



Request: **Amendment to Site Development Master Plan (SDMP) in the Regional Mixed-Use (R/M-U) Zone**
 Project: Cottonwood Mall Redevelopment
 Address: 4835 South Highland Drive
 Applicant: Ivory Homes, LLC & Woodbury Corporation
 File No: 07-7-1-1
 Staff: Paul Allred, Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner, Pat Hanson, Planner

GOVERNING ORDINANCES:

13.65	REGIONAL MIXED USE ZONE
13.65.060	SITE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN (SDMP)
13.65.080	AMENDMENTS TO THE SDMP – procedure
Gen. Plan	Cottonwood Redevel. Chapter 9 -- SMALL AREA MASTER PLANS COTTONWOOD SITE
2007	COTTONWOOD MALL SITE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission once again met last week to discuss the SDMP and to dialogue with the applicants and staff on technical details of the Plan. The applicants provided some additional very useful graphic information that was requested to help address certain concerns expressed by the public, staff and the Commission. In the interim, the applicants have developed additional revisions and clarifications to the Plan for Commission discussion that may assist them in forwarding a recommendation to the City Council for their immediate consideration. The TRC has provided below analysis, findings and recommendations, including new wrinkles to the Plan.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE R-M/U ZONE & SDMP ANALYSIS

The current Site Development Master Plan (2007 SDMP) is an active regulating document guiding future growth within this area; it is a comprehensive but flexible guide for use when approving specific development site plans. Much of this current SDMP is found by the applicant to be incompatible with redevelopment ability based upon market shifts since 2007. Therefore, several elements of the original plan are proposed by the applicant to be amended. As only the Council may approve modifications to the SDMP, the Planning Commission is required to review an amendment proposal and ensure that the Council will be considering an SDMP which includes all 21 goal elements either as proposed amendments or to be retained. Amending an SDMP is defined (13.65.070.B):

1. A proposed modification exceeds maximum allowable height, density and/or intensity.
2. Proposed modification in density (residential) or intensity (floor area ratio) which varies by ten percent (10%) or more of that approved for a given sector (restricted, limited or open).
3. The height of an exclusively residential building is proposed to be increased by more than ten feet (10') or ten percent (10%), whichever is less.
4. The height of any other building is proposed to be increased by more than fifteen feet (15') or fifteen percent (15%), whichever is greater.
5. The footprint of a building is proposed to be moved by more than fifty feet (50') in any horizontal direction.
6. Any change in the designated land use (for example, from restricted to open).

As the SDMP summarizes the maximum contemplated extent of the development and gives a realistic indication of its mass, scale, appearance, relationship to surrounding uses, the document includes specific elements. Due to the applicant's statement of redevelopment opportunity, the following are areas proposed to be amended as they relate to the 21 goal elements of the R-M/U zone (as enumerated 13.64.060.B.):

- Residential Density (elements #1, 17, 18)
- Commercial and Office intensity (elements #1, 4, 17, 18)

- Parking ratios (element #7, 17)
- Building Heights and massing (element #4)
- Anticipated Architectural elevations and building materials (elements #14, 13)
- Location, distribution and phasing of Land Use Districts (elements #1, 2)
- Associated street circulation, aesthetics and traffic study due to shifts in location, density and intensity of uses (elements #6, 8, 9, 10)
- Associated utility capacity changes (elements #5, 17)
- Open/gathering place plan (element #3)

Due to changes in state and environmental standards including innovations in technology and industry standards, the following elements are also considered amendments, not necessarily associated with the applicants' land redevelopment proposal, but as needed SDMP updates (as enumerated in 13.64.060.B.):

- Overall conceptual site lighting plan. (element #11)
- Environmental and energy efficiency statement of intent. (element #15)
- Site construction control plan and overall environmental quality control/hazard mitigation plan (element #21)

Of utmost important are those elements NOT proposed to change, or requested by the Planning Commission to be updated (as mentioned above), and therefore are not lost "in the shuffle" but retained from the original SDMP. These elements serve as valuable and principal guidelines for ensuring a high quality redevelopment when each block is submitted for site plan approval by the Planning Commission.

