

Chapter One

Introduction

What is a General Plan?

The term “general plan” describes a general, comprehensive, long-range statement of goals and related policies to guide future growth and development of a city. The term “general plan” is often used synonymously with “comprehensive plan” and “master plan,” although the term “master plan” often denotes a specific physical plan for one parcel or a small group of parcels or for a targeted area.

The Provo City General Plan is comprehensive because it seeks to coordinate all the interrelated systems of the City and all properties within the City. While it is primarily a plan to guide the physical development or non-development of the City, it deals indirectly with social and political issues. Thus, it is comprehensive on several levels.

The General Plan is general in that it does not precisely locate every church, institution, store, school, apartment building, or house in the City. The General Plan acts as a guide, establishing policies and procedures for growth, development, conservation, and location of various land use activities. Policies are based on an analysis of the population being served, the physical conditions of the land, the adequacy of public facilities, and the compatibility of land use.

This General Plan is long-range, dealing with planning for the future and establishing policies for existing and future land uses. The plan cannot be fully implemented immediately, but is implemented in phases.

This General Plan emphasizes policies, not mapped, end-state solutions. Maps are used to show locations of land use activities, facilities, and physical characteristics, but emphasis is placed on policies for land use decision-making. Policies, when applied with good, sound judgment, provide both consistency, to maintain order and balance, and flexibility to meet unforeseen difficulties. If a conflict occurs between the land use map and adopted policies, written policies are the over-riding factors in decision making. If ever the City or any of its residents decides an adopted policy is no longer in the community’s interest, amendments to the General Plan may be initiated, according to procedures set forth in Chapter 15.17 , Provo City Code, and ultimately approved or denied by the Municipal Council after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

The Contents of the General Plan

Utah State law suggests general plans include eight basic elements: Land Use; Transportation and Circulation; Environment; Public Services and Facilities; Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation; Economic; and Implementation. A moderate income housing plan is required. Other

elements which the City deems appropriate to include in the Provo City General Plan are: Administration; Population; Housing (including the Moderate Income Housing Plan); Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; and Urban Design. A separate chapter is devoted to each element, discussing current conditions and proposed changes, goals, policies, and action programs. The following sections provide brief descriptions of each element.

Administration Element

The Provo City General Plan is an advisory document adopted under provisions of State of Utah and Provo City laws. The General Plan and future amendments thereto must be adopted through the legal process established under the Land Use Development and Management Act, of the Utah Code, and Title 15 Land Use and Development, of the Provo City Code. These laws detail procedures for amending the Plan, including the frequency of amendment hearings, reviews, and updates. The Administration Element of the General Plan addresses the need for a General Plan, the processes by which the Plan is approved and amended, and the administration of the Plan through the zoning ordinance (Title 14) and other titles of the Provo City Code.

Population Element

This element describes the population as enumerated in the latest census figures and explains how demographics affect the City. Population projections are given to provide information on the character and size of the population for which the City is planning. Population projections are the “demand side” for land, housing, business, industry, streets, utilities, parks, schools, and other needs of City residents. The “supply side” of the equation is presented in the other elements of the plan.

Housing Element

The Housing Element anticipates the type and quantity of housing needed by the projected resident population. It identifies the number of units in each price range of housing which must be provided to maintain moderate income housing for the resident population. The Utah Legislature has mandated that each community’s general plan contain a moderate income housing component. A strategy to provide housing for moderate income families is outlined. Anticipated needs are carried over into the Land Use element (to set aside sufficient land for various types of housing), the Transportation and Circulation element (to accommodate traffic demands), and the Municipal Services and Facilities element (to provide adequate services).

Urban Design Element

The appearance of the built environment sends a message about the City’s character. However subjective the message may be, the look and feel of a community affects people. If it is clean, interesting, visually stimulating, and orderly, people are comfortable moving in and around it. The design of the City can create a sense of community. Provo City has a fine, though sometimes neglected, architectural legacy. Preserving good design from the past and building new, quality traditions strengthens the community’s image and gives it character and a sense of place. This element identifies projects, programs, and standards to enhance the appearance of the community.

Land Use Element

Land use refers to the activity taking place on a given parcel of ground. It may be a business, school, farm, home, or vacant lot. The Land Use Element outlines how land is to be used to ensure wise, efficient land use and complementary relationships between differing land uses. Land use patterns should not be interpreted precisely, but as indications of predominant land usage in each generalized area. Specific parcel boundaries for land uses are guided by written policies in the plan and set forth on the zoning map. The Land Use Element does not automatically change zoning classifications or permitted uses of the land; it merely establishes policy for future changes.

