

Chapter Six

Land Use

Purpose	page 6-2
Relationship between the General Plan Map and Land Use Element	page 6-2
Relationship between Land Use Policies and Zoning	page 6-3
Urban Growth	page 6-4
General Plan Designations	page 6-6
Zoning and Development Policy Changes	page 6-7
Key Land Use Policies	page 6-12
How to Use these Policies	page 6-12
Neighborhood Structure in Relation to Land Use Policies	page 6-12
Key Land Use Policies by Area Council and Neighborhood	page 6-12
Central Area Neighborhoods	page 6-12
Central Business District ❖ Dixon ❖ East Bay ❖ Franklin ❖	
Franklin South ❖ Joaquin ❖ Maeser ❖ North Park ❖ Timp	
Northeast Area Neighborhoods	page 6-35
Edgemont ❖ Indian Hills ❖ North Timpview ❖	
Rock Canyon ❖ Sherwood Hills	
Northwest Area Neighborhoods	page 6-37
Carterville ❖ Grandview North ❖ Grandview South ❖	
Riverbottoms ❖ Rivergrove ❖ Riverside	
Southeast Area Neighborhoods	page 6-41
Foothills ❖ Oak Hills ❖ Pleasant View ❖ Provost ❖	
Provost South ❖ Spring Creek ❖ University ❖ Wasatch	
Southwest Area Neighborhoods	page 6-50
Fort Utah ❖ Lakeview North ❖ Lakeview South ❖	
Lakewood ❖ Provo Bay ❖ Sunset	
Additional Tools for Urban Growth and Land Use	page 6-58
Annexation Policy Plan	page 6-58
Project Redevelopment Option	page 6-63
Specific Development Plans	page 6-65

Purpose

The Land Use Element establishes policies regarding urban growth, annexation, General Plan Map designations, and key land use policies for individual neighborhoods and groups of neighborhoods within Area Councils. The Land Use section is organized:

- to plan for sufficient land for residential, industrial, commercial and public uses;
- to appropriately locate land uses in order to enhance community character;
- to preserve important natural resources and sensitive lands; and
- to enable the City to efficiently ensure that adequate municipal services are provided.

This element of the Plan – in conjunction with other chapters of this Plan – provides a guide to the future use of undeveloped land, to the use and maintenance of the built environment, and to the redevelopment and in-fill policies where the existing built environment no longer makes the best use of a limited resource in Provo: land. This element helps to define the neighborhoods' visions for changes that may occur within their boundaries and for preventing changes that they feel may threaten their neighborhoods. It provides a framework for use by policy makers, commissions, and City staff, to assist in the evaluation of land development proposals and the legislation that guides land use in Provo.

As it is difficult to include informal visioning documents as part of the General Plan policies, some of this information will be placed on file in the City Recorder's Office. While not a part of the adopted General Plan, these statements can provide a useful reference to Plan users.

Relationship between the General Plan Map and Land Use Element

The General Plan Land Use Map is not intended to be used as a stand-alone reference. The neighborhood policies in this chapter are intended to be used in conjunction with the map. Where there seems to be a discrepancy between the two, the written policies are generally considered to carry the stronger weight.

At times, however, what appears to be a discrepancy between the map designation and written policy is an intentional choice about policies related to a particular parcel or area. Where there may be significant issues related to the use of property, the General Plan Land Use Map may carry a more restrictive designation than implied by the written policy. If the written policy is intended to govern a specific use of that land, and that use does not occur, the more restrictive map designation should then govern the intent of policies applying to this land.

In some cases, a map designation serves as a “flag” to put prospective purchasers, land developers, and City representatives on notice that there may be physical limitations or hazards associated with development of these lands. These are often found in the areas designated as Developmentally Sensitive (DS), described further in Chapter 9 Environment, although a parcel's location outside the DS boundaries cannot be taken as assurance that similar characteristics do not exist on that property. Any lands with specific characteristics, whether located within this generally defined DS boundary or outside the boundary, will be subject to the Sensitive Lands ordinance of Title 15.

Likewise, the broad-brush application of the DS map designations does not, in itself, indicate that a specific parcel of land within this boundary is not suitable for development – or even that there will be problems associated with the development of a specific area within or comprising one parcel or multiple parcels. It does indicate a higher likelihood that additional studies may be required prior to determining whether the land can or should be developed. It also indicates a higher likelihood that special requirements and restrictions may apply to any development that is approved on at least some portion of these lands.

Existing zoning designations govern the current and continued use of land currently lying within Provo City limits until a change in land use is approved through the rezoning of property. Written policies in this element provide additional insight and guidance for evaluating proposals for changes in the land use of some of these areas. This relationship is explained in greater detail, below.

Relationship between Land Use Policies and Zoning

Land use designations on the General Plan Land Use Map are often not indicative of the current zoning on the land and may or may not be clearly indicative of an appropriate zoning for future use. The Council may use discretion in determining the most appropriate zone district in relation to the guidance available.

Zoning is legislation that regulates the use and development of property. Where zoning exists, the General Plan Map designation does not change current zone regulations. If there are special use provisions under a zone, such as uses that may be approved conditionally based on certain evaluation factors, the General Plan Map designation may be reflective of issues that should be considered in approving or disapproving a conditional use. The written policies of this element are consulted in the analysis of such proposals, but with consideration for the uses and the development parameters of the current zone applied to the property.

General Plan Map designations and General Plan policies included in this element may strongly influence requests for changes in the zoning of property. The rezoning of property is a legislative act that amends the Zoning Map, which is an integral part of Title 14 Zoning of the Provo Municipal Code. As a change in the zone district attached to property is a change in policy, the General Plan is an appropriate tool to serve as guidance for the appropriate long-term use of that property and will be consulted as an advisory document in the decision-making process. This is further discussed in Chapter 2 Administration of the General Plan.

The Provo Municipal Council has maintained a policy that proposed changes in zoning that do not comply with the recommendations of the General Plan will be considered only after making a decision on an application to amend the General Plan. The Council's intent is that the General Plan should be substantially reliable as a guide to land use to those who may reside in an area or who may be considering purchasing or investing in an area of the city affected by certain plan policies. A significant change warrants review of the General Plan as a guide for the area so that the change in permitted land use – granted through the change in zoning – is evaluated for its broader impacts to the future of Provo.

General Plan land use map designations are, however, more general or more specific depending on areas of the city and the level of concern over specific parcels of property. These differences may be influenced by the density of the area, the special character of an area, a development aspect unique to a parcel, or some other concern that warrants a greater level of specificity in defining land use boundaries. For this reason, there may be times when the Council will use its discretion in determining that a parcel complies with the generalized boundary of a recommended land use designation, or with the overall guiding principles of the General Plan, and may make zoning decisions without the requirement for a General Plan amendment.

Urban Growth

Provo's population growth, and the resulting demands for growth in the built environment, continue at a steady rate. Much of Provo is developed, with limited areas for new construction (particularly east of I-15). Redevelopment (replacing or rehabilitating existing development) and infill development (making use of confined parcels of land surrounded by existing development) are useful tools in these areas for meeting the City's current and expanding needs for housing, businesses, schools, medical facilities, recreational spaces and other uses. These tools may include adaptive reuse of existing buildings and lands, particularly where historic resources contribute character to the city, or the replacement of homes and commercial buildings that no longer make the best use of available land. In some cases, this may involve an increase in housing density. In other cases, it may involve providing homes with amenities that appeal to today's families.

Provo is not an unbounded plain with limitless development potential as are some communities. Physical geography has already set definite limits on growth. The Wasatch Range blocks the city's growth to the east, and Utah Lake blocks it to the west and southwest. Orem and Springville block growth to the north and south, though there are still some areas within Provo's influence that can be annexed to Provo.

Provo is a mature city with an established infrastructure. The threat of runaway growth outpacing the ability to provide municipal services is not as great as many of the newly expanding, high growth communities. Nevertheless, it becomes necessary and desirable to set some limits or benchmarks for growth. The City must balance demands for development of privately owned land and cost efficiency in meeting the needs of developed land for water, sewer, storm drainage, flood protection, fire protection, police services, street construction and maintenance, and other aspects of public support for the City's residents and businesses. In-fill development may be more timely and appropriate, in comparison to developing new areas and converting agricultural lands to new residential development, in order to provide for logical growth of the built environment and control of costs to taxpayers for expansion of municipal services. In Provo, those constraints on new growth are important on the mountainous bench areas to the east and on the agricultural lands of west Provo.

The 5200-foot elevation from mean sea level is generally considered to be the approximate boundary for urban development along the eastern benches of the city. This corresponds roughly

with the Questar Gas easement which traverses the city. A system of trails for recreation and access to the canyons is being developed along the easements and service roads through this area, and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail is envisioned to someday provide nearly continuous trail access from Logan to Spanish Fork along the ancient “shoreline” of the Wasatch Front. Efforts should be made to ensure that public access to these trails and canyons is maintained where new development can be supported and well integrated with this transitional boundary.

But for the most part, lands above these elevations become too steep for development (usually 25 percent slope and greater) and are fraught with geologic hazards and natural drainageways that should not be disturbed. Slopes of 30 percent or greater are restricted from development by the Sensitive Lands ordinance of Title 14 Zoning. These areas are designated as Developmentally Sensitive (DS) in the General Plan. Providing services to these areas brings inordinate costs or, in some cases, is simply impossible. Residents in these areas may be at risk because of the natural hazards and the City’s limited capability to provide services to these areas. The DS designation and related physical constraints of the land are further discussed in Chapter 9 Environment.

The natural boundary to urban growth on the west side corresponds roughly with the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) definition of the “AE” flood zone, as defined on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). Policies intended to ensure that infrastructure for development can be extended in a logical manner without “leap-frogging” (expanding to non-contiguous properties by jumping over undeveloped land and areas without municipal services) will continue to influence decisions about the use of agricultural lands and properties along the shoreline of Utah Lake within the foreseeable future. These areas include those designated as Developmentally Sensitive (DS) in the General Plan. These policies are also appropriate to consider for areas within the Agricultural land use designation and may even be appropriate when rezoning land (actions within the short term for immediate development) within areas designated to develop for Residential use within the longer-term planning horizon.

To be a truly “sustainable community,” the demands on our natural and man-made resources should be in balance with the ability of those resources to be replenished. This does not mean that the City needs to create some kind of closed or self-sufficient ecological system. It does mean that the City needs to wisely use the resources it has, conserving where necessary and replenishing where possible. Having a strong agricultural base may become extremely important to the city if normal inter-urban or interstate lines of transportation are disrupted, if weather conditions adversely affect major agricultural suppliers, or if the supply of fossil fuels is suddenly disrupted.

The protection of some rural, natural, and even “wild” places in urban areas is something Provo’s residents seek, almost as a refuge from the urbanization taking place all around us. Many communities that have set out to preserve significant open spaces on their periphery, and to guide development into more compact urban corridors, have found that their communities have become even more attractive places to live and work. Many high-tech companies gravitate to those types of communities for the quality of life.

General Plan Designations

Table 6.1 General Plan Land Use Designations shows the names and acronyms of the land use designations as used on the General Plan Land Use Map. It also shows the zoning districts which may be allowed in the various land use designations. When property is annexed to the city, the property annexed is zoned to the lowest density or intensity zone allowed under that land use designation.

For order of lowest to highest density or intensity of zones, please refer to Table 6.1 General Plan Land Use Designations.

TABLE 6.1 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS	
Designation	Zones
Developmentally Sensitive (DS)	A1.40 when annexing to Provo City. Lands currently within City limits retain their current zoning designations, but are designated as DS on the City General Plan Map to denote the need for additional studies to determine if lands can or should support new development or redevelopment.
Agricultural (A)	A1.40, A1.20, A1.10, A1.5, A1.1, and RA
Residential (R)	R1.20, R1.15, R1.10, R1.9, R1.8, R1.7, R1.6, RC, RM, R2, R2.5, R3, R4, R5, SDP1, SDP2, and PRO-R or PRO-A
Public Facilities (PF)	PF
Commercial (C)	SSC, PO, SC1, SC2, SC3, CA, EBD , CG, MP, CM, PIC, and PRO-C
Industrial (I)	FI, PIC, M1, and M2
Mixed-Use (M)	PRO and future zoning districts tailored for this designation
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	ITOD and future zoning districts tailored for this designation
Downtown Planning Area (D)	CBD and future zoning districts tailored for this designation
Airport Related Activities (AR)	PIC, M1 and future zoning districts tailored for this designation

Using the above General Plan Land Use Designations in Table 6.1, Table 6.2 Acres of General Plan Land Use Designations shows the acres of land for each category as proposed on the General Plan Map.

TABLE 6.2 ACRES OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS		
Designation	Acres without Seven Peaks Annexation	Acres with Seven Peaks Annexation
Agricultural (A)	9,508 (36.4%)	16,734 (50.2%)
Residential (R)	8,748 (33.5%)	8,748 (26.2%)
Public Facilities (PF)	3,594 (13.8%)	3,594 (10.8%)
Commercial (C)	821 (3.1%)	821 (2.5%)
Industrial (I)	1,651 (6.3%)	1,651 (5.0%)
Mixed-Use (M)	528 (2.0%)	528 (1.6%)
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	350 (1.3%)	350 (1.0%)
Downtown Planning Area (D)	268 (1%)	268 (0.8%)
Airport Related Activities (AR)	651 (2.5%)	651 (2%)
Total	26,120	33,345

Provo City Community Development Department

The Developmentally Sensitive (DS) Overlay described on page 2 is overlaid on 39.8% of General Plan designations within and without the City, not including the Seven Peaks Disconnection Area.

Zoning and Development Policy Changes

Issues

This element goes beyond managing projected growth. It seeks to address several major issues the community is currently facing. The plan sets forth goals, objectives, and specific actions to deal with these issues. Refinements in overall build-out have been modified downward as a result of the scarcity of developable land, politically unacceptable changes in the quality of life, and the adequacy of public facilities. This plan is shaped by the following key issues.

Protecting Viable One-Family Neighborhoods, while Meeting the Need for Affordable Owner-Occupied Housing

Past City policies of rezoning older neighborhoods for multifamily housing created a hodgepodge of densities in some central city neighborhoods. Potential home owners have to compete with outside investors who are willing to pay duplex, triplex, and fourplex prices for homes. As a result, these once affordable homes are being priced outside the reach of most home buyers. Families feel high density zoning leaves them unprotected by the City. Many families are moving from central neighborhoods because they do not want to live or invest in unstable, congested, and declining areas. Property maintenance is declining while crime is increasing. This cycle is being reversed with recent changes that are helping to help stabilize this situation.

Apartment Licensing was started in 2003 and is starting to make a difference. The object of apartment licensing is to make sure all rentals are legal, safe, and have sufficient parking. Zoning verification is part of the licensing process, and this is identifying units that were illegally, and often unsafely, created. Landlords must also provide the name of a responsible agent within 20 miles of the rental, which helps with any enforcement issues. In the end, legal and safe rentals make things better for renters, as well as for home homeowners, both of whom reside in the same neighborhood.

NeighborWorks of Provo, Provo Housing Authority, and the Central Neighborhood Revitalization Coordinating Committee (CNRCC) and the Neighborhood Coordinating Committee (NCC) have combined forces and are working with the Redevelopment Agency to provide new and refurbished housing units for families desiring to stay in, or move to, the Pioneer neighborhoods. Residents of these neighborhoods have also made a positive difference by working with the Community Oriented Policing (COP) program and by forming Neighborhood Watch organizations.

These efforts are augmented by the Pride in Provo (PIP) program. PIP looks to build on previous efforts, while highlighting all the good things that are in the Pioneer neighborhoods. PIP aims to attract reinvestment by making these neighborhoods more marketable and desirable to live in. PIP will mirror other “Healthy Neighborhood” initiatives that have sprung up around the United States.

In addition to the Pioneer neighborhoods, other neighborhoods are also struggling and have requested that home buyer assistance programs be made available outside the current boundaries for these programs. Some neighborhoods have also chosen to limit the number of unrelated individuals that may reside together as a family unit in a dwelling that is limited to family occupancy (in contrast to batching singles occupancy, usually intended to serve students who are often unrelated but reside together as house-mates). The residents of the neighborhoods that have “opted in” to this occupancy provision hope this will remove the incentive for off-site investors to create new rentals within neighborhood dwellings.

Finally, the decision by BYU to limit where, in Provo, BYU will approve off-campus housing

will help to ensure that family-occupancy condominium developments and homes lying outside the new BYU boundary will actually be marketed to families. The occupancy of these homes by students has led to significant and ongoing issues with the enforcement of occupancy limitations and parking, as these units are often more spacious and intended for larger families that can legally increase the numbers of individuals living in the home due to the relationships and relative ages of the residents. These units typically have parking more in character with two adults of driving age, perhaps with younger family members who would not impact the available parking.

Finding Ways to Reduce the Exponential Growth of Automobile Traffic

In many neighborhoods, the number of vehicle trips made by households exceeds national averages. Provo's development pattern has historically segregated land use activities, causing reliance on the automobile. Since most of the development pattern in Provo is set, automobile reliance probably will not change significantly unless area specific plans are adopted and implemented that facilitate reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). However, in developing and redeveloping areas, changes in development patterns could help decrease automobile traffic. Throughout the city, much can be done to encourage pedestrian travel, bicycle usage, and other forms of transportation.

The greatest benefit in automobile trip reduction may be expected in the areas of commuter traffic for reaching locations of employment or to access major educational institutions, such as Brigham Young University (Provo, located in Utah County), Utah Valley State College (Orem, located in Utah County) and the University of Utah (Salt Lake City, located in Salt Lake County), and possibly even to Weber State University (Ogden, located in Weber County). Secondary benefits are expected in the use of new transit options to access sporting events, entertainment opportunities, and cultural events in the Wasatch Front region, as well as religious conferences or other special events that draw large numbers of people throughout the region.