- Method of calculating heights – benchmark elevation study for each block (element #20)
- Guiding language allowing the Planning Commission to apply during site plan review and consideration (element #20)
- Land uses per district (element #1)
- Building function tables (element #1)
- Site Geologic Hazards investigations, review and recommendations as per the original SDMP (element #19)
- Site Flood Plain Hazard assessments as per FEMA Certified Letter of Flood Map Amendment (element #19)
- Creek Relocation and channelization as per Army Corps of Engineers' and State of Utah review and requirements (elements #19, 20)
- Creek Setback (element #20 – Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit for Stream Setbacks)

KEY: R-M/U ELEMENTS

1. Land use regulating plan showing the proposed distribution and types of all uses, projected densities, etc.
2. An overall conceptual phasing/subdivision plan.
3. Open space/gathering place plan including location, size, etc.
4. Building massing and heights including proposed floor area ratio.
5. Utility capacity and availability.
6. Traffic control and circulation plans and studies including estimated traffic impacts during construction and demand at build out with potential impacts and possible connections with mass transit, bike and pedestrian trails facilities.
7. Overall parking plan.
8. Thoroughfare locations, types and direction of travel.
9. Street cross sections.
10. Typical examples of streetscape design including aesthetic elements.
11. Overall conceptual site lighting plan.
12. Civil engineering conceptual plans including grading, storm drainage and utilities.
13. Architectural elevations with examples of anticipated design architectural style(s).
14. Examples of anticipated building materials.
15. Environmental and energy efficiency statement of intent.
16. A general signage plan for the exterior and interior of the site.
17. Estimated statistical information for the project.
18. Estimated raw square footage of building by residential or nonresidential use, etc.
19. Geotechnical studies or data supporting proposed level of development.
20. Other studies/information as deemed necessary by the city.
21. A site construction control and overall environmental quality control hazard mitigation and monitoring plan.

SUMMARY OF HOW EACH ELEMENT HAS BEEN ADDRESSED

1. Land use regulating plan showing the proposed distribution and types of all uses, projected densities, etc.
As per the R-M/U guiding language a range of allowed densities are applicable to a master plan (SDMP) – flexible range of minimum and maximum uses are conducive to the success of any redevelopment area. The commission should query the applicant as to the how office and residential intensities are balanced when considering how the increase or decrease of each use support a retail component.
2. An overall conceptual phasing/subdivision plan.
Elements have not changed from Ivory’s first proposal
3. Open space/gathering place plan including location, size, etc.
Plan includes additional new open space extending the “festival” field and clarification on gathering place elements. This is significant because it effectively links the mixed use area to the lower density area from a visual and functional perspective – and reduces or eliminates the argument that this SDMP complies with the 30 acre minimum for the RM/U zone. It also provides additional space for residents to recreate on-site.
4. Building massing and heights including proposed floor area ratio
Dramatic changes to building tiers (stepping back) have been proposed. The proposed 136’ height has been reduced to 110 feet for the NE corner with the 136’ foot height still proposed at the NW corner with massing of the bulk and height away from the intersection of Murray Holladay and Highland Drive. All other mixed use heights are proposed at 90’. (Summary: One building at 110’, not including rooftop equipment, and, three more buildings at 90’, not including roof top mechanical equipment) Overall this represents a proposed increase in building height over the current SDMP, but much less than initially proposed at the public hearing 11/21. The rooftop equipment constitutes a very small portion of the roof area and will be located well away from the edge of roof effectively screening it from public view.
5. Utility capacity and availability.
Connections locations have been noted, water and sewer availability are lacking at the moment pending determination of overall service connections – units/space will have to be connected to utilities.
6. Traffic control and circulation plans and studies including estimated traffic impacts during construction and demand at build out (10 years) with potential impacts and possible connections with mass transit, bike and pedestrian trails facilities.
Staff requested Dr. Joe Perrin from A-Trans to review this study. His review is attached to this staff report. Recommendations were submitted to the applicant’s traffic engineer who is currently making the requested additions and clarifications in a revised study – yet to come. Overall, Dr. Perrin noted at the 1/9/18 meeting that there is ample road width, access points and signalization to handle to increased traffic associated with the development. However, Dr. Perrin, and Tosh Kano, Holladay Public Works Director, have assessed and recommended needed changes to off-site infrastructure to accommodate the anticipated impacts generated by the proposed SDMP.
7. Overall parking plan.
Ratios have been increased over those of the 2007 plan. According to the applicant, parking demand for the mixed use area can be accommodated entirely by the structured parking decks within the buildings. Nevertheless, additional on-street, angled parking is proposed throughout the mixed use area. Parallel on-street parking is proposed for the lower density residential areas
8. Thoroughfare locations, types and direction of travel.
Dramatic changes to vehicular connections were made at the commission’s request. Most significant is the street connection from the lower density areas (south end) to the mixed use area (north end), and the removal of the proposed emergency access to Memory Lane. This will allow for vehicular cross connection within the site, which eliminates the necessity of turn movements on Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road while minimizing “cut through” potential.