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element

Quality of life distinguishes “livable” communities from sterile, urban compounds. Passive and active recreational spaces are oases in an otherwise hurried, and often synthetic, environment. Man-made recreational spaces designed for outdoor sports and activities, such as trails and parkways, as well as natural scenic areas near mountains, canyons, rivers, and lakes, contribute to the quality of life. The Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element proposes the maintenance and improvement of the existing and proposed park system, improvement of organized activities in the recreation program, and protection of natural amenities in the community for the enjoyment of residents and visitors alike.

Transportation and Circulation Element

Ensuring the efficient movement of people and goods throughout the City is the goal of the Transportation and Circulation Element. Plans are laid for automobile, mass transit, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation. These plans create a powerful link between the Land Use Element and the Transportation and Circulation Element. Total segregation of land use activities – the predominant land use pattern – creates the need to drive farther and more frequently, increasing congestion. In developed areas of the City, transportation may not experience much change. However, in developing areas, where transportation routes are not set, emphasis will be placed on linking housing with shopping and places of employment and increasing the safety of pedestrian and bicycle routes in neighborhoods and commercial districts.

Environment Element

This element addresses the protection, conservation, development, and use of natural resources, including air quality, forests, soils, rivers, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources. Recommendations are made regarding the regulation of land use on hillsides, protection of water quality and watersheds, wetlands, pollution control, flood hazard and control, and problems related to geological hazards, including rock fall, faults, earthquakes and liquefaction, land slides, and strata expansion.

Municipal Services and Facilities Element

The Municipal Services and Facilities Element addresses the need for maintenance and expansion of public facilities. Water must be provided; storm water must be drained away; wastewater must be collected and treated; solid waste must be collected and disposed; communications systems must be built or expanded; electrical power must be provided. This element compares existing facilities

to the needs of the projected population and sets forth plans to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation Element

This element addresses historic preservation and proposes the establishment of historic districts within Provo City. Recommendations are made concerning the elimination of blight and the redevelopment of housing, business, industrial, and public building sites.

Economic Development Element

This element states the purpose of economic development in our community, which is to promote job creation and increase the tax base. To this end, this element identifies the need for a citywide economic development strategic plan which will include current policies as well as identify policies to be established or given more emphasis.

Implementation Element

Implementation includes a discussion of specific actions necessary to carry out the General Plan. It proposes changes in zoning and subdivision ordinances, references plans for capital improvements, and identifies steps needed to address design corridors, preservation and rehabilitation activities, and other issues of importance to the development of Provo and services provided. The Implementation Element ties the other elements together by presenting a comprehensive list of recommendations made in the General Plan.

Previous General Plans

Provo City adopted its first general plan in 1968, at the start of a period of anticipated growth. But the construction of a major destination shopping mall in the City of Orem rather than Provo and the placement of an enrollment ceiling at Brigham Young University suppressed the predicted growth. These factors contributed to the decline of Provo's status as the business and retail center of Utah County and made it necessary to reassess the City's future. Efforts to update the 1968 General Plan started in 1973. In 1977, the Municipal Council adopted a general plan that established policies for growth and development through the year 2000.

The 1977 General Plan set forth "pro-growth" strategies. The plan's primary objectives were economic development and an increased tax base. City leaders sought to increase the retail base, establish new industrial centers, and revitalize older neighborhoods through high density redevelopment. Some R1 (One-Family Residential) neighborhoods were re-zoned and designated in the General Plan as Very High Density Residential (VHDR). Commercial zones were expanded into formerly one-family residential areas.

Such zoning occurred because it was believed that land zoned for high intensity uses would be redeveloped, bringing needed tax dollars. However, many up-zoned areas were poor locations for commercial or high density uses under the economic climate of the times and resulted in inconsistent patterns of redevelopment. Zoning property to allow redevelopment to proceed in accordance with

established development standards did not allow opportunities for review of appropriate timing and sequencing of redevelopment and allowed individual parcels to redevelop without aggregation of larger land areas that could provide a more orderly pattern of redevelopment. Safeguards were not in place to ensure that true redevelopment occurred and in many instances existing uses were converted into more intense uses. At best, such policies were “broad brush” and premature, allowing intrusions of incompatible uses among more stable areas of one-family structures. At worst, they were guarantees for neighborhood decline as redevelopment pressures failed to meet expectations. The remaining homes were less desirable for families with the intrusions of higher intensity uses, and many structures were bought by off-site investors wishing to convert the homes to two or more student apartments.

