very successful in galvanizing interest in Downtown and many of the concepts highlighted by the plan were later integrated into the official Downtown Master plan.

The *Downtown Master Plan* is the result of the official City master planning process. The Plan was generally patterned after the 1962 Second Century Plan. It focused on 11 major projects which had quantifiable results. This is officially adopted City policy. Many of the concepts in the Downtown Master Plan are still valid but are in need of update. For example, transportation is still a major issue and concern, but the debate has moved beyond whether to implement light rail and is now centered on how best to expand light rail and other forms of transportation. Similarly the debate has moved beyond merely providing housing, and is now centered on how to best increase the number of housing units Downtown. Therefore the update of the Downtown Master plan will be primarily a modernization of existing policies, not a wholesale rewriting of new policies.

#### OPTIONS FOR UPDATING PLANNING POLICIES FOR DOWNTOWN

There are currently proposals to reconvene all three Downtown planning processes: the Chamber of Commerce “Second Century” process, the American Institute of Architects “*R/UDAT*” process, and the official Salt Lake City Master Plan process. Each has its own advantages and drawbacks, as discussed below.

The *Chamber of Commerce* is proposing to initiate a type of *Second-Century Plan*. This proposal has many merits because the Chamber provides a strong regional voice for Downtown that is lacking within the Citizen/ Community Council input system. The Chamber also has the ability to draw from many members that are often difficult or reluctant to participate in the public process. Also, by creating a business community vision, there is a built-in implementation group. By participating in the Chamber’s process the City would be able to hear the issues, visions and goals of a large number of stakeholders in Downtown. In addition, the Chamber is ready to begin a new planning process. Therefore, the possibility exists to either allow the Chamber to move forward independently or to move forward concurrently with a City run process. There are advantages to mixing the Chamber public relations process with the City’s citizen input process to insure maximum input. The City will particularly benefit from the Chambers efforts to create regional consensus (outside of City limits). However, the City cannot rely on the Chamber’s process completely because the City plan must include an opportunity for all interests to be heard on an equal basis to ensure that the issue of neighborhood interface and the broader City goals are adequately addressed. The City must also prepare a plan that will be adopted as a legal policy document by the City Council. Therefore, if the City and the Chamber choose to engage in a joint effort, it is critical that each party has a clear understanding of their role in the process. These roles should be defined from the onset to eliminate any confusion and to insure the best possible output.

In general, the *R/UDAT* process also has many plusses. The previous effort was viewed as very successful by the community and effectively launched interest in completing a formal Downtown Master Plan that was later adopted by the City. *R/UDAT* brought many divergent groups together to create a shared vision. Various “Districts” were identified for areas of Downtown. Those concepts were included in the Downtown Master Plan. *R/UDAT* is an excellent endeavor

when there is a need to spark interest in Downtown, however, the interest already exists and there does not seem to be a need to kick start a completely new vision at this time. Clarification and renewal of existing policies is the immediate priority. There is momentum to update and clarify the existing vision. In addition, the time constraints of applying for a new R/UDAT process would delay its implementation. There is a long selection process through the American Institute of Architects who must determine whether to instigate another study. The process would also be very long and labor intensive for City staff because of the amount of coordination and sub-committees involved in preparation for the main event. Because R/UDAT will not be able to come online for a considerable amount of time, it cannot be concurrent with a City process unless the City is willing to delay the Plan's development. Therefore, it is not recommended that a R/UDAT be pursued independently at this time. However if the AIA wishes to participate in a R/UDAT like format (intensive charettes and design workshops) within the confines of a larger planning process, it would certainly be welcome.

The official *Salt Lake City Master Plan* process focuses on traditional practiced and legally required forms of information gathering and community interface. This process will need to be followed regardless of other processes if the intent is to have a legally adopted document.

#### RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION

The Downtown Master Plan should be updated (not reinvented). This is the legal document and the one that should be ultimately produced. Because the Chamber is ready to proceed, it may be possible to blend the two processes to create a document or even two independent documents that share a common vision and are prepared using the same citizen input process. In such a scenario, City staff would be heavily involved with the Chamber's process to cull public input. This would allow the City and business community to share in each other's knowledge and insure the visions are compatible. This partnership would also lessen confusion and frustration of citizens and those who wish to participate in the process by having one public input process rather than two or more. The Chamber process would be augmented or expanded to include a City public process that reaches out to all citizens, rather than just the business community, to insure that all parties are represented. The final document could be a single joint plan that is within an adoptable format for the City or two documents, with the City document coming after the Chamber document in an adoptable format. However, before the City and the Chamber embark on any joint effort, both should first negotiate a clear understanding of the proper roles and responsibilities each will have in developing the plan. Attachment B represents a proposed task list and outline of how the City would proceed if it is determined not to partner with the Chamber. This outline should serve as a base point for negotiating a joint process so that the City and Chamber may jointly move forward completing a document that is adoptable and has broad community input and support.

It is staff's recommendation that a R/UDAT process not be independently pursued at this time because of the lack of need to spark interest in creating a new vision for Downtown. It is suggested that the AIA work with the City to include the design community in the Chamber/City process.

A timeline, outlining the necessary steps to update the plan is included as Attachment B and should be followed if it is determined that the City should proceed on its own without partnering with the Chamber



# Downtown Master Plan Implementation Review

## Major Projects

The 1995 Downtown Master Plan contained 11 major projects designed to accomplish the following goals and objectives.

### 1. People Oriented Amenities

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Street trees	Included in all sidewalk/park strips	Generally. Street trees are included as a matter of city policy in all public or private projects downtown. Examples include new trees along 400 South light rail, the saving of trees on Main Street and new trees throughout Gateway.	Policy	Include & delineate policy to ensure continued accomplishment Medians – 7 <sup>th</sup> East & 300 South
Standard paving patterns	Create a distinctive pattern for Downtown in general and Main Street and South Temple specifically	Yes. The paving patterns have been standardized: there is a standard pattern of 80% concrete/20% concrete pavers for the area from 200 East to 600 West (excluding 500 West. and South Temple to 400 South. Main Street and South Temple have their own specific pattern.	Policy	Include & delineate policy to ensure continued accomplishment
Street lighting	Part of a larger system of district and boulevards, distinctive light designs.	Yes. The city has developed a coordinated street lighting plan that moves far beyond Downtown Decorative lighting – Main St, State St, SID - Rose Park.	Policy	Include & delineate policy to ensure continued accomplishment.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Public Art	To be encouraged, 1% of public projects investment	TRAX Justice Court Building SLC Sports Complex. Ten new commissioned since 1995. Public art at the City/County Building and Library. Art in Transit.		Salt Lake City Arts Council Grants, RDA budget and CIP budget as well as partnerships.
Ground level glass	60%+ transparent glass is required on retail streets, Main Street, from South Temple to 400 South., 100, 200 and 300 South between West Temple and State Street.	Yes. The zoning ordinance has been modified to require glass at the ground level. This has helped to eliminate blank walls on new buildings, for example; along Main Street and in the Gateway.	Integrated into zoning code	Reiterate general policy
Ground level retail activity	Required of all buildings along retail streets & Block 57 Plaza	Yes. Retail (or service. activity is required on the ground level - this keeps Main Street pedestrian active.	Integrated into zoning code	Reiterate general policy
Coordinated parking entrances	Entries prohibited on Main St. between S. Temple & 400 South, discouraged between 400 & 900 South.	Yes. As redevelopment occurs, parking entries are encouraged to be on streets adjacent to Main to eliminate pedestrian auto conflicts.	Policy	Reiterate general policy
Police patrol	Foot, auto & bike, highly visible, non-threatening, substation on Block 57 Plaza	Yes. Substation on 110 S. Main Community Oriented Policing	Policy	
Cleanliness	Sidewalks swept/washed during summer. Snow removal in winter	Yes.		
On street ambiance	Regulated vendors, musicians, artists, carriages, outdoor dining, etc.	Yes. Policies regarding sidewalk artists have been changed The sidewalk vending ordinance has been reviewed. Policies for artists in the public way have been established.	Ordinance changes	Reiterate general policy

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Mid block walkways	Center walkways to shorten distance to cross streets.	Yes. New walkways have been established as a result of the policy, for example; through the California Tire Building. Pedestrian Safety Initiative	Policy and ordinance	Expand general policy into a more definitive plan