These transit trips may be made by Provo residents accessing locations within Provo or elsewhere along the Wasatch Front or may be made by residents of other areas coming to Provo. While transit users may be the greatest beneficiaries of improved transit, reduced traffic will also benefit automobile travelers using Interstate 15 and other arterial and major collector streets and will further improve the efficiency of transit modes (buses, van pools) using these travelways.

Downtown Planning Area

See Central Business District Neighborhood Goals and Policies.

Transit-Oriented Development

Commuter-Rail Transit (CRT) is under construction and is expected to be completed by 2012. Additionally, Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) is currently being studied for a proposed route between the planned Orem Intermodal Center and Utah Valley University to the Novell Campus and future Southgate Commercial Area in Provo via a route that connects University Mall, Brigham Young University, Downtown Provo, Provo Towne Centre and Provo's Intermodal Center amongst other stops. This route holds great potential to combine transit ridership and higher-

density residential and commercial development in a development pattern known as Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) that may hold Provo's greatest opportunity to decrease local and regional vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion. The Mountain Lands Association of Governments – who helps facilitate regional transportation planning – has indicated that this BRT line may be upgraded to light-rail in the future if the line proves successful and potential ridership increases.

The recent enactment of a transit-oriented development zone around the intermodal center sets the stage for this development pattern. Future TOD areas may be carefully planned and tailored for selected bus-rapid transit station areas, such as Provo Towne Centre Mall, Downtown, the South Campus Planning Area and the Plumtree/Brent Brown Automotive area. Special attention should be given to each TOD plan and regulating zone to:

1. Determine the appropriate mix and intensity of residential and commercial development to be centered around future BRT stations.
2. Be cognizant of creating an appropriate transition from BRT stations to established neighborhoods through the use of transitional zoning standards in building form, mass and scale.
3. Define the desired urban form with emphasis on enhancing the pedestrian scale and relationship to the planned environment through carefully articulated form and design standards.
4. Enhance transit ridership through carefully cited retail locations, civic and open spaces and density.
5. Reduce the need for parking and automobile ownership.
6. Enhance additional alternative transit modes to CRT/BRT such as pedestrian, bicycle and bike and car-sharing facilities.

Transit-Oriented Planning Areas are identified on the General Plan Land Use map as TOD.

Mixed-Use Development Areas

Occasionally areas within the General Plan call out mixed-use (commercial and residential) development areas. Some of these areas are not within or adjacent to future CRT/BRT areas, and have limited access to alternative transit options such as bus and bike facilities. Therefore, not being transit-oriented, these areas should not have drastic reductions in parking and automobile facilities. However, these mixed-use planning areas, like TOD, should:

1. Determine the appropriate mix and intensity of residential and commercial development to be centered around future determined neighborhood centers.
2. Be cognizant of creating an appropriate transition from neighborhood centers to established neighborhoods through the use of transitional zoning standards in building form, mass and scale.
3. Define the desired urban form with emphasis on enhancing the pedestrian scale and relationship to the planned environment through carefully articulated form and design standards.
4. Enhance transit ridership, where available, through carefully cited retail locations, civic and open spaces and density.

5. Enhance additional alternative transit modes such as local bus service, pedestrian, bicycle and bike and car-sharing facilities.

Within newly developing areas, careful attention to placement of housing types, commercial and public services, and employment, in relation to each other and in relation to key transportation corridors, help to reduce the resulting need for excessive automotive trips. Throughout the city, much can be done to encourage walking and bicycling as a means to access transit and for travel independent of transit.

A review of current development trends, established zoning boundaries that allows new development or expanded development to occur, and possible changes in zoning boundaries and development regulations to protect land from inappropriate or poorly timed development may help to ensure the successful implementation of commuter rail and other transit options utilizing the intermodal station.

Protecting Historic Neighborhood Character

The mix of land uses, density, and design within a neighborhood affects that neighborhood's character. Historically significant design themes should be preserved through rehabilitation and protection of significant existing properties. New construction should be compatible with existing design themes in an area. Provo City's Design Review Committee is raising the level of awareness of design issues, and quality projects are being constructed as a result of this awareness. The Landmarks Commission is identifying properties worthy of preservation, finding ways to provide preservation incentives, and protecting historic properties.

Promoting Safe Development, Promoting Open Space Preservation, and Protecting Public Access to Recreational Areas in the Foothills

When the City cannot provide fire protection or garbage collection in steep bench areas; when homes are literally crumbling apart because of subsidence, landslides, and fault displacement; when grading of hillside areas damages the integrity of off-site views; or when private development interests are allowed to block public access to canyons, trails, and the mountains, hillside development has gone too far. Current policies regarding hillside development should be re-evaluated and strengthened to avoid these problems.

Increasing the Tax Base through Commercial Development

Residential development requires more services than paid for through property taxes and user fees. This is also true of many institutional land uses, such as churches and schools. To offset this, new opportunities to provide revenue-producing commercial and industrial uses, or to revitalize old uses, need to be found. Provo City should be a "full service" community, providing consumer choices and convenient shopping opportunities.

Replacing and/or Consolidating Neighborhood Plans Adopted Since 1977

Lacking resources to revise the 1977 General Plan, the City adopted neighborhood plans. They were substitutes for a comprehensive general plan and filled policy voids. The neighborhood plans resulted in an amalgam of policies, codes, and requirements, that proved cumbersome to

administer and difficult to interpret. Since that time, Provo City has worked with many stakeholders to provide a more comprehensive General Plan. The creation of that General Plan in 1997 provided one document, ensuring consistency within the document and with overall citywide needs. The comprehensive update to the plan, adopted in 2004, addressed changing needs and circumstances in a number of these neighborhoods, but through a comprehensive, citywide planning process.

For a discussion regarding the population and demographic characteristics of Provo City, please see Chapter 3, Population.

Key Land Use Policies

How to Use these Policies

This element of the General Plan is intended to be used in conjunction with the General Plan Land Use Map. The relationship between the General Plan written policies and land use map and the relationship between zoning and land use designation are explained earlier in this chapter. Additional vision statements submitted by neighborhood chairs, while not a part of this adopted plan, are on file in the City Recorder's Office as a resource. These were difficult to fully incorporate into the General Plan policies, given the level of review conducted with the invitation to provide this input to the General Plan. Yet, these statements may provide valuable insight and an understanding of the character of these neighborhoods and the desires and expectations of the people who have worked to ensure that their neighborhoods will be desirable places to live and work in the years to come.

Neighborhood Structure in Relation to Land Use Policies

The City is divided into 34 neighborhoods within five area neighborhood councils. Map # 6.4 Provo City Neighborhoods Map shows the 34 neighborhood boundaries. Map # 6.5 General Plan Map shows the General Plan land use designations for all of Provo. Area Neighborhood Council Maps for the various area neighborhood councils can be found in the map document accompanying the General Plan with its land use designations (Maps # 6.6 to 6.10). They include the Central Area Neighborhood Council, Northeast Area Neighborhood Council, Northwest Area Neighborhood Council, Southeast Area Neighborhood Council, and the Southwest Area Neighborhood Council.

Land Use Policies by Area Council and Neighborhood

Central Area Neighborhood Council Map # 6.6

The Central Area Neighborhood Council consists of nine neighborhoods. They include the Central Business District, Dixon, East Bay, Franklin, Franklin South, Joaquin, Maeser, North Park, and Timp. Five of those neighborhoods are defined as Pioneer Neighborhoods; they are Dixon, Franklin, Joaquin, Maeser, and Timp. The Pioneer Neighborhoods are being targeted for neighborhood conservation by protecting one-family structures. By protecting these homes, the

City hopes that the real estate market will stabilize so these homes will be preserved for residential uses and to make it possible and desirable for greater numbers of families to move back into these neighborhoods.

Key policies for the Central Area Council are listed below, with policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Central Area neighborhoods, followed by policies of specific importance.

Central Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals:

The following policies and goals are considered to be shared, to some degree, by all of the Central Area neighborhoods and apply in addition to the policies listed individually for each neighborhood:

1. Residents in the Central Residential Area strongly support establishing and encouraging healthy neighborhoods where residents and property owners live and invest their time, energy, and money because they are family friendly and because financial investment makes economic sense. City policies and daily administrative actions must strongly support, respect and encourage family friendly neighborhoods and investment in new and existing single family homes. The City's overriding focus in Central Residential Area neighborhoods is to increase owner-occupancy and balance the owner/renter occupancy ratio in Central Residential Area neighborhoods through:
 - a. Increasing owner-occupancy, and
 - b. establishing the one-family dwelling as the principal residential use except in areas designated for higher-density, campus-oriented redevelopment in the Joaquin South Campus Planning Area, the Central Business District zone, Transit-Oriented Development zones and areas identified as Transit Oriented Development, Downtown Planning Area or Mixed-Use on the General Plan Map.
2. Within Central Residential Area neighborhoods the City must continue to strongly support and participate in revitalization programs such as, but not limited to:
 - a. Neighbor works' Provo activities;
 - b. purchase rehabilitation projects;
 - c. neighborhood projects such as Plant Your Heart Out and Paint Your Heart Out; and
 - d. loan programs that encourage owner occupancy.
3. Ensure responsible management of non-resident owned properties through enforcement of the Rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance. Occupancy and parking challenges should be addressed in one or more ways, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. continue to enforce the occupancy and parking requirements of the rental dwelling business license ordinance;
 - b. relieve on-street parking shortages that negatively impact residents and property owners;
 - c. evaluate the effectiveness of the rental dwelling business licensing in reducing

- over-occupancy and ensuring that sufficient on-site parking is provided for each vehicle operated and maintained by residents of a rental dwelling;
- d. investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing a parking permit program, by neighborhood;
 - e. effectively enforce RDL and parking permit programs as may be adopted by the Municipal Council; and
 - f. adopt fees that reflect administrative costs.
 - i. Fees should be sufficient to cover the cost of program anagement and enforcement to avoid burdening taxpayers with the cost of administering rental dwelling licensing and parking permit programs, as well as others.
 - ii. Privatizing parking enforcement should be considered to reduce costs and achieve greater effectiveness in program management.
4. Strengthen and enhance the Community Oriented Policing, mobile watch, and neighborhood watch programs, to increase crime awareness, provide key contact people and a process for reporting crime concerns, and to educate neighbors in neighborhood safety. Report back to the neighborhoods and maintain a responsive relationship between law enforcement and citizens.
 5. Pedestrian-friendly design is strongly encouraged to achieve standards of “livability” within urban corridors, with special concern for safety aspects of collector streets for pedestrians and bicyclists, including children using these corridors to access schools, parks, libraries and community-oriented commercial services.
 6. Integrity in architecture is strongly urged for any new development or redevelopment; the styles that exist may vary between neighborhoods and within sections of a neighborhood.
 7. Consider development proposals, submitted through the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO), against the back-drop of the community goals to promote homeowner-occupancy, but also with consideration for the character and general scale of housing on surrounding and nearby properties. Projects should reflect the type of housing and architectural style of the surrounding neighborhood and be compatible with the density of the neighborhood. The benefits of redevelopment should be weighed against the current use of the property in order to achieve the most desirable result, but not as a substitute for good maintenance of existing uses through responsible property management and enforcement of the rental dwelling business licensing requirements.
 8. Ensure that businesses operate within the zoning laws, continuing enforcement efforts to prevent encroachment of business activities into residential areas and limiting impacts such as noise, light, pollution, odors, and hazards from outdoor business activities.
 9. Monitor and enforce truck routes for businesses that impact neighborhoods with illegal truck routing, stacking and standing. Continue to improve infrastructure to provide appropriate and adequate street access for trucking, as an alternative to unsatisfactory routes through residential areas.
 10. The need for social service clients to reside near public transit or within walking distance of social service agency offices, places of employment and shopping is acknowledged; yet there is concern with concentrating special populations within a particular neighborhood and the possible inequitable burden placed on a neighborhood’s residents as a result of this concentration of high-impact residents.

11. Plan for the integration of the future intermodal transportation center located at 650 South between 200 West and University with multiple public transit and trip reduction options. These options are anticipated to include local bus service, regional express bus service, bus rapid transit (BRT), and commuter rail transit (CRT), with parking and support facilities for these and other trip-reduction measures, such as RideShare (program for car-pooling and van-pooling), taxi-services, bicycle facilities, greyhound bus, car rental and Amtrak service.
 - a. Planning efforts will need to anticipate:
 - i. street access to and from the intermodal station for buses, automobiles, bicycles and pedestrians (including those needing wheelchair or other specialized access); and
 - ii. sufficient areas for train passenger loading platforms, internal circulation of buses and automobiles, passenger drop-off and pick-up, pedestrian circulation and ticketing facilities, and automobile and bicycle parking.
 - b. Relationship to the railroad corridor will be key for resolving access and efficiency issues. Anticipated area based on Utah Transit Authority (UTA) projections is eight acres, with parking for approximately 800 cars. Transit modes may be phased in over a period of time, starting with commuter rail transit, bus service and park-and-ride facilities, expanding at a later time to incorporate other facilities.
 - c. Design criteria for integrating new commuter rail lines into the community should seek to mitigate visual and noise impacts to neighboring residential properties (for existing development and to encourage future transit-oriented housing).
12. Plan for appropriate transit-oriented redevelopment (TOD), to focus new development and redevelopment along transit corridors, with (a) appropriate residential densities to support transit use, (b) mixing of uses to reduce the need for vehicle trips, and (C) efficient use of infrastructure, in such a way as to further support a reduced reliance on individual automobile trips.
 - a. Facility and neighborhood planning and design should encourage walking and bicycling as a means to access transit and for travel independent of transit.
 - b. Consider changes in zoning that may be needed to:
 - i. encourage appropriate land use development or redevelopment compatible with future intermodal plans, and
 - ii. discourage development under the current zones where those developments may conflict with the City's abilities to establish an intermodal station and supporting development and infrastructure.
13. Plan for new street connections to open up large blocks of land that have inadequate access for good development or redevelopment:
 - a. Consider needs related to development of an intermodal station, transit-oriented development and walkable communities, and
 - b. Consider needs related to emergency ingress and egress when at-grade street crossings of railroad tracks are blocked for periods of time.
14. Consider possibilities for grade separation of streets (including pedestrian walkways) and railroad tracks to:

- a. Eliminate access issues, related to trains blocking streets, for buses and automobiles using the intermodal station, and
 - b. Facilitate pedestrian access between the Amtrak station (located north of the railroad tracks on 600 South, east of Freedom Blvd) and the intermodal station, and
 - c. Improve safety and access for other walking and bicycling trips, such as connections between homes north of the tracks and the church located south of the tracks serving the residents of those homes.
15. Work with the railroads to resolve issues impacting neighborhoods and feasibility for transit improvements:
- a. Impacts to traffic related to neighborhood access and related to scheduling of buses traveling to and from the planned intermodal station and providing local bus service; and
 - b. Safety, noise and visual aesthetic issues for existing, new and redeveloped residential and business uses in the vicinity of the intermodal station through facility enhancement of the existing heavy rail lines (such as fencing, landscaping, walkways and bicycle paths) and through operations management related to heavy rail use and switching yards.
 - c. work with UTA and railroad companies to construct quiet zone improvements in conjunction with the construction of commuter rail.
16. Commercial development fronting an arterial or collector road should not be extended beyond existing property lines to include other lots that do not front on an arterial or collector road. The rear yard of a lot fronting on a local street should not be used to extend the depth of a lot used for commercial purposes.
17. Study the feasibility of establishing a transferable development rights (TDR) program to increase owner occupancy in targeted areas. Potential TDR sending and receiving areas should include, but not limited to, the North Joaquin, Interim Transit Oriented Development and Center Street areas, including West Center Street to I-15.
18. Structures originally built for residential use on:
- Center Street: 100 East to 400 East and 600 West to 800 West
 - 500 West: 200 North to 500 North
 - University Avenue: 500 North to 960 North
- should be allowed to retain commercial uses. A feasibility study should be conducted of historic and other aesthetically valuable structures along arterial and collector roads that have been identified for mixed-use and commercial redevelopment to determine costs and viability of their relocation within adjacent neighborhoods as a tool for neighborhood revitalization programs.
19. Freeway-oriented commercial zoning should be initiated for property adjacent to Interstate 15. Planning for the area should identify and implement mechanisms to ensure that frontage properties are developed with adequate street access to the north and south.
20. Center Street, between 500 West and the railroad tracks should be studied and planned to capitalize on the reconstruction of the Interstate 15 Center Street interchange. An analysis of appropriate mixed-use and commercial land uses, densities and other factors should guide the development of any zoning ordinances regulating this area.

Key land use policies for individual neighborhoods within the Central Area Council are listed, below, by neighborhood:

Central Business District Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Establish a Downtown Planning Area to establish new zoning policies based upon the following guidelines:

The Downtown Planning Area is established to direct the creation of future zoning amendments to the area currently zoned Central Business District and its periphery of surrounding residential neighborhoods. Previous General Plan policies have called for a peripheral CBD zone, addressing the need to create an adequate transition from protected low-density areas to regionally centered business towers and envisioned high-density mixed-use development with the existing Provo Central Business District. Additionally, the current CBD zone does not provide the regulations necessary to ensure that future development facilitates a pedestrian friendly, mixed-use regional center as envisioned by stated General Plan goals, related visioning documents and recommendations from professional consultants.

Future amendments to zoning for the Downtown Planning Area will not only focus on appropriate land uses in different locations but seek to establish regulations that will require development to facilitate the envisioned:

- Height and mass of buildings
- Location of buildings and parking, their relationship to each other and to the street in their respective locations
- Architectural and lighting standards
- Street and pedestrian way standards
- Public open space and recreational amenities
- Signage on public and private property
- Housing diversity and types to accommodate various demographic backgrounds and life-cycle stages including higher-income, higher quality housing.