In 1983, central city residents affected by high density zoning initiated grassroots efforts to protect their neighborhoods through down-zoning. Their efforts, dubbed the Neighborhood Conservation Program, resulted in much of the central city being down-zoned from R5 (Very High Multiple Residential) zones to R4 (High Multiple Residential) and R3 (Medium Multiple Residential) zones. Some R3 areas were down-zoned to the R2 (Two-Family Residential) zones.

Down-zoning helped protect neighborhoods, but it was not enough. Apartment developments already extended into one-family neighborhoods. Even though densities had been lowered, zoning still permitted uses which were inconsistent with the original one-family subdivisions. In the 1990s, largely through the work of several neighborhood planning task forces, residents decided zoning should reflect existing uses (that one-family residential areas should be zoned one-family residential). Deteriorating areas with specific redevelopment plan proposals and plans for imminent development were an exception to this zoning concept. While the General Plan deals with future land uses and the timing of development, the City’s zoning is based primarily on existing uses. This policy helps to avoid creating nonconforming uses and protects existing neighborhoods.

In the last two decades a movement continues to grow among residential property owners who live within the City to preserve one-family dwellings and promote them for owner-occupied families. To implement this concept, the Municipal Council went to great lengths in down-zoning the R2 (Two-family Residential), R2.5 (Low Multiple Residential), R3 (Medium Multiple Residential), R4 (High Multiple Residential), and R5 (Very High Multiple Residential) zones to the RC (Residential Conservation) zone.

There has been some recent interest to update zoning to reflect actual or desired uses, particularly in examining properties within the RC zone, with the intent of unifying neighborhoods rather than simply perpetuating any land use elements that may not be in harmony with promoting the goals of any given area. The need to balance healthy residential neighborhoods with retail, commercial, and industrial growth is also recognized. All aspects of the community need to be appropriately blended to provide jobs, tax revenue, services, and quality of life for Provo’s residents and visitors.

The Need for a General Plan Update

The basic elements of city planning – a comprehensive general plan, a comprehensive zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, and a capital improvements plan – have existed in Provo for many years. Provo City’s previous general plans of 1968, 1977, and 1997 were complete rewrites of the previously existing plans. To prevent the current General Plan from becoming outdated and not reflecting the land use policies of the City, an ordinance requiring the General Plan to be updated every five years was passed by the Municipal Council. In 2002, a comprehensive update of the plan was initiated in accordance with the requirements of Title 15 Land Use and Development, of the Provo Municipal Code. This update was considered through an extended hearing process by the Planning Commission during 2003 and was adopted by the Municipal Council in 2004. The process began again in 2009 and subsequently adopted in 2010.

Change has swept through Provo during the last decade. Unprecedented growth in high-tech industries created jobs, drawing people to Provo. Job growth, along with above average natural increase and increased enrollment at Brigham Young University and Utah Valley University, has brought continued growth to the City over the past dozen years. Growth has produced a variety of challenges such as increased traffic, air quality concerns, housing shortages, fluctuating school enrollments (K-12), increased demand for services, and reduction in the amount of natural open space. City residents are very aware of the consequences of growth, and many expect the quality of life to continue to improve.

The subprime mortgage crisis of 2007, resulting in the collapse of the US housing bubble, began an extended recession in the US that spread to most developed countries. October 2008 saw the failure of many of the Country’s largest financial institution and the automotive industry soon followed. The ensuing slide in the stock market and loss of millions of jobs further deepened the recession to the point that it impacted all Americans. Despite attempts by the Federal government to mitigate the effects, nationwide unemployment ultimately climbed to 10%. Many of those who were not directly impacted by job loss or wage cuts changed their spending habits, opting to set more money aside into savings. The effect on local and state governments has been profound as sales tax revenues have declined sharply. Most experts agreed that by July 2009 the recession was beginning to end, but the effects are still lingering. While it is the intent of the City to carry out all the recommendations listed in this plan, some of the action items will necessarily be delayed due to funding shortfalls. Careful evaluation, review, and prioritization of all action items is crucial at this time.

Comprehensive Plan Process and Design

The planning process involves determining reasons for existing problems, taking corrective actions to avoid or reduce such problems in the future, looking for opportunities, and devising means to take advantage of opportunities in ways which promote the public good. Planning is a process, not an event. It is an ongoing process of evaluating what has been done and what is being done, and making appropriate changes to accomplish desired objectives according to the General Plan.

Task Force 2000

In response to perceived changes in community character, grassroots efforts had called for change. Citizens called for the implementation of long-range planning to reevaluate the policies of the 1977 plan. In 1994, Mayor George Stewart initiated the process to rewrite the Provo City General Plan. During meetings with the Mayor and Municipal Council in October, 1994, basic general plan concepts were discussed. The Mayor and Council wanted the plan to be prepared by the City staff, not by outside consultants.