## 2. Balanced Transportation System

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Light rail system	Linking Downtown to the suburbs	Yes. Sandy to Downtown and to the University Hospital. Also, Intermodal Hub extension location/station decisions have been made.	Policy	Advance policy on transit lines, particularly Downtown to Airport and south Davis County routes; Commuter Rail and Intermodal Hub. Joint Resolution w/ WFRC
Bus network	Expansion of service throughout the valley, focusing on Main St.	In process.	Working with UTA	Needs reevaluation
I-15 freeway improvements	Additional lanes, interchange. Minimized negative impacts	Yes. I-15 project completed. The viaducts on I-15 were shortened and decorative lighting placed upon the bridges to highlight the entry into the City, for example; 400/500 and 600 South and 600 North.	Working with other agencies.	Continue policy discussion for north I-15 and I-80
600 North viaduct/interchange improvement	Modified to make better use of 300 & 400 West streets	Yes. The 600 North viaduct was shortened and beautified. Homes that were formerly under the viaduct are being restored	Working with other agencies	Engage in broader discussion of downtown access & neighborhood impacts including possibility of 100 South off-ramp access

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Improvements to 400 West	Curb, gutter, sidewalk. To better define roadway, improve efficiency	Yes. 400 West has been rebuilt and connected to Beck Street	Policy. Working with other agencies	Discuss 400 West southbound and other access issues
Long range consolidation of heavy rail lines on 500 West	Behind the rail depots. First priority to remove rails from 400 West north of 200 South.	Yes the rail lines were consolidated onto 600 West, creating hundreds of acres of developable space in the Gateway area	Working with railroad and other agencies	Discuss realignment of Grant Tower and long-term rail access
Improve 500 West	To provide a freeway frontage road/secondary access route from the south	Partial. This is an ongoing policy to extend 500 West both north and south. It has been rebuilt between North Temple and 400 South. Additional right-of-way needed to the north.	Policy & budget	Clarify policy regarding overall access to downtown
Closure/narrowing of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue @ State St.	To discourage through traffic in residential areas	Partial The street was not closed or narrowed, however parks were created on both sides of the street to create the sense of entry into the Avenues (Brigham Young Park and City Creek Park.. Traffic calming has been installed to slow traffic.	Policy	Review measures taken to determine effectiveness
Victory Road disconnected from direct access to Beck St.	To encourage commuter traffic to use 300 & 400 West, not in the Capitol Hill residential area	No. Although there are ongoing discussions regarding slowing traffic. Traffic signal installed at 300 North to better control commuter traffic, 500 North signal proposed.	See policy	Discuss northern access in broad terms
Center medians on West Temple, 200 North, Main Street & State Street, north of North Temple	To clearly identify residential areas, discourage through traffic	No. These medians were proposed for the block north of North Temple to scale down their size to a residential scale. Only West Temple median has been built.	See policy & budget	Determine if still valid

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Major markers placed at north and east ends of Downtown	To define boundaries	No. This proposal was to better delineate Downtown from adjacent neighborhoods to alert motorists to the fact that they are entering a distinctly different district.	Policy and budget	Needs more work
Improved signage to University	To direct through traffic	Partial Directional signage has been placed along major roadways. 400 South has honorary Street Name of University Boulevard.	Policy, budget and working with other agencies	Needs more work
Zoning ordinances	To be changed to reflect parking maximums as well as minimum capacities	Partially. Many minimum parking requirements have been lowered so that most parking numbers are driven by the private market, not City legislation. Parking maximums have been placed in the Downtown ordinance but requires legislative action to initiate their effect. Note: Walkable Communities and TOD Ordinance have been implemented, which affect parking location and numbers.	Ordinance change	Evaluate policy and/or implement parking maximums incorporated into ordinance
30% of stalls within primary retail area	Required to be validated or metered short term parking	Partially. Short term parking has been required in parking lots financed with city funds.	Ordinance change	Needs work
Improvements of or contributions to fund mass/alternate transit system	In lieu of parking construction	Yes. Alternative parking measures in the ordinance allow employers to contribute to transit in lieu of constructing parking. Light Rail Commuter Rail	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Enlarge Park & Shop, create parking authority or empower downtown management group.	To oversee the coordination and management of parking in central core	Yes Uniform validations and parking token program; Parking Initiatives such as free holiday parking. 300 South and 300 East, center of street parking has been installed.	Policy & management	Continue to define process