9. Street cross sections.

Three street cross sections; mixed use, private residential and alley have not changed from Ivory's first proposal. However, it is now proposed that all streets within the site will be privately built and maintained. The residential cross section is 4 feet wider (54 v. 50) than Holladay residential public streets. This allows for ample on-street parking, a greater variety of street trees in the park strips. Sidewalks are proposed at (5' v.4') feet which is wider than required by the City for public streets at 4 feet. Five foot sidewalks are much more able to allow two people to walk side-by-side than 4 foot sidewalks. Wider parkstrips (6' v. 5') allow for more snow storage during winter months and additional area for a greater variety of street trees to be planted and grow to maturity.

10. Typical examples of streetscape design including aesthetic elements

Elements have not changed from Ivory's first proposal

11. Overall conceptual site lighting plan.

Updated to include provisions for light pollution prevention/mitigation. Applicant has agreed to refine lighting plan to include LED lights, soft white spectrum, use of coordinated light sensors, etc.

12. Civil engineering conceptual plans including grading, storm drainage and utilities.

Grading to reflect FEMA and State of Utah Flood and Drainage standards and, City standards.

13. Architectural elevations with examples of anticipated design architectural style(s).

Styles have been amended

14. Examples of anticipated building materials.

High quality of traditional materials shown. Final design of each building will be addressed by the Planning Commission during the site plan review stage.

15. Environmental and energy efficiency statement of intent.

Largely unchanged. However statements have been updated to current industry standards

16. A general signage plan for the exterior and interior of the site.

Largely unchanged. However, signage plans should include Dark Sky compliant or similar statements of light pollution prevention and 4000k and warmer uses of the light spectrum. Crown signs for taller buildings will need to be allowed, as well as blade/fin signs, and additional monument signs. This can be done by referencing allowances elsewhere in Section 13.82 to be applicable at this location, and/or amending the text at a later date.

17. Estimated statistical information for the project

Updated as relevant to the site scope

18. Estimated raw square footage of building by residential or nonresidential use, etc.

Updated as relevant to the site scope

19. Geotechnical studies or data supporting proposed level of development.

Unchanged – should stay as originally proposed

20. Other studies/information as deemed necessary by the city.

21. A site construction control and overall environmental quality control hazard mitigation and monitoring plan.

Unchanged – Recommend to be updated to reflect current state laws. Also, shall provide detailed site construction staging and parking areas with no access to Arbor or Memory

SDMP ANALYSIS 2007-2018

PG 1: COVER PAGE -GENERAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND SITE STATISTICS.