With the advice and consent of the Municipal Council, Mayor Stewart appointed a twenty-five-member citizen task force (Task Force 2000) to work with the Planning Commission and City staff in preparing a new General Plan. Task Force members were charged with the responsibility of preparing a set of comprehensive policies for consideration and adoption by the Municipal Council. Citizen participation was the main component of Task Force 2000. The plan was to address growth management issues with an emphasis on policy statements. The assignment given by the Mayor and Council was based on the following concepts:

1. Policy statements should be used in the plan instead of the traditional “master plan” series of maps. Policy statements, which may apply to many situations, are more flexible than land use maps relating to site-specific situations.
2. Task Force members should be selected from existing organizations representing a wide range of interests. These interest groups should represent the key stakeholders in the City’s growth and development: neighborhood groups, educators, Realtors, developers, builders, business, industry, environmental groups, etc. Existing organizations and interest groups have high levels of understanding and involvement with certain community issues and can express organized opinions. Interest groups can communicate with their members who, collectively, represent a cross-section of the community.
3. Alternative plan development should allow full expression of varying viewpoints and provide a means of arriving at a final plan by comparing alternatives. Creating alternative plans as an intermediate step toward the preparation of a final plan document can allow for different perspectives to be expressed and understood. The final plan should be a result of consensus building and some conflict resolution between interest groups.
4. City departments should be represented in the plan development process. Departments should provide technical assistance and express opinions to help shape the plan. Interest group representatives and departmental representatives should communicate during the preparation process. Dialogue creates ownership and identification with the plan, assuring greater understanding and implementation of the policies by City departments.
5. The Community Development Department staff should assume the roles of: (1) coordinators and facilitators of the planning process, (2) researchers and collectors of data and information needed by the program participants, (3) advocate planners for various interest groups in preparing alternative plans and for the Task Force in its preparation of a final plan.

Building a Vision (Values, Goals, and Objectives)

The Provo Task Force 2000 members and the City staff held five area meetings in neighborhoods throughout the city. The Task Force gathered comments and information from citizens of Provo to determine residents' concerns about the future of Provo City. Following the area meetings, the Task Force and staff worked together to organize the public's concerns into a list of values, goals, and objectives of the community. These values, goals, and objectives were organized into workable elements of the General Plan. The Task Force worked in subcommittees addressing public concerns and prioritizing values, goals, and objectives in order of importance.

After a first draft by the Task Force, a series of community-wide meetings were held, one in each of the City's five area councils. A combination open house/hearing format was employed, allowing neighborhood participants to voice their sentiments regarding the values, goals, and objectives. Hundreds of citizens attended those meetings. Public comments recorded at the meetings were evaluated by the Task Force who re-prioritized the values, goals, and objectives accordingly. Occasionally, priorities were shaped by City government's limitations to affect the values, goals, and objectives. Priorities outside the City's control were assigned a lower priority than those more directly controlled by the City.

Provo Visioning, 2030

Mayor John Curtis took office January 2010, and as part of his 100 Day Plan put together a group tasked with creating a strategic vision for Provo. This visioning process to help define the objectives and goals of the City for the next twenty years. This visioning process is in the elementary stages of development. However it is anticipated that this exercise may result in amendments to long-term City planning documents, including the General Plan and it's associated master plans.

Value Statements

Values, Goals, and Objectives

I. We value safety and security for all citizens, within our homes and throughout our community.

1.1 Goal: Create and Maintain Safe Neighborhoods

- 1.1.1 Objective: Bring public safety services closer to the neighborhoods
- 1.1.2 Objective: Promote zero tolerance of drug and alcohol abuse, gangs, gang activity, pornography, and gambling
- 1.1.3 Objective: Establish and strengthen neighborhood watch programs throughout the city
- 1.1.4 Objective: Develop neighborhood based emergency preparedness programs

1.2 Goal: Educate Residents about Local, State, and Federal Laws

- 1.2.1 Objective: Review and establish laws and ordinances for the protection of all residents
- 1.2.2 Objective: Provide public instruction about Provo City ordinances on a regular, on-going basis
- 1.2.3 Objective: Provide service opportunities for the public as a part of this education process

1.3 Goal: Promote Safety through Urban Design

- 1.3.1 Objective: Require maximum fire and life safety devices in multi-residential and commercial developments
- 1.3.2 Objective: Promote better pedestrian safety by using interior connections, footpaths, adequate lighting, crosswalks, etc.
- 1.3.3 Objective: Encourage design that focuses activity and surveillance in front yard space, and limits access by unwanted visitors (i.e., front porches, verandas, windows for surveillance, fences, gates, hedges, outdoor lighting, etc.)

