

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

All Comments sorted chronologically

As of May 1, 2018, 12:03 PM



Open City Hall is not a certified voting system or ballot box. As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The comments in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

As of May 1, 2018, 12:03 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 128

All Comments and Comments: 29

Minutes of Public Comment: 58

This topic started on April 6, 2018, 6:15 PM.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 1 - Land Use, Growth, and Urban Design'

Mike Roan inside City Boundary (registered)

April 19, 2018, 12:07 PM

Mike Roan - These are my comments on the 1st section – land use.

Land use –

- Design review – pls add inclusion of neighborhood representatives
- Visible design - re: Signage – corridors for larger signs and areas restricted from large signs
- Design corridors – specific/unique requirements for each existing & proposed corridor?
- Table 1.4 – needs explanation of 7 peaks area & reasons for both in & exclusion.
- Table 1.4 – I'd like another category for public lands (gov't, schools, churches, hospitals, etc.)
- Zoning – accessory apts, will help meet affordable housing demands
- Update name of BRT to new name (pg 11)
- Incorporate UTA/UDOT & Mountain lands long range plans for mass transit, roads, etc. (pg 11-12)
- Page 10-12 – need to expand and make easier to find more parking to facilitate and support biking and walking, etc.
- Pg 13 mention the updates to the gen'l plan since 2009
- Pg 13 have the names for these neighborhood areas (councils) be recodified as noted here?
- Edgemont neighborhood – no mention of Timpview HS, Days Market Shopping Center, pharmacies, fast food, building by the seminary building, etc.
- Edgemont – what does modernization of the auto repair/gas station mean? Who will pay for this?
- Riverbottoms –
 - o 1& 2 – what about the church property? Arbors? PEG project on 4800? The area north of Riverwoods shopping center and north & east of Heritage school? Town houses along the river west of Merrill Lynch?
 - o What about the redevelopment of the intersection of Canyon Rd and University ave??
- Riverside –
 - o 2 – good idea, however there are currently access issues, per the city.
 - o 3 – is there a consistent architecture there??
 - o 6 - given that except for Stutz park which is NOT mentioned here all of the land adjacent to the Provo River is privately owned and most owners do NOT want people traipsing through their back yard along the river.
 - o Riverside Country Club is NOT mentioned here and needs to be....
- Many other neighborhoods have virtually NOTHING in their respective plans.

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 4:48 PM

In sections 1.24 and 1.25, a list of characteristics worth considering for new development standards are outlined. In both cases, the height of buildings and massing is not mentioned. I believe that to be a significant oversight. Height and massing are significant components of any infill development.

Design Corridors: I appreciate the emphasis on maintaining character of existing neighborhoods while responding to the modern needs of the built environment. A topic of significant research in the planning field

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

currently is the idea of CENTERS. While I applaud the intent of the design corridors, I believe it would be better to target specific nodes or centers for development. For example, the Shops at Riverwoods is already a great center of activity. It deserves to grow as seen in the recent PEG Development and future Arbors expansion, etc. What would be sad is if University Ave, from the Shops to Jamestown to Center Street because one continuous corridor. It would start to look and feel like State Street. State Street is bad all over the Wasatch Front as seen in the ongoing study "Life on State" in Salt Lake/South Salt Lake. We need to avoid the immense corridor and focus on centering the intense development. This helps with walkability and vitality of the places and allows single-family character to be maintained where appropriate.

Also, while focusing on growing the commercial base for tax revenue is a good goal, I continue to be astounded by the number of vacancies all over Provo, Orem, etc. Part of this goal should involve getting those units filled and not just building new ones.

Celeste Kennard inside City Boundary (registered)

April 17, 2018, 4:33 PM

Design Corridor Section

My understanding is that the Center Street Corridor has been adopted by ordinance and this section should reflect that change.

Mary Wade inside City Boundary (registered)

April 17, 2018, 12:41 PM

I'd like to add a comment to this statement (as well as other language that suggests that single-family dwellings are the only long-term housing options): "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."

Overall, I agree with this statement, and I especially appreciate the inclusive remark to consider "a growing demand for [alternative] housing types." However, I would just like to share an additional perspective when it comes to longterm viability of those alternative housing types based on my family's experience, as well as a growing number of other Provo homeowners we know. We are a family of 5 and proud townhome owners in the Dixon neighborhood, despite the fact we could certainly afford a larger single family home. We love our small space, our shared common areas for our kids to play safely, and our lower mortgage/maintenance that allows us more time and resources to give back to our community & to spend family time. We have had multiple opportunities to pursue the more traditional "move to the suburbs" of other Utah communities, but we have chosen to stay here in Provo because of the existing and growing walkability & bike-ability, as well as the many features we love (BYU, Provo River Trail, Downtown, proximity to events, etc. etc). We recognize we represent a minority; people tend to be surprised when we tell them our 1,350 sq foot 3 bedroom 2 bath townhome is our "forever home." However, I just wanted to make you guys aware that there exists a number of people for whom alternative housing types are actually desirable longterm options. Thank you for all your work, and overall, I think this looks like a great document headed in a positive direction for Provo!