The goal is to provide for more predictability for the design of individual buildings to assemble neighborhood/district centers and environments while increasing the ability to provide for adequate transitions into neighborhoods conserved for one-family dwellings and low-density residential use as envisioned by the General Plan. To facilitate appropriate development for a regional mixed-use downtown in close proximity to protected historic neighborhoods, several new zoning districts should be established. Appropriate sub-districts could also be established if needed. Four planning areas have been identified so far: Transitional Urban, General Urban, Urban Center and West Downtown Gateway.

Transitional Urban

The Transitional Urban Planning Area seeks to provide an appropriate scaled development bridge between protected neighborhoods and high-density downtown developments. This should

be accomplished by reductions in building height and mass, more residentially based architectural standards, increases in setbacks, with uses limited to those that are compatible with the lower-scale nature of the adjacent neighborhood.

General Urban

The General Urban Planning Area, encompassing the traditional area of the Central Business District – including Historic Center Street – seeks to provide a human-scaled pedestrian environment suitable for the majority of the Downtown Planning Area. This planning area’s mixed-use nature is intended to provide housing and business opportunities adjacent to public transit and thereby facilitate increased use of public transit and reduce City-wide traffic and congestion elsewhere. The General Urban Planning Area is characteristic of pedestrian oriented, well-lit streets, ample pedestrian ways, landscaping and attractive, inviting, residential uses, well-maintained shops, stores, offices, with buildings designed to accommodate a mix of uses.

A subdistrict planning area within the General Urban Planning Area for the unique circumstances of Historic Center Street, between 100 East and 500 West should be addressed. Center Street is the historic core of the City’s business and architectural legacy. To preserve the historic integrity and nature of Center Street, zoning regulations should be tailored to be compatible with historic buildings that are targeted for preservation.

Urban Core

The Urban Core should be the identifiable heart of the City with the largest scale of building height, mass and uses. Rather than allow taller, regionally focused development in the entire Downtown Planning Area, these structures should be concentrated to provide a visible and identifiable center to the City. This center should be focused around the key transportation corridors of University Avenue and Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) on 100 West and other existing regionally institutions, such as the district courts, Utah County government facilities, existing and future hotel and convention centers and major office buildings.

Downtown Gateway Planning Area

The area between the Center Street I-15 interchange to 500 West is a gateway into the downtown and should be planned, and ordinances developed, that enhance its supportive role to the downtown. The area needs a comprehensive plan and ordinance tailored to redevelop the area while maintaining appropriate transition to adjacent protected residential neighborhoods.

Goals of the Downtown Planning Area also include:

1. The residential standards in the Downtown Planning Area should promote residential development with mixed uses such as retail and office. Residential development should not be on the ground floors on primary streets, but should be developed on the remaining stories and as ground floor uses on secondary streets. The downtown planning area should require sufficient off-street parking yet should be flexible enough to allow residential development at lower than typical parking ratios. Residential uses are recognized as being essential to providing 24-hour use of the downtown and for providing a strong residential base to support businesses within a walkable community.

2. The Downtown Planning Area should establish location requirements for parking lots and structures for any development so that parking is not immediately adjacent to street frontages. In no case should off-street parking be immediately fronting historic Center Street.
3. The Downtown Planning Area should identify primary streets that should be required to maintain and increase pedestrian oriented activity associated with ground floor commercial uses. Secondary streets should be identified where residential uses are permitted on ground levels.
4. The Downtown Planning Area should be compact, pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use.
5. Ordinary activities of daily living should occur within walking distance of dwellings, allowing independence to those who do not drive.
6. An interconnected network of streets should be designed to disperse and reduce the length of automobile trips. These streets should typically create relatively small blocks that encourage pedestrian walkability.
7. Appropriate building densities and land uses should be provided within walking distance of transit stops, typically within 1/4 to 1/3 of a mile.
8. Civic, institutional, and commercial activity should be embedded in neighborhood centers, not isolated in remote single-use complexes.
9. A range of open space including parks, squares, and playgrounds should be distributed within neighborhoods and urban center zones.
10. Buildings and landscaping should reinforce and define the streets role as a civic and public space for people.
11. Development should adequately accommodate automobiles while respecting the pedestrian and the spatial form of public space.
12. The design of streets and buildings should reinforce safe environments, but not at the expense of accessibility to buildings from the public street.
13. Civic buildings and public gathering places should be provided in locations that reinforce community identity.
14. Civic buildings should be distinctive and play a more prominent role than other buildings in constructing the fabric of the city.

Downtown Specific Action Plan

During the last several years a number of planning studies have been under taken to assess what may be done to revitalize the City's downtown area. Professionals and citizen groups alike have provided very helpful advice, summarized below, regarding the importance of promoting downtown as the center of Utah County, preserving and enhancing the downtown sense of place, and improving traffic, circulation and parking. These recommendations must be further refined in a comprehensive downtown specific action plan that incorporates strategies from former studies and others yet to be determined strategies that can catalyze accelerated downtown redevelopment. Financing strategies, funding resources, prioritization of objectives, property strategies, downtown programing, tourism, patron interface and experiences, retail partnerships as well as attracting key development partners all need to be included as high priorities in a downtown specific action plan. Wherever possible the plan should establish detailed steps, funding resources, and a timetable for action to be taken by the City.

1. Downtown Provo as the County Center. Downtown Provo will continue to function as the financial, civic, cultural, educational, and hospitality center of Utah County. In order to fulfill this role, the City and other stakeholders must continue to promote Downtown for a wide range of purposes including employment, residency, shopping, dining, entertainment, and a variety of special events.

City Strategies:

- Work with UDOT and others to beautify the entrances to the Downtown area through landscaping, signage, decorative entrance features, and rigorous maintenance.
- Continue to encourage and assist Utah County with the development of a new Downtown convention center.
- Promote a variety of opportunities for high-quality Downtown office, retail, other commercial, and residential development through code updates and redevelopment assistance. Emphasize the redevelopment of high profile properties at Downtown gateways such as West Center Street and South University Avenue.
- Support the development of additional hotels adjoining the new convention center.
- Assist the Downtown Business Alliance and the real estate community to aggressively identify and recruit additional dining and specialty retail, focusing on Center Street. Give particular attention to the untapped young adult market.

2. Preserving Downtown's Sense of Place. As the Downtown grows to accommodate many more people, the City must take actions necessary to preserve the distinctive qualities which attract people and distinguish it from other places. Center Street between 500 West and 100 East in particular will maintain this distinctiveness in the form of a very pedestrian-oriented scale of development with well-maintained historic buildings, mature and well-tended landscaping, on-street parking, and a variety of unique dining and shopping opportunities. New Center Street buildings will continue the traditional two-to-four-story scale, located at the right-of-way line, with traditional-style front entries and fenestration. The more intensive office, residential, and other growth necessary to sustain a strong Center-Street-type of environment will take place very close by in the Downtown, on the upper floors of and behind the traditional Center Street buildings and on the predominant streets such as University Avenue and Freedom Boulevard.

City Strategies:

- Work with business owners, the Downtown Alliance and others to establish an ongoing program for increased cleanliness and maintenance of both private properties and the public realm.
- Review, update, and enforce development codes to ensure that they help to encourage, (and do not discourage), the qualities which give Center Street its distinctive character.
- Establish the area around the Covey Center for the Arts as a Downtown arts sub-district.
- Through regulations and incentives, encourage the preservation of historic buildings and building facades, and promote great urban design and architecture through development standards.

- Promote immediate removal of graffiti with a 24 hour hotline.
3. Enhancing Downtown’s Distinctive Sense of Place. Downtown’s long-standing distinctiveness will be enhanced by adding a variety of well-designed new features.

City Strategies:

- Extend decorative street lighting and power outlets for seasonal events beginning with West Center, University Ave., Freedom Blvd., 100 North, and 100 South.
- Install improved wayfinding signage and informational kiosks.
- With other stakeholders, identify the types of community events for which new community gathering space(s) are most needed, and develop outdoor public gathering place(s) suited to these events.
- Encourage a private developer to undertake a landmark-quality interactive water feature, or assist private stakeholders to raise funds for a public water feature at a strategic Downtown location.
- Encourage arts groups to continue to bring public art to Downtown locations, including at public transit stations (jointly with Utah Transit Authority).

4. Circulation and Parking. If not planned for thoughtfully, the intensification of development and traffic which is needed to support a thriving Downtown business district will lead to self-defeating gridlock. In order to avoid this, access to, and circulation within, the central business district must involve a full range of transportation modes: pedestrian, bicycle, public transit (bus rapid transit and busses connecting to commuter rail), truck, and personal motor vehicle. Downtown circulation needs to integrate all of these modes in a balanced system in which transfers between modes are convenient, potential for conflict among modes is mitigated, and the pedestrian experience is enhanced. The City needs to develop a well-rationalized system of on- and off-street vehicular parking. Plans should include more parking structures, strategically placed around the Downtown and governed by operating arrangements which ensure their efficient use.

City Strategies:

- Undertake and implement a multimodal Downtown transportation plan to maximize the level of service on streets and intersections.
- Plan and design Downtown Provo streets as public spaces which are safe for all modes of transportation and which allow flexibility in use.
- Through City capital improvement and regulatory processes, improve the quality and safety of Downtown sidewalks and mandate pedestrian-friendly urban design.
- Develop and carry out a Downtown bicycle plan.
- Work with transit providers to maximize the function, level of service, comfort, and quality of the public transit system serving the Downtown.
- Develop a Downtown parking plan to optimize both the supply and the efficient functioning of parking.

Available Studies

Several assessments, studies and planning exercises have occurred regarding the CBD area that may be of value in developing additional policies, ordinances and tools for the CBD area. These include:

- Pioneer Neighborhood Study (2002)
- Chris Leinberger Assessment (2004)
- Block 70 Charette (2005)
- Economic Research Associates (ERA) Market Analysis (2007)
- Center Focus Downtown Specific Action Plan (2008)
- Randol Mackley Downtown Assessment (2009)

Dixon Neighborhood

Goals of the Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Increase owner-occupancy to build long-term owners by having permanent residents to support community, school and a mixed age of residents.
3. To maintain the architectural integrity we find at the present time. History is important to Provo's unique heritage.
4. Improvement of the two existing schools (Dixon Middle School and Timpanogos Elementary) to meet the demands of new population growth and to replace, or bring up to code, existing structures.
5. Improve the pedestrian-friendly and safety aspects of our neighborhood.
6. Improve and support off-street parking situations.
7. Reduce crime and take steps to have a drug free neighborhood.

Dixon residents envision the neighborhood as being a family-oriented area with healthy family, married and one-family households, residing in one-family dwellings, with or without accessory apartments.

Architectural styles of value, to be reflected in redevelopment projects, include Victorian, Victorian Classic, Modern Victorian, Tudor Revival, bungalow, Salt Box, Post War and Modern Ranch in order to preserve the historic character of the community.

Dixon is one of the Pioneer neighborhoods of Provo and needs to continue the cooperative efforts of the City and other resources, such as the Neighbor works and other eligible non-profits to achieve this goal. The Provo Redevelopment Agency home-buyer assistance programs, the CNRCC and NCC, and other programs should be maintained and others added as they become available in order to accomplish this goal. Residential neighborhoods should be protected from expansion of commercial businesses and manufacturing through careful zoning and strong enforcement.

Key Land Use Policies to achieve the goals of the Dixon Neighborhood

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R).

2. Restrict commercial uses along Center Street from 500 West to 1000 West from extending into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
3. Study the feasibility of placing landscape medians in Center Street from 500 West to 900 West to enhance the proposed design corridor.
4. Study the feasibility of conducting a historic designation survey in the Dixon Neighborhood.
5. Property generally located at 1280 West 220 North owned by the Provo Redevelopment Agency, NeighborWorks of Provo and others, as warranted, should be designated R - Residential on the General Plan Map. Development of this area may include one-family detached, semi-detached (twin homes) or attached (town homes).
6. Commercially and Industrially zoned property on Center Street from the Interstate to 500 West should be designated as part of the Downtown Planning Area on the General Plan Map in order to plan for a future Downtown Gateway zone. Development of this area may include commercial and residential uses.
7. If and when redevelopment of the Fresh Market commercial center – located between 600 West and 500 West Center Street – should occur the plan should provide for a more appropriate transition between commercial and residential uses on 600 West. Loading docks, block walls and other uninviting design is strongly discouraged. Preferentially, residential development should front 600 West.

East Bay Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Restrict the heavy commercial and heavy manufacturing uses from encroaching into the retail shopping areas.
3. Evaluate the Planned Industrial/Commercial Zone to determine whether greater distinction should be drawn between the industrial park development and the commercial development, using East Bay as the foundation for the evaluation. Distinction in principal uses, conditional uses, sign standards and colors, and traffic circulation may be appropriate for greater distinction between the industrial and commercial areas.
4. Evaluate the East Bay covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) for conflicts with the PIC zone language and consider revisions that impact the City's issuance of permits in conformance with City ordinances that may conflict with the East Bay covenants.
5. The Neighborhood Chair will continue to serve on the East Bay Association Board of Directors during the development phase of East Bay and work toward establishing and maintaining long-term, successful businesses in the planned industrial/commercial park.
6. That approximately 60 acres located south of 1860 South and east of the I-15 Freeway be developed as a Regional Shopping Center and zoned SC3. This project should be high quality and consist of retail and professional office uses that will complement the existing East Bay Center and the Provo Towne Centre Mall.
7. Continue to encourage quality development and redevelopment near the Provo Towne Centre Mall, including an attractive, well landscaped frontage along University Avenue, to create a more significant entrance to this vital retail anchor. Uses that complement and support the shopping mall should be actively sought and encouraged. Ordinances should be reviewed for uses that could detract from the long-term success of the Provo Towne

- Centre Mall. Design to facilitate traffic circulation between the mall and these University Avenue businesses should be required during the development process.
8. Continue planning for the intermodal station south of the railroad tracks, and in the area generally located around it to guide future transit-oriented development. These continued planning efforts should also seek to select an appropriate name for the intermodal area that recognizes the past and looks forward to the future.
 9. Consider a study that evaluates development of the East Bay Golf Course for retail and consider relocation of an enhanced golf course elsewhere.

Franklin Neighborhood

Neighborhood Vision, Challenges and Goals

Franklin Neighborhood encompasses the first area permanently settled area in what is now Utah County. This area has been partially preserved in Provo's 4.2-acre Pioneer Park as the original city block from which the rest of Provo was laid out. Franklin is rich in both local history and early architecture and includes Utah's oldest continuously occupied home at 677 West 200 South. Bordered by Center Street and 100 South to the north, Freedom Boulevard to the east, 600 South corridor to the south and I-15 freeway to the west, its residents can easily access a range of educational institutions, shopping, and places of employment by major transportation corridors along 500 West, Center Street, 300 South and I-15 and will have nearby access to future transit opportunities associated with the planned intermodal station in Provo. The Franklin neighborhood's vision is to build upon the value of its central location and historical context for Provo in order to enhance the living environment for its current residents and to attract new residents with a long-term commitment to the neighborhood.

Franklin's challenges are that it is sometimes viewed as “old” rather than “historic.” As of the 2000 Census, its housing was 66% rental and should be a focus of City efforts to reestablish an interest in home ownership and owner occupancy. While residents have ready access to a range of social services, this creates a concentration of residency that can present special challenges that impact the image of the neighborhood – a challenge shared with other Pioneer neighborhoods, as well. The changing population creates special needs for providing educational services in a bilingual community and to create an environment that is supportive of the diverse community. Transportation issues and challenges associated with the use and development of the west Center Street corridor and I-15 interchange will be of continued interest.

Goals of Franklin neighborhood include:

1. Increase home-ownership through financial incentives and rehabilitation efforts;
2. Reduce cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets, appropriate speed limit controls on major corridors, improved pedestrian and bicycling access, and enhanced landscaping from 600 West to 900 West as a tool to calm traffic and enhance the transportation corridor's appeal;
3. Rezone properties for appropriate residential and commercial development and to encourage quality, “new urbanist” mixed-use development in appropriate locations;

4. Establish working groups with all social service agencies to examine their roles in Provo's central neighborhoods with the goals of improved services to those in need and decreased impacts to the living environment;
5. Gain historic designations and landmark status to protect valuable architectural resources within the Franklin neighborhood.

Key Land Use Policies to address challenges and goals of the Franklin Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
3. Restrict commercial uses along Center Street from 600 West to 1100 West from extending into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
4. Study the feasibility of placing landscape medians in Center Street from 500 West to 900 West to enhance the proposed design corridor.
5. Study the feasibility of doing a historic designation survey in the Franklin Neighborhood.
6. Encourage quality mixed use of commercial and residential from 1100 West to the railroad tracks to the west and from the Interstate 15 off-ramp to the north to approximately 250 South to the south. Mixed-use rezoning is also recognized as a tool for redevelopment for properties along Center Street from 800 West to 1100 West. Prior to rezoning, a West Center Street redevelopment plan addressing long-term goals, design guidelines, preservation of quality housing along West Center Street, transition into one-family areas and other considerations should be developed and adopted by the City. The plan should also address the interface with the redeveloped Center Street interchange.
7. New development should be coordinated with the ongoing planning for the intermodal center and related street network and redevelopment guidelines, including mixed use, transit-oriented development in appropriate locations.
8. Develop a dialogue between citizens, the City and social service agencies to review concerns and complaints about social service clients living in the neighborhood. Evaluate the services agencies are providing, the degree of responsibility for clients by these agencies, and possible changes to reduce resident complaints resulting from these services.
9. The need for social service clients to reside near public transit or within walking distance of social service agency offices, places of employment and shopping is acknowledged; yet there is concern with concentrating special populations within a particular neighborhood and the possible inequitable burden placed on a neighborhood's residents as a result of this concentration of high-impact residents. Rental dwelling business licensing requirements should be diligently enforced, and responsible property management set as the standard.
10. Plan for the intermodal station south of the railroad tracks, in the area generally located southeast of the intersection of 600 South / railroad tracks / Freedom Blvd (200 West).