The Commissioners will note these are not typical distributions. In particular, intensity of uses is anticipated by the General Plan to be high and landscaping and open space percentages much lower. Originally this development was intended to be a unique “lifestyle” center, and, the original 2007 distributions were found to meet those goals. As time passed, markets changed and population increased, the scope and need for that type of “destination” in the valley has shifted. The previous SDMP guideline ratios for commercial vs. residential space are now widely seen as unattainable by general market place, the applicant and the City. Therefore, they are proposed to be amended to include a much greater residential presence on the site – with the possibility of more retail/office as market conditions allow. As there is a dearth of residential availability of all types along the entire Wastach Front, which may continue for the foreseeable future, the greater ratio of residential to commercial is logical regardless of the desire to have more commercial space in Holladay. Commission should query the applicant on how they proposed to balance shifts in residential and commercial/office sizes as tenants commit to the site.

PG 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION/VISION STATEMENT

This proposed vision statement reads similar to the current 2007 version. However, once closely compared, staff has found notable differences. In particular, apart from the obvious loss of Macy’s, this statement envisions removal of the site-bisecting Main Street in favor of shorter version “Festival Street” that does not connect through to the south entrance. The original 2007 SDMP included, a well-designed, main collector street brought all elements of the site together, rather than stopping short of the residential end, separating a mixed-use retail development from a strictly residential subdivision. Changes proposed by the applicant have addressed the “walling off” of the mixed use area from lower density residential areas to the south by expanding common green space that visually and functionally connects them.

PG 3: PERMITTED LAND USES BY DISTRICT AND BUILDING FUNCTIONS

Overall, the allowed land uses by district matrix has not changed much between the proposed and 2007 SDMP, only their locations. Apart from reducing the size of the “Open” Use district (most intense) and limiting it to the north-east corner of the project, the applicant is proposed to take advantage of the fact that Macy’s and their abutting surface parking is no longer part of the project. These areas were originally set aside as essentially “unavailable” for development. As Macy’s is no longer apart of the plan this area will be leveled and included as a future development pad for this project.

PG 4: CONCEPT PHASING/SUBDIVISION PLAN

Overall Phase 1 proposes to build a good cross section of all building types and across all three land use districts. This plan shows commitment to the project. However, building only half the “Open” (intense mixed use area on the north end) use district may be an issue as well as leaving the buffering aspects of the single family homes to the south until last.

PC 5: LAND USE REGULATING PLAN - USES BY STORY

Commission should note that within the “Open” use district, no indication has been provided as to what story will accommodate specific uses such as residential, office and retail. Uses should be proposed/clarified by level if possible. Otherwise, a “mixed-use” tower of entirely one use is possible. Possible consideration should be given to requiring the first story or large percentage of the first story as only available to retail only uses, etc. And, clarification is needed such as; will any building be completely residential, with no commercial space of any kind? If so, which one(s) and why? Will any building be commercial space only? If so, which one(s) and why?

PG 6: BUILDING MASSING AND HEIGHT PLAN

Height was also a point of contention during the approval of the original SDMP. At first, 100’ was discussed with ultimately 90’ being the agreed upon maximum building height allowed for this site including mechanical equipment. 2018 SDMP proposes building heights up to 110’ not including mechanical enclosures are a distinct departure from that 2007 SDMP decision as well as the current development patterns in the City. For comparison, the new office buildings at Millrock are around 80 FT high with additional mechanical equipment adding another 8 FT? (elevators) in height. Buildings in a portion of the HV zone can be up to 48 Ft with the clock tower at 68 ft.

As the area considered for the “Open” land use district is proposed to be dramatically reduced from the 2007 Plan, the property owner’s development goals naturally propose taller buildings. At what height does this type of construction fit into the context and character of this area? One of the tallest buildings is proposed toward the center of the mixed use section. This building will give a distinct “presence” to one of our busiest streets and will be a dramatic change from the uninteresting parking lots that currently face that street.

Consideration by the Commission should include massing elements relative to the original SDMP. The tallest buildings in the current (2007) SDMP are/were centered on a common thoroughfare - Main Street which is/was the “spine” of the development within the site that connected all major roads within the site and also connected to abutting arterial and collectors. Arguably, maximum building heights are out of place right at the street. Well documented studies of human scale streets, have heights equaling half the width of the abutting public rights of way at the pedestrian level, with allowances for taller structures only at distances further from the street (at minimum distance of the overall height proposed). Essentially, the idea is to tier the building so as to locate the mass (whatever the maximum may be) of the tallest buildings appropriately away from the proposed intersection/street. The applicants are proposing to locate the tallest portions of the mixed use buildings equal to or greater their height from the street edge with frontage buildings approximately one-half, or slightly, greater, the width of the street.

