



G R E A T E R S A L T L A K E
**Municipal Services
District**

Trustees
Joe Smolka, Chair
Paulina Flint, Vice Chair
Kelly Bush
Sean Clayton
Dan Peay

Bart Barker
General Manager

File # 30650

General Plan Amendment/Rezone/P-C Zone Plan Summary

Public Body: Salt Lake County Council

Meeting Date: February 25, 2020 – County Council Meeting

Parcel ID's: 26-27-300-001, 26-32-200-004, 26-32-400-001, 26-32-400-002, 26-33-100-001, 26-33-301-001,
26-34-100-001, 26-34-100-002, 26-34-226-001, 26-34-276-015

Current Zone: A-2 (Agricultural), M-2 (Industrial)

Proposed Zone: PC (Planned Community)

Property Address: approximately 6300-8500 W. and 12400-13100 South

Request: Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Approval of the Planned Community Zone Plan and the associated Development Agreement

Planner: Todd A. Draper, AICP

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval (with recommended changes)

Planning Staff Recommendation: Approval (with recommended changes)

Applicant Name: Doug Young on behalf of Olympia Land, LLC

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application is to rezone approximately 933 acres from A-2 (Agricultural) and M-2 (Industrial) to P-C (Planned Community) in the Southwest community of Salt Lake County. The application was proposed and approved at County Council in May 2018 but ultimately the three ordinances accompanying the application were vetoed by the County Mayor in June 2018. In May 2019 the County Council passed Resolution 5577 establishing parameters of how a revised application would be processed and considered. Revised application materials were provided to the County July 2, 2019 and the revised application was complete when associated review fees were paid on November 13, 2019.

In conjunction with the rezone request, a general plan amendment is required which clarifies the densities, uses and transportation network for the subject property. Chapter 19.69, Planned Community Zone, also requires that applicants submit a P-C zone plan with the rezone application. The P-C Zone plan proposes land uses, residential densities, major infrastructure systems and proposed non-residential space for the property, as well as studies and

reports needed to justify the density, commercial space, and overall infrastructure design. The revised P-C zone plan proposal, together with the associated Master Development Agreement (MDA), Transportation Impact Study (TIS), Design Standards, and general plan amendment, were provided to the County Council and released to the public for review on December 19, 2019. County's contracted planning and engineering staff and Developer each provided presentations on the revised proposal and associated materials to the Council on January 7, 2020 and at the Public Hearings before the County Council on January 14 and 28, 2020.

Following the Public Hearings minor modifications have been proposed by staff for addition to the Master Development Agreement regarding requirements for a commercial development plan. These are included with this update to the staff report.

The proposed ordinances are being provided to the County Council only in the event that they vote to approve the same.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

See attached summary document.

SITE & VICINITY DESCRIPTION (see attached map)

The site is bounded by Kennecott and Suburban Land Reserve to the north, residential subdivisions in Herriman City to the east and northeast, the soon to be developed Dansie property to the south, and Herriman Hwy/Bacchus Hwy to the west and southwest. Addresses range from approximately 6300 to 8500 West and approximately 12400 to 13100 South.

GENERAL PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

As mentioned above, the P-C zone requires a rezone and general plan amendment concurrently when a zone change is requested. The 2008 Southwest Community Plan amendment indicated the subject property should be developed as a planned community, only a minor amendment to that plan is required to accommodate the request—that of the maximum allowable density. The proposed maximum density would be 6.8 units per acre. The plan anticipated over a 5 unit per acre average in the planned community area but did not set a maximum limit. Based on state law requirements, adopted general plans are required to have a transportation and traffic circulation element which is included as part of the general plan amendment.

ISSUES OF CONCERN/PROPOSED MITIGATION

The main issue for County staff is ensuring that the pace of development on the site does not outpace required system improvements to accommodate that development—particularly those improvements that are outside the boundaries of the project, such as roadway improvements across or through adjacent lands and jurisdictions. As part of the revised application the applicant provided an updated Transportation Impact Study (TIS) that was reviewed by an independent consultant for the County. This study identified impacts to the surrounding transportation network and proposed solutions to mitigate or resolve those impacts. As part of the Master Development Agreement (MDA), the Developer is required to provide an updated TIS when each subsequent Community Structure Plan (CSP) is filed with the County, and to pay the proportional cost of off-site roadway infrastructure improvements that are not yet in place.

Design Standards (DS) are also included as an attachment to the MDA. These were developed during the review and approval process rather than at the CSP level to address the concerns of the County Council as stated in Resolution 5577. These standards set specific requirements for place types and land uses, street network, street types and design, parks, trails, opens space, site design, buildings and architecture, landscape, and sustainability.

One of the concerns addressed in the MDA is parks and open space. Salt Lake County has a standard of 5 acres of park area for each 1,000 residents. The MDA and DS address this issue by requiring a minimum of 20% of the acreage be dedicated to open space and parks. The requirements include a minimum 50-acre regional park, four 10-acre community parks, and many smaller parks and trails. An additional requirement is that a park be located a ¼ mile from every doorstep. Open space will also include stream corridors, trails, and park connectivity.

Another concern is long-term provision of municipal services. Salt Lake County does not intend to be the long-term service provider for the area. The MDA includes provisions that will require municipal incorporation or annexation into a surrounding community. The provisions call for an incorporation/annexation petition to begin by at least 1,500 residential units and the diligent pursuance of the petitions(s). The MDA will also address shortfalls that occur between tax revenue and service provision, with the developer covering the additional costs incurred by the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD) in excess of generated revenues.

In part due to Public Comment received staff has proposed additional language for consideration of the Council regarding the proposed commercial development in the project. The language would bolster the requirements by requiring that the developer provide a commercial development plan and market study supporting the plan as part of the submittal and review of each Community Structure Plan (CSP).