Franklin South Neighborhood

Goals of the Franklin South Neighborhood are as follows:

1. Add another access across the railroad tracks;
2. Develop intermodal plans and design all development around the plan;
3. Develop better road infrastructure and access to the neighborhood;
4. Add a community park of five acres;
5. Increase homeowner-occupancy;
6. Eliminate existing blighted, high-density properties and identify locations for appropriately located and designed public recreational parks to serve this densely populated neighborhood.
7. Complete sidewalks and off-site improvements to provide walkability throughout the neighborhood and adjoining communities.

Challenges for the neighborhood

Franklin South neighborhood struggles with high density population and lack of recreation facilities for children and families in the neighborhood. Children are bussed to schools outside the neighborhood, and park space is not available. A higher concentration of English as a Second Language (ESL) families has occurred in recent years, with challenges for integration of all families into the culture, laws and educational programs of the community in a way that builds on the strengths of diversity and unifies the neighborhood.

Franklin South needs the cooperative efforts of the City and other agencies to achieve appropriate new development and redevelopment, through a) planning, b) zoning to prevent the inappropriate encroachment of new projects into areas that will disrupt future street connections and redevelopment plans, and c) financial participation. The neighborhood could significantly benefit from the Provo Redevelopment Agency home buyer assistance programs, CNRCC, NCC NeighborWorks and other related neighborhood programs.

Franklin South is the gateway to the Provo Towne Centre Mall. Transportation connections between this neighborhood and the mall and other commercial services should include walkways, bikeways, traffic calming measures, and transit. Improvements for pedestrian access from the neighborhoods to the mall, through the mall parking lot, should be identified and implemented to encourage walking trips through increased pedestrian safety, comfort and appeal.

Key Land Use Policies for the Franklin South Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
3. Require any future proposals for multi-family housing to be pursued through the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO) process.
4. Encourage an open public place or a small park for any large scale redevelopment within the neighborhood.
5. New development should be coordinated with the ongoing planning for the intermodal center and related street network and redevelopment guidelines, including mixed use,

transit-oriented development in appropriate locations. Residential development in mixed-use projects should not be on the ground floors, but may be developed on the remaining stories. Commercial development on ground floors within mixed-use zoning should be carefully sited to ensure maximum success and long-term viability with the neighborhood.

6. Develop a dialogue between citizens, the City and social service agencies to review concerns and complaints about social service clients living in the neighborhood. Evaluate the services agencies are providing, the degree of responsibility for clients by these agencies, and possible changes to reduce resident complaints resulting from these services.
7. Continue planning for the intermodal station south of the railroad tracks, and in the area generally located around it to guide future transit-oriented development.
8. Continue to evaluate the process by which the CDBG eligible neighborhoods may effectively utilize neighborhood revitalization initiatives and as provided through the Central Neighborhood Revitalization Coordinating Committee (CNRCC) and the Neighborhood Coordinating Committee (NCC).

Joaquin Neighborhood

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the Joaquin Neighborhood

The Joaquin neighborhood has long been a desirable area to live in Provo due to its excellent location, peaceful tree-lined streets and rich architectural history, but has experienced special challenges due to its proximity to Brigham Young University. The campus influence both energizes the neighborhood and creates particular pressures for the neighborhood. Considered at one point for division into two distinct neighborhoods to reflect campus-oriented needs and home-owner needs, area residents and City policy makers determined that Joaquin should be respected as a single neighborhood with a range of needs.

Not unlike other neighborhoods that address varying needs for housing, commercial services, parks, schools, and infrastructure improvements, the Joaquin neighborhood can best thrive through cooperative planning efforts and implementation steps to restore and conserve one-family homes. Joaquin home owners want to attract additional residents with a long-term commitment to the neighborhood and to reestablish an environment that encourages families and others to make Joaquin their permanent home. Joaquin residents also recognize the need and value of providing desirable housing in a walkable environment for students, through campus-oriented redevelopment on streets within walking distance from BYU.

Through cooperative and coordinated planning efforts, appropriate transition between the South Campus Planning and Neighborhood Conservation Areas of Joaquin can be established through architectural and land development standards, zoning, and use. These changes can improve the living environment in the Conservation planning area and help to overcome the impacts created by pressures for student housing within the broader neighborhood. These impacts have included the intrusion of multiple-family housing structures into one-family neighborhoods, with little transition or neighborhood-friendly design, as well as the conversion of one-family homes into multiple-unit student housing. These conversion units experience a high turn-over rate and, too

frequently, a decline in the standards to which these properties are maintained. Pressures due to inadequate parking for the increased density and for students who commute to campus from outlying areas have long been an emotional issue in Joaquin.

Goals of the Joaquin Neighborhood include:

1. Increase owner-occupancy to build the neighborhood community, by having more permanent residents to support schools and community efforts;
2. Preserve and maintain the historic homes in the neighborhood;
3. Retain schools for the children within the neighborhood;
4. Improve the pedestrian-friendly aspects of the neighborhood;
5. Improve the on-street parking pressures and the conflicts that result from those;
6. Provide appropriate campus-oriented redevelopment with suitable transition to the neighborhood conservation area through architectural and land development standards, zoning, and land use policies;
7. Provide family-oriented public recreational space within this densely populated area.

Joaquin residents envision their neighborhood a being family-oriented, but with a healthy mix of both married and single students. The mix of historic homes and apartment buildings must be maintained in good condition. Redevelopment should focus on property that is inconsistent with the character and goals of the neighborhood, rather than removal of one-family homes with historic character. As one of the Pioneer neighborhoods of Provo, cooperative efforts of the City and other forces, such as NeighborWorks of Provo, can help to achieve these goals.

Encroachment of commercial businesses into residential areas should be discouraged; however, appropriate mixed-use development to provide commercial services is recognized as potential benefit within the walkable, campus-oriented village redevelopment, with zoning and design controls to appropriately integrate the commercial uses into the overall redevelopment plan.

Within the South Campus Planning Area, new development projects, including projects initiated by Brigham Young University along its southern boundary, must be carefully reviewed to assure compatibility with existing development and to assure transportation impacts are properly mitigated.

Areas of specific interest to the neighborhood include:

- Center Street improvements to rebuild boulevards from 100 East to 900 East to enhance natural beauty;
- respecting residential use and efforts to reunite the Joaquin neighborhood when evaluating traffic patterns, infrastructure changes, and street designations (including 200 North and 400 East);
- housing transition and redevelopment along 800 East to provide quality townhomes and other quality housing between 560 North and Memorial Park;
- improved parking within the Neighborhood Conservation Area of Joaquin;

- enforcement of zoning with a focus on housing occupancy, as well as use of tools such as rental dwelling licensing and parking restrictions to minimize impacts of student housing and parking demands on homes within the Conservation Area of the neighborhood;
- improved public transit service along the corridor between Novell (East Bay) and Utah Valley State College (Orem) to help alleviate parking and traffic impacts to Joaquin and other city neighborhoods; and

Key Land Use Policies – Joaquin Neighborhood, Neighborhood Conservation Area

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures within areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
3. Study the feasibility of placing landscape medians in Center Street from 100 East to 1000 East to enhance the proposed design corridor.
4. Discourage encroachment of higher-density, student-oriented housing in the Joaquin Neighborhood Conservation Area.
5. Promote the use of the adopted South Joaquin Residential Design Standards to assist developers with infill development or redevelopment for one-family housing, adopted herein by reference and incorporated as Appendix B-2 to the General Plan.
6. Continue to evaluate infrastructure upgrades, designation of streets, and opportunities to provide appropriately designed and located public recreational space within the neighborhood and to retain the neighborhood school serving the children of the neighborhood, with the goals of encouraging a reestablishment of owner-occupied, one-family homes for long-term residency. Impacts of traffic patterns and parking to residents from use and designation of city streets and the beneficial influence of services such as schools and parks that can attract long-term residents should be central to planning efforts that help to define and unite the Joaquin neighborhood.

Key Land Use Policies – Joaquin Neighborhood, South Campus Planning Area:

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Create a vision for the planning area south of campus area, anticipated to redevelop for student-oriented housing and amenities within the South Campus Planning Area, as shown on Map # 6.4 Provo City Neighborhoods Map.
3. Encourage any future redevelopment proposals for student or multi-family housing to be pursued through the rezoning process to assure new development is compatible with the goals of the South Campus Planning Area and the Joaquin neighborhood. University-sponsored student housing projects must be similarly reviewed.
4. When redevelopment occurs, have the developer consider the opportunity to relocate homes that may have historical significance.
5. Inasmuch as the Provo City School District has closed the Joaquin Elementary School and has transferred the property into private ownership, it is important to establish policies for the future development of the property. As a site of particular sensitivity to the neighborhood and location key to defining the future character of the South Campus Planning Area, this property should be required to develop through the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO) process and should consider the following goals:

- A. Open public or semi-public space should be incorporated in the redevelopment of the Joaquin Elementary School property. This may include the park-block pedestrian plaza concept as outlined in the South Campus Area Master Plan (SCAMP) study report, which study document provided the basis of many of the principles and goals adopted within the Joaquin Neighborhood Key land use policies of the General Plan and may be important for future visioning documents for the area. If a park-block pedestrian plaza is considered for this property, careful attention should be given to its implementation as it will provide a standard for future phases of the park-block pedestrian plaza system that could extend from 500 North to the BYU campus.
 - B. Planning for the site should be more comprehensive than the Joaquin School Elementary site alone. Properties immediately west of the site along 500 East and east of the site along 700 East should be planned in conjunction with the property. Future developers for the Joaquin Elementary School property need not control or develop these properties; however, prior to the adoption of any new zone for the Joaquin Elementary School properties, a conceptual plan should be prepared that illustrates how adjacent properties will integrate into an overall and unified plan for the block.
 - C. The modification of the streetscape on 500 North should be avoided. Existing trees and parkways should be preserved.
 - D. As the neighborhood policies call for an adequate transition between the South Campus Planning Area and the neighborhood south of 500 North, buildings should not exceed two (2) and three (3) stories along 500 North.
 - E. A parking permit program as discussed within the General Plan should be implemented prior to the development of this property.
 - F. The traffic impacts of any project in the Joaquin School area must be fully analyzed by the City Administration so that impacts of a particular project can be properly mitigated.
6. Develop a campus oriented residential district, focusing on higher density housing within the general boundaries of 500 North to 800 North and from University Avenue to 900 East, thereby providing a walkable district for student access to campus. Development and redevelopment should focus on larger assembly of property, such as full blocks, rather than smaller parcels. Also included is the area from 800 North to the indoor practice field and from 150 East to University Avenue.
- A. Identify strategies to achieve the density recommendations of the South Campus Area Master Plan (SCAMP) Study, while achieving desirable parking ratios and encouraging a transition from vehicle-dependency to walking, bicycling, and transit use. Highest densities should be developed around future bus-rapid transit stations with less density between station areas.
 - B. Identify opportunities and implementation tools for larger-scale redevelopment, assembling parcels of sufficient size to incorporate pedestrian plazas and people-oriented spaces in conjunction with housing and possibly mixed-use buildings. These may include public or private incentives to attract a master developer, use

- of public-private partnerships, or innovative tools to encourage long-term investment in the SCAMP Study Area.
- C. Use the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO) process for effective redevelopment of assembled parcels, encouraging integration of plans for future redevelopment of entire blocks or street frontages even where those may not be within the ownership of the developer requesting the initial redevelopment proposal. Encourage looking beyond the boundaries of a proposed development for more effective integration of redevelopment projects into the fabric of the surrounding neighborhood. Avoid use of streets as boundaries for change in development type or scale.
 - D. Require new housing initiated by Brigham Young University to be established in a “university housing” zone. Among other things, this zone should assure provision of adequate on-site parking and should incorporate transitional development standards to ensure compatibility with adjoining neighborhoods, such as those adjacent to the periphery of BYU.
 - E. Establish appropriate transition development guidelines to reduce conflicts between streets of higher density redevelopment and increased building heights and surrounding streets with traditional and revitalized one-family housing. Integrate transition areas across neighborhood boundaries.
 - F. Establish appropriate development and architectural design guidelines for both large-scale and infill redevelopment for the student-oriented residential district and surrounding neighborhoods as a guide for developers in proposing redevelopment projects or for revitalizing homes within transition areas. Encourage use of New Urbanism elements, such as orienting buildings to a walkable streetscape, providing human scale architectural elements and landscaping along street frontages to create pedestrian-level interest, incorporating neighborhood retail and commercial services within mixed-use buildings, and the use of transit-oriented design.
 - G. Work with Brigham Young University (BYU), Utah Transit Authority, and private service providers to further opportunities for transit service to move students within the BYU campus and SCAMP Study Area and to provide access for students to shopping, recreation, and entertainment throughout the Provo community. Plan for appropriate transit, auto, pedestrian and bicycle connections between campus-oriented development and the intermodal station
 - H. Work with Brigham Young University to coordinate development efforts to best meet the needs of students within the student-oriented community of the SCAMP Study Area.

Maeser Neighborhood

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the Maeser Neighborhood

The Maeser neighborhood is one of the Pioneer neighborhoods of Provo, with a desirable central location and pleasing architectural styles that reflect the history of the area. The Maeser School, closed as a public elementary school, was felt to be a valuable historical architectural resource and a reflection of community values; efforts to preserve this structure have resulted in an

adaptive reuse of the school building, with redevelopment of the surrounding grounds to one-family dwellings.

Residents of the neighborhood have concerns about encroachment of multiple-family housing structures that are not appropriately designed for transition and compatibility with one-family homes. Residents of Maeser desire to reestablish the neighborhood as a location where long-term residents choose to buy their homes and to attract families that can stabilize and energize the neighborhood. Proximity to social services, while a benefit to residents, can also present special challenges as in other Pioneer neighborhoods of the Central Area Neighborhood Council. Residents feel it is important to establish a dialogue with social service agencies to evaluate how best to provide services while reducing impacts to the neighborhood that may discourage a resurgence in home ownership investment.

Residents desire improvements to the transportation system to promote better access to public transit and improved walkability. They see a need for visioning studies to help identify desirable redevelopment scenarios and standards in areas such as 600 South from University Avenue to 900 East.

Key Land Use Policies to address the goals of the Maeser Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures within areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood by limiting new development to detached, one-family homes. Some exceptions, such as development along State Street, may be considered through the City's established planning and development procedures.
3. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family, detached housing. Higher density residential housing, such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments, other than legal accessory apartments created in owner-occupied, one-family dwellings, are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood. Some exceptions, such as development along State Street, may be determined through the City's established planning and development procedures.
4. Promote use of existing neighborhood residential design standards to assist developers with infill development or redevelopment of one-family homes.
5. Encourage responsible property management through enforcement of the rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance.
6. Develop a dialogue between citizens, the City and social service agencies to review concerns and complaints about social service clients living in the neighborhood. Evaluate the services agencies are providing, the degree of responsibility for clients by these agencies, and possible changes to reduce resident complaints resulting from these services.
7. The need for social service clients to reside near public transit or within walking distance of social service agency offices, places of employment and shopping is acknowledged; yet there is concern with concentrating special populations within a particular neighborhood and the possible inequitable burden placed on a neighborhood's residents

as a result of this concentration of high-impact residents. Rental dwelling business licensing requirements should be diligently enforced, and responsible property management set as the standard.

8. Existing commercial development should not be allowed to expand to the degree that it encroaches into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
9. The City and neighborhood should work with UDOT and Utah County to identify transportation alternatives, including better transit and walkability standards, that would prevent the need for widening of 300 South from University avenue to State Street.
10. Study the feasibility of placing landscape medians in Center Street from 100 East to 1000 East.
11. Promote the use of a professional vision planning consultant to identify desirable development in areas such as 600 South, from University avenue to 900 East.
12. Although a primary goal of the neighborhood is to increase one-family owner-occupied residences, areas of the neighborhood near University Avenue and 600 South that are currently zoned Central Business District, Heavy Commercial, or Light Industrial should be considered for future zone changes to transit-oriented development zoning to encourage redevelopment and improvement that redevelopment would bring to the adjacent one-family areas of the neighborhood by eliminating industrial and heavy commercial use.

North Park Neighborhood

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the North Park Neighborhood

The North Park Neighborhood shares many of the characteristics of the other Central Area neighborhoods. There is a desire to reestablish one-family occupancy and opportunities for home ownership and residency by families and individuals who can make a long-term commitment to the neighborhood. A high rate of rental properties and a general decline in the condition of many properties provides a challenge for the revitalization of the neighborhood. The architectural character of historic homes contributes character to the neighborhood, and there is a desire to see these homes preserved and restored.

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the Neighborhood

1. Increase the number of owner-occupants to stabilize and strengthen the neighborhood.
2. Improve and support the availability of off-street parking and enforce current requirements.
3. Improve the pedestrian-friendly and safety aspects of the neighborhood.
4. Reduce crime and implement programs to have a drug-free neighborhood.
5. Preserve and maintain the family-oriented public recreational facilities in the neighborhood, including, Exchange Park, North Park, Paul Ream Wilderness Park, and Riverside Park.
6. Maintain the architectural heritage on University Avenue that is a unique part of Provo's heritage.

Key Land Use Policies to address the goals of the North Park Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.

2. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood by limiting new development to detached, one-family homes and the rehabilitation of existing one-family homes, where designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map
3. Study the feasibility of doing a historic designation survey in the North Park Neighborhood with the goal of preserving homes and buildings of historic and architectural value that help to create the character of the neighborhood.
4. Discourage the encroachment of higher density housing into the areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
5. Should redevelopment occur, efforts should be made to incorporate historic structures into the development and/or relocate them.
6. Encourage responsible property management through the enforcement of the Rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance and other applicable zoning ordinances.
7. Develop a dialogue between neighborhoods, the City, landlords and social service agencies to review concerns and complaints about social service clients living in the neighborhood. Evaluate the service the agencies are providing, the degree of responsibilities for clients by these agencies, and possible changes to reduce neighborhood resident complaints and concerns resulting from these services.
8. Develop a zone that addresses the unique needs of the Utah Valley Regional Medical Center and surrounding related facilities.