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section '1 - Central Area Neighborhoods'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 3:56 PM

Item 10 of the "guiding principles" section states that the Amtrak station is east of Freedom Blvd, but it is west. Otherwise, I like all the things you have listed and are working toward.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section '1 - Southeast Area Neighborhoods'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:20 PM

We've lived in this area for 21 years and NEVER had our road repaired (aside from one slurry seal and 1 gluey haphazard crack fill). Please make sure that road maintenance is addressed in the general plan or transportation plan for this area of the city.

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:14 PM

Make sure that plans for the Provost and Provost South neighborhoods both include enforcement of occupancy restrictions. Even with new regulations for illegal rentals that were recently passed, many of the homes along Slate Canyon Drive are still renting out their basements or renting to more than 3 unrelated individuals. Please enforce the ordinance so that the problem doesn't get worse! It doesn't do any good to have single family areas designated on the general plan and related zoning map if we don't protect these areas with enforcement and new development that gets approved.

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:08 PM

The 2nd #5 listed (discussing development of former Meridian School property) is obsolete since this has already been built up entirely by that huge LDS chapel.

Jared Oldroyd inside City Boundary (registered)

April 21, 2018, 9:52 AM

The statement that the supplemental zone overlay in the Wasatch Neighborhood should not expand beyond its current boundaries should be removed. There are several homes that were built with supplemental apartments prior to the current boundaries that should be allowed to make use of these improvements. Doing so will not have a detrimental effect on the neighborhood. There are several of these homes for which use of the apartments is allowed based on the age of the primary occupants or the good will of the neighbors without any problems so the boundaries should be updated to allow common sense practice. The mix of long term home owners with young student families in basements or apartments is an important part of the vitality of this neighborhood.

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2018, 1:27 PM

I really like the idea of building more detached single family homes as well as increasing owner occupancy. Enforcing the rental laws is also key, as they seem to be abused with nary a care by anyone. As a resident with children of elementary school age and younger, I have experienced first-hand the impact of a very transitional population. It is extremely disruptive in classrooms, to teachers, and negatively affects the school as a whole. It seems that Provo has become less and less friendly to families, instead pandering to the much louder (and much more transient) single professional population. I love Provo, I have lived here for years, I would love to live

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

here for my whole life, but if it becomes unfriendly feeling to me and my family, and the schools become so affected by the transient population as to disrupt their education, I will move elsewhere. I am hiding this comment because I know it will be attacked, belittled, and also harassed by 20948576 single professionals, as this is how the neighborhood meetings and Facebook comments go.

R. PAUL EVANS inside City Boundary (registered)

April 9, 2018, 3:50 PM

The Pleasant View neighborhood has long been a desirable area to live in Provo due to its excellent location, peaceful streets and varied architectural history. The location is both a benefit and a challenge due to the immediate proximity of Brigham Young University, major arterial roads, and significant public transportation nodes.

Residential

Single Family Homes

Maintain, protect and allow the turn over that naturally occurs in the viable and significant areas of one-family structures in the neighborhood. These areas are designated as single family residential (R1) on the General Plan Map. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the single family home areas of the neighborhood. Restrict the Supplementary Residential and Accessory overlay zones from expanding beyond the current boundaries. Continue enforcement of zoning laws to ensure public safety and the quality of residential properties. Non-residential uses such as commercial, public facilities, and professional office must not be allowed within the residential area on the north side of University Parkway between 450 East and 650 East. The single family residential area between University Avenue and North Canyon Road south of 2200 North and north of Stadium Avenue must be maintained without loss of any property to higher density residential or non-residential development.

Condominiums, Apartments, and Performance Developments

The higher density residential housing, such as condominiums, apartments, and performance developments in the neighborhood provide a mix of housing opportunities. This housing is located in existing R2, RC, R3 and R4 zones. The expansion of these types of higher density housing may occur into adjacent properties zoned general commercial (GC) or public facility (PF) but not into property with a single family (R1) use.