II. We value the conservation and protection of existing neighborhoods.

2.1 Goal: Conserve and Protect the Physical Integrity of Neighborhoods

- 2.1.1 Objective: Encourage owner occupancy in one-family neighborhoods
- 2.1.2 Objective: Encourage reinvestment in, and the beautification and restoration of, established neighborhoods
- 2.1.3 Objective: Maintain and upgrade neighborhood infrastructure
- 2.1.4 Objective: Revitalize blighted and dilapidated neighborhoods

2.2 Goal: Preserve Single Family Neighborhoods

2.3 Goal: Maintain Integrity and Preserve the Identifiable Personality of Neighborhoods

2.3.1 Objective: Encourage diversity of age groups in neighborhoods

2.4 Goal: Preserve Public Facilities, Parks, and Schools in Each Neighborhood

III. We value orderly growth.

3.1 Goal: Empower Neighborhoods

3.1.1 Objective: Continue emphasis on the Neighborhood Program

3.1.2 Objective: Involve neighborhood representatives to ensure orderly growth

3.1.3 Objective: Address specific concerns from each part of the city with regular area meetings

3.2 Goal: Establish Acceptable Service Levels for Public Infrastructure and Limit Growth to Maintain Those Levels

3.3 Goal: Develop High Quality Residential Neighborhoods

3.3.1 Objective: Encourage new one-family detached neighborhoods

3.3.2 Objective: Identify and reserve areas suitable for family housing

3.3.3 Objective: Encourage new developments to create a sense of identity and belonging in their designs, fencing, entrances, landscaping, etc.

3.3.4 Objective: Identify criteria for properties with potential for multi-family and one-family housing

3.3.5 Objective: Encourage gradual land use transitions

3.3.6 Objective: Promote safety through urban design

3.3.7 Objective: Make design standards for public and private roads similar

3.3.8 Objective: Design collector and arterial roads to support neighborhood residential streets

3.3.9 Objective: Require landscaping around perimeters of residential projects to soften development

3.3.10 Objective: Encourage site specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings

3.3.11 Objective: Design the open space first in future residential development projects

3.3.12 Objective: Size utilities consistent with anticipated growth when development occurs

3.3.13 Objective: Continue to require developments to pay for their fair share of infrastructure

3.3.14 Objective: Regulate the scale of buildings by the land size of the parcel

3.4 Goal: Require High Quality Commercial Development

3.4.1 Objective: Encourage performance standards for commercial developments

3.4.2 Objective: Require landscaping around perimeters of commercial projects to soften development

- 3.4.3 Objective: Locate limited commercial and service facilities for the convenience of neighborhoods
- 3.4.4 Objective: Hide or soften commercial area parking by using berms and trees with perimeter and interior landscaping
- 3.4.5 Objective: Integrate signs within the architecture of a development and limit the size
- 3.4.6 Objective: Design the open space first in future large-scale commercial development projects
- 3.4.7 Objective: Encourage site specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings
- 3.4.8 Objective: Regulate the scale of commercial buildings by the land size of the project

3.5 Goal: Make Quality Housing and Services That are Accessible to All Segments of the Population

- 3.5.1 Objective: Encourage housing of diverse design in order to adequately accommodate all types of users (singles, young couples, families, and elderly)
- 3.5.2 Objective: Encourage maximum buildout in existing higher density areas (south of Brigham Young University and within the Central Business District)

3.6 Goal: Disperse a Broad Range of Affordable Housing throughout the City

- 3.6.1 Objective: Encourage home ownership and preservation through neighborhood-based economic assistance programs
- 3.6.2 Objective: Encourage development patterns that reduce land and development costs

IV. We value convenient access to all parts of our city with well-planned streets and neighborhoods.

4.1 Goal: Provide an Efficient and Integrated Transportation System

- 4.1.1 Objective: Evaluate existing traffic and the current transportation system
- 4.1.2 Objective: Develop a Congestion Management Plan that will encourage flex-time, rideshare programs, alternative methods of parking, and discourage driving to work and school
- 4.1.3 Objective: Establish acceptable service levels for roads and intersections and limit growth to maintain those levels
- 4.1.4 Objective: Complete a collector and arterial road system (major streets plan) throughout the city
- 4.1.5 Objective: Improve east/west traffic flow
- 4.1.6 Objective: Control access on arterial streets
- 4.1.7 Objective: Prohibit on-street parking on major arterial and collector streets

4.1.8 Objective: Work towards becoming a gold-level bicycle friendly city as designated by the League of American Bicyclists.

