**Chapter One
Land Use, Growth, and Urban Design**

[1.1: Design Corridors Map](http://www.codepublishing.com/UT/Provo/html/pdfs/map_5-1.pdf) (PDF)

# 1.1 Introduction

The Land Use Chapter of the General Plan 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;
* To preserve important natural resources and sensitive lands; and
* To provide adequate municipal services.

This chapter of the General Plan (herein referred to as “the Plan”) – in conjunction with other chapters of this Plan – provides a guide for the future use of undeveloped land, the use and maintenance of the built environment, and redevelopment and in-fill policies for the City. This chapter helps to define neighborhoods’ visions for changes that may occur within their boundaries. It provides the Municipal Council, commissions, and City staff a framework in the evaluation of land development proposals and the policies that guide 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.

# 1.2 Background

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION HEADINGS** |
| 1.2.1 Relationship between the General Plan Map and Land Use Element | 1.2.6 Design Corridors Approved by Ordinance |
| 1.2.2 Relationship between Land Use Policies and Zoning | 1.2.7 General Plan Designations |
| 1.2.3 Urban Growth | 1.2.8 Zoning and Development Policy Changes |
| 1.2.4 Urban Design | 1.2.9 Key Land Use Policies (by Area and Neighborhood) |
| 1.2.5 Design Standards | 1.2.10 Additional Tools for Urban Growth and Land Use Annexation Policy Plan |

## 1.2.1 Relationship between the General Plan Map and Land Use Element

The General Plan Map is developed from the policies in this chapter, but 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 generally take precedence.

However, in some cases, a restrictive map designation serves as notice that physical limitations or hazards may be associated with development of some lands. These are often found in the areas designated as Developmentally Sensitive (DS), described further in Chapter 4 Natural Resources and 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 Title 15 of the Provo City Code, relating to Sensitive Lands.

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 use of land 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 zone change proposals.

## 1.2.2 Relationship between Land Use Policies and Zoning

Land use designations on the General Plan 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 should 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. The General Plan Map designation does not change current zone regulations; rather it informs interested parties of what types of land uses may be considered for future development. The written policies of this chapter 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 chapter may strongly influence zone change requests. 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..

Proposed changes in zoning that do not comply with the General Plan will be considered only after making a decision on an application to amend the General Plan. 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.

General Plan Map designations are broader 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.

## 1.2.3 Urban Growth

Provo’s population growth, and the resulting demands on the built environment, continues 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.

Provo has geographic limitations, which can limit traditional growth patterns. The Wasatch Range blocks the City’s physical growth to the east, and Utah Lake limits physical growth to the west and southwest. Orem and Springville block physical growth to the north and south, though there are still some areas within Provo’s influence that can be annexed to Provo. If it is the desire of Provo to accommodate some of the projected population increase for Utah County, a variety of housing products and forms will need to be considered due to the lack of available raw land.

Provo is a mature city with an established infrastructure. Nevertheless, the City must balance demands for development with cost effective capacity in meeting the needs 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. Infill development may be more timely and appropriate in order to provide for logical growth of the built environment and control of costs to taxpayers for expansion of municipal services. Those constraints on new growth are particularly important when considering 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 the approximate boundary for urban development along the eastern benches of the City. This corresponds roughly with the natural gas easement that 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. The Bonneville Shoreline Trail is envisioned to someday provide nearly continuous trail access from Logan to Spanish Fork along the ancient “shoreline” Lake Bonneville. Efforts should be made to ensure that public access to these trails and canyons is maintained.

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 Chapter 15.05 of the Provo City Code, relating to Sensitive Lands. 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 4 Natural Resources and Environment.

The natural boundary to urban growth on the west side has historically corresponded 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 west of I-15 for the foreseeable future. These areas include those designated as DS on the General Plan Map.

For sustained growth, the demands on our natural and man-made resources should be in balance with the ability of those resources to be replenished. The City needs to wisely utilize its available resources; 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 that is taking place all around the City. 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.

## 1.2.4 Urban Design

Urban design standards for commercial and residential developments should be implemented to promote neighborhood conservation, maintain property values, and enhance Provo City’s appearance. Design standards should promote public health, safety, and general welfare. Design standards should regulate landscaping, signage, architecture, scale, setbacks, and the overall style character of developments in order to help protect important views, significant architectural resources, and improve the overall built environment.

Urban design should also include the overall contextual design of neighborhoods and streets to promote safe and convenient walkability and bike-ability where possible. Easy access to public transportation and basic shopping needs to cut down on automobile traffic and encourage alternative modes of transportation is a positive outcome of effective urban design.

### Design Review Process

A Design Review Committee (DRC), consisting of professionals in various fields of design, architecture, and planning, was established to address general design relationships and site planning principles that are applicable citywide. District guidelines, based on existing design characteristics, as well as needs observed in particular districts, are also addressed in design review.

The design review process seeks to ensure compatibility of structures in districts. This can be achieved by repeating building lines and surface treatment and by requiring a degree of uniformity in detail, scale, proportion, textures, materials, color, and building form. Harmony of design is sought to protect visual patterns of the community and to enhance visual relationships and transitions between older and newer buildings.

### Visible Design Influences in Provo

Provo has not developed as a design-oriented community, nor does it have thematic districts; however, areas with strong design elements do exist. Developments and infrastructure improvements have helped to establish a character for localized regions of the city and have, in some cases, influenced the design of new projects occurring on nearby properties. Favorable examples of urban design elements may be seen in the Jamestown office park region along N. University Avenue, the pedestrian-oriented historic downtown Provo region of the Central Business District, the Provo City Old Academy Library, the Shops at Riverwoods and Riverwoods Research and Business Park, and the South University Avenue/East Bay planned commercial and industrial complex.