Commercial and Public Facility

Existing commercial and public facility developments should not be allowed to expand into the residential areas (R) identified on the General Plan. Conversion of land designated Public Facility use to a Professional Office (PO) or Commercial (GC) use is not consistent with the long term growth and sense of community in this neighborhood.

Traffic

Reduce cut-through traffic on local (residential) streets, provide appropriate speed limit controls and

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

enforcement on local, collector and arterial streets, and improve pedestrian and bicycling access.

Maintain the current boundary between the higher density uses such as Brigham Young University (BYU) in existing Public Facility zones and the single-family residential uses of the Pleasant View neighborhood. These boundaries best respect existing uses and protects both uses from the incompatibility of having high density residential or commercial uses next to single-family residential uses.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section '1 - Southwest Area Neighborhoods'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 25, 2018, 2:40 PM

I'm commenting here because I live in one of these neighborhoods. I am grateful to the city for desiring to maintain green spaces for our communities. I am concerned about two things - one of them is relevant in the land use area. I read that companies building condos or townhomes must provide sufficient parking for residents. However, in many of the cases of town homes and condos, they are rented out. For example, the property on the SE corner of 820 N and Geneva Rd is totally renter occupied. And there isn't sufficient parking for everyone who resides there. Therefore, residents park on 820N and under the freeway. Additionally, on my own street there are plenty of renters who bring 3, 4 and sometimes 5 cars to their property. Can't there be some kind of regulation for these properties that become rentals regarding parking and number of vehicles?

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:24 PM

I love the ideas listed in #3 of the "Key Land Use Policies – Provo Bay Neighborhood" section. The Westside connector is an underutilized gem and these ideas would give residents more access to beautiful recreation resources in the city.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section '1 - Vision and Goals'

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:03 PM

I commend the city for emphasizing the need for owner-occupancy or at least accountable and involved landlords. This is critical in maintaining that sense of place and encouraging involvement and permanence in our neighborhoods.

I also appreciate the recognition of the value of open spaces and recreational connectivity. Perhaps it will come later on, but I think an ongoing commitment to the parkway trail should be stated as a goal including the goal to improve it. The section of the Parkway Trail which lies adjacent to North University Ave is problematic. At this point, it may be impossible to get it to follow the river all the way to the lake, but isn't that a good goal? Or what about creating a buffer between it and the arterial (especially in light of a recent, significant vehicular accident). Additionally, where does the Bonneville Shoreline trail fall in this? There are sections of that trail which need to be more aggressively connected to the existing trail (around Rock Canyon park for example) that would enhance the recreation opportunities and connectivity of the City overall.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 2 - Transportation and Mobility'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 25, 2018, 2:55 PM

With the high density residential areas coming on Geneva Rd., what is being done to increase access in and out of the west side? I understand that east/west connections are tough to improve because they go through many residential neighborhoods. However, Geneva Rd is already crowded and is about to explode in growth. Yet, I don't ever read anything about growth in roads and access. This must be addressed. I'm assuming that the connector road on the west side of the new high school is going to help with the north/south access. But, getting to the east side of Provo could become much harder.

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:34 PM

I like the suggestion in the "traffic calming" section where residents can borrow speed monitoring equipment and then send educational material to frequent violators. This would be a non-threatening approach to let people know the dangers of what they are doing in our neighborhoods, especially on those roads with lots of problems. I feel like lots of zoning and traffic violations could be reduced if people actually knew what the rules were and were reminded not to break them.

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:12 PM

One issue that I don't see in the items regarding mobility below is one of education, mind-set, or cultural norms. I have heard many residents complain about the traffic on University Ave and suggest the need for more lanes or some other way of speeding up traffic. I appreciate the section on Traffic Calming as a way to enhance quality of life because it is not all about speed and throughput. I think there need to be some educational materials and pilot programs on sections of the city where traffic calming (road diets is another term) should be tested. The success of Center Street with the center-median-parking is a prime example. Other sections of the city would benefit from center islands/medians or other forms of pedestrian refuge's when pedestrians out cross wide/busy streets.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 3 - Housing'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:41 PM

I feel like even if you figure out how to do this: "3.4.2.5 Provide sufficient housing options for single professionals as a means to increase family occupancy in the single-family areas." that it still won't address the illegal rental problem because illegally renting a larger home to more people will always be cheaper than buying a smaller place for yourself.

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:22 PM

I appreciate the struggle experienced by the city in balancing the worthy goals of maintaining existing single-family communities while adding additional and diverse housing stock. I worry that none of the goals in this section encourage creativity in these new designs. Even a casual study of housing developments (multi and single-family) outside of Utah suggest that there are lots of creative ways to provide housing to meet the demands of the growing city. Yet in many cases, we see more of the same typology which does not always fit the market or fit within the context of the individual site. In some cases, developers request zoning changes and variances when more creativity by them and an open-mind by the city and neighbors might be more beneficial.