Timp Neighborhood

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the Timp Neighborhood

The residents of Timpanogos neighborhood seek to provide restoration and redevelopment of the remaining homes, as well as the substandard multi-family apartment units. Approximately 80 percent of Timp residents live in apartment units. Restoring and maintaining one-family homes, many of which are historic, in owner-occupancy will provide balance and stability to this neighborhood.

Solutions

The residents believe that the zoning laws currently in place and their enforcement will hold the solutions to the many difficult problems the neighborhood is facing. Residents envision a neighborhood without blight, restoring the community feel that once existed, through careful planning and zoning. Residents urge continued, aggressive enforcement of zoning laws add continued pursuit of effective rental dwelling business licensing implementation to ensure public safety and the quality of residential properties.

Key Land Use Policies to address the goals of the Timpanogos Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Central Area.
2. Increase homeowner occupancy in remaining one-family home structures to strengthen the neighborhood by having more permanent residents to support local central area schools and community efforts. Seek also to increase owner occupancy in the many condominium units that have come to dominate the neighborhood as a primary source of individual ownership opportunities.

3. Preserve and maintain remaining historic homes in Timpanogos. Study the feasibility of doing a historic designation survey in the Timp Neighborhood.
4. Where possible, redevelop and restore current multi-family/apartment dwellings.
5. Through zoning and enforcement, begin to eliminate illegal and substandard housing.
6. Enforce parking standards.

Northeast Area Neighborhood Council Map # 6.7

The Northeast Area Neighborhood Council consists of five neighborhoods, which includes the Edgemont, Indian Hills, North Timpview, Rock Canyon, and the Sherwood Hills neighborhoods. *Key policies for the Northeast Area Council are listed below, with policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Northeast Area neighborhoods, followed by policies of specific importance, by neighborhood.*

Northeast Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

The following policies and goals are considered to be shared, to some degree, by all of the Northeast Area neighborhoods and apply in addition to the policies listed individually for each neighborhood:

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
2. Maintain the Residential (R) General Plan designation with one-family residential development with a goal of increasing the amount of owner-occupied housing units.
3. Any new development within areas with the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) will be subject to studies of potential geologic hazards, geotechnical constraints, slopes or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or State Geologist to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary, to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
4. Establish policies and ordinances for Rock Canyon that limit commercial activity and development as well as protect and enhance the area as a city-wide recreational asset.

Key land use policies for individual neighborhoods within the Northeast Area Neighborhood Council are listed, below, by neighborhood:

Edgemont Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the Northeast Area.
2. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family, detached housing. Higher density residential housing, such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments, are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood. One-family housing should be developed within the scale of surrounding existing development. The neighborhood may consider design regulations to control housing scale in established residential areas to prevent incompatible infill development.

3. Limit rural agricultural tracts south of Timpview High School to one-family residential development. If developed as performance developments, they should be limited to one-family dwellings.
4. Prohibit existing commercial and office nodes from expanding into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
5. Retain the auto repair service and gas station property on the northeast corner of 2950 North and Canyon Road as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map to reflect neighborhood concern that this property not be sold for commercial redevelopment or change in commercial use. The City has approved a PRO (Project Redevelopment Option) zone to allow facility expansion and redesign of the existing, nonconforming business within the original parcel boundaries, using the PRO process. This action recognizes that this business has provided a needed service to the community for many years, but is in need of modernization to compete economically and to better integrate into this substantially one-family residential area.
 - a) This action is not intended to encourage or facilitate further commercial development at this intersection, but to allow this nonconforming use to establish as a conforming business through the PRO process. It is not the Council's intent to amend the General Plan Map upon rezoning, but to maintain the R map designation.
 - b) The adjoining lot(s) under the same ownership, fronting 2950 North, would remain designated as Residential (R) for the purpose of one-family residential use. The General Plan boundary for expansion of the existing commercial use is considered to be the existing property line.
6. The property located generally at 3645 North Canyon Road, now used for a car wash, may be redeveloped for low density residential use (R110 zone) with areas exceeding 30 percent slope restricted from development. Any development must be compatible in density, scale and design with adjoining residential development. Consolidating the property with additional property is encouraged.
7. The Fire Station should be designated as Residential on the General Plan Map. Should the property be sold by the City, the property should be developed with a zoning designation comparable to the R1.10 zone.

Indian Hills Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NE Area.
2. Prohibit development in the unincorporated USDA Forest Service land east of Indian Hills within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS).
3. Work with the Provo City Traffic Engineer to explore the possibilities of developing a traffic-calming improvement plan to address issues of traffic speed concerns, particularly on Navajo Lane and Indian Hills Drive.

North Timpview Neighborhood (previously Little Rock Canyon Neighborhood)

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NE Area.

2. Prohibit new Agricultural (A) designations, within the City limits, which grant animal rights, except where agricultural use is established on property that may be annexed into City limits.
3. Strive for increased owner-occupancy. Densities higher than R1.10 zoning is not within the goals of this neighborhood.
4. Designate the island of property in Utah County's jurisdiction as Agricultural (A) to reflect the existing agricultural use and the request of the property owners to maintain that use after future annexation.
5. Although not shown on the map as PF - Public Facilities, the anticipation is that the East Lawn Cemetery will expand in a manner consistent with the PF designation. Provo City recognizes the need to appropriately expand the East Lawn Cemetery to provide services for Provo's population and does not intend this expansion to require an amendment to the Provo City General Plan.
6. Work to establish an infrastructure improvement plan that focuses on the implementation of installing, replacing or repairing sidewalks, street lights, and sewer laterals to private residences to replace the use of septic systems.

Rock Canyon Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NE Area.
2. See Appendix C-2 for information regarding the Country Club Manor Specific Development Plan.

Sherwood Hills

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NE Area.
2. New development above the 5200 foot elevation within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) may be restricted due to conditions described in Chapter 9 Environment of this General Plan.

Northwest Area Neighborhood Council Map # 6.8

The Northwest Area Neighborhood Council consists of six neighborhoods, which includes the Carterville, Grandview North, Grandview South, Riverbottoms, Rivergrove, and the Riverside neighborhoods. Key policies for the Northwest Area Council are listed below, with policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Northwest Area neighborhoods, followed by policies of specific importance, by neighborhood.

Northwest Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

The following policies and goals are considered to be shared, to some degree, by all of the Northwest Area neighborhoods and apply in addition to the policies listed individually for each neighborhood:

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures within areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.

2. Maintain the Residential (R) General Plan designation with one-family residential development.
3. Supports the creation of design corridor standards and alternative land use controls for property along Columbia Lane in the Rivergrove Neighborhood.
4. Supports alternative land use designations – such as commercial, residential, or mixed-use – for the existing mobile home park on the southwest corner of Columbia and Grandview Lanes in the Rivergrove Neighborhood.

Key land use policies for individual neighborhoods within the Northwest Area Neighborhood Council are listed, below, by neighborhood:

Carterville Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. The Mixed-Use (M) Land Use Map designation should not develop under mixed-use guidelines (see pg. 10) until an area master plan has been established. The area master plan should specifically address how development interacts with the Provo River frontage. Policies that encourage a pedestrian friendly, mixed-use riverwalk area are highly encouraged.

Grandview North Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. This neighborhood is well established and is expected to remain consistent in its uses and continue to meet the guiding principles for the Northwest Area.

Grandview South Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. This neighborhood is well established and is expected to remain consistent in its uses and continue to meet the guiding principles for the Northwest Area.
3. Plan, adopt, and implement a landscaping plan for property adjacent to the 1375 West corridor in order to beautify the area and mitigate safety hazards created by vegetative overgrowth into the sidewalk and right-of-way.

Riverbottoms Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. Maintain the Residential (R) General Plan designation with one-family residential development; except as otherwise provided, all new residential developments along University Avenue should be one-family residential development..
3. Any properties north of 4800 North and west of University Avenue that consist of 20 acres or more in size may develop as independent research and business park. Land assembly may be required for smaller parcels. Individual lots along 50 West or Edgewood Drive should be redeveloped for research and business park uses. The entire residential uses that are currently zoned A1.1 should be redeveloped, or none of it should. It is an already isolated residential enclave, and should not be further encroached upon, making it

- more difficult and costly to redevelop as research and business park. This area should be developed to the same standards as those required in the Riverwoods Research and Business Park.
4. Designate the property located at approximately 5600 North east of University Avenue and Canyon Road as Residential (R). Approximately two acres of the site are flat and developable if adequate access can be provided, subject to the Sensitive Lands ordinance as it may apply to property proposed for development or access. The remaining four acres are too steep to develop, and are in the middle of a natural drainage channel.
 5. Development of properties east and north of the property listed above in #4 and the power substation, which are within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS), may not be possible. While there are some flat lands on top, access to these areas will require roads anticipated to be well in excess of 12% grades. Cutting and grading required to develop those roads could also be excessive, and contrary to Provo City's Sensitive Lands Ordinance. Natural and man made hazards exist throughout this bench: fault lines, slide areas, unstable soils, and high power electric transmission lines. Providing adequate water pressures, fire protection, and garbage collection services would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide. Any new development within Provo City's General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) will be subject to studies of potential geologic hazards, geotechnical constraints, slopes or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or State Geologist to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development. Lands currently farmed are anticipated to remain in agricultural use, but may be designated DS to note concerns for potential investors seeking more intensive redevelopment comparable to residential neighborhoods to the south, such as Sherwood Hills.
 6. Designate the northeast corner of 4800 North University Avenue, containing approximately two (2) acres, as Residential (R) to be developed as high density. The appropriate units per acre will be determined through the Project Redevelopment Option approval process and should not exceed 32 units per acre.
 7. The proposed design corridor along 4800 North should be extended to Canyon Road.
 8. Development of the properties along the east frontage of University Avenue, from 5000 North to the intersection of University Avenue and Canyon Road, should include components of residential and mixed-use buildings that include retail, professional office and one-family residential uses. Residential development within the mixed-use portion of a project should not be on the ground floors, but may be developed on the remaining stories. The development of these parcels must conform, in scale and quality, with the Shops at Riverwoods development, be architecturally compatible with the Riverwoods development, and not include any gas stations, drive-through fast-food restaurants, or mini-mart convenience stores. Landscaping should be consistent with the Shops at Riverwoods. This property will need to develop using the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO) process.
 9. See Appendix C-1 for Villages at Riverwoods Specific Development Plan documents.

Rivergrove Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. Provide alternative land use designations for the mobile home park at Columbia Lane and Grandview Lane as Commercial (C), Residential (R), or Mixed-Use (MU). Any of these designations could be appropriate in this location, and would facilitate the redevelopment of that parcel. Whatever is approved on this site should have landscaping along the street frontage consistent with the residential developments on the northeast and southwest corners, and commercial buildings should be designed to fit in with the residential character.
3. Encourage the commercial redevelopment of Columbia Lane from State Street to the residential development just south of Grandview Lane. Sidewalk, curb, and gutter should be installed for safety and to prohibit parking backing out onto Columbia Lane. Land uses should be better screened in the future or promote retail rather than automotive related uses. The Council may consider a design corridor for this area. Bike lane planning should be included in the development of a design corridor plan and ordinance.
4. Undeveloped property northwest of 820 North and Independence Avenue may develop at higher residential densities provided that the product type remains one-family dwellings, attached or detached, or one-family semi-detached (twin homes). Efforts should be made to unify new development with the existing Park Ridge Performance Development to the east by incorporating architectural themes, well-planned open space, and a diversity of floor plans and sizes. Consideration should be given to a community focal point which brings the two developments together, such as a commons, monument, landscaping features or other design elements. Appropriate project design measures should be taken to help mitigate sound disturbances for residents from adjacent Interstate 15 and rail lines.
5. Encourage the improvement of the neighborhoods and by supporting policies and ordinances that attract a mix of family types, including retirees and singles, increasing owner-occupancy, encouraging neighborhood activities and requiring the proper maintenance of homes and landscaping.
6. Work with law-enforcement programs, such as Community Oriented Policing (COP) to decrease illegal activities within the neighborhood.
7. Work to develop and implement an infrastructure improvement plan to install sidewalks in areas that do not have them.
8. Preserve and maintain park and open space by working with the Parks Department to repair, maintain, improve and increase recreational facilities within the neighborhood.
9. Commercial uses should not encroach into established residential areas.

Riverside Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the NW Area.
2. All undeveloped land along the University Avenue corridor, lying between 50 West and 100 East, may be developed for professional offices within the Commercial designation, while any land west of 50 West and any land east of 100 East should be one-family detached homes. This presents a consistent University Avenue business corridor, while providing high-quality, low-density housing for Provo residents, and supports Provo's goal to encourage new neighborhoods of one-family detached homes.

3. All undeveloped land lying between 3300 North and 3080 North, and east of 100 East, may be developed for professional offices within the Commercial designation.
4. All new professional office use must be consistent in architecture and style to existing office buildings to provide a planned presentation.
5. All efforts must be made to preserve the natural trees, foliage and land topography in order to maintain a mature, natural look and feel to the Riverside area.
6. In order to prevent excessive traffic in residential areas, direct and indirect access should not be permitted or accommodated between University Avenue and 3700 North through residential neighborhoods.
7. The Mixed-Use (M) Land Use Map designation should not develop under mixed-use guidelines (see pg. 10) until an area master plan has been established. The area master plan should specifically address how development interacts with the Provo River frontage. Policies that encourage a pedestrian friendly, mixed-use riverwalk area are highly encouraged.

Southeast Area Neighborhood Council Map # 6.9

The Southeast Area Neighborhood Council consists of eight neighborhoods, which includes the Foothills, Oak Hills, Pleasant View, Provost, Provost South, Spring Creek, University, and the Wasatch neighborhoods. Key policies for the Southeast Area Neighborhood Council are listed below by neighborhood. Key policies for the Southeast Area Council are listed below, with policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Southeast Area neighborhoods, followed by policies of specific importance, by neighborhood.

Southeast Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

The following policies and goals are considered to be shared, to some degree, by all of the Southeast Area neighborhoods and apply in addition to the policies listed individually for each neighborhood.

1. Viable, significant areas of one-family structures within the Residential (R) should be protected for continued one-family use.
2. Maintain the Residential (R) General Plan designation with one-family residential development, except where specified otherwise.
3. Any new development within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) will be subject to studies of potential wetlands, flood plains or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or by any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary, to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
4. Establish ordinances that protect and enhance the Slate Canyon area. The development policies for the Slate Canyon Area are as follows:

Slate Canyon Area Development Policies

The following policies should apply to the area generally east of Slate Canyon Drive and along the mountainside, from 300 South to 1400 South Street. Property south of 1400 South Street have policies adopted as part of the Slate Canyon Master Plan:

Hillside Protection

- Clarify and enhance hillside protection ordinances to restrict grading to assure the smallest impact to significant natural features including, but not limited to, slopes in excess of 25%, woodlands, stands of trees, existing vegetation, scenic views, drainage ways, existing structures, roads, trails or access to trails.
- Evaluate off-road motorized vehicle damage to the hillside and study legislation that limits such use, if appropriate.
- Study and evaluate policies and ordinances that seek to encourage, govern and require the reclamation of existing and abandoned gravel and mining operations. Acceptable reclamation is not aggregate or partial removal of soil materials for the purposes of a business operation. Acceptable reclamation activities may include restoration of natural and open space development of park and recreational facilities carefully monitored in appropriate low-density residential development if geologic and other natural hazards are appropriately mitigated.
- Initiate legislation that removes mining uses from sensitive land areas.

Recreational Facilities

- Continue efforts to implement the expansion of Bicentennial Park as described in the Slate Canyon Master Plan and the Bicentennial Park Master Plan.
- Evaluate other city-owned property within the area for additional public recreational amenities and open space in both improved and natural conditions.
- Evaluate and address efforts that improve the quality, safety, and cleanliness of the trails and trail heads.

Housing

- Developable land in the area designated for residential development should be developed for low-density, one-family housing. Multi-family housing in this area is not within the goals of the neighborhood. New housing should comply with current existing housing maintenance and development standards.

Streets

- Streets, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, trails, and pedestrian improvements should be evaluated for quality and safety issues. Funding opportunities should be identified and implemented where appropriate.
- Work with Community Oriented Policing (COP) program to address vagrancy issues in the area.

South State Street Corridor Development Policies

South State Street is the main entrance into southeast Provo City and traverses from the intersection of State Road (SR) 75 (Springville City Limits) to 300 South. From approximately 900 South to the city limits, State Street divides the Provost South and Spring Creek Neighborhoods from each other.

The intent of this policy is to create a mixed use corridor with uniform public and private property design and development standards that are conducive to both of the adjacent neighborhoods and that will enhance the character of South State Street. The policy encompasses all properties located between the existing railroad tracks west of State Street and all properties adjacent to State Street on the east side.

Due to the length and character of South State Street, the corridor is divided into two large areas for discussion of land use policy. These areas are described as Area A (North of 1860 South) and Area B (South of 1860 South). The Public Way Design Standards are for the entire length of South State Street.

Public Way Policies

Policies should address uniform *public way* improvements for the entire corridor including the following:

1. All new and existing utilities should be placed underground when development occurs where feasible.
2. The street design (acceptable to UDOT and Provo City by mutual agreement) should include, but not be limited to: uniform curb, gutter, sidewalks, street width, street lighting, landscaping, street signage, etc. and provide for efficient movement of traffic and pedestrians.