PG 7: CONCEPTUAL RENDERINGS

Though massing is only considered at this point, the design elements of that mass are critical, especially when a building is proposed at the tallest heights within surrounding development. Traditional neighborhood development elements should be employed at specific levels; at the pedestrian level, the mid band, and cornice. Linear horizontal masses should be broken up at regular intervals to minimize bulk. New architectural designs are forthcoming and the detail of any individual building will be determined during the site plan process

PG 8: SITE PARKING PLAN

Without the Site Parking Analysis one is unable to determine how many stalls will be provided. As with the Village parking the TRC feels that if the site is under-parked, the developer will be unable to market their product and parking is essentially a self-regulated component of design. Nevertheless, the parking ratios are shown in the Plan. The ratio for limited seems low. The Commission may wish to probe the applicant on the number presented. The applicant has increased the original parking ratios and is confident that they can provide for all their parking needs on-site without spill-over parking in the surrounding neighborhoods. The city should be committed to future monitoring of the neighborhood streets for impacts from traffic and parking but without a shared parking analysis this will be difficult to gauge at this point in the review process.

PG 9: SITE PARKING AVERAGE ANALYSIS

Not available

PG 10: TRANSPORTATION THOROUGHFARES

First draft showed either side of the project is restricted to pedestrian only paths. As mentioned earlier, the applicant has responded to this issue and has connected the site with new vehicular connections

The privately owned protection strip owned by Cottonwood Inc. prevents access to the surrounding neighborhoods. (See Exhibit attached) This creates a dichotomy between the Cottonwood Small Area Master Plan goals and the Subdivision development standards. Where SAMP goals mention restricting access to the Arbor and Memory neighborhood, the subdivision design standards require streets to connect wherever possible.

UTA has provided their input on the new SDMP and although no provision for public transit is proposed, and, UTA does not suggest any needed within the site, they feel that current routing can accommodate any fluctuations this site may provide. Access to all stops should be considered and designed in a clear, aesthetically distinct and safe manner. New bus shelters will be needed on the perimeter of the site, however.

PG 11: THOROUGHFARE TYPES & STREET CROSS SECTIONS

Wide mixed use cross-sections provide a multitude of useful public space. Residential streets are set at a wider cross section than normal public roads provide

PG 12: BUILDING MATERIALS AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STYLES

There was much discussion with the applicant and the TRC regarding the types and styles of buildings that could be built in this project. All buildings should have specific architecture, building materials or specific streetscape elements available to guide the planning commission during eventual approvals – especially in the case of the taller buildings. At this time, the SDMP does not require architectural review by the Design Review Board as it does in the Holladay Village. Those elements need careful consideration and require a significant investment in time and effort that is not supported by the applicant at this time due to the. However, staff is concerned that without specific, approved design guidelines architectural styles and/or building materials, approving individual building permits may be problematic at site plan consideration stages. Currently the SDMP retains the statement that a “big box” type building with large, blank walls could not be utilized.

Staff feels that the language included on this page gives the city just enough criteria to challenge requests for building permits that do not follow the overall goals of the SDMP and the attached architectural element on pp. 11-12. The guidelines along with the representational pictures will help guide staff when buildings are fully designed and submitted for building permits. Additionally, the Commission will have the ability to dialogue with the applicants about specific architectural design elements during the site plan process for each phase/block. Staff would recommend that, at a minimum, there be a mixture of building styles to avoid “date stamping” the development.

PG 13: STREETSCAPE DESIGN EXAMPLES/BRANDING PRECEDENTS

Staff is concerned that building permit approvals will have to be based on these very general guidelines. It is suggested to include, in some part of this document, a process whereby major disagreements over design issues could be brought to the planning commission for resolution – or requesting non-binding assistance/recommendation from the Design Review Board.