4.2 Goal: Reduce Reliance on Automobiles by Encouraging Alternative Modes of Transportation

4.2.1 Objective: Expand and encourage rail, bus, bike, air, and other modes of transportation

4.2.2 Objective: Design streets to favor mass transit options

4.2.3 Objective: Secure future rights-of-way for all types of transportation systems

4.2.4 Objective: Improve pedestrian safety by evaluating pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, trails, and overpasses

V. We value a healthy, livable environment.

5.1 Goal: Provide Clean Air and Water

5.1.1 Objective: Improve air quality through better monitoring of automotive emissions, fireplace and industrial pollution, and enforce standards not to exceed those set by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

5.1.2 Objective: Maintain and improve the quality of our water through constantly updating and modernizing our treatment plants and protecting our water supply

5.1.3 Objective: Conserve water through educating citizens about conservation

5.1.4 Objective: Acquire additional water resources

5.1.5 Objective: Evaluate runoff and drainage into the Provo River and Utah Lake to protect the quality of those water bodies

5.2 Goal: Require Clean Business and Industry

5.2.1 Objective: Develop a general plan that encourages non-polluting business and industry to locate in Provo

5.2.2 Objective: Provide regulations and incentives to encourage established businesses to improve air quality

5.3 Goal: Enhance the City Park System

5.3.1 Objective: Evaluate the present park system plan as compared with other cities and states, including the quality, variety, location, and adequacy, and develop a revised parks master plan to provide adequate parks in the future

5.3.2 Objective: Develop a financial plan that would provide funds for the financing of an upgraded park system for the next century

5.4 Goal: Enhance Recreational Programs and Facilities

5.4.1 Objective: Develop a plan and financing for enlarged recreational facilities for youth, adults, and families for both summer and winter use

5.4.2 Objective: Develop a plan that would increase recreational programs for citizens of all ages

5.5 Goal: Preserve Natural Resources That All Can Enjoy

5.5.1 Objective: Implement the present plan for open space in association with parks, trails, canyons, Provo River, etc., including neighborhood parks close to residential areas

5.5.2 Objective: Develop a plan for optimizing the shores of Utah Lake as a Provo City asset, and purchase property bordering Utah Lake if necessary

5.6 Goal: Preserve or Replace Natural Vegetation and Habitats

5.6.1 Objective: Identify and evaluate the urban forest and habitat areas within the city, and develop policies and ordinances that would protect plant life, encourage planting, maintain a green belt, and preserve habitats for wildlife

VI. We value economic development.

6.1 Goal: Develop Business Facilities and Locations to Encourage New Business Growth and Job Formation

6.1.1 Objective: Support Provo Towne Centre Mall

6.1.2 Objective: Strengthen the airport and access to the airport as assets to the business community

6.1.3 Objective: Support the future development of Ironton as a mixed use facility for jobs and retail services

6.1.4 Objective: Support Riverwoods and East Bay for additional business locations to accommodate both small and large businesses

6.1.5 Objective: Promote business creation through a small business incubator

6.2 Goal: Promote the Central Business District

6.2.1 Objective: Improve public transportation and parking in the Central Business District

6.2.2 Objective: Create a vibrant mix of businesses, government, residential development, and cultural opportunities in the downtown area

6.2.3 Objective: Draw new cultural activities into the downtown area

6.2.4 Objective: Target land uses that bring more people to the downtown area

6.3 Goal: Provide a “Business Friendly” Provo

6.3.1 Objective: Support Provo City Economic Development Department initiatives that aid local businesses and business development

6.3.2 Objective: Facilitate business interaction with City government

6.3.3 Objective: Use the Internet to provide on-line services

6.4 Goal: Support and Strengthen Existing Business Areas

6.4.1 Objective: Revitalize blighted and dilapidated commercial centers

6.4.2 Objective: Recognize and plan for existing and future commercial corridors, particularly at major entrances into Provo, in order to maintain a critical mass for business development

6.4.3 Objective: Provide effective transitional areas between commercial and residential area

VII. We value a caring atmosphere for all individuals and families.

7.1 Goal: Create an Atmosphere in Which People Care about Each Other

7.1.1 Objective: Consider the well-being of children as a number one priority

7.1.2 Objective: Promote understanding of our diverse cultures, traditions, beliefs, and heritage

7.1.3 Objective: Encourage community involvement by all ages, socioeconomic levels, geographic areas, and ethnic groups

7.1.4 Objective: Give recognition to caring people

7.2 Goal: Make Government More Accessible to Encourage Citizen Involvement

7.2.1 Objective: Improve communication between the citizens and City departments

7.2.2 Objective: Make the wording of ordinances and documents easier to understand

7.2.3 Objective: Include social, ethnic, and religious segments of the community on City boards, committees and commissions