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Eliminate distance from building required for parking	Except for retail sites. Allowed to be constructed at peripheral sites	Yes. The ordinance was modified to allow off site parking for Downtown buildings	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Encourage employers flexibility	Use of alternate transit, mass transit, flextime, etc.	Yes	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Shared parking	Promoted for day and nighttime uses	Yes. Shared parking criteria has been placed in the zoning ordinance to allow uses of differing time frames to count the same stalls.	Ordinance change	Restate policy

### 3. Salt Palace Expansion/Update

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Salt Palace	Continue to develop Salt Palace plans	Yes. The original expansion envisioned in 1995 has been complete and new expansion is under construction. Longer term needs and competition from suburban convention facilities need to be explored.	Policy. And Working with S.L. County	Needs to be updated to reflect changing needs
Delta Center	Arena to host sports activities	Partial. The Delta Center has been constructed; however newer sports arenas also need to be located Downtown. Hockey and soccer were lost to suburban sites. There needs to be a clear Downtown preferred location and support for other professional sports.	Working with business community	Update policy regarding other venues

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Museums	Encourage west Downtown locations	Partial. Museum of Utah Art & History New Clark Planetarium remained Downtown. Several art galleries have opened.	Policy and working with other governments	Needs to be reevaluated
Science center	Clark Planetarium built	Yes. Also, Leonardo.	Working with other levels of government.	
Performing arts complex	Additional arts space req.	Partially. Rose Wagner. New arts district needs more exploration and Community commitment for a Downtown location. Utah Theater under consideration for renovation.	Working with other levels of government.	Needs to be updated to include Utah Theatre and arts complex

#### **4. Consolidated Courts Complex and Civic Center**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Consolidated courts complex & civic center	Combining courts and related functions at a single location	Yes. The Matheson Courthouse and Library Square were the focus of the original policy, however the City has also created a City Court in the area and there are ongoing discussions for a new Police headquarters near City Hall. Moss Federal Courthouse is proposed for expansion.	Working with other levels of government.	Continue policy discussions regarding south end anchors. Also, Federal Moss Court House expansion.

## 5. Town Square/Block 57

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Town square/Block 57	Design to be a center of activity	Yes. Gallivan Plaza	RDA, budget	Restate policy and evaluate long term options

## 6. Memory Grove Extension

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Memory Grove extension/City Creek parkway	Bring M.G to 1 <sup>st</sup> Ave. Integrate C.C. parkway through downtown to connect with Jordan River parkway	Partially City Creek has been brought to the surface at City Creek Park and along North Temple at the Conference Center, but the concept needs to be implemented in the locations between State Street and the Jordan River.	Policy & budget	Needs to be updated to incorporate the State Street to Jordan River corridor



## 7. Downtown Zoning Modifications

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Removal of height req. from basic land uses	Allows height to be controlled as a separate issue	Yes Buildings downtown have a nominal height limited of 375 feet which may be exceeded. The Conditional Building and Site Design review process (rather than Conditional Use. is proposed to make the process for height adjustments simpler.	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Implementation of mixed use in east downtown area	To solidify the eastern boundary of downtown and stabilize residential area	Yes The RMU zoning district was created	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Mixed use zoning in area adjacent to Pioneer Park	To enhance existing and encourage new residential use	Yes. New D-3 and Gateway zoning has been established to encourage housing.	Ordinance change	Restate policy
Warehouse historic dist. development	Rio Grande Depot, Pierpont areas, preserve as historic areas	No Although the area surrounding Pioneer Park qualifies as historic district, it has not been designated as a City Historic District, although most renovations have followed historic guidelines and the area is designated as a National Historic District.	Establishment of a historic district	Still valid Restate policy
View corridors	Temple Square, City-County Building, Cathedral of the Mad., State Capitol.	Yes. Policies have been established in the Downtown and East Downtown Master Plans to protect views when considering projects requiring conditional use for height.	Policy & ordinance	Continue to refine policy
Downtown view corridors	From Downtown to surrounding views, mountains etc.	Yes. Generally sky bridges and other uses that would block street view corridors have been discouraged.	Policy & ordinance	Continue to refine policy (particularly in anticipation of new mall proposals.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Gateways	Changes in zoning to enhance entry into Downtown on major streets	No. Changes to zoning at the 500 and 600 South off-ramps was proposed but has not been implemented. The area is still zoned CG which allows for a variety of uses.	Ordinance & policy	Continue discussions regarding Gateway image
Retail overlay for Main Street	Design standards for pedestrian	Yes and No. Zoning was modified to require service or retail uses at the ground level on Main Street. Policy has recently been reversed to allow housing on the ground floor to provide more housing options for Downtown.	Ordinance	Restate policy
General parking requirements	Parking design measures	Yes. Parking requirements have been reduced overall and allowed to consolidate in dense areas	Ordinance	Restate policy
Theater & arts dist. overlays	To encourage a concentration of related businesses	No. The intent of this concept was to have a concentration of all types of entertainment uses in a general area. That area was identified as the Pierpont corridor. The Rose Wagner theater has been built but other zoning modifications have not been made to encourage consolidation. Such modifications could include parking reduction and/or inclusive zoning for entertainment.	Policy & ordinance	Still needs work

