



Jennifer Wilson
Salt Lake County Mayor

Catherine Kanter
Deputy Mayor, Regional Operations

Mike Reberg
Associate Deputy Mayor, Regional Operations

Dina Blaes
Director, Office of Regional Development

Ryan Perry
Director, Regional Planning & Transportation

Salt Lake County Council
Chairman Richard Snelgrove
2001 South State Street, Suite N2-200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

December 18, 2019

Dear Chairman Snelgrove and County Council Members,

In accordance with Salt Lake County Council Resolution 5577 passed on May 21, 2019; Mayor Wilson requested that Planning Staff conduct a thorough review of the revised application for development for the area named by the developer as Olympia Hills. The process of reviewing the application has been a coordinated approach between various agencies of Salt Lake County (SLCo) and the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD). Outside consultants were hired to assist in the areas of planning (Landmark Design) and Transportation (Avenue Consultants). I am pleased to report that we have used Resolution 5577 as a basis for review and have incorporated the directives of the County Council.

Please find below the inclusion of the items listed in the resolution and how staff incorporated the principles in the application review. The list of items begins on page 4, Item 2 of the resolution:

2. Developer may present a revised proposal to the Salt Lake County Council by filing with the County Planning & Development Services Division a revised application with any revisions to its original application that it requests the County Council to consider;
3. The revised application shall be processed consistent with County Ordinances and State law;
The County District Attorney has reviewed the application and corresponding documents and find them to be in accordance with County and State Law.
4. To the extent additional agency review is required, additional review fees will be charged to Developer in accordance with the Council approved Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule;
The County has hired two outside professional consulting firms-- Avenue Consultants for Transportation and Landmark Design for Land Planning-- to provide additional reviews and consultation to the County and MSD; their services were reimbursed by the Developer per County ordinance.
5. The Council requests that the Mayor and Developer renegotiate the Master Development Agreement if Developer chooses to submit a revised application for the Council's review. The Council asks that the following parameters be pursued in the Master Development Agreement:

- a. Complete streets
Established County Complete Street policy integrates the needs of all road users into everyday transportation planning practices. The purpose is to improve the ability of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities to safely move along and across a complete street. This has been generally achieved through the transportation review, and specifically in Section 3.0 of the Design Standards that establish a variety of street cross sections that include vehicular travel lanes, bike lanes, streets for transit, park strips, and sidewalk components of a Complete Street system.
- b. Street Connectivity, with many options beyond collector streets including small streets and smaller blocks, where streets *connect* versus *collect*
Section 2.0 of the Design Standards specifically requires street connectivity with maximum block sizes and link/node street requirements. This section also requires that the development be planned to connect with neighboring communities.
- c. Plans for infrastructure and commitment for transportation, water and sewer
The Master Development Agreement (MDA) requires the development to construct all on-site improvements (Section 2.5.4.5); to pay its proportionate share of costs for off-site transportation improvements (Section 2.5.5); to update its water, sewer, and stormwater master plans (Section 2.5.4.8); and to provide ongoing verification of availability and adequacy of water, sewer, stormwater, and other utilities (Section 2.6). *See also* Exhibit D, Transportation Plan.
- d. Minimum Open Space for Development 10%, with minimum Open Space and Common Area (as both are defined in the P-C Zoning Ordinance) totaling 20%
Section 4.0 of the Design Standards requires the developer to provide a minimum of 20% Open Space, including 5 acres of parks per 1,000 residents (County Parks Standard). The Design Standards includes requirements for a Regional Park, four 10 acre Community Parks and small neighborhood parks.
- e. Mix of housing types within neighborhoods, including for various ages and price points
The proposed plan and Design Standards include three different Place Types (areas to live/work). These include Town Center, Village Center and Neighborhood. Each Place Type will include different dwelling unit types (i.e. townhomes, condominiums, apartments, single family etc).
- f. Mix of Housing options – with incentives for Affordable Housing and Rent/Buy
The MDA has included a requirement that Affordable and Workforce Housing is provided at a minimum of 15%, including both housing for rent and for sale.
- g. Design standards in the following areas:
 - i. Community wide (place making, centers, parks, trails and street connectivity)
Section 1.0 of the Design Standards specifically outlines the type of centers and places that will be included in the development such as Town Center, Village Center, Neighborhoods, Commercial Center, Parks, Trails and Open Space and Institutional (including USU

Campus).