7.2.4 Objective: Make better use of technology to communicate with the public

VIII. We value a beautiful and well-kept city.

8.1 Goal: Establish Reasonable Community-Based Design Review Standards for All Development

8.1.1 Objective: Encourage quality design standards where desirable design themes are present

8.1.2 Objective: Discourage “cookie cutter” (overly repetitive) designs

8.1.3 Objective: Establish higher minimum landscaping and tree density requirements for all development

8.1.4 Objective: Establish open space requirements within developments

8.1.5 Objective: Encourage open space through appropriate clustering of developments

8.1.6 Objective: Encourage signage compatible with development

8.2 Goal: Establish and Maintain a Clean and Healthy Environment

8.2.1 Objective: Enhance ordinances, incentives, and penalties that would encourage the cleaning up of properties by removal of trash, junk, weeds, and the repair of deteriorating facilities

8.2.2 Objective: Continue and expand the present program of the regular cleaning of streets

8.2.3 Objective: Continue and enlarge the present programs of picking up seasonal trash through a community volunteer effort

8.3 Goal: Beautify Public Streets and Rights-of-Way

8.3.1 Objective: Define, identify, and beautify the major entrances to the community

8.3.2 Objective: Develop uniform street landscaping standards

8.3.3 Objective: Continue and enhance the street tree planting program

8.3.4 Objective: Encourage the removal of billboards

8.4 Goal: Evaluate Open Spaces in the Community and Recommend Policies and Ordinances That Would Protect and Enlarge Green Belts and Open Space

8.4.1 Objective: Include preservation of vistas and views in open space requirements

8.5 Goal: Preserve Historic Landmarks

8.5.1 Objective: Encourage identification, marking, and restoration of historic landmarks

IX. We value quality education for all citizens

9.1 Goal: Support Quality Education

9.1.1 Objective: Cooperate with the Provo School District in planning for and anticipating growth and fluctuation in school enrollment

9.1.2 Objective: Continue and improve the partnership with Provo School District on community and school parks

9.1.3 Objective: Publicize community and school activities that enrich education (including colleges and universities)

9.2 Goal: Support the Arts

9.2.1 Objective: Continue to support the arts through the Covey Center for the Arts and other City-Sponsored arts programs

9.3 Goal: Provide a Quality City Library

9.3.1 Objective: Enhance library facilities and library programs

Identifying Problems and Conflicts

Problems were qualified through citizen participation and quantified by research data. Inevitably, there are real problems, perceived problems, and occasional conflicting goals because of the interrelationships between them. Ideals began to be tempered by reality. Value statements represent a community wish list, a written description of conditions as we want them to be. When people identify problems in the community, it is usually because they perceive core values and goals are being threatened. Part of the purpose of the General Plan is to identify problems and find solutions. However, with many diverse interests in the City, sometimes there are competing interests. Consider the following two examples:

- We want traffic congestion lessened, but we also want very low density neighborhoods with a complete segregation of residential and nonresidential land uses. The latter goal actually guarantees the former goal will not be met because it forces people to make more frequent and lengthier vehicle trips.
- We want to conserve water in this arid climate, but we want large, landscaped yards to beautify development. The conflict here is obvious.

Judgments have to be made concerning the proper balance between competing interests. Limited financial resources force choices about which projects and initiatives can be funded. Priorities established in the General Plan help City officials make fiscal decisions in their annual budgets and capital improvement programs.

Gathering Data (Community Profile)

City staff, consultants, and the U.S. Bureau of the Census gathered data on population, land use, housing, traffic and transportation, environmental constraints, public facilities and services, and historic preservation. Comprehensive land use and building condition surveys were conducted and entered into a land use database. Data were computerized and linked to a digital mapping system in the City's Geographic Information System (GIS). Meaningful descriptive statistics were organized from the data and, where possible, mapped to reflect and quantify existing trends, as well as the area and extent of problems and constraints. GIS facilitated the analysis of existing conditions and various plan alternatives.

The integrity of the General Plan depends upon an objective and realistic analysis of data and statistics. Correct data interpretation is needed to provide an accurate picture of the City and an understanding of the causes of trends, patterns, problems, and opportunities. Data-based assumptions were made about the City's growth. Findings were made about the consequences of pursuing various courses of action. These assumptions and findings led to the recommendation of a "preferred general plan" and its ultimate adoption by the Municipal Council.