Landscaping is a common element that enhances the appearance of any site. Best practices for incorporating water-wise landscape design should be used where and when possible. Plantings and design, including endemic and drought-tolerant plants, should be utilized to reduce unnecessary water use.

The absence of freestanding signs and the use of small-scale signs reduce the amount of visual clutter. Architectural design has improved the appearance of buildings that could otherwise be mundane. Urban design is not limited to exterior design of buildings. It takes into account the appearance of the entire built environment and all aspects of development.

The implementation of urban design requirements will establish citywide design standards to beautify the City as a whole and will help to carry out the values, goals, and objectives of Provo’s citizens.

## 1.2.5 Design Standards

The following categories are to be implemented in some type of policy, regulation, or ordinance to establish urban design criteria within Provo City. Design elements should promote public health, safety, and general welfare while serving the general interest of the public. Policies should be implemented in a timely fashion to encourage the style of development requested by the general citizenry.

### Landscaping

Landscaping adds aesthetic qualities to the built environment. Without trees, shrubs, grass, and other greenery, the environment may be dull and unattractive. Landscaping improves the look and feel of the community. It softens hard surfaces, adds color and visual contrast, provides pedestrian appeal and comfort, creates human scale along large-scale building faces, screens parking or mechanical areas, provides transition between uses, and provides shade and cooling in urban areas. To avoid becoming a concrete and asphalt-paved community, the City should require developments to meet landscaping standards.

### Signs

Without restrictions, signs can become garish and overbearing. Provo City has a sign ordinance, but further steps need to be taken to improve the appearance of signs throughout the city. Steps need to be taken to improve the desirability of monument signs. Signs should be required to reflect the building’s architecture and complement landscaped areas. Billboards should be removed from developed sites.

### Construction

Incentives that encourage diversity in appearance (material, height, form) in multi-structure projects need to be provided. While diversity is encouraged, compatibility needs to exist in architecture and themes. Multi-structure projects that could benefit from incentives include commercial, multiple-family, and one-family residential subdivisions. New construction in older, developed areas should be sympathetic to existing form, color, material, style, and scale. Remodels and additions should also be sympathetic to form, color, material, style, and scale of the existing structure. However, there may be a few areas of the city where there are no aesthetic qualities. In these areas, a new design or style may benefit the community and offer diversity in theme, form, color, material, style, and scale.

## 1.2.6 Design Corridors Approved by Ordinance

Design corridors preserve the aesthetic integrity of an area by imposing criteria for the appearance and design of buildings within the corridor. In 1997, twelve design corridors were proposed to improve design and beautify the city; the list has since been expanded to fourteen. Map  [1.1](http://www.codepublishing.com/UT/Provo/html/pdfs/map_5-1.pdf) Design Corridors Map shows the current and proposed design corridors for Provo. As Table 1.1 Current Design Corridors indicates, four design corridors have been implemented by ordinance. The design corridors should be comprehensively evaluated and amended, where appropriate. As these corridors typically straddle neighborhood boundaries, amendments should be developed to all design corridors that will make meaningful connections between neighborhoods.

| **TABLE 1.1 CURRENT DESIGN CORRIDORS** |
| --- |
| **Design Corridor** | **Location of Design Corridor** |
| North University Avenue | 500 North to 960 North |
| North University Avenue Riverbottoms | 2230 North to the mouth of Provo Canyon |
| West Center Street | Interstate 15 to Utah Lake |
| South State Street | 300 South to Highway 75 |

### Proposed—Standards to Be Developed

Listed below, in Table 1.2 Proposed Design Corridors, are design corridors that still need implementation. Some of the proposed corridors are dilapidated, and there are no aesthetic qualities to maintain. In these corridors, it is hoped that attractive, uniform design will aid redevelopment efforts. Each corridor will be established with design requirements specific to that corridor. Developments in these corridors will be subject to design review. Corridors at City entryways will have logos, landscaping, and welcome signs. Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) rights-of-way also need to be beautified, but are subject to special regulations and approvals through the State of Utah.

| **TABLE 1.2 PROPOSED DESIGN CORRIDORS** |
| --- |
| **Design Corridor** | **Approximate Location of Design Corridor** |
| University Parkway | University Avenue to City Boundary |
| North State Street | 1230 North to City Boundary |
| South University Avenue | 600 South to Interstate 15 |
| Downtown University Avenue | 500 North to 600 South |
| 500 West | 300 South to 1230 North |
| Center Street | 1100 West to 1000 East |
| 4800 North | University Avenue to City Boundary |
| 3700 North | University Avenue to City Boundary |
| 300 South | 500 West to 850 East |
| Columbia Lane | 500 West to 1200 West / City Boundary |
| Geneva Road | Center Street to 2000 North/ City Boundary |

## 1.2.7 General Plan Designations

Table 1.3 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 that 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 1.3 General Plan Land Use Designations.

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 1.3 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 needed 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, LDR, MDR, HDR, CHDR, and PRO-R or PRO-A |
| Public Facilities (PF) | PF |
| Commercial (C) | SSC, PO, SC1, SC2, SC3, CA, CBD, 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 1.3, Table 1.4 Acres of General Plan Land Use Designations shows the acres of land for each category as proposed on the General Plan Map.

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 1.4 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 |

## 1.2.8 Zoning and Development Policy Changes

### This subsection identifies several major issues Provo is facing and 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.

### 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 homeowners have to compete with outside investors who are willing to pay duplex, triplex, and four-plex prices for homes. As a result, these once affordable homes are being priced outside the reach of many homebuyers.

Apartment Licensing was started in 2003 to help enforce existing occupancy requirements. 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 can identify 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, Habitat for Humanity, and other interested groups 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.