PG 14: CONCEPTUAL OPEN/GATHERING SPACE PLAN

On page 13, the applicant has included typical examples of streets and plazas that reflect their vision for these public spaces. Green space has been since added to connect the gathering area to the residential neighborhoods. Also, design guidelines on page 11 list some of the proposed materials, street furniture and anticipated uses incorporated into the final development. A detailed streetscape plan should be developed to harmonize and support the final architecture of the buildings. These plans should be submitted with each phase at the subdivision approval stage.

PG 15: CONCEPTUAL SITE LIGHTING - SIGNAGE

Originally, staff feels the site lighting plan is perhaps too vague to begin with; however, it guides the planning commission on approval standards to be completed when the applicant eventually provides an overall foot-candle diagram and a detailed site lighting plan to be submitted with each individual subdivision/phase application. Professionally prepared lighting plans are a must at the site plan stage.

Signage Plan – The applicant has included this plan mainly for approval of the temporary signage that they would like to have on site during construction of the commercial buildings and future marketing of the residential units. Permanent signage for the project will need to be designed to enhance the architecture of the site. A more detailed signage plan should be provided at the site plan permitting stage (height, illumination style etc.) The monument signs on the perimeter of the site should be not over used.

PG 16: CIVIL PLANS: SITE

Civil work should reflect land development grading and road circulation plans.

PG. 17: CIVIL PLANS: SITE UTILITY CONNECTIONS PLAN

Connection plan updated to reflect new land development patterns

PG. 18: UTILITY CAPACITY AND AVAILABILITY

Water and sewer letters are not available at this time but will be submitted to the City from these providers when a known number of connections (sub-metered users) are determined. Applicant proposes all culinary connection be made by Salt Lake Public Utilities – not Holliday water

PG. 19: CIVIL PLANS: GRADING DRAINAGE PLAN

Engineering has raised questions regarding the storm water sheet flow data. Storm water capacity and treatment is still in flux due to the elapsed time between the 2008 approval and the proposed which may alter the overall storm drain plan. The applicant is in discussion with the City Engineer regarding this matter. Also missing is a page noted on the front page titled “Civil Plans: Center Elevations of Proposed Building” which shall show the base elevations of all proposed buildings within the site. This page will ensure a standard of height measurement for phases/buildings. The applicant will need to develop a fixed elevation for each building before each mixed use building can be permitted.

PG. 20: PG. 21: CIVIL PLANS: CREEK RELOCATION MODEL

All work completed see permit file #07-507. Creek relocation plans from McNeil Engineering should be included here.

PG. 22: ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY STATEMENT OF INTENT

Due to the intense use at this site, sustainable practices and construction of energy efficient building are critical to accomplishing the goal of the Holladay General plan. This amendment updates current Green Building practices.

PG. 22: SITE CONSTRUCTION/ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Staff foresees an update amendment here requiring all future site elements to comply with current State of Utah standards, or those that may be required in the future as technology and/or standards change.

PP. 23 & 24: TRAFFIC STUDY AND IMPACTS

Staff requested Dr. Joe Perrin from A-Trans to review this study. His review is attached to this staff report. Recommendations were submitted to the applicant’s traffic engineer who is currently making the requested additions and clarifications in a revised study that will be completed shortly.

PGS 25 & 26: GEOTECHNICAL DATA AND STUDIES SUMMARY

Extensive geotechnical reports have been completed at this site along with a review from the City’s contract geologist, Western Geologic, LLC. As a master plan document, standards and recommendations herein will apply to each proposed building and should not be amended.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION SUGGESTIONS

The staff feels that a combination of the 2018 Ivory proposed amendments, along with the unchanged elements of the current 2007 SDMP serves as a responsible, comprehensive, and flexible guide for future development of this site and should be recommended, with some conditions, for approval by the City Council. If the Planning Commission agrees, then upon approval of the City Council, subsequent site plan approvals can be contemplated.