Private Property Policies

Prior to considering the adoption of a PRO Zone or similar zoning regulation for South State Street, the South State Street Design Corridor (SSSDC)(Chapter 14.34.290) should be amended to reflect appropriate guidelines for the development of private properties. The amended SSSDC should address the following:

1. Development design elements to assure that all future development in the SSSDC will adhere to a consistent design theme. The design theme should address both site and building design and should focus on a Village type concept rather than the conventional “strip mall” layout.
2. Inter connectivity between the various phases of development, rather than isolated development pods.
3. Appropriate land use types and mixed use requirements;
4. Appropriate lot area, yard area and building height standards;
5. Appropriate buffering requirements adjacent to the railroad right-of-way;
6. A circulation system within new projects that will link the various villages into a continuous, harmonious neighborhood, without being dependent on State Street for access.

7. Building materials that will help assure a high standard of quality.
8. Signage
9. Area A should consist of a mix of uses, including residential, retail and offices, with a focus on residential. Area B should be developed with a mix of light industrial and limited residential uses with a master development plan. This area includes the Mountain Vista Business Park development.

Key land use policies for individual neighborhoods within the Southeast Area Neighborhood Council are listed, below, by neighborhood:

Foothills Neighborhood

Vision, Challenges and Goals of the Foothills Neighborhood

Over time, the Foothills neighborhood has become a diverse neighborhood including homes ranging in size from small, post-war starter homes to large luxury homes. The neighborhood includes a small, but distinct commercial zone and a strip of high density student housing. This mix of uses creates advantages and challenges for the neighborhood.

Foothills is an ideal place for young couples just starting out to rent or even own a small home, duplex, or basement apartment as they transition toward permanent housing. At the same time, there are a significant number of families that have lived in the neighborhood for decades. New, larger homes on the east side of the neighborhood are also very attractive to established families that are looking for a place to sink roots. Additionally, batching singles rent student housing along 450 North.

The vision for this neighborhood is to maintain the current delicate balance of residents and uses in a way that is sustainable economically and socially. Some of the keys to making this viable:

1. Attracting families that intend to be permanent residents of the neighborhood is a critical focus of the neighborhood. Having permanent residents provides community stability and support for those that are just starting out.
2. Encourage policies that encourage batching singles to reside in the South Campus Planning Area and reclaiming former one-family dwellings for one-family occupancy.
3. Ensuring that all property owners are aware of the neighborhood rules and municipal regulations that help maintain this balance so that new investors are working in the same direction.
4. Strict enforcement of occupancy and rental dwelling licensing rules.

Past efforts to maintain this balance have focused on stricter enforcement of zoning requirements, modification of parking requirements and zones, and the implementation of restrictive covenants in new developments. The intent of these efforts has been to make family housing pleasant and attractive to families appropriate to the size of the home as well as to providing adequate usable and attractive housing in areas designated for batching singles.

It is the goal of the neighborhood to work with owners of condominium complexes in the heart of the neighborhood to encourage the unit owners to abide occupancy limitations and other noise, nuisance, and parking issues as regulated by Provo City Code.

The neighborhood encourages that city-owned property near 1480 North is maintained, kept weed and junk free and becomes developed as a park in the future.

Goals of the Foothills Neighborhood

1. Increase owner occupancy within the neighborhood.
2. Increase the stability of the neighborhood by attracting longer-term residents.
3. Increase a sense of neighborhood and belonging.
4. Find a permanent resolution to the occupancy violations and concerns within the condominium complexes.
5. Ensure that existing designated student housing remains an attractive option for batching singles.

Foothills residents envision their neighborhood as being a family-oriented, yet diverse area, including a mix of single and married students, working families, and retirees. In order to keep this balance healthy and sustainable, it is important that family homes remain attractive and available. As homes and complexes in the neighborhood begin to age, it is important to make sure that properties are maintained and kept up to present a desirable image to potential residents. Redevelopment in this neighborhood should focus on preserving this character and should not be allowed to displace current one-family homes with multiple occupancy units.

New residential developments should focus exclusively on creating residences that appeal to families that will intend to become permanent owner-residents of the neighborhood. Every effort should be taken to ensure that new developments limit or prohibit the opportunity for creating situations that appeal to renting or batching singles.

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area.
2. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood by limiting new development to detached, one-family dwellings.
3. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family detached housing. Higher density residential housing such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood.
4. It is the intent of Council that a boundary between the higher density uses of Brigham Young University (BYU) on the west side of 900 East and the one-family residential uses of the Foothills neighborhood be maintained. This plan designates 900 East as the boundary that best respects existing uses and protects both uses from the incompatibility of having high density residential or commercial uses next to one-family residential uses. Because 900 East provides the most logical buffer between these two incompatible uses, this plan designates that residential properties on 900 East, where currently zoned and used for one-family detached homes, should be maintained as one-family detached

- housing. Higher density residential housing such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments are not compatible with the goals for this area.
5. It is the intent of the Council that existing commercial development not be allowed to expand.
 6. It is the intent of the Council that new non-residential uses such as commercial, public facilities, and professional offices not be allowed to expand.
 7. The former Meridian School property should be developed in a way that is compatible with adjacent properties. One acceptable use would be a public facility that benefits the neighborhood, such as a church or park. An alternative acceptable use would be a mixed-use project redevelopment option zone, as long as the proposed project is structured in a way to create a buffer between any high density elements and the one-family uses that border the property. It is anticipated that the property will be developed in a manner that will encourage the long-term stability of the one-family neighborhoods near the property. Any residential or mixed use development of the property should have a high ratio of parking to minimize any on-street parking. If the development includes any high density elements, after such a development is completed, the property should remain under one ownership in accordance with Brigham Young University housing rules. Regardless of the final use, there should be no access from 300 North.
 8. Residential project plans for property under the Residential (R) General Plan Map designation east of the Seven Peaks Water Park Resort may develop with a variety of housing types, including one-family detached, one-family semi-detached (twin homes), or one-family attached (townhomes or condominiums not stacked above or below each other). Multiple-family configurations incorporating stacked units may be suitable if designed with dispersed massing (not centrally located in a few buildings). Any project should be designed with sensitivity to the adjacent hillside and should integrate with existing residential development to the north. The project design should not draw attention to itself but rather seek to blend the new residential use with the surrounding land uses.

Oakhills Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area.
2. Limit development above 1550 East to one row of homes one lot in depth, with no flag or panhandle lots.
3. Development of properties east of 1550 East that are within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) may be restricted or prohibited.

Pleasant View Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area.
2. Restrict the Supplementary Residential overlay zone from expanding beyond its current boundaries as shown on the September 5, 2002, Provo City Zoning Map.

Provost Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area.
2. Maintain the Public Facility (PF) General Plan designation for the detention basins along Slate Canyon Drive.

3. Maintain the one-family character of the neighborhood by:
 - a. Limiting development in the R designation to detached, one-family dwellings;
 - b. Appropriately and consistently enforcing relevant zoning laws to resist conversion of owner-occupied, one-family homes into rental units;
 - c. Appropriately and consistently enforcing applicable zoning ordinances following the neighborhood vote to “opt in” to the change in “family” designation to include up to two, rather than three, unrelated individuals residing in a one-family home as a family unit;
 - d. Developing a process by which the older segments of the neighborhood may request and be included in neighborhood revitalization initiatives currently limited to the Pioneer neighborhoods of Provo City.
4. Property to the east of the existing and proposed developments east of Slate Canyon Drive within the Developmentally Sensitive designation is of notable concern for protection from inappropriate development due to the characteristics of the land.
5. Continue implementation of the South State Street Design Corridor, with application of appropriate design standards to new development and redevelopment within this vital business and residential corridor serving as the southernmost entry to Provo City.

Provost South Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area. For all properties located adjacent to South State Street, see the guiding principles for the South State Street Corridor Development Policies.
2. New, quality, one-family homes should be developed to provide adequate living space for growing families that wish to relocate to or remain within the Provost South neighborhood, including detached homes. Focus for new development for mixed housing types suitable for owner-occupancy should develop using the Project Redevelopment Option or other appropriate rezoning tools and provide adequate open space, family-oriented amenities, buffering from non-residential uses, and such architectural styles and orientation as to not give the appearance of multiple-family housing.
3. Strategies to encourage and maintain owner-occupancy of homes should be implemented, with particular focus in the Bay Harbor and Jodel areas, the area bounded by South Nevada, South California, State Street and Dakota Avenue, and within the residential development locating on or near the former Pioneer Drive-in Theater property. Strategies may include changes to zoning and occupancy and continued enforcement of zoning and occupancy, as well as other appropriate strategies.
4. Continue to evaluate the designation of roads within the South Provost neighborhood in relation to impacts to existing residents, taking into consideration neighborhood concerns voiced over collector designations. Continue to evaluate the impacts of new development and on-street parking in constrained areas such as the east bench and implement traffic calming measures and parking restrictions as determined appropriate.
5. Provide and upgrade infrastructure to improve services for existing residents and new development, including appropriately designed and located, family-oriented public recreational space.

6. Continue to implement the South State Street Design Corridor from the south City limits to 300 South for new development and redevelopment. Educate owners of existing buildings about the goals and standards of the Design Corridor and encourage them to comply with the design corridor standards to the extent possible, given the limitations of building location and configuration. Require compliance with Design Corridor standards for expansion and exterior remodeling of existing businesses to the extent possible, given the limitations of building location.
7. Properties along the South State Street corridor should develop for quality businesses that are compatible with adjoining and nearby residential development, with focus on retail commercial and shopping center uses within a planned, well-designed configuration with quality architectural and landscaping details to enhance this redevelopment corridor and gateway to the city. New heavy commercial uses should be discouraged along the State Street frontage, and existing heavy commercial uses should be evaluated for appropriate zoning and upgrades consistent with the desired character of this gateway corridor.
8. The Slate Canyon Area Master Plan has been adopted as Key Land Use Policy for the area of the Provost South Neighborhood encompassed by the Plan. The Slate Canyon Specific Area Plan is included in Appendix B-3 of the General Plan. (See **Southeast Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals** regarding Slate Canyon Area Development Policies)

Spring Creek Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area. For all properties located adjacent to South State Street, see the guiding principles for the South State Street Corridor Development Policies.
2. Restrict development of wetlands, flood plains, and accretion lands controlled by the State of Utah and/or the Army Corps of Engineers which have a Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS). Any new development within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) will be subject to studies of potential wetlands, flood plains or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or by any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
3. Ironton should be developed as an upscale business park, with industrial and commercial uses within a park-like atmosphere. The City should look for an anchor project, which may include a significant civic or recreational facility, to establish an identity for the planned commercial/industrial park. Ironton Boulevard should be connected to Larsen Parkway, and a traffic control signal should be placed at Ironton Boulevard/Mountain View Parkway and South State Street, for the benefit of both the Spring Creek and Provost South businesses and residents.
4. The Mixed-Use (M) Land Use Map designation should not develop under mixed-use guidelines (see pg. 10) until an area master plan has been established. Mixed-use development should be considered for the property along the west side of South State Street (US 89), between 900 South and 1860 South, with mixed-use commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above (vertical mixed-use), or with commercial uses

along street frontages and residential uses to the rear (horizontal mixed-use). Multi-family housing may be developed within this area with or without the commercial elements if developed as part of a project redevelopment option (PRO), performance development (PD), or specific development plan (SDP) zone.

- a) Flexibility in interpretation of these use boundaries and careful planning in establishing uses within the corridor, based on need and the desire to “soften” the frontage with limited areas of residential, is encouraged.
 - b) This policy will guide the location and development of appropriate residential uses within the Commercial land use designation of the General Plan Map for these properties. Mixed-use neighborhood centers with the heaviest emphasis on commercial/residential vertical mixed-use should be focused near the intersections of 1320 S State and 1860 S State. The highest vertical mixed-use intensities should be closest to these mixed-use neighborhood centers with residential density and commercial intensities tapering off between the general centers.
 - c) Exceptions to this policy should be made for existing businesses, developed within the M-1 zone, that have made significant investment in the area and have upgraded their properties to more closely comply with the expectations of the adopted design corridor through enhanced landscaping, architectural improvements, and other standards.
5. Continue to implement the South State Street Design Corridor from the south City limits to 300 South for new development and redevelopment. Educate owners of existing buildings about the goals and standards of the Design Corridor and encourage them to comply with the design corridor standards to the extent possible, given the limitations of building location and configuration. Require compliance with Design Corridor standards for expansion and exterior remodeling of existing businesses to the extent possible, given the limitations of building location.
 6. Properties along the South State Street corridor should develop for quality businesses that are compatible with adjoining and nearby residential development, with focus on retail commercial and shopping center uses within a planned, well-designed configuration with quality architectural and landscaping details to enhance this redevelopment corridor and gateway to the city. New heavy commercial uses should be discouraged along the State Street frontage, and existing heavy commercial uses should be evaluated for appropriate zoning and upgrades consistent with the desired character of this gateway corridor.
 7. Provide family-oriented public recreational space, possibly at the neighborhood park level as defined by the Parks and Recreation element of the General Plan, to service the residents of this neighborhood.
 8. Continue to evaluate the process by which the CDBG eligible neighborhoods may effectively utilize neighborhood revitalization initiatives and as provided through the Central Neighborhood Revitalization Coordinating Committee (CNRCC) and the Neighborhood Coordinating Committee (NCC).

University

1. The University is an exception to the guiding principles of the Southeast Area Neighborhood Council as there are no significant areas of one-family housing within its boundaries.
2. Due to its magnitude and unique characteristics, Brigham Young University (BYU) is significantly different from other public facility land uses. In particular, BYU owned properties that lie within or in proximity to the boundaries of the adjoining Joaquin Neighborhood South Campus Planning Area should be reviewed for compatibility with key land use policies for campus-oriented student housing, mixed-use development, and ancillary services in the areas south and west of the BYU campus.

Wasatch Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SE Area.
2. Do not allow the Supplementary Residential overlay zone to expand beyond its current boundaries as shown on the September 5, 2002, Provo City Zoning Map.
3. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood by limiting development to detached, one-family dwellings.
4. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family detached housing. Higher density residential housing such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood.
5. It is the intent of Council that a boundary between the higher density uses of Brigham Young University (BYU) on the west side of 900 East and the one-family residential uses of the Wasatch neighborhood be maintained. This plan designates 900 East as the boundary that best respects existing uses and protects both uses from the incompatibility of having high density residential or commercial uses next to one-family residential uses. Because 900 East provides the most logical buffer between these two incompatible uses, this plan designates that residential properties on 900 East, between Cedar and the PF Public Facilities zone, should be maintained as one-family detached housing. Higher density residential housing such as duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments are not compatible with the goals for this area.
6. It is the intent of the Council that existing commercial development not be allowed to expand to the degree that it encroaches into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
7. It is the intent of the Council that non-residential uses such as commercial, public facilities, and professional office not be allowed within the residential area on 900 East between Cedar Avenue and the PF (Public Facilities) zone.

Southwest Area Neighborhood Council Map # 6.10

The Southwest Area Neighborhood Council consists of six neighborhoods, which includes the Fort Utah, Lakeview North, Lakeview South, Lakewood, Provo Bay, and the Sunset neighborhoods. Key policies for the Southwest Area Neighborhood Council are listed below by neighborhood. Key policies for the Southwest Area Council are listed below, with policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Southwest Area neighborhoods, followed by policies of specific importance, by neighborhood.

Southwest Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

The following policies and goals are considered to be shared, to some degree, by all of the Southwest Area neighborhoods and apply in addition to the policies listed individually for each neighborhood:

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
2. Maintain the Residential (R) General Plan designation with one-family residential development. The aggregate gross density for any development or SDP should not exceed four units per acre.
3. Restrict the conversion of agricultural lands to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Residential (R) area is developed in order to provide logical sequencing of development where infrastructure is available to support increased density and to avoid leap-frog development.
4. Land within the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) definition of the "AE" flood zone, as defined on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), should be included within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) and will be subject to studies of potential wetlands, flood plains or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or by any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
5. Development of wetlands and flood plain south of the Utah Lake meander line should be prohibited or restricted, subject to studies of potential wetlands, flood plains or other conditions, as required by the City Engineer or by any State or Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction to ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld from development.
6. The Southwest Area encompasses the majority of Provo City's significant undeveloped tracts of land. Development of many of these areas will have a direct impact on Provo City's existing utility and street systems. Some of these areas were not included in the current Transportation Master Plan or the Wastewater Collection System Master Plan. Updates to these planning documents will need to be made in order to evaluate and respond to the impact of new development on critical infrastructures.
7. It is the intent of the City to update these master plans in the near future. No development (including annexation, preliminary plan approval, rezoning, etc.) should occur in areas where development will place a burden upon Provo City and the ability to service the areas, and the City should process requests for additional development west of I-15 only after the City Public Works Department confirms that the street and public utility systems can comfortably absorb the additional development.
8. Subject to documentation that the public street and utility systems can support a new development, it is the intention of the Planning Commission and Municipal Council to encourage private property owners interested in the development of land to cooperatively assemble multiple parcels to allow for large-scale, unified and cohesive development through the application of a Specific Development Plan (SDP).

a) Undeveloped tracts of land, other than those deemed as infill to the development of a general area, should not be annexed into the City, or be rezoned, until a Specific Development Plan addressing that area has been adopted.

b) In most instances, private parties, rather than the City, will be responsible for the preparation of a Specific Development Plan. Private parties are expected to work closely with the planning division staff to ensure that General Plan and other goals are incorporated into the plan.

c) The City may amend the General Plan to outline general goals for Specific Development Plans in targeted areas.

d) The section of this chapter of the General Plan addressing Specific Development Plans provides additional information on the purpose, intent and method for this process. Title 14 Zoning, of the Provo Municipal Code, provides the regulatory framework for the SDP Overlay Zone.

e) The adoption of a Specific Development Concept plan does not guarantee the development of properties if the utilities and street systems need to be upgraded as described in Number 5, 6 and 7 of this policy.

9. The Southwest Area has typically been referred to as Provo's west side. This area should develop a more specific and unique name that captures its character and distinctiveness.
10. Additional parks and recreational facilities should be evaluated for the Southwest Area when the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is updated.
11. A master plan should be developed for the Southwest Area.