In addition to the Pioneer Neighborhoods, other neighborhoods are also struggling and have requested that homebuyer assistance programs be made available outside the current boundaries for these programs.

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 which 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—such as a mix of uses and modern housing alternatives--could help decrease automobile traffic. Much can be done to encourage pedestrian travel, bicycle usage, and other forms of transportation.

Efforts to reduce commuter traffic to locations of employment, commerce, and major educational institutions are likely to be most effective in automobile trip reduction. New public transit options such as FrontRunner and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) are providing or will provide increased opportunities for decreased automobile dependence. Both residents and nonresidents benefit from increased transit usage through reduced traffic congestion and reduced emissions.

### Transit-Oriented Development

Provo’s Intermodal Center and BRT route have great potential to combine transit ridership and higher-density residential and commercial development in a development pattern know as Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), which is a significant opportunity to decrease local and regional vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion. The Mountain Lands Association of Governments – who helps facilitates regional transportation planning – has indicated the BRT line may be upgraded to light-rail in the future if warranted.

The Interim Transit-Oriented Development (ITOD) zone around the intermodal center sets the stage for this development pattern. Future TOD areas should be planned and tailored for selected bus-rapid transit station areas. Special attention should be given to each TOD plan and regulating zone to:

* Determine the appropriate mix and intensity of residential and commercial development to be centered around future BRT stations.
* Be cognizant of creating an appropriate transition from BRT stations to established neighborhoods using transitional zoning standards in building form, mass and scale.
* 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.
* Enhance transit ridership through carefully cited retail locations, civic and open spaces and density.
* Reduce the need for parking and automobile ownership.
* Enhance additional alternative transit modes such as pedestrian, bicycle and bike and car- sharing facilities to FrontRunner and BRT stations.

Transit-Oriented Planning Areas are identified on the General Plan Map as TOD.

### Mixed-Use Development Areas

Occasionally areas within the General Plan call out mixed-use (commercial and residential) development areas that currently have limited access to alternative transit options such as bus and bike facilities. Reductions in parking and automobile facilities in these areas should be augmented by development of alternative transit options along with a traffic demand management plan. However, these mixed-use planning areas, like TOD, should:

* Determine the appropriate mix and intensity of residential and commercial development to be centered around future determined neighborhood centers.
* Be cognizant of creating an appropriate transition from neighborhood centers to established neighborhoods using transitional zoning standards in building form, mass and scale.
* 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.
* Enhance transit ridership, where available, through carefully cited retail locations, civic and open spaces and density.
* Enhance additional alternative transit modes such as local bus service, pedestrian, bicycle, 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 primary means of transportation and to access transit and for travel independent of transit.

### Protecting Historic Neighborhood Character

The mix of land uses, density, and design affect neighborhood 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 because 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

Current policies regarding hillside development should be strictly enforced and periodically re-evaluated to ensure public services are not strained, homes are safe, and access to open space is preserved.

### Increasing the Tax Base through Commercial Development

Residential development requires more services than property taxes and user fees provide. This is also true of many institutional land uses, such as churches and schools. To offset this, opportunities to establish and sustain revenue-producing 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. Since the 2009 General Plan Update, several other neighborhood plans have been adopted. These plans have been incorporated into the General Plan and added as appendices.

For a discussion regarding the population and demographic characteristics of Provo City, please see the Plan’s Introduction, Administration, and Population chapter.

## 1.2.9 Key Land Use Policies (by Area and Neighborhood)

### Neighborhood Structure in Relation to Land Use Policies

The City is divided into 34 neighborhoods within five area neighborhood councils. Map 1.4 Provo City Neighborhoods Map shows the 34 neighborhood boundaries. Map 1.5 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 1.6 to 1.10). 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 1.6

|  |
| --- |
| **CENTRAL AREA NEIGHBORHOODS** |
| Downtown | Joaquin |
| Dixon | Maeser |
| East Bay | North Park |
| Franklin | Timp |
| Franklin South |  |

The Central Area Neighborhood Council consists of nine neighborhoods. They include the Downtown, 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.

While the single-family dwelling should remain the ideal, this emphasis should not exclude a growing demand for housing types for middle-income individuals who often are priced out of larger family homes and not looking to move into student apartments.

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. Actions include:
	1. Increasing owner-occupancy; and
	2. 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 or Mixed-Use on the General Plan Map.

Within Central Residential Area neighborhoods, the City must continue to strongly support and participate in revitalization programs and ensure responsible management of non-resident owned properties through enforcement of the Rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance.

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Evaluate development proposals against the backdrop 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.
5. Ensure that businesses comply with zoning laws.
6. 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. 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.
7. 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.
8. Plan for new street connections to open up large blocks of land that have inadequate access for good development or redevelopment.
9. Consider possibilities for grade separation of streets (including pedestrian walkways) and railroad tracks to:
	1. Reduce access issues, related to trains blocking streets, for buses and automobiles using the intermodal station, and
	2. 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
	3. Improve safety and access for other walking and bicycling trips to surrounding dwellings, services, and businesses.
10. Work with the railroads to resolve feasibility issues for transit improvements impacting neighborhoods:
	1. 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
	2. Safety, noise and 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.
	3. Work with UTA and railroad companies to improve quiet zones in conjunction with commuter rail.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Structures originally built for residential use on the streets listed below 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.
* 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
1. Freeway-oriented commercial zoning should be initiated for property adjacent to I-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.
2. 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:

#### Downtown Neighborhood

The Municipal Council adopted the Downtown Master Plan on April 7, 2015 as a component of the General Plan. The Downtown Master Plan provides specific details on the existing conditions of the Downtown Neighborhood. Guidance for future land uses and development patterns are detailed in the Downtown Master Plan. Additionally, it sets forth urban design criteria and gives direction for parks and open space as well as transportation patterns and circulation. The Downtown Master Plan is incorporated into the General Plan as Appendix X1 and it should be adhered to as redevelopment projects within the area are reviewed.