Upon the following suggested findings and recommendations, Staff suggests the Commission forward a conditional based recommendation to the amended SDMP to the City Council:

FINDINGS

The amended SDMP meets the intent and vision for the R/M-U zone, including addressing all of the technical items required by the zone regulations.

- The SDMP, as outlined in the conclusions and findings of the 1/2/18 staff report substantially complies with the 2007 Holladay General Plan (Cottonwood Mall Element – Small Area Master Plan) for this particular area of the city, as well as overall compatibility with Chapters 1-8 of the larger General Plan.
- Recent proposed amendments to the SDMP by the developer since the beginning of calendar year in terms of stepping of building mass and building height, reduction of maximum building height, internal vehicular access and enhanced pedestrian access between the mixed use and lower density areas, proposed pedestrian accesses to, and through the site, including a substantial trail amenity along Big Cottonwood Creek, expansion of green space within the site, “festival space”, etc., the courting of a significant office tenant, have significantly reduced several areas of concern noted by staff in the 1/2/18 report and responded to many concerns expressed by Holladay residents as well.

- Overall, the Plan arguably strikes a balance between holding on to past development patterns while addressing future resource restrictions and demographics.
- The proposed SDMP contributes to the long range goal of environmental and economic sustainability of the City and high quality of life by providing a number of lifestyle arrangements and shopping, dining, employment opportunities.
- It also represents a very efficient use of a critically located parcel of land by providing a place for many people to live/work/dine/shop/recreate in a relatively small area of land. Vertical development pressure will increase dramatically everywhere along the Wastach Front as population projections predict massive population change. This will still be true for areas considered more desirable such as Holladay even though they do not have much open land left. Also, the extension of infrastructure to more remote areas will become more costly than to upsize in areas already developed.
- The proposal, if approved, puts to work vacant land that, for the moment, only produces noxious weeds, dust, and on occasion, a fire hazard to abutting residential homes.
- The development of this property will positively impact surrounding businesses due to the “halo” affect that the construction and subsequent occupancy of businesses and dwellings has on nearby businesses.
- Over a period of years, the development will enhance the community’s overall sense of place as it has its own identity which will at the same time create a contrast between itself and other “nodes” in the community such as the Village and the Holladay Crossroads areas. A sense of place here can be achieved with superior building design, finishes, orientation and attention to detail.
- Submitted traffic studies have been generated by the applicant, reviewed by City appointed third party consultants and recommendations made to the applicant. The studies conclude that there is sufficient street capacity and signalization to handle anticipated traffic. Given that it will take a number of years to fully build all the uses on the site, it will also take an equivalent number of years to realize the maximum impact of traffic produced by this site. By that time, most drivers will become accustomed to the increased traffic and may opt to amend driving behaviors to compensate for peak driving times. Additionally, emerging technologies, such as Autonomous Vehicles (AV) may decrease congestion by increasing efficiency in movement and parking, reduce parking space demand, etc.
- Building heights are an integral part of the overall design and function of the project and are warranted in this area of the city when direct, measurable visual impacts on surrounding residential areas will be minimized.
- The proposed max. heights of buildings is much reduced from the initial fall 2017 submittal, and represents less **overall** mass and height compared to the 2007 SDMP.
- The proposed SDMP amendment reflects current and future housing and commercial trends and allows for reasonable flexibility in their application to help minimize risk of economic downturn and to maximize economic development potential.
- The SDMP properly plans for future populations and today’s rapidly evolving demographic trends such as smaller, lots and homes for “millennials” and those that will follow, including single level living for some seniors, a range of flexible apartment choices for a wide range of current and future Holladay residents, and prestigious townhome and detached single family dwellings.
- This new Plan, even if built at the maximum allowed in all land use categories, would result a more modest community node than can already be found in many other Salt Lake valley (and abutting) communities, and much smaller than future large-scale development that will occur elsewhere.
- The density proposed is significant, but, in the long-term, necessary to support existing and future commercial uses both on-site and in abutting commercial areas to the west, northwest and north.
- The proposed residential density is located where it can best be handled. Also, a general rule of thumb in land use planning is that it is better to place density, such as in the Holladay Village, it where it has already been, or where there is density in the immediate vicinity, than to move density to a location where it has never been.
- The level of housing density is not likely to overwhelm the public school system as some fear, but will, of course, increase enrollment in some Holladay schools. (It should be noted that Spring Lane Elementary was proposed to be closed only a few years ago due to declining enrollment). Generally, Holladay has a lower than average household size, and, that apartments, especially those with less than three bedrooms, contribute little to the school population.
- The amendment will foster redevelopment and increased property values of other commercial land within the City and will also enhance property values in surrounding residential areas and community as a whole.