On a separate note, please ensure continued involvement by neighboring residents when these new developments come up. I would even encourage that this feedback be encouraged earlier in the development process.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 4 - Natural Resources and Environment'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:45 PM

I'd love to see some sort of education campaign or new ordinances that encourage people to turn off their cars while waiting (think of the air quality improvement just from parents waiting to pick up kids from school if they all shut their cars off!) and that encourages people not to over-water their lawns or to water them unnecessarily. I don't know if this is something that you can build into the general plan, but it certainly seems like a good goal that would be relatively easy to achieve, at least from an educational standpoint.

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:30 PM

In the Flood Hazard Zone goals, it says, "minimize" development in the flood hazard zones. The idea of minimizing exposure in areas that are known to be hazardous is an expression of hubris. In 2005, St. George was "surprised" by flash floods which eroded the banks of their rivers damaging private and public property. Much of the cost was subsequently born by tax payers. They "minimized" the exposure but as many of us have personally seen or experienced, there needs to be a greater buffer. Therefore, I recommend the term minimize be changed to avoid.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 5 - Municipal Services and Facilities'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 4:57 PM

I love the goals and ideas for expanding the airport and the recycling programs. These have been great improvements already and continuing to add to these options/programs will benefit residents.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 6 - Preservation & Redevelopment Conserv.'

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 26, 2018, 11:14 AM

As a lifelong resident of Provo, I have been saddened to see the downward spiral of our once beautiful neighborhoods. Many single family homes have become overcrowded, rundown rental properties, with inadequate parking. I believe this is a huge problem to the overall well-being of our city.

As city officials, I hope you recognize the importance of enforcing existing housing laws and have expectations for owners to take care of the condition of their properties. It would be great to have a renewed city-wide effort to beautify our neighborhoods. Years ago, there were city beautification awards given out to homeowners and neighborhoods to encourage and recognize their efforts.

Another concern is the large apartments being built in historic neighborhoods look so out of place. There is no consideration for making them architecturally compatible to the surrounding area. The apartments that were built on 500 West, where the Catholic church once stood, are an example of this poor planning. The apartments by the Startup building are another example.

I have never been in favor of the BRT and it's sad to see the demolition taking place. I hope it will become a good thing for our city, but I remain skeptical as I see mostly empty buses driving through Provo.

Name not shown inside City Boundary (registered)

April 23, 2018, 5:08 PM

The section on "Project Area #4" (Provo Towne Center Mall) seems outdated as it refers to Home Depot as a new addition. I would love to see more specific goals stated here about plans to revitalize the economic developments in this area. There are way too many vacant stores in East Bay. Tell us what goals and efforts there are for this part of the city.

I also love the improved goals and ideas for historic preservation efforts. There are countless gems sprinkled throughout the city that don't fall in these larger historic zones. It would be great to figure out how to educate the citizens of Provo on benefits/resources available for owners of historic properties so that they would recognize the incentives for owning and improving some of these areas around the city.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 7 - Economic Development'

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:50 PM

Economic Development is critical to healthy growth and long term sustainability. With such a large number of vacancies in retail, office, and other commercial spaces in the city including completely vacant buildings (i.e. ExactWare) I believe encouraging occupancy should be part of the goals and visions of Economic Development.

Additionally, the idea of maintaining a human scale to the large-scale developments downtown or elsewhere is critical to future vitality and walkability. In some cities, this is found through tree selection and tree canopies. Elsewhere, it is found through material selection and window placement along the sidewalk facade. When tall buildings are constructed, having significant setbacks is important to maintain the human scale at the street frontage. Center Street has done this well on the north side of the street. The south side is dominated in sections by NUSkin and the County buildings which create a lopsided and moth-eaten effect. Maintain parking lots to the rear and entries at the main sidewalk are important walkability components.

As mentioned in a previous comment, the idea of CENTERS over CORRIDORS is a valuable concept to consider as part of economic development. Centers should encourage TODs and other multi-use properties. They should not start out as being spread along a long corridor.

Lastly, many locations in Orem are infilling enormous parking lots with small strips of commercial/retail/service development. This improves the human scale of the project by avoiding getting lost in the vastness of the parking lot and adds vibrancy and a street presence where one did not previously occur. This is an important and valuable way to gain tax dollars within under-utilized space. If you want people to use the the expensive modes of transit being developed, this is also a way to encourage alternative transportation modes.