## 8. Theme Monument

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Theme monument	Anchor the south end of downtown	No. Brigham Yong Monument exists at the north, but a southern anchor has not been constructed.	Policy, budget	Warrants reevaluation

## 9. Gateway Redevelopment Area

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Gateway redevelopment area	Master plan	Yes. The railroad tracks were consolidated, the viaducts shortened and the gateway area master planned. Many projects have come to fruition: Gateway, Bridges, Hilton Intermodal.	Policy, ordinance	Continue to refine and integrate Gateway

## 10. Sports Park/Stadium

Topic	Policy	Implemented?	Method	Recommendation for the Future
Sports Park/Stadium	To host additional professional sports organizations	No. Hockey and Soccer stadiums were built or are proposed for construction in suburban communities.	Budget, policy	Still valid for other potential professional sports venues

## 11. Housing

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implemented?</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Recommendation for the Future</b>
Housing	Top priority	Partial. There have been numerous housing projects completed, but more are always welcome, for example: Bridges and Gateway. Recent zoning modifications allow dwellings on the first floor in an effort to remove barriers to housing development.	Budget, policy, ordinance	Policy needs to be expanded upon and opportunities identified

**ATTACHMENT B:  
City's Master Plan Process Outline**

CITY MASTER PLAN PROCESS  
(NO PARTICIPATION FROM THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OR AIA)

*TASKS*

1. COMPILE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Compile base information and maps
- Review existing Planning Documents and Policies and identify what has been accomplished, or unaccomplished and where we want to go (see Attachment A)
- Gather demographic and statistical information (existing land use, property ownership maps, property acreage, zoning, historic preservation information, non-conforming uses, conditional uses, traffic counts, etc.)
- Identify existing and known future projects

Time frame: May 2006-July 2006

2. CITIZEN INPUT

- Issues Gathering
- Open Houses (initiations extending to, but not limited to, the following)
  - Community Councils
  - Business Owners
  - Chamber of Commerce
  - American Institute of Architects, American Planning Association and other design professional organizations
  - Institutional use representatives
  - Housing agencies, social service agencies and advocacy groups
  - Property Owners

3. ANALYZE INFORMATION AND PREPARE DRAFT DOCUMENT

- Analyze information gathered
- Identify land use conflicts
- Formulate recommended policies and implementation items
- Create a public draft
- Advisory Committee (community council representatives, business owners, property owners, representatives of major institutions, representatives of Historic Landmark Commission, Transportation Division, UTA, housing advocacy groups, representatives of specialty housing agencies, design professionals, UDOT)
  - Identify issues and goals.
  - Review draft document including recommended policies and action items.

Time frame: July- September 2006

4. PREPARE FINAL DRAFT FOR ADOPTION PROCESS

Time frame: September to October 2006

## 5. ADOPTION PROCESS

- Review by Community Councils, Transportation Advisory Board, Salt Lake City Business Advisory Board, Housing Trust Fund Board, Historic Landmark Commission, etc.)
- Planning Commission Recommendation
- City Council Adoption

Time frame: Community Councils December 2006, Planning Commission January 2007