

***ITEM #9** Ryan Salmon is requesting a General Plan Map Amendment from a Commercial designation to Residential designation in association with a zone change request and concept plan for a twelve-unit apartment building in a proposed HDR (High Density Residential) zone, located at 2050 N Canyon Road. Pleasant View Neighborhood. Aaron Ardmore (801) 852-6404 aardmore@provo.org PLGPA20220301

OVERVIEW

Ryan Salmon is requesting approval of a General Plan Map Amendment from Commercial to Residential in order to build a twelve-unit apartment building over two properties on North Canyon Road. This request is associated with a rezone request to HDR, and a concept plan that would be tied to the rezone request through a Development Agreement. The reason the HDR zone is being requested for a MDR (Medium Density Residential) zone density project is for the reduced yard requirements in the HDR zone.

The related concept plan proposes an “L-shaped” apartment building fronting Canyon Road, with a surface parking lot hidden behind and accessed off of 2100 North. The building has six, one-bedroom units on each of the two levels, each around eight-hundred (800) square feet. The building elevations show a height of twenty-four feet (24') to the parapet, and just under thirty-feet (30') to the midpoint of the sloped roof features. For context, single-family homes have a permitted height of 35'.

The site includes twenty-one off-street parking spaces and approximately 8,600 square feet of landscape/open space. There is no requirement for amenities for projects under twenty units in the HDR zone, but the applicant has provided landscaped space for around forty-one percent (41%) of the project area.

RELEVANT HISTORY

As stated earlier, the applicant has adjusted his proposed project over the previous six months. The initial concept for three levels, fifteen units, and a reduced parking request raised concerns from the neighborhood and from Provo City Staff. Through discussions with the applicant and three rounds of revised plans with the CRC (Coordinator Review Committee) the project has been able to address concerns with building height, setback, and parking. The applicant has been responsive to staff comments and acknowledges future design details that will need to be addressed in the future Project Plan application if the zone change and General Plan amendment are granted by the City Council.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In order to analyze the proposed General Plan Map change, staff uses the criteria in Section 14.02.020, as follows: **(Staff response in bold type)**

Before recommending an amendment to this Title, the Planning Commission shall determine whether such amendment is in the interest of the public, and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Provo City General Plan. The following guidelines shall be used to determine consistency with the General Plan:

(a) Public purpose for the amendment in question.

Staff response: The applicant has noted that the purpose is “to engage in a redevelopment that significantly improves the aesthetic and use of these otherwise under-utilized properties” and to provide additional housing in the area.

(b) Confirmation that the public purpose is best served by the amendment in question.

Staff response: Staff feels that the applicant has worked to provide a project that would help meet the above goals and that this General Plan Map Amendment, along with the zone map amendment and proposed development agreement, would best meet those goals.

(c) Compatibility of the proposed amendment with General Plan policies, goals, and objectives.

Staff response: One of the top three land use strategies listed in Chapter Three of the General Plan text is to “promote small scale, infill development across the city”. Staff feel this plan is consistent with that strategy, but also is consistent with the goals later on in that chapter to “promote neighborhood scale development in residential areas, including a mix of density” (goal 1c).

(d) Consistency of the proposed amendment with the General Plan’s “timing and sequencing” provisions on changes of use, insofar as they are articulated.

Staff response: This proposal is consistent with the relevant implementation matrix on page 92 of the General Plan.

(e) Potential of the proposed amendment to hinder or obstruct attainment of the General Plan’s articulated policies.

Staff response: The proposed amendment should not hinder or obstruct attainment of the General Plan policies. The designation change from Commercial to Residential doesn’t have much impact on the economic development goals for the City in this circumstance, as this commercial property has been struggling over the past decade.

(f) Adverse impacts on adjacent land owners.

Staff response: Staff feel that the loss of the commercial designation and what it would be replaced with would not bring in any adverse impacts, but provide for a more attractive and useful property.

(g) Verification of correctness in the original zoning or General Plan for the area in question.

Staff response: Staff has verified the zoning and General Plan for the area in question.

(h) In cases where a conflict arises between the General Plan Map and General Plan Policies, precedence shall be given to the Plan Policies.

Staff response: Staff has shown that this amendment will be consistent with the policies of the General Plan.

CONCLUSIONS

The related rezone and concept plan give staff the confidence to support this General Plan map amendment. The scale and design of the concept plan blend with the residential character of the neighborhood more appropriately than the existing commercial building and should provide more value as various uses have been tried in the commercial building and all have struggled to stay in business.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Area Map
2. Zone Map
3. General Plan Map
4. Concept Site Plan

ATTACHMENT 1 – AREA MAP



ATTACHMENT 2 – ZONE MAP



ATTACHMENT 3 – GENERAL PLAN MAP



ATTACHMENT 4 – SITE PLAN