Scott Bowles inside City Boundary (registered)

April 17, 2018, 5:00 PM

7.2.1 Current Economic Development Policies

Attract new retail business to Provo: Provide a broad range of goods and services within Provo to keep tax dollars local, including a grocery store on the west side of I-15

This language should be changed to reflect direct impacts to control sales tax and services leakage in our community. Provo's retail strategic plan provided very specific categories, with examples of retailers in those categories, where we are experiencing the greatest sales leakage.

Part of retail attraction must also focus on the foundation of where retailers can build and establish their businesses. The continued effort to attract a specific retailer(s) (a grocery store) to an extremely specific portion of our community as a stand-alone amenity (west side of I-15) is a fruitless endeavor unless large amounts of subsidies and incentives will be provided. We cannot base retail attraction on a missed opportunity that occurred over 15 years ago, especially considering that an established retail/commercial node does not exist on Provo's west side.

Scott Bowles inside City Boundary (registered)

April 17, 2018, 4:56 PM

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

7.4.15.1 Support the Provo Towne Centre, Downtown Provo, University Parkway, commercial corridor and the North State Street commercial corridor.

Each of these commercial entities need to be broken out to discuss the specifics required to create a true commercial corridor. The presence of State-owned roads is both a benefit and impediment to retail development in our community, especially since East Bay (our largest concentration of retail in the community) is separated by railroad and an outdated, non-bike/pedestrian friendly bridge.

Efforts for beautification, streetscaping, lighting plans, pedestrian infrastructure, and discussion on improvement/opportunity zones should be discussed in greater detail if long-term, sustainable retail development and retention is desired.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 8 - Parks, Recreation, and Open Space'

Matt Wheelwright inside City Boundary (registered)

April 18, 2018, 5:55 PM

The Provo River Parkway trail will celebrate its larger system connectivity this summer as part of an extensive trail system running all the way to Ogden. This should be celebrated in Provo and noted here. I also recommend language about protecting it and enhancing it in places where it is not along the river (i.e. Riverbottoms area) and look for ways to get it back along the river or at least protected from traffic in some way.

Also, the Bonneville shoreline trail deserves to be considered as a way of connecting these rich, natural areas.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

comments attached to the annotation section 'Chapter 1 (brief)'

R. PAUL EVANS inside City Boundary (registered)

April 9, 2018, 3:53 PM

Update Pleasant View Neighborhood language.

The Pleasant View neighborhood has long been a desirable area to live in Provo due to its excellent location, peaceful streets and varied architectural history. The location is both a benefit and a challenge due to the immediate proximity of Brigham Young University, major arterial roads, and significant public transportation nodes.

Residential

Single Family Homes

Maintain, protect and allow the turn over that naturally occurs in the viable and significant areas of one-family structures in the neighborhood. These areas are designated as single family residential (R1) on the General Plan Map. Promote owner-occupancy throughout the single family home areas of the neighborhood. Restrict the Supplementary Residential and Accessory overlay zones from expanding beyond the current boundaries. Continue enforcement of zoning laws to ensure public safety and the quality of residential properties. Non-residential uses such as commercial, public facilities, and professional office must not be allowed within the residential area on the north side of University Parkway between 450 East and 650 East. The single family residential area between University Avenue and North Canyon Road south of 2200 North and north of Stadium Avenue must be maintained without loss of any property to higher density residential or non-residential development.

Condominiums, Apartments, and Performance Developments

The higher density residential housing, such as condominiums, apartments, and performance developments in the neighborhood provide a mix of housing opportunities. This housing is located in existing R2, RC, R3 and R4 zones. The expansion of these types of higher density housing may occur into adjacent properties zoned general commercial (GC) or public facility (PF) but not into property with a single family (R1) use.

Commercial and Public Facility

Existing commercial and public facility developments should not be allowed to expand into the residential areas (R) identified on the General Plan. Conversion of land designated Public Facility use to a Professional Office (PO) or Commercial (GC) use is not consistent with the long term growth and sense of community in this neighborhood.

Traffic

Reduce cut-through traffic on local (residential) streets, provide appropriate speed limit controls and enforcement on local, collector and arterial streets, and improve pedestrian and bicycling access.

General Plan Update - Public Comment

We are in the process of updating the General Plan and would like your input on these drafts.

Maintain the current boundary between the higher density uses such as Brigham Young University (BYU) in existing Public Facility zones and the single-family residential uses of the Pleasant View neighborhood. These boundaries best respect existing uses and protects both uses from the incompatibility of having high density residential or commercial uses next to single-family residential uses.