#### Dixon Neighborhood

##### Goals of the Neighborhood:

1. Increase permanent residents to support community, school and a mix of ages.
2. Maintain existing architectural.
3. 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.
4. Improve the pedestrian-friendly and safety aspects of our neighborhood.
5. Improve and support off-street parking situations.
6. Reduce crime and take steps to have a drug free neighborhood.

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

As properties within the neighborhood redevelop, architectural styles to be reflected 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.

##### 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. If 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. Restrict the heavy commercial and heavy manufacturing uses from encroaching into the retail shopping areas.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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 ProvoTowne Centre Mall. Design to facilitate traffic circulation between the mall and these University Avenue businesses should be required during the development process.
7. 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 permanently settled area in what is now Utah County. The Franklin Neighborhood Plan was adopted by the Municipal Council, and it is incorporated in the General Plan as Appendix (#). It details existing conditions in the neighborhood and provides additional detail on acceptable future land uses. It should be closely followed as properties redevelop.

#### 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. Increase homeowner-occupancy;
5. Eliminate existing blighted, high-density properties and identify locations for appropriately located and designed public recreational parks to serve this densely populated neighborhood.
6. Complete sidewalks and off-site improvements to provide walkability throughout the neighborhood and adjoining communities.

##### Challenges for the Neighborhood

Franklin South Neighborhood is one of Provo’s more population-dense neighborhoods, yet lacks recreation facilities for children and families. Children are bussed to schools outside the neighborhood, and central park space is not available. Neighborhood cohesion that builds on the strengths of diversity is also a challenge.

Franklin South needs the cooperative efforts of the City and other agencies to achieve appropriate new development and redevelopment. The neighborhood could significantly benefit from the Provo Redevelopment Agency homebuyer assistance programs 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 should be identified and implemented.

##### Key Land Use Policies for the Franklin South Neighborhood

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family structures in areas designated as Residential (R) on the General Plan Map.
2. Encourage an open public place or a small park for any large-scale redevelopment within the neighborhood.
3. New development should be coordinated with 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 be developed above the ground floor. Commercial development on ground floors within mixed-use zoning should be carefully sited to ensure maximum success and long-term viability with the neighborhood.
4. Develop a dialogue between citizens, the City and social service agencies.
5. Continue to evaluate how eligible neighborhoods may effectively utilize neighborhood revitalization initiatives, such as Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

#### 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 Joaquin Neighborhood Plan was adopted by the Municipal Council, and it is incorporated into the General Plan as Appendix (XB). It further describes the existing conditions of the Joaquin Neighborhood and provides guidance for implementation of future land uses. The Joaquin Neighborhood Plan should be closely followed when considering redevelopment of properties in the neighborhood.

#### 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 is a valuable historical architectural resource and a reflection of community values through the efforts to preserve this structure, which have resulted in an adaptive reuse of the school building and 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 with long-term residents who can energize and provide stability to the neighborhood. Proximity to social services, while a benefit to residents, can also present special challenges as in other Pioneer Neighborhoods. Residents feel it is important to establish a dialogue with social service agencies to evaluate how best to provide services while encouraging home ownership investment.

Residents desire improvements 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. 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.
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, other than legal accessory apartments created in owner-occupied, one-family dwellings, is 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.
3. Promote use of existing neighborhood residential design standards to assist developers with infill development or redevelopment of one-family homes.
4. Encourage responsible property management through enforcement of the Rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance.
5. Develop a dialogue between citizens, the City and social service.
6. 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.
7. Existing commercial development should not be allowed to expand to the degree that it encroaches into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
8. Study the feasibility of placing landscape medians in Center Street from 100 East to 1000 East.
9. 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.
10. 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 Light Manufacturing should be considered for future zone changes to transit-oriented development zoning to encourage improvement to the adjacent one-family areas of the neighborhood.

#### 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.

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. 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
2. 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.
3. Should redevelopment occur, efforts should be made to incorporate historic structures into the development or relocate them.
4. Encourage responsible property management through the enforcement of the Rental Dwelling Business Licensing ordinance and other applicable zoning ordinances.
5. 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.

#### 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 Timp Neighborhood

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

Currently, a Timp Neighborhood Plan is being drafted which will provide additional details on existing land uses and conditions. The Timp Neighborhood Plan will provide guidance on future land use policies and redevelopment preferences. After the Timp Neighborhood Plan is completed and adopted by the Municipal Council it should be incorporated into the General Plan and closely adhered to as redevelopment occurs.
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The Northeast Area Neighborhood Council consists of five neighborhoods: Edgemont, Indian Hills, North Timpview, Rock Canyon, and Sherwood Hills. 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 shared, to some degree, by all of the Northeast Area Neighborhoods, and they apply in addition to the policies listed for each individual 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. This will ensure that sensitive lands are appropriately developed or, where necessary, to protect people, property or significant natural features, withheld fromdevelopment.
4. Establish policies and ordinances for Rock Canyon that limit commercial activity and development as well as protect and enhance the area as a citywide recreational asset.

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

#### Edgemont Neighborhood

1. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family, detached housing. Duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments, are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood. Housing should be developed at 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.
2. 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.
3. Prohibit existing commercial and office nodes from expanding into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
4. 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.
	1. 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.
	2. 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.
5. The property located generally at 3645 North Canyon Road, now used for a car wash, may be redeveloped for low-density residential use (R1.10 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.
6. The Fire Station along Canyon Road should be designated as Residential on the General Plan Map. If the property is sold by the City, it should be developed comparable to the R1.10 Zone.