- The proposed mixed use development is a much needed component of the City’s long term economic stability. This location represents the best opportunity for the development of tax base for the City.
- This SDMP will enhance pedestrian and bike activity both within the site and outside of it due to a number of path connections on the perimeter of the site which connect to safe pathways through the site to activity nodes, including the festival space and an enhanced trail along Big Cottonwood Creek. Additionally, this network will encourage more use of the two large community parks a short distance to the west on Murray Holladay Road – Creekside Park and Big Cottonwood Park/Holladay Lions.
- Enhanced bus service, including more frequent buses and new shelters will occur, in part, because of this development.
- Fiscal impacts have not and cannot be determined by the Commission, but rather the Council/RDA. However, the SDMP would likely have a more positive impact on City finances than 57 acres of non-productive land.

SUGGESTED CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO FINDINGS FOR COUNCIL/RDA CONSIDERATION

1. The Commission is not supportive of the SDMP if it results in negative fiscal impacts on City finances. The Commission acknowledges that it is not qualified to make such decisions and trusts the Council/RDA, city staff and its consultants to review and determine fiscal fitness of the development.
2. The developer should partner/participate in off-site improvements directly related to the impacts generated by the development such as changes to signalization, painting and striping of lanes, new and/or improved crosswalks, construction of medians, curb, gutter and sidewalk along Highland Drive, street lights, and bus shelters.
3. Incorporate moderate income housing within the development as outlined in the existing plan.
4. Building height shall be allowable up to 90 feet, not including screened mechanical enclosures, for up to three mixed use/residential use buildings. One building, only if it incorporates significant office space may be allowed up to 110’ feet, not including screened mechanical enclosures.
5. Building height to allowed to be measured from the plaza area adjacent to each of the four mixed use buildings.
6. Buildings are not allowed at their full heights at the right of way but instead must be set back from the street and tiered or stepped to minimize visual impact on the street. Building space at the pedestrian/street level must have ample glazing for interaction between the exterior and interior of the buildings and may not “turn its back” to the street.
7. Clarify the maximum residential vs. commercial spaces ranges that are proposed and how they might change depending on market forces or other factors.
8. Clarify fire suppression plans/approvals for the site, including for those portions of buildings that would exceed ladder truck capacity.
9. Prior to any City Council approval, revise/resubmit information identified by the Technical Review Committee regarding; final updated traffic study information, missing “will serve” letters for water and sewer, address vital civil engineering issues such as overall site drainage and base elevations to determine starting point for building height.
10. Prior to any Planning Commission site plan approval, submit more detailed overall site and building lighting plan details, streetscape design elements and detail, shared parking study, finalized architectural details.
11. Consideration of Design Review Board oversight and recommendation to the PC on building design.
12. Allow for wall, blade, crown and additional monument signs as referenced by current sign ordinance, 13.82, or, if not, then as specifically as proposed in the SDMP
13. Compliance with State required environmental control during construction periods.
14. Adherence to energy and water efficiency (Sustainable and Green Building Practices) throughout the site.
15. That previous setbacks for buildings along the Creek be continued to allow for ample space for walking path, landscaping etc. If not, the applicants will need to request a stream exception permit through the Planning Commission.
16. Because this in an amendment to the existing 2007 SDMP, all approved changes are to be integrated into the original 2007 SDMP document with revisions and accompanying notations throughout the document.