*Key land use policies for individual neighborhoods within the **Southwest Area Council** are listed, below, by neighborhood:*

Fort Utah Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
2. Encourage 100 feet of public open space along the south side of the Provo River with the development of each property.
3. The property along the south side of the Provo River located between Geneva Road and Interstate 15 tracks, known as the KOA campground, may be considered for one-family development subject to compliance with Chapter 14.33 (Flood Plain Zone), Provo City Code, and may be developed pursuant to the requirements for a Specific Development Plan, Project Redevelopment Option or Performance Development as set forth in Title 14 of the Provo City Code.
4. The area bounded by Center Street and the Provo River, west of the Lakeside Village Subdivision, within the Residential (R) designation of the Fort Utah Neighborhood, should develop as one-family detached homes with lot sizes of one-half acre or greater, and may include limited animal rights unless a proposed subdivision is designed as a "cluster" type development wherein smaller lots enable the developer to provide a significant amount of common open space. It should be noted that a future collector road is proposed by UDOT to connect into Geneva Road (approximately 2000 North, Provo) and connect to Center Street (Provo) west of 3110 West. The minimum width of right-of-way required will be 100 feet. The exact alignment of the collector road is unknown, therefore, prior to approval of any future

- development including rezoning of any property in this vicinity, the location of the proposed collector road should be determined. Right-of-way dedication for the proposed road may also be required.
5. The Residential Agricultural Specific Development Plan, adopted by Municipal Council Resolution 2006-104, is included as Appendix C-3 of the General Plan in order to guide development of this area when the Specific Development Plan zone is adopted.
 - a) The three (3) acre parcel identified in the Pelican Creek Specific Development Plan as open space should develop with recreational uses such as an equestrian center, riding park or other similar uses.
 - b) The Master Street Plan indicates that 3110 West, designated as a collector road, will eventually cross northward over the Provo River via a future bridge linked to Lakeshore Drive. The timing of this element will be addressed with each successive phase of the Pelican Creek Specific Development Plan.
 6. The River's End Specific Development Plan, adopted by Municipal Council Resolution 2007-72, is included as Appendix C-4 of the General Plan in order to guide development of this area when the Specific Development Plan zone is adopted.
 7. Center Street, between Geneva Road and Interstate-15, should be studied and planned to capitalize on the reconstruction of the Interstate 15 Center Street interchange. An analysis of appropriate mixed-use and commercial land uses, densities and other factors should guide the development of any zoning ordinances regulating this area.

Lakeview North

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
2. The property west and parallel of Geneva Road from Lakeshore Drive to 2000 North should be developed for uses compatible with the Residential (R) land use designation.
3. Property within and to the west of land located within the "AE" flood zone of the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) should receive the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) and be subject to the same provisions as defined under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
4. Infrastructure needs should continue to be evaluated in order to resolve issues for existing and future residents, particularly where road conditions may be hazardous.
5. Continue to review for appropriately siting the airport access road and consider potential impacts to current residents along Lakeshore Drive.
6. The area between 1680 North and 2000 North, and between Geneva Road and I-15, should be developed as a Specific Development Plan comprised of: high density multifamily units to be located at the southeast corner of Geneva Road and 2000 North, where density and design are determined at the time of approval of the Specific Development Plan, and one family subdivision development comprised of approximately 135 lots in the areas designated as R (residential). No commercial uses shall be permitted between Geneva Road and the railroad corridor.
7. The Lake View Fields Specific Development Plan, adopted by Municipal Council Resolution 2006-08, is included as Appendix C-5 of the General Plan in order to guide development of this area when the Specific Development Plan zone is adopted. The

following policies relate to the Celebrations SDP, adopted by the Municipal Council Resolution 2009-36:

- a. The area between Geneva Road and Utah Lake, and between 1390 North and 2000 North (approximately 287 acres) should be developed as a Specific Development Plan (SDP) comprising of Village commercial with retail and professional office uses located at the southwest corner of 2000 North and Geneva Road together with a mix of housing units, parks and open space on the remainder of the property as generally shown in the attached concept plan (see Appendix C-6). The concept plan provides for commercial and residential uses that are appropriate for the area. Density should be highest adjacent to the Village commercial and reduced in density as development moves away from the town center.
- b. Single family subdivision lots may range from 5,000 square feet to more than 10,000 square feet in area and be designed in a proportional method to provide a wide range of housing sizes, style and variety. Single family detached units will be permitted on these lots.
- c. Single family attached units and multi-family units will be permitted in the SDP development. The Planning Commission and Municipal Council will determine the densities as part of the preliminary plan and rezoning approval process.
- d. The adoption of a conceptual plan is to assist with the revision of the Master Street Plan and the Wastewater Collections Master Plans and to lay the foundation for future development. The eventual adoption of a preliminary Specific Development plan and ordinance text amendment for the SDP will determine the final design of the project.
- e. The architectural theme for the SDP may include colonial, cottage, country, craftsman, farmhouse, French country, prairie, ranch and Tudor styles. Individual neighborhoods within the SDP including the commercial center must contain a variation of the above architectural styles.
- f. There must be at least three distinct design elements carried throughout the entire SDP project as part of an overall theme.
- g. All proposed parks and open space areas will be installed by the developer in conjunction with each phase. Amenities are to be provided with each park or open space area such as sport courts, amphitheaters, play fields for soccer, football, baseball, other sports activities, family and group picnic areas including pavilions, barbeques, playgrounds, tot lots, trails, walkways for walking, jogging and bicycle riding, in addition to nature trails. In cooperation with Provo City, parks may be considered for dedication for public use. Maintenance of dedicated parks will be provided by the City. Maintenance of all remaining open space, trails, paths, amenities and parks will be provided by a homeowner's association.
- h. Consideration must be given for the development of a future fire station and a public facility structure which may include a pump house and/or other facilities which may be deemed important to service this area.
- i. Until recently, this area was located in unincorporated Utah County, and it has not been included in the design of future streets and utilities and cannot be properly serviced without the upgrading of the existing infrastructure. The City recognizes

that the current public utility infrastructure will not support this project. The Master Street Plan and the Wastewater Collections Master Plans must be revised, factoring in the proposed development. Until the Master Street Plan and the Wastewater Collections Master Plans are revised and adopted, development in this area may be premature.

- j. Any development of this area may require off site improvements beyond the proposed development to existing systems at a developer's expense. The extent of the required upgrades has not been yet determined.
- k. Limitations on development (including annexation, preliminary plan approval, rezoning, etc.) should occur in the area until the Master Street Plan and the Wastewater Collections Master Plans are revised, adopted and funded or the overall infrastructure issues can be addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of Provo City.

Lakeview South

- 1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
- 2. An infrastructure improvement plan should be considered for improvements to sidewalks, drainage, parks, landscaping and traffic conditions.
- 3. All development within the Residential (R) designation should develop as one-family detached homes with lot sizes of one-half acre or greater, and may include limited animal rights unless as proposed subdivision is designed as a "cluster" type development where in smaller lots enable the developer to provide a significant amount of common open space. Development should complement and enhance the neighborhood.
- 4. Retail development should be discouraged within the Lakeview South Neighborhood.
- 5. The neighborhood supports the mobile home park known as Leisure Village to redevelop under the guidelines of a Specific Development Plan (SDP) or PRO to consist of one-family detached, one-family semidetached (twin homes), and/or one-family attached (town homes).

Lakewood

- 1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
- 2. Continue to evaluate airport access and the potential impacts or benefits to existing residents resulting from planned road connections to the airport access road, taking into consideration a neighborhood recommendation to connect 1600 West rather than 500 West.
 - a. The need for northbound and southbound access on 1-15 into the neighborhood should be evaluated and implemented if warranted.
 - b. The collector road system should seek to make minimal impacts on existing farming/agricultural properties.
 - c. 500 West and 680 West should be carefully evaluated for their need to be developed as collector roads and appropriate design measures should be incorporated into the design of these streets to mitigate detriments to the neighborhood.
- 3. Continue to work toward infrastructure improvements to serve existing residents and to ensure that infrastructure is in place, prior to new development, to provide adequate storm drainage, street connections and appropriately designed and located public park space.

4. New development should be appropriately incorporated to respect the rural feel of the Lakewood area, to complement and enhance the neighborhood, and to provide adequate living space for growing families that wish to relocate to or remain within the Lakewood neighborhood.
5. The lack of sidewalks in the Lakewood Neighborhood is a public safety concern particularly for school children. Providing sidewalks where they currently do not exist should be a high priority.
6. Applicable environmental impacts should be thoroughly evaluated prior to approving any new development in the Lakewood Neighborhood.
7. The City should consider aesthetic improvements to the City owned property at 920 South, 770 West. This property should be improved to be a pleasing entrance into the Neighborhood.
8. The Lakewood Neighborhood should be evaluated for additional neighborhood parks.
9. Footprinters Park creates challenging neighborhood impacts regarding traffic and parking area. These concerns have had a detrimental impact to the neighborhood and the City should take actions necessary to mitigate these issues.

Provo Bay Neighborhood

Goals of the Provo Bay Neighborhood:

1. Preserve the current open feel of the neighborhood. New development should always enhance not detract from the neighborhood.
2. Achieve a balance of sizes and styles when new one-family homes are developed.
3. Provide better recreational opportunities and take advantage of recreational opportunities afforded by Utah Lake.
4. Evaluate and encourage retail development in appropriate areas that would provide needed neighborhood services.
5. Evaluate the feasibility of locating new arterial roads – such as the proposed West Side Connector – to not be adjacent to current residential development.

Key Land Use Policies – Provo Bay Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area
2. Discourage residential development west of 3110 West to avoid airport flight paths and the airport protection area, as identified in the Airport Master Plan (Appendix B-1).
3. Achieve a balance of sizes and types of one-family residential development. New developments should complement and enhance the neighborhood, providing adequate living space for growing families that wish to relocate to or remain within the Provo Bay Neighborhood.
4. Enhance recreational opportunities and take advantage of the proximity to Utah Lake. These include, but are not limited to: developing recreation access to Provo Bay and trails along the proposed West Side Connector. The purchase of Utah Lake State Park from the State should be evaluated and considered. Access from the proposed West Side Connector to Provo Bay for canoeing, bird watching and fishing, along with a paved trail system to

provide residents with biking, walking and other activities along the Provo Bay shore line should be considered.

5. Retail development should be encouraged at proper locations within the neighborhood, such as along Center Street and the proposed West Side Connector. Retail should include but not be limited to grocery and banking services.
6. The area west of 1600 West and South of 600 South that borders the proposed West Side Connector road should be developed as a Specific Development Plan consisting of commercial, retail and residential use. This Specific Development Plan should be initiated by the City and not left entirely up to developers and land owners. This property, if properly planned, could have a combination of retail and residential uses.
7. The West Side Connector alignment should be located away from existing development but should also not jeopardize environmentally sensitive areas.
8. Study the feasibility of maintaining 3110 West as a residential arterial road and align the West Side Connector road to the edge of the airport development area as it proceeds north.
9. Conduct a study to identify appropriate land uses within the Airport Related Activities designation
10. The Airport Master Plan is an adopted sub-document of the General Plan (see Appendix B-1) and should be referred to in determining land use policy for this neighborhood.

Sunset Neighborhood

1. See policies under the guiding principles for the SW Area.
2. The area between 600 South and 1150 South from 1100 West to 1600 West should be developed with uses compatible with the Residential (R) land use designation. The following guidelines should be considered in the development of this area:
 - a. The area should be developed (allowably in phases under multiple ownership) as a whole and integrated plan using the SDP process as described in the SW Area Guiding Principles and Goals.
 - b. Those currently wishing to maintain animal rights should do so through the application of a Residential Agricultural (RA) zone on their property.
 - c. The area should develop with a rural character in mind and should incorporate a balanced distribution of lot sizes, which should be interspersed amongst each other and should not exceed density limitations expressed in the SW Area Guiding Principles and Goals.
 - d. Equestrian based facilities and trail systems are highly encouraged.
 - e. Footprinters Park should be expanded to add additional neighborhood recreational facilities is encouraged.
 - f. Commercial and non-recreational public facilities are currently not encouraged but may be considered if designed as part of the SDP process and demonstrates that it will be an asset to the development and surrounding neighborhood.
 - g. Road connectivity is encouraged in the design of the SDP. Cul-de-sacs will be highly discouraged unless it is demonstrated that alternatives do not exist.
3. Evaluate opportunities to expand public park services to better serve the Sunset neighborhood and to resolve traffic, parking and light pollution impacts to neighborhoods in the vicinity of the ball park.

4. An infrastructure improvement plan should be considered for improvements to sidewalks, drainage, parks, landscaping and traffic conditions.

Additional Tools for Urban Growth and Land Use Annexation Policy Plan

Provo City's Annexation Policy Plan was brought to the Planning Commission for a public hearing in 2002 and was approved by Resolution 2003-15 of the Municipal Council on February 4, 2003. This plan has received subsequent review through public hearings of the Planning Commission and Municipal Council in association with the Comprehensive Update to the 1997 General Plan, initiated in 2002 and approved in 2004. As the changes effected through recent annexations reflect policies of the Municipal Council and elements of agreements with Utah County, Springville City, Orem City, and the U.S. Forest Service, the plan incorporated herein as part of the Provo City General Plan retains the 2003 Annexation Policy Plan, but notes which annexations have been completed at the time of adoption of this update to the General Plan in Fall 2009.

Need for an Annexation Policy Plan

As pressures for development and expansion continue within the city and its environs, it is necessary that the City maintain an annexation policy plan to assure orderly growth and development of the community. An annexation policy will also protect the general interests of the taxpaying public, as well as those individual property owners who wish to annex to the City to enjoy the benefits which accrue from being within the City limits. In order to assure this mutual protection, there must be specific policy guidelines or criteria by which the annexation requirements of the City, as well as each individual annexation, may be judged and evaluated. The following constitutes the guidelines established for the Provo City annexation policy plan.

Annexation Policy Plan Guidelines

Each annexation under consideration should be expanded to include the greatest amount of property possible, within the limits shown on the attached map, to assure that:

1. Public reaction in and around the annexation area is appropriately balanced with the needs of the community;
2. Duplication of services is eliminated;
3. City standards related to improvements are maintained consistently on a contiguous block face and on adjoining properties to the greatest extent possible;
4. Piecemeal annexation of individual small properties does not occur which would diminish the potential for later annexation of small pockets or "islands" of opposing unincorporated area;
5. Expansion of city boundaries will include some unimproved land which will provide an inventory for future development;

6. The circulation system of streets and highways is enhanced by placing a system in one jurisdiction to eliminate maintenance confusion;
7. There is an increased ability to plan for orderly community and area-wide development through orderly and logical boundaries for the incorporated areas of Provo City, the unincorporated areas of Utah County, and the boundaries of adjacent communities;
8. The ability exists to better control fire, police, and other safety-oriented problems through more logical development and more reasonable political boundaries;
9. There is greater efficiency and economy in supplying utilities and other public services in areas of more orderly and systematic city boundaries;
10. The City's right of self-determination and local home rule is enhanced through the realization of ultimate city boundaries which are more desirable and more orderly;
11. The City is able to exercise greater regulation over improper and undesirable land uses and development in the fringe areas, thereby protecting the city taxpayers against future costs which may occur to correct such uses and development.

The Character of the Community

The character of Provo City consists of agricultural, residential, commercial, public/institutional, and industrial land uses. Annexation proposals should be evaluated based upon the compatibility of the proposed land use with the character of the overall surrounding neighborhood and city.

The Need for Municipal Services in Developed and Undeveloped Unincorporated Areas

Provo City utilities and services shall not extend into unincorporated properties on the fringes of the city nor to "islands" of unincorporated properties, except to other units of government. In order to provide for the orderly growth and development of Provo City and to avoid undue costs to taxpayers, Provo City utility and service hook-ons shall not be provided to unincorporated areas, but shall only be made available to those areas which are annexed to Provo City. The only exception shall be those extensions which are made to other units of government under the Interlocal Government Cooperation Act, as deemed appropriate by the Municipal Council.

The Municipality's Plans for Extension of Municipal Services

Utilities, such as water, sewer, and electrical should be extended to annexed areas as soon as practicable after annexation. Residents of urbanizing areas require increased municipal services, which the City should provide immediately upon annexation. These include garbage collection, snow removal, paramedic services, and police and fire protection, which are financed by general fund revenues and service fees. The requirements for extension of such utilities are set forth on an area by area basis, which areas are described in "Areas Proposed for Future Annexation," below.

The City feels the responsibility of developing the backbone of the various utility distribution and collection systems in newly developing areas. This work includes the development of new water wells, reservoirs, and utility trunk lines. However, specific commitments and the construction time frame for such utilities will be dependent upon development demand and sufficient capital budgets. Such commitments and time frames will be determined at the time annexation occurs and will be a part of the impact report required by the Provo City Code.

How the Services will be Funded

Provo City's policy is to participate with developers in the cost of improvements for which benefits do not accrue directly to developers. For instance, when utility mainlines are required to be a certain size to serve an entire area, but that size is larger than that required to service a given subdivision, the City will fund the difference in the cost of providing the larger size. In this way, costs of improvements benefitting the City, at large, are borne by the taxpayer; and costs associated with the particular development are borne by the developer, who passes these costs onto individual property buyers. Adopted as part of the subdivision ordinance is the breakdown of costs in the respective portions to be paid for by the developer and the City. The City's share is financed by the general fund, gas tax road funds, and connection and user fees.

An Estimate of the Tax Consequences to Residents Both Currently within the Municipal Boundaries and in the Expansion Area

Tax consequences and interests of affected entities, relative to a proposed annexation, should be considered. Present mil levies in Provo City are comparable to adjacent County areas, including Utah County residents in the Nebo and Alpine School Districts. Utility costs, particularly for electricity, are less expensive in the City than in the County. Thus, many times it is economically beneficial for property owners to annex to Provo City. Additionally, such property owners receive many benefits in return for higher tax assessments. These include snow removal, increased police and fire protection, and other City services.