#### Indian Hills Neighborhood

1. 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).
2. 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

1. 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.
2. Strive for increased owner-occupancy. Density higher than R1.10 zoning is not within the goals of this neighborhood.
3. 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.
4. Work to establish an infrastructure improvement plan that focuses on installing, replacing, or repairing sidewalks, and streetlights. Also, improve access of private residences to sewer laterals to replace existing septic systems.

#### Rock Canyon Neighborhood

See Appendix C-2 for information regarding the Country Club Manor Specific Development Plan.

#### Sherwood Hills Neighborhood

New development above the 5200-foot elevation within the Provo City General Plan Map designation of Developmentally Sensitive (DS) is restricted due to conditions described in Chapter 4 Natural Resources and Environment of this General Plan.
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The Northwest Area Neighborhood Council consists of six neighborhoods: Carterville, Grandview North, Grandview South, Riverbottoms, Rivergrove, and Riverside. Key policies for the Northwest Area Council are listed below. Policies to address issues shared, to some degree, within all Northwest Area neighborhoods, are followed by policies of specific importance, by neighborhood.

### Northwest Area Guiding Principles, Policies and Goals

The following policies and goals are shared, to some degree, by all of the Northwest Area Neighborhoods, and they apply in addition to the policies listed for each individual 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.

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

#### Carterville Neighborhood

1. Property designated as Mixed-Use (M) on the General Plan Map should not develop under mixed-use guidelines 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. This neighborhood is well established and expected to remain consistent in its uses and continue to meet the guiding principles for the Northwest Area.

#### Grandview South Neighborhood

1. This neighborhood is well established and expected to remain consistent in its uses and continue to meet the guiding principles for the Northwest Area.
2. 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. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. The northeast corner of 4800 North University Avenue (4878 N. University Ave.), containing approximately two acres, to be developed with a Commercial use.
5. The proposed design corridor along 4800 North should be extended to Canyon Road.

See Appendix C-1 for Villages at Riverwoods Specific Development Plan documents.

#### Rivergrove Neighborhood

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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, requiring the proper maintenance of homes, and landscaping.
4. Work with law-enforcement programs, such as Community Oriented Policing (COP) to decrease illegal activities within the neighborhood.
5. Work to develop and implement an infrastructure improvement plan to install sidewalks in areas that do not have them.
6. Preserve and maintain park and open space by working with the Parks Department to repair, maintain, improve and increase recreational facilities within the neighborhood.
7. Commercial uses should not encroach into established residential areas.

#### Riverside Neighborhood

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. All new professional office use must be consistent in architecture and style to existing office buildings to provide a planned presentation.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The Mixed-Use (M) designation should not develop under mixed-use guidelines until an area master plan is 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.
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The Southeast Area Neighborhood Council consists of eight neighborhoods: Foothills, Oak Hills, Pleasant View, Provost, Provost South, Spring Creek, University, and Wasatch. 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 shared, to some degree, by all of the Southeast Area Neighborhoods, and they apply in addition to the policies listed for each individual 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 proposed development within Developmentally Sensitive areas 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 policies and ordinances that protect and enhance Slate Canyon.

### 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.

*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, baching 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 permanent residents to the neighborhood is a critical focus. Having permanent residents provides community stability and support for those that are just starting out.
2. Encourage policies that prompt baching singles to reside in the South Campus Planning Area and reclaim dwellings for one-family occupancy.
3. Ensure that all property owners are aware of the neighborhood rules and municipal regulations.
4. Enforce 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 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 baching 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 City-owned property near 1480 North be developed as a park in the future.

##### Goals of the Foothills Neighborhood

1. Increase owner occupancy within the neighborhood.
2. Attract longer-term residents to increase neighborhood stability.
3. Foster a sense of community.
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 baching singles.

New residential developments should focus on creating housing that will encourage permanent residents.

1. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood by limiting new development to detached, one- family dwellings.
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.
3. 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.
4. Commercial and other non-residential development not be allowed to expand.
5. 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, 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.
6. 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.

#### Oak Hills Neighborhood

1. Limit development east of 1550 East to one row of homes one lot in depth, with no flag or panhandle lots.

#### Pleasant View Neighborhood

1. Restrict the Supplementary Residential overlay zone from expanding beyond its current boundaries.

#### Provost Neighborhood

1. Maintain the Public Facility (PF) General Plan designation for the detention basins along Slate Canyon Drive.
2. Maintain the one-family character of the neighborhood by:
	1. Limiting development in the R designation to detached, one-family dwellings;
	2. Enforcing relevant zoning laws to resist conversion of owner-occupied, one-family homes into two-family dwellings;
	3. Be included in neighborhood revitalization initiatives.
3. Property in the Developmentally Sensitive designation is of notable concern for protection from inappropriate development.
4. Continue implementation of the South State Street Design Corridor.

#### Provost South Neighborhood

1. 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 appropriate rezoning tools and provide adequate open space, amenities, buffering from non-residential uses, and such architectural styles and orientation as to not give the appearance of multiple-family housing.
2. Encourage and/or maintain owner-occupancy.
3. Evaluate the impacts of road designations to existing residents, especially collector designations. Evaluate the impacts of new development on street parking in constrained areas such as the east bench and implement traffic calming measures and parking restrictions as determined appropriate.
4. Provide and upgrade infrastructure, including appropriately designed and located, public recreational space.
5. Continue to implement the South State Street Design Corridor from the south City limits to 300 South for new development and redevelopment. 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.
6. 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.