Analyzing Causes and Effects

Solving urban problems is difficult, requiring great political will. However, having the will to make tough choices is only half of the equation. Integrity, courage, and an open mind are also required to evaluate the causes and effects of problems and their solutions. People often jump to conclusions because they are misinformed or because it is popular and, therefore, politically expedient. Unless the causes and effects of problems and solutions can be properly understood and community support

generated to resolve them, we are treating symptoms, not curing problems. Therefore, it is imperative that findings are based on verifiable evidence or research data.

Formulating Potential Solutions and Drafting Alternative Plans

In this stage of the general plan process, solutions were formed which focused on changes needed to reach goals and objectives. Proposed solutions were based on data, community values, and priorities. At this point the process began to repeat itself, as the causes and effects of potential solutions were analyzed to make sure they were consistent with the data. These solutions, along with goals and objectives, were prioritized according to need and budget limitations.

Adopting the Plan

Working with the Task Force 2000 and neighborhood chairpersons, alternative plans were prepared. City departmental staffs reviewed the alternatives and made their own plans and recommendations to coordinate with land use proposals as well as the goals and policies of the Task Force. This process involved further refinements to the General Plan. Another series of community meetings was held throughout the city to present the draft recommendations to the public and to seek public comments. After further refinements, a draft was submitted to the Planning Commission in April, 1997. The Commission's recommendation was forwarded to the Council in May, 1997. The Council held four public meetings and, on August 26, 1997, adopted Resolution 1997-085 to adopt the Provo City General Plan.

2002-2004 General Plan Update

Subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan, a number of amendments were approved upon application through the process established. The Comprehensive Update to the General Plan was initiated in the summer of 2002 in accordance with the Title 15 requirement for a comprehensive update every five years. Meetings and open houses were conducted with neighborhood chairs and area council representatives, with solicitation of public input to the update. Following a series of seven public hearings before the Planning Commission on April 23, May 14, June 4, June 11, June 25, July 9 and August 6, 2003, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommended General Plan text and maps to the Municipal Council.

Public hearings were conducted before the Municipal Council on December 9 and December 16, 2003, and January 6, January 20, February 3 and February 17, 2004, followed by a series of working study sessions between the Council and staff and additional public meetings on June 15, 2004, and September 21, 2004. The Council approved a motion during the September 21, 2004, public hearing to adopt the text of the General Plan; the public hearing for the maps related to the General Plan was continued to October 19, 2004. Following public comment during the October 19 public hearing on the plan's transportation map, Council continued further discussion of the maps. Following a public hearing on November 9, 2004, the Municipal Council adopted Resolution No. 2004-109 adopting the General Plan, including the General Plan Map and other related maps, but retained the most recently adopted Major and Local Street Plan Map, with work on the transportation element to be ongoing. Any subsequently approved amendments to the Plan are herein acknowledged.

2009 General Plan Update

A comprehensive update to the General Plan, as required by Section 15.17.040(3), Provo City Code, was initiated in March 2009. A public open house was held on March 17, 2009, to initiate the update process. The open house provided information on the purpose of the update, provided a timetable for the update process, and instructed the public on how to provide public comment and input.

A series of meetings with the Community Development Staff and Neighborhood Chairs were held to facilitate their involvement and participation in the process. Initial public input was accepted through July. A draft proposal was presented by Community Development to the administration at the end of July and beginning of August, 2009. Another public open house was held on August 26, 2009, that presented the draft recommended changes to the public. Additional public input on the draft recommended updates was accepted through September 14, 2009. A General Plan study meeting with the Planning Commission was held on September 9 and a final copy of the draft update was reviewed by the Planning Commission on September 23, 2009, which the Commission recommended to the City Council for approval.

City Council study meetings held on November 3 and 17 were held that allowed staff to present the draft changes in addition to Council discussion of the proposed changes. On December 1, 2009, the Council held a public hearing on the General Plan update and made a series of motions to adopt specific changes to the Planning Commission recommended plan. These changes were presented to the Council on December 15, 2009 and the General Plan was subsequently approved by the Council by Resolution No. 2009-98.

At the January 19, 2010 Council Study Meeting wherein the Council voted to reconsider the Resolution No. 2009-98, that had adopted the 2009 General Plan update, and continued the reconsideration to the March 16, 2010. At the March 16, 2010 Council Meeting the Council again continued the reconsideration to April 20 wherein it was continued again to July 20 and then again to August 3, 2010. On August 3, 2010 Council Meeting, the Council approved the General Plan updates by Resolution No.2010-85.