The Interests of All Affected Entities

Areas proposed for annexation are logical expansions of Provo City's corporate limits and will not unduly affect the tax revenues of adjacent entities. Utah County has the policy of not providing urban services to rural areas, and minimal services are now provided by the county to such areas. It is felt that Provo City can most efficiently deliver the urban services which will be required as urbanization occurs. The City of Springville and the City of Orem may also be impacted by land annexed into and developed in Provo City. Noticing and coordination with these jurisdictions, along with noticing and coordination with special improvement or service districts and school districts, should also occur.

Areas Proposed for Annexation Policy Plan Map # 6.1

Area One: Area one is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the north and west. No serious water or sewer constraints exist in this area. There are gravity flow sewers in the immediate vicinity, and the culinary water supply to the area was extended with the East Mountain development. The General Plan calls for Residential (R) and Commercial (C) development in this area. However, a portion of this area is currently being used for a sand and gravel mining operation with permits issued in the county. Any significant development here would first require the reclamation of the sand and gravel operation. There is also an auto salvage operation just south of the East Mountain development and Utah County's Public Works buildings. Since South State Street is one of the major entries to the city, having this property in the city gives Provo some control over how it develops, and the image created as

one enters Provo. South State Street is one of the “design review” corridors proposed along major entrances to the city.

Annexation Ordinance 2006-1, annexing approximately 1.25 acres of real property, located generally at 2400 S. Alaska Avenue, Provost South Neighborhood, was approved by the Municipal Council on May 6, 2009. 08-0001(A)

Area Two: Area two is bounded by I-15 on the west, existing Provo City limits on the north and east, and the Provo/Springville City Boundary Agreement Line on the south. The General Plan calls for a combination of light and heavy industry (I) in this area, between the railroad tracks and between Kuhni Road and I-15. Provo City has electrical lines in this area, and has extended sewer lines as far south as the Kuhni rendering plant. Water and sewer line extensions would be required to continue annexation south of the rendering plant and east of the railroad tracks.

Area Three: Area three is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the north and by Utah Lake on the south and west. The Central Utah Project calls for the eventual diking and drainage of Provo Bay, thus providing the potential for urban development. Should this occur, Provo City would be in the best position to service this area. The General Plan currently designates this area as Developmentally Sensitive (DS) because of the flood plain and wetlands. A General Plan amendment would be required to determine land use and other policies in this area, if it were reclaimed, and significant capital investment in utility systems would also be required to service this area. A frontage road west of I-15 between the University Avenue and Springville interchanges would also be necessary to provide access to this area.

Area Four: Area four is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the south and east, Utah Lake on the west, and 2000 North on the north. The development of this area will require additional water distribution system capacity as well as the construction of waste water lift stations. Present land uses in this area are agricultural and residential types. A large conservation easement, wetlands, and other environmental considerations in this area will need substantial consideration in the annexation and development process.

Annexation Ordinance 2004-1, annexing approximately 139 acres of real property, located generally between 1552 North, 2000 North, Geneva Road and I-15, Lakeview Neighborhood, was approved by the Municipal Council February 3, 2004. 03-0002(A). This represents the northeast portion of the Area Four proposed annexation.

Annexation Ordinance 2009-2, annexing approximately 346.72 acres of real property, located generally between 1300 North and 2000 North From Geneva Road to the Utah Lake 100 Year Flood Plain Meander Line, Lakeview North Neighborhood, was approved by the Municipal Council on October 8, 2009. 08-0001(A)

Area Five: Area five is bounded on the west and south by existing Provo City limits, and on the east by the Uinta National Forest boundary. Existing water pressure zones can serve this area to an elevation of approximately 5,200 feet. Area 5 can be served by gravity waste water systems, but main lines would have to be extended into the area from existing lines several thousand feet away. Development in most of this area (over 10% slope) would be controlled by the Hillside Development Standards of the Subdivision Ordinance. The General Plan calls for Residential (R) development in this area.

A petition to annex 4.6 acres, known as the Loveless Annexation, within Area Five, generally located at 5001 N. Canyon Road, between Canyon Road and University Avenue, application 04-0002 A, was pending action by the Municipal Council at the time of adoption of the Comprehensive Update to the General Plan in 2004. [Approved 11/9/2004, Annexation Ordinance 2004-2]

An annexation of 1.18 acres, known as the Gillespie Annexation, within Area Five, generally located at 5290 N. Canyon Road, application 05-0001 A, was approved by action of the Municipal Council on 10/18/2005, Annexation Ordinance 2005-1, in response to a petition to annex 0.93 acre.

An annexation of 9.04 acres, known as the Budge Annexation, within Area Five, generally located at 5240 N. Canyon Road, application 09-0001A, was approved by action of the Municipal Council on August 8, 2009, Annexation Ordinance 2009-01.

Area Six: Area six is bounded on the west, south, and north by Provo City limits and on the east by Utah County. The area encompasses the Forest Service land east and north of Sherwood Hills and north of Little Rock Canyon. Even though this area contains steep slopes that would limit development, it would be annexed into Provo to preserve the hillsides from future mining uses.

Area Seven: Area seven is located between 4400 North and 4600 North from University Avenue to Canyon Road. This property is an island of Utah County which is completely surrounded by Provo City limits. Most of these properties receive Provo City municipal services.

A City-initiated petition in 2003 to annex 26 acres within Area Seven for the purpose of street improvements did not meet the requirements of annexation due to protest by more than 50 percent of the property owners living in the area. The petition to annex was withdrawn. 03-0001(A). Based on the intended use stated by the property owners, the land has been designated on the General Plan Map as A - Agricultural rather than its previous designation of R - Residential.

Areas Proposed for Municipal Boundary Adjustment Map # 6.2

Area One: Area one is located in Provo along 1700 North 2100 West and should be adjusted with the City of Orem to allow for the Ercanbrack property to be developed in Orem. The railroad right-of-way that Provo City owns should be purchased by the Ercanbracks and should also be adjusted to Orem's boundary.

Area one has been accomplished by agreement with the City of Orem.

Area Two: Area two is located in Provo just before the Carterville Road bridge northeast of University Parkway. The City of Orem owns a lift station on this property, which is located in Provo City, and should be adjusted to Orem's boundary.

Area Three: Area three is located in Orem just north of 3700 North and just east of the Provo River. Provo City owns a deep well on this property, which is located in the City of Orem and should be adjusted to Provo's boundary.

Area Four: Area four is located in Orem east of the Provo River at the entrance of Provo Canyon and should be adjusted to Provo's boundary. The property is very steep and probably will not develop, but it should be in Provo to establish U.S. Route 189 as the common boundary between Provo and Orem in Provo Canyon.

Areas Proposed for Municipal Disconnection Map # 6.3

Area One: Area one is the Heritage Mountain Ski Area Annexation and was annexed into Provo City in 1978 to construct a world class ski resort. After review of the Environmental Impact Statement, the U.S. Forest Service denied the permit, and the facility was never built. Therefore, Provo is proposing a disconnection of 7,035 acres, which is most of the 7,515 acres of the Heritage Mountain Ski Area Annexation.

Project Redevelopment Option

The Project Redevelopment Option, or PRO, was adopted in 2002 as an element of Title 14 Zoning to provide a flexible zoning tool, primarily for redevelopment and infill development within Provo. The evaluation factors for use of a PRO as a development tool for land within Provo is detailed in Title 14 Zoning of the Provo Municipal Code. The General Plan is consulted as a guide, but recognition is given to the PRO as a tool intended for flexible and creative development that will better meet the needs of the immediate community, and the greater community of Provo, than would be produced through use of standard zone districts.

Approval of a PRO zone is a legislative action, as it includes three approval steps, two of which require action of the Municipal Council. The PRO involves (1) Council approval, following a recommendation by the Planning Commission, of an ordinance text amendment to Title 14 Zoning to create the development parameters of the new PRO zone; (2) Council approval, following a recommendation by the Planning Commission, of a request to rezone a specific tract of land to the

new PRO zone, and (3) approval by the Planning Commission of a preliminary project plan for the new development.

The best use of the PRO is being evaluated over time and may continue to change to meet concerns related to administering the Provo City Zoning Ordinance. A long-range planning effort should be undertaken to develop and adopt zones tailored to the unique needs of the neighborhoods. Once appropriate locations for the specialized zones have been determined and the standards adopted, the PRO should be used limitedly to facilitate redevelopment of exceptionally difficult properties or to allow development of an exceptionally unique project that cannot be modified to accommodate the zone standards.

An alternative possibility would be to establish four or five PRO zones that had enough flexibility to regulate existing and newly proposed PRO zones. These zones could be developed in such a way to also eliminate the Performance Zoning standards (which have been identified in the General Plan to be updated or absorbed into the PRO format).

The PRO is now the principal tool used for multiple-family residential developments or one-family attached developments, as a city-wide rezoning of multiple-family residential districts to the Residential Conservation (RC) zone necessitated that a rezoning occur to construct or expand multi-family housing projects. The PRO can also be used for one-family detached homes where the development parameters do not comply with the standard R1 zones and where use of the Performance Development (PD) overlay zone is not possible or preferable. This is more likely to occur for redevelopment projects that replace a single home or several homes with new homes, whereas a PD is more likely to be used for new development on larger tracts of previously undeveloped land.

It is intended that a PRO will be used for assembling multiple parcels into a larger development area and that the PRO will look beyond its own boundaries and consider how adjoining lands could be incorporated in the future, particularly within a single city block. The PRO may be applied by the Council, at its discretion, to a larger boundary than the area owned by or under contract for purchase by the developer. Again, the PRO is envisioned as a redevelopment tool, whereas the Specific Development Plan may be more appropriate for new development or larger-scale, master-planned projects with multiple components.

Use of the PRO tool is not limited to residential development. Although not yet widely used for commercial or other non-residential proposals at the time this General Plan was adopted, the PRO has been used for mixed-use proposals that will combine residential and commercial uses in a new-urbanist design. In this application of the ordinance, the PRO has also been used for new development on previously undeveloped land (in contrast to its expected use for redevelopment or infill development) due to severe constraints that made development within standard zone district parameters difficult. These have not yet been constructed, so it will take some time to evaluate the long-term usefulness of the PRO, particularly where it is applied to previously undeveloped land. This use has also raised issues related to deviations from design corridor standards, which must be further evaluated over time.

Specific Development Plans

A primary problem of growing cities and towns is piecemeal, uncoordinated development. Undeveloped land is often parceled into many separately owned holdings, each with a variety of sizes and configurations. If such properties develop independently, coordinated features, such as an overall network of connected streets or neighborhood parks, may be difficult to obtain. Standard subdivision requirements that prescribe open space requirements and street connections attempt to address this problem but may not always go far enough, resulting in uncoordinated, patchwork development, rather than a coherent neighborhood.

Different goals between property owners or a simple lack of communication can unnecessarily fragment new development. The design of development projects is left largely to landowners and prospective developers. Plans are then reviewed by the City for compliance with existing policies and standards. Often, little design cooperation exists between neighboring property owners involved in a prospective development. As a result of different goals, many fractious hearings may be held concerning development proposals and associated zone map amendments.

These kinds of problems may be addressed by developing and adopting a Specific Development Plan (“SDP”) for a given area. An SDP describes in more detail the type of development planned for a specific area than is typically found in most general plans, zoning ordinances, or public-facilities plans. Unlike a project plan, which is typically applied to a land area assembled within single ownership for the purpose of development, an SDP can apply to a large area with multiple landowners. An SDP may require more detailed planning, but also allows for more innovation in design and organization of land uses.

The SDP is intended to promote coordinated planning concepts and pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development. Establishing an SDP in a particular area in advance of a development proposal can help to ensure that an area is built in a coherent fashion. An SDP can also provide a framework for locating creative, smart development features such as a connected network of safe streets, neighborhood parks, open space, efficient development patterns, and better neighborhood design.

The SDP provides greater certainty for all parties (the City, developers, and the neighbors) as a detailed, overall plan is approved, as a General Plan amendment and rezoning may be approved, in accordance with this plan, in advance of development. The Council may a) rezone the entire property at the time of approval of the Specific Development Plan, b) rezone only a portion of the property, or c) defer the rezoning until such time as application is made for project plan or subdivision approval. Thus, all the stake-holders will know what will be built and the quality of development expected. As a result, individual owners, developers and interested citizens will likely spend less time in hearings on a particular project located within an SDP area.

The City and/or property owners should prepare SDPs for large or critical areas of the city. Undeveloped or developed tracts with inadequate facilities may be considered for inclusion within an SDP so that the timing of critical infrastructure can be coordinated with development. Specific Development Plans may include residential development, commercial development, or a combination of the two in mixed-use projects. In some areas, such as those designated in the

General Plan for "residential" or "commercial development," a Specific Development Plan may be initiated by the land owner or may be required by the City for large, undeveloped tracts of land or where greater flexibility and creativity of design is desired, such as in a mixed-use development involving residential and commercial uses.

Once an SDP is approved, however, no building permit should be issued unless subdivision applications, project plans and other development approvals are consistent with the SDP. Where separate SDPs are proposed on adjoining or nearly adjoining tracts of land, there should be no gaps or islands of land not covered by the plans. The City may request the inclusion of properties needed to avoid such gaps and islands.

Use of the SDP versus the PRO as a Development Planning Tool

While the Project Redevelopment Option (PRO), previously discussed in this Chapter, may be used for new development on previously undeveloped land, it is primarily intended as a redevelopment tool where assemblage of multiple, smaller parcels is desired for encouraging a more cohesive plan for redevelopment of land previously developed as discrete parcels, typically unrelated to each other in any way other than general use and zoning. The PRO envisions that these properties will be redeveloped as a whole and typically under single ownership.

For raw land or land formerly used for agricultural and very low density housing – and in particular for large areas of land suitable for master planning with varied housing types, localized commercial uses, and church and school uses and other public services such as fire stations – the SDP is a better tool. The SDP creates an overall plan for an area, which may include parcels that remain under control of multiple land owners. It addresses General Plan issues and allows the overall plan to guide individual applications for rezoning and project development on parcels in separate ownership. This helps to overcome the lack of coordination that may occur when separate land owners pursue plans at different times and with little concern for the course of development on adjoining or nearby parcels.

The SDP Process

The process to establish a SDP may be initiated by the Mayor, the Municipal Council, or interested property owners who represent a majority of the land area, and at least 1/3 of the value of real property within the planned area. Property owners who initiate SDP requests should pay the cost of preparing the plan. Similarly, an SDP fee should be imposed on persons seeking approvals required to be consistent with a specific plan initiated by the City in an amount that is proportional to the applicant's relative benefit derived from the SDP.

SDPs should be prepared in consultation with the land owners and neighbors. The Mayor may appoint a steering committee to guide development of the plan, when it involves more than one property owner, and it is undertaken by the City. The steering committee should include persons representing affected property owners, neighbors, Planning Commission, Municipal Council, and City departments. If a consultant is hired by the City to prepare the specific plan, the Steering Committee may assist in evaluating the proposals and selecting the consultant.

A specific plan must have enough detail so that individual projects can be reviewed and approved administratively if the proposal conforms to the plan. Stakeholders, including landowners, developers, existing businesses and area residents need to be involved in the planning process to set and support these standards. With input from stakeholders, a set of objectives for each SDP should be identified. For example, the plan may encourage a certain type of development or may endeavor to protect open space.

The adoption of a specific plan does not necessarily vest development, but its entitlements may be defined by development agreement. Specific plans themselves are dynamic documents and may be subject to future revisions.

A principal purpose of each SDP is to provide administrative approval for projects consistent with the plan. Thus, each SDP, rather than a project, requires close scrutiny. Each SDP should:

- Be consistent with General Plan policies;
- Meet identified objectives;
- Be compatible with the surrounding community;
- Identify specific uses and detailed site and building design guidelines, including street designs and locations; and
- Identify the location, timing, and financing of public facilities.

Draft SDPs should be submitted to the Planning Commission and Council for review, modification, and approval. Application requirements are included in Title 14 of Provo Municipal Code. The hearing process is essentially the same as for amending the General Plan.

Once approved, a specific SDP should be added to the General Plan's appendices with a reference in the specific policies of Chapter 6 for that area. Each SDP area should be rezoned to a new Specific Development Plan Overlay zone that requires all future development in the area to conform to the adopted SDP. If an SDP plan applies to land outside the City limits, the plan should indicate where the SDP overlay zone will be applied upon annexation. New construction under site review or building permit review should be required to meet the special development and design standards of an applicable SDP. Finally, allowed uses, standards, and procedures of an SDP zone should supplement and supersede standards and procedures of the underlying zone.

Special Considerations for Use of the SDP as a Long Range Planning Tool

This new level of planning in the City will solve problems for both the City and developers. It empowers the City to exert greater control and coordination over the development process, promotes more liveable neighborhoods, creates a more predictable development process, and achieves greater consensus in the process. A thorough specific plan can enable planners to effectively implement selected long term General Plan objectives in a relatively short time frame. This policy is to be flexible, allowing the City to create standards for the development of a wide range of projects or solutions to any type of land use issues. The plan may present the land use and design regulations which guide the development of a new civic center or incorporate land use and zoning regulations, infrastructure plans, and development approval processes for the development of residential, office, commercial and open space uses.

The City may need to budget monies for the preparation of SDPs for areas determined to be of critical need, with reimbursement from individual property owners within the SDP as development occurs. Development within areas targeted for SDPs should be restrained to the extent possible until such plans are prepared. The Administration, Council, and Planning Commission must be included in the process of prioritizing areas where SDPs will be prepared. SDPs that have not been developed within five years of their adoption should be reviewed by the Planning Commission to determine whether such SDPs remain viable or need to be amended.