#### Spring Creek Neighborhood

1. Ironton should be developed as an upscale business park, with industrial and commercial uses in a park-like atmosphere. Ironton Boulevard should connect to Larsen Parkway with adequate traffic control for the area.
2. 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, after an area master plan has been completed. 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.
	1. 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.
	2. Mixed-use neighborhood centers 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.
	3. 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 comply more closely with the expectations of the adopted design corridor through enhanced landscaping, architectural improvements, and other standards.
3. Continue to implement the South State Street Design Corridor from the south City limits to 300 South for new development and redevelopment.
4. Properties along the South State Street corridor should develop for quality businesses that are compatible with adjoining and nearby residential development.
5. Provide public recreational space to service the residents of this neighborhood.
6. Evaluate the process by which CDBG eligible neighborhoods may effectively utilize revitalization initiatives.

#### University Neighborhood

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. The Supplementary Residential Overlay Zone should not expand beyond its current boundaries.
2. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the neighborhood.
3. Maintain all existing one-family residential areas of the neighborhood as one-family detached housing. Duplexes, twin homes, condominiums, and apartments are not compatible with the goals for this neighborhood.
4. 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.
5. Existing commercial development not be allowed to expand to the degree that it encroaches into the Residential (R) General Plan designation.
6. 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 Public Facilities (PF) Zone.

### Southwest Area Neighborhood Council Map 1.10

|  |
| --- |
| **SOUTHWEST AREA NEIGHBORHOODS** |
| Fort Utah | Lakewood |
| Lakeview North | Provo Bay |
| Lakeview South | Sunset |

The Southwest Area Neighborhood Council consists of six neighborhoods: Fort Utah, Lakeview North, Lakeview South, Lakewood, Provo Bay, and Sunset. 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 shared, to some degree, by all of the Southwest Area Neighborhoods, and they apply in addition to the policies listed for each individual 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, except as designated in item number 12.
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 leapfrog 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).
5. Development of wetlands and flood plain south of the Utah Lake meander line should be prohibited or restricted.
6. Update the Transportation and Wastewater Collection System Master Plans in order to evaluate and respond to the impact of new development on critical infrastructures. 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. Requests for additional development west of I-15 should only be considered after the Public Works Department confirms that public facilities are adequate.
7. Subject to documentation that the public street and utility systems can support a new development, private property owners interested in the development of land should cooperatively assemble multiple parcels to allow for large-scale, unified, and cohesive development through the application of a Specific Development Plan (SDP)or other applicable zoning tool.
	1. 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.
	2. In most instances, private parties, rather than the City, will be responsible for the preparation of a Specific Development Plan. Private parties will work closely with the Community Development staff to ensure that General Plan and other goals are incorporated into the plan.
	3. The City may amend the General Plan to outline general goals for Specific Development Plans in targeted areas.
	4. 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.
	5. 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.
8. Additional parks and recreational facilities should be provided for the Southwest.
9. A master plan is being created for the Southwest Area, and it should be incorporated into the General Plan after its adoption.
10. The area located on the southeast corner of 820 North and Geneva Road, bordered on the north by 820 North, on the west by North Geneva Road, on the east by I-15, and on the south by the southern boundary of the property owned by Chris Olsen as of February 21, 2012, was allowed to develop with one-family, attached dwelling units with a density greater than four units per acre.

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

#### Fort Utah Neighborhood

1. Encourage 100 feet of public open space along the south side of the Provo River with the development of each property.
2. 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.
3. 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.
	1. 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.
	2. 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.
4. 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.
5. Center Street, between Geneva Road and Interstate-15, should be studied to capitalize on 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 Neighborhood

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. Infrastructure needs should continue to be evaluated in order to resolve issues for existing and future residents, particularly where road conditions may be hazardous.
4. Continue to review for appropriately siting the airport access road and consider potential impacts to current residents along Lakeshore Drive.
5. 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.

#### Lakeview South Neighborhood

1. An infrastructure improvement plan should be considered for improvements to sidewalks, drainage, parks, landscaping, and traffic conditions.
2. 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.
3. Retail development should be discouraged within the Lakeview South Neighborhood.
4. The neighborhood supports the mobile home park known as Leisure Village to redevelop to consist of one-family detached, one-family semidetached (twin homes), and/or one-family attached (town homes).

#### Lakewood Neighborhood

1. 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.
	1. The need for northbound and southbound access on 1-15 into the neighborhood should be evaluated and implemented if warranted.
	2. The collector road system should seek to make minimal impacts on existing farming/agricultural properties.
	3. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Provide sidewalks where they currently do not exist.
5. Evaluate environmental impacts prior to approving any new development in the Lakewood Neighborhood.
6. The City-owned property at 920 South and 770 West should be improved to be a pleasing entrance into the Neighborhood.
7. The Lakewood Neighborhood should be evaluated for additional neighborhood parks.
8. Mitigate traffic and on street parking impacts from Footprinters Park.

#### Provo Bay Neighborhood

##### Goals of the Provo Bay Neighborhood:

1. Preserve the current open feel of 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 in locations that are not adjacent to current residential development.

##### Key Land Use Policies – Provo Bay Neighborhood

1. 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).
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 landowners. This property, if properly planned, could have a combination of retail and residential uses.
6. 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.
7. Conduct a study to identify appropriate land uses within the Airport Related Activities designation

#### Sunset Neighborhood

1. 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:
	1. The area should be developed (allowably in phases under multiple ownerships) as a whole and integrated plan using the SDP process as described in the SW Area Guiding Principles and Goals.
	2. Those currently wishing to maintain animal rights should do so through the application of a Residential Agricultural (RA) zone on their property.
	3. 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.
	4. Equestrian based facilities and trail systems are highly encouraged.
	5. Footprinters Park should be expanded to add additional neighborhood recreational facilities.
	6. 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.
	7. 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.
2. 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.
3. An infrastructure improvement plan should be considered for improvements to sidewalks, drainage, parks, landscaping, and traffic conditions.