- ii. Site design (parking, building placement, walks, landscaping, lighting and signs)

Section 5.0 of the Design Standards specifically addresses the requirements for parking placement, building placement, walks, and lighting. Landscaping is addressed in Section 7.0 of the Design Standards. Certain sign types are prohibited in Section 1, with specific Sign standards to follow at the CSP level.

- iii. Architecture (basic massing, not uniform “cookie cutter”, doors, percentage of glass, mixture of architecture in residential and commercial construction)

Section 6.1 of Buildings & Architecture specifically addresses the request for no “cookie cutter” buildings or repetitive architecture, and the requirement that buildings located on the same block should have individual architecture and unique design elements. In addition, Section 6.0 addresses requirements of Building Types at the CSP level which provide specific glazing requirements.

- iv. Design that encourages communities - not neighborhoods

The Design Standards require parks and trails within walking distances of all dwelling units; gathering places help create communities. Also, the requirement for unique architecture helps to create community.

- v. Parking as a supportive element - not the central design

Section 5.0 of the Design Standards requires parking to be located at the side or rear of buildings. Also, the MDA outlines the requirements for establishing a Parking Authority which governs items such as shared parking, on street parking and parking maintenance.

- vi. Street parking

See v. answer above.

- vii. Sustainable and energy-efficient design features

Sustainability requirements are expressed throughout the document. Section 8 of the Design Standards 8.0 Sustainability Overview provides a summary of the sustainability requirements found throughout the document. Section 5.12 of Buildings & Architecture addresses requirements for Energy Conservation and Water Conservation.

- viii. Design standards review committee

The bulk of the Design Standards have been prepared as a companion to the MDA. The MDA includes the requirements of a design consultant who will advise the planning commission regarding compliance with the Design Standards. (See MDA Section 2.9)

- h. Work with UTA and UDOT on future road alignments for long-term population growth

County staff, MSD and consultants have consulted with UTA and UDOT in reviewing the application to understand future transportation needs. The application has included a thorough Traffic Impact Study (TIS) which specifically addresses transportation needs (See Exhibit D of MDA). The MDA provides for reserving land and corridors for future growth (See Section 2.6).

The MDA also requires future TIS and mitigation of transportation impacts, with developer paying for all on-site system (and all other) improvements, and its share of off-site system improvements (See Sections 2.5.4.5 and 2.5.5).

- i. Multi-family residential areas clustered around Town Centers and Villages
Section 1.0 of the Design Standards specifically requires multi-family to be located in the Town and Village Centers.
- j. Place holders for Transit right of ways, trail systems, schools and churches
Included in the MDA (See Response to 5(h) above) and Design Standards are requirements to plan for right-of-way and specified items (schools, churches). However, the specific location of these facilities will come at the CSP or Project Phases.
- k. Plan road connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods within and outside the planned community
Design Standards Section 2.0 Street Network includes specific requirements (see page 16) for perimeter streets to connect to adjacent communities or stub streets where no communities exist.
- l. Transition edges of development to be compatible with adjoining communities
See above for street transitions. Trails are required to connect to adjoining community trails. Design Standards Section 6.0 Buildings and Architecture discusses building transitions, maximum height of buildings and various standards of compatibility.
- m. Incentives for meeting development standards and/or penalties for not meeting development standards
The County has the right to withhold reviews, approvals, licenses, building permits, and other permits for failure to comply with development standards. (See MDA Section 7.17.6)
- n. Parameters that the Mayor deems necessary before agreeing to execute the Master Development Agreement
The Mayor has been an active participant in the negotiation of the MDA. There are several provisions throughout the documents that have received policy direction from the Mayor.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Ryan Perry
Director of Regional Planning and Transportation