## 1.2.10 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 the update to the General Plan in Fall 2009.

### Need for an Annexation Policy Plan

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. There must be specific policy guidelines by which a proposed annexation is 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. No piecemeal annexation of individual small properties 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;
8. Fire, police, and other safety-oriented service systems are more controlled with logical political boundaries;
9. Utilities and other public services have more systematic city boundaries;
10. The City’s self-determination and local home rule is enhanced through the resulting city boundaries;
11. The City is able to exercise greater regulation over improper and undesirable land uses and development in the fringe areas.

#### The Character of the Community

Annexation proposals should be evaluated based upon the compatibility of the proposed land uses with the character of the overall surrounding neighborhood and City.

#### The Need for Municipal Services in Developed and Undeveloped Unincorporated Areas

Provo City utility services 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 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

City services should be extended to annexed areas as soon as practicable after annexation. The requirements for extension of such utilities are set forth on an area by area basis 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 period for such utilities will be dependent upon development demand and sufficient capital budgets. Such commitments and timeframes will be determined when annexation occurs and will be a part of the impact report required by the Provo City Code.

#### How Services Will be Funded

Provo City’s policy is to participate with developers in the cost of improvements, which benefit the City as a whole. 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. 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, 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 1.1

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: Repealed by Res. 2013-70.

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 system distribution capacity as well as the construction of wastewater lift stations. Present land uses in this area are agricultural and residential types. A large conservation easement, wetlands, and other environmental factors 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 Five 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 approved 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 1.2

Area One: Area one is located 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 be developed, 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 1.3

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 a 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.

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 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.

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.

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

The PRO 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. The PRO envisions that these properties redevelop 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 land uses – 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 landowners. It addresses General Plan issues and allows the overall plan to guide individual applications for rezoning and project development on parcels in separate ownership.

#### 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 landowners 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 need to be involved in the planning process to identify objectives for each SDP. 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 One 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 livable 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 timeframe. 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.

# 1.3 Vision

Vision 2030 states:

Provo City is characterized by well-maintained neighborhoods that accommodate diversity and enrich the quality of life while maintaining their own unique sense of place. Provo’s neighborhoods are well connected and offer recreational opportunities by capitalizing on its abundant local natural amenities. Provo’s neighborhoods offer families and individuals a safe and positive environment in which to interact and prosper.

Provo is a city where families and individuals feel safe, where land use is planned and zoned to promote a vibrant and active downtown, quiet residential neighborhoods, and a thriving commercial and environmentally sensitive industrial tax base. The city is balanced appropriately to encourage an exceptional quality of life. As a maturing city, with a limited amount of undeveloped land remaining, the focus for land use is on quality rather than quantity.

# 1.4 Goals and Implementation

**1.4.1 Improve neighborhood inter-connectivity.**

1.4.1.1 Encourage a pedestrian-friendly environment throughout Provo;

1.4.1.2 Create and maintain bike trail and sidewalk systems that connect all parts of Provo.

**1.4.2 Capitalize on local natural resources and neighborhood amenities.**

1.4.2.1 Consider gathering and social spaces (plazas, community gardens) within the context of each neighborhood;

1.4.2.2 Utilize the Provo River to foster gathering and an increased sense of community;

1.4.2.3 Improve the access and recreational uses to the Wasatch Mountains east of Provo and especially Provo, Slate and Rock Canyons;

1.4.2.4 Include preservation of vistas and views in open space requirements.

**1.4.3 Help neighborhoods preserve their own identity and sense of place.**

1.4.3.1 Create neighborhood-gathering places that draw people from their homes and encourage interaction, awareness, and interdependence;

1.4.3.2 Encourage strong neighborhood organizations;

1.4.3.3 Foster a strong sense of ownership and “place” in each neighborhood;

1.4.3.4 Provide and publicize a clearinghouse for information about neighborhoods for residents; and

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

**1.4.4 Empower neighborhoods by giving families, individuals, and businesses opportunities to participate in neighborhoods.**

1.4.4.1 Use social networking, the Internet, and other communications tools and technology to involve all individuals in neighborhood discussions and activities;

1.4.4.2 Foster activities that involve and support youth and students attending local schools and universities in city activities and government;

1.4.4.3 Seek to minimize divisions within the community by removing perceived barriers to interaction and foster a sense of belonging.

 1.4.4.4 Continue emphasis on the Neighborhood Program;

 1.4.4.5 Involve neighborhood representatives to ensure orderly growth; and

 1.4.4.6 Address specific concerns from each part of the city with regular area meetings.

**1.4.5 Encourage owner occupancy or long-term residency by promoting healthy and balanced neighborhoods and by involving schools, businesses, religious congregations, and community organizations.**

1.4.5.1 Encourage new, one-family detached neighborhoods;

1.4.5.2 Identify and reserve areas suitable for family housing;

1.4.5.3 Maintain low crime rates in neighborhoods;

1.4.5.4 Maintain and encourage good quality, sustainable housing and infill developments;

1.4.5.5 Increase direct landlord responsibility and accountability for overuse of city resources;

1.4.5.6 Continue the support of neighborhood loan and grant programs that encourage owner occupancy or long-term residency and neighborhood revitalization;

1.4.5.7 Identify criteria for properties with potential for multi-family and one-family housing;

1.4.5.8 Encourage diversity of age groups in neighborhoods; and

1.4.5.9 Regulate the scale of buildings by the land size of the parcel.

**1.4.6 Maintain and improve the physical appearance and beauty of neighborhoods.**

1.4.6.1 Plant larger, long-lived canopy trees in parks, green spaces, and recreation areas where shade will increase the enjoyment of future users;

1.4.6.2 Ensure adequate enforcement of zoning regulations;

1.4.6.3 Provide, encourage and maintain attractive landscaping in medians and corridors.

1.4.6.4 Beautify and improve gateways into the city;

1.4.6.5 Seek grants and promote volunteer efforts to improve neighborhood appearance;

1.4.6.6 Use non-profit partners to assist in revitalizing Provo neighborhoods as needed in focused efforts to improve curb appeal and neighborhood appearance;

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

1.4.6.8 Continue and expand the present program of regular cleaning of streets;

1.4.6.9 Continue and enlarge the present programs of picking up seasonal trash through a community volunteer effort; and

1.4.6.10 Maintain integrity and preserve the identifiable personality of neighborhoods.

**1.4.7 Help neighborhoods become well informed and educated on city-related issues.**

1.4.7.1 Have effective communication tools in place to disseminate information to the public;

1.4.7.2 Improve the emergency notification system to better inform the public and keep neighborhoods safe.

1.4.7.3 Review and establish laws and ordinances for the protection of all residents;

1.4.7.4 Provide public instruction about Provo City ordinances on a regular, on-going basis; and

1.4.7.5 Provide service opportunities for the public as a part of this education process.

**1.4.8 Protect existing owner-occupied housing and neighborhoods and encourage an increased percentage of owner-occupied or long-term residency housing in Provo neighborhoods.**

1.4.8.1 Encourage owner occupancy in one-family neighborhoods;

1.4.8.2 Encourage reinvestment in, and the beautification and restoration of, established neighborhoods;

1.4.8.3 Identify exceptional areas that would benefit from area specific master plans, where the city would conduct a detailed land-use analysis. The objective is for a plan for every neighborhood;

1.4.8.4 Develop strategies to increase owner-occupancy or long-term residency in the city’s residential neighborhoods;

1.4.8.5 Limit additional rental housing outside areas specifically planned for higher density development;

1.4.8.6 Require landscaping, which could include xeriscape, around perimeter of residential projects to soften development; and

1.4.8.7 Encourage site-specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings.

**1.4.9 Identify opportunities for neighborhood amenities in established neighborhoods.**

1.4.9.1 Provide opportunities to establish neighborhood amenities such as neighborhood oriented retail, small parks, leisure activities and/or medical services for residents in existing neighborhoods;

1.4.9.2 Preserve public facilities, parks and schools in each neighborhood;

1.4.9.3 Maintain and upgrade neighborhood infrastructure;

1.4.9.4 Revitalize blighted, dilapidated neighborhoods and distressed commercial centers; and

1.4.9.5 Design the open space first in future residential development projects.

**1.4.10 Disperse the increasing demand for affordable housing throughout the City and the County.**

1.4.10.1 Initiate actions necessary to encourage other cities within the county to accommodate a share of the rental housing market;

1.4.10.2 Encourage home ownership and preservation through neighborhood-qualified economic assistance programs; and

 1.4.10.3 Encourage development patterns that reduce land and development costs;

 1.4.10.4 Make quality housing and services that are accessible to all segments of the population;

1.4.10.5 Encourage housing of diverse design in order to adequately accommodate all types of users (singles, young couples, families, and the elderly);

1.4.10.6 Encourage maximum buildout in existing higher-density areas (south of Brigham Young University and within the Central Business District) with adequate parking and infrastructure; and

1.4.10.7 Establish acceptable service levels for public infrastructure and limit growth to maintain those levels.

**1.4.11 Prioritize areas within the city for economic development**

1.4.11.1 Determine the appropriate type, level, and location of economic development initiatives for Provo City;

1.4.11.2 Size utilities consistent with anticipated growth when development occurs;

1.4.11.3 Continue to require developments to pay for their fair share of infrastructure; and

1.4.11.4 Encourage site-specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings.

1.4.11.5 Consider amending zoning districts and regulations to encourage higher-density uses in proximity to major transportation facilities. Discourage high-density development where transportation facilities cannot be developed to provide an acceptable level of service commensurate with the high-density development proposed.

1.4.11.6 Ensure that adequate measures are in place to protect the Provo Airport from the encroachment of incompatible development.

**1.4.12 Facilitate environmentally sensitive industrial land use and development to contribute to employment opportunities and the city’s tax base without negatively impacting quality of life.**

1.4.12.1 Accommodate an appropriate amount of industrial growth in the city.

**1.4.13 Promote safety through urban design**

1.4.13.1 Require maximum fire and life safety devices in multi-residential and commercial developments;

1.4.13.2 Promote better pedestrian safety, including bicyclists, by using interior connections, footpaths, adequate lighting, crosswalks, etc.; and

1.4.13.3 Encourage design that focuses activity and surveillance on front yard space and limits access by unwanted visitors (i.e., front porches, verandas, windows for surveillance, fences, gates, hedges, outdoor lighting, etc.).

**1.4.14 Establish reasonable community-based design review standards for all developments**

1.4.14.1 Encourage quality design standards where desirable design themes are present;

1.4.14.2 Discourage “cookie-cutter” (overly repetitive) designs;

1.4.14.3 Establish higher minimum landscaping and tree density requirements for all development;

1.4.14.4 Establish open space requirements within developments;

1.4.14.5 Encourage open space through appropriate clustering of developments;

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

1.4.14.7 Provide effective transitional areas between commercial and residential areas;

1.4.14.8 Encourage gradual land-use transitions; and

1.4.14.9 Encourage signage compatible with development.