NEIGHBORHOOD RESPONSE

Citizen and agency inputs have been received as part of the original proposal, subsequent Open Houses hosted by the Developer, and two Growth Summit series facilitated by the County Council. Input from these sources prior to the resubmittal of the applicant materials is noted and utilized in general as a basis for reviewing the revised application but is not included in detail as part of this report. Any additional public input provided directly to the Municipal Services District (MSD) regarding the revised application will be compiled when received and will be presented to the Council at the Public Hearings in January.

Citizen and neighbor inputs were additionally received from website comments, and at each of the public hearings. Written comments were compiled and provided directly to the County Council. Most comments were not in favor of approving the rezone. Common concerns included frustration with existing vehicular traffic and road conditions in the area, provision of schools and other community needs, a lack of jobs and commercial development in the vicinity, and the residential density as applied to the number of potential new residents.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESCOMMENDATION

Regarding the general plan amendment: The planning commission recommended approval as drafted and proposed by the planning staff.

Regarding the proposed rezone and P-C zone Plan: The planning commission recommended approval of the rezone and P-C zone plan, subject to the following:

1. The building height limits in the Town Center and Institutional districts should be changed from "N/A" to "To be determined through the Community Structure Plan or Project Plan approval process."

2. The development agreement entered into between the County and the developer should place the responsibility on the developer to ensure that infrastructure system upgrades, including transportation, storm drainage, water, and sewer (both on and off-site) are constructed.
3. The development agreement should require that the timing of critical infrastructure improvements is such that development does not outpace the installation of the needed improvements, meaning that improvements are installed concurrently with the phase(s) of development causing the need for said improvements.
4. The development agreement should also address the need for municipal service provision to the properties as agreed upon by the Municipal Services District.
5. The development agreement should require that a plan be in place regarding the future governance of the property through either annexation or incorporation.
6. The water availability should be confirmed by the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District before the County Council takes action on the rezone.

REVIEWING AGENCIES RESPONSE

Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District reviewed the original development plans. It is our understanding that they have the capacity to provide water to the development, but have not committed to an approval in writing, because that commitment is generally based on specific plans rather than at the rezoning stage. (See attached letters)

South Valley Sewer District states that they can provide service to the site, but that their system would need some upgrades and the western portion of the property would need to be annexed into their service district. (See attached letter)

The County Engineer reviewed initial plans, and recommended approval of the rezone, with the recommendation that detailed storm drainage plans need to be reviewed and compared to the master storm drain plans as each phase of development is proposed. This would be completed as part of the CSP review and approval prior to reviewing and approving of individual subdivision plats.

The developer's TIS provides off-site mitigation resulting from traffic impacts related to the development. The TIS was reviewed by Avenue Consultants for the County, and proposed mitigation was acceptable to County staff. The MDA indicates that mitigation is the responsibility of the developer for all on-site transportation improvements and its proportionate share of off-site transportation improvements.

Other County agencies that reviewed the plan indicated that their concerns are addressed as part of the MDA or will be addressed in whole or in part at later stages of the development process when specific designs of projects and subdivisions are submitted for review.

PLANNING STAFF ANALYSIS

There are three components of this application: the general plan amendment, the rezone, and the P-C zone Plan/associated MDA. The general plan amendment basically accommodates the P-C zone plan process by removing reference to a specific density (allowing the county council to set the density through the rezone process) and by updating the general plan to include a section on transportation.

The rezone decision is based on whether the Council is satisfied that the reports and studies submitted by the applicant sufficiently show that the requested amount of development can be accommodated on the property in

line with the intents and purposes of the General Plan. Based on the materials submitted, it appears that the amount of proposed development can be accommodated if the report recommendations are followed. It is important that the development agreement approved by the Council and the subsequent Community Structure Plan(s) ensure that the required improvements are provided for the infrastructure to service the property and to avoid negative impacts on neighboring communities.

The third element that requires approval is the Master Development Agreement (MDA). The MDA has been negotiated through a collaborative process with the Developer, expert Consultants, the County, and the Municipal Services District. Staff is comfortable that the agreement provides adequate provisions to ensure that development is orderly and will adequately address impacts to the surrounding community through steps that are tied and timed directly to the increase in development activities on the property. Furthermore, the MDA provides detailed standards that address the quality of the development on the site including; roadway connectivity, building and architectural design, site layout, parking, landscaping, and the provision of parks, trails and open space.

UPDATE – 2.20.2020 – In response to concerns raised at the public hearings before the County Council, the following language has been proposed to be added to the Master Development agreement with regards to commercial development:

2.5.6 Commercial Development Plan. A commercial development plan shall be submitted to the Administrator along with each CSP. The commercial development plan shall outline the proposed commercial, retail, or other non-residential development to take place within each geographic area covered by that CSP. Developments that are solely residential do not count towards commercial development, but the non-residential component, if any, of any mixed use development shall be included. The commercial plan for each CSP shall include the estimated square footage of non-residential development, the location of the non-residential development, and the estimated number of jobs to be created and the estimated average salary of those jobs. Each commercial development plan shall include a market study that supports the conclusions in the plan. If the commercial development plan and associated market study is supported by sound market data and methodologies, the Administrator shall approve the commercial development plan. The Administrator shall have 15 calendar days to determine whether the County needs to have a consultant review the study. If the County determines to hire a consultant, the Master Developer shall reimburse the County pursuant to Section 2.91. The County shall have up to 10 business days to obtain the services of a consultant. After the consultant has been retained the Administrator shall make a determination in 30 calendar days. Commercial development within the geographic area covered by the CSP shall take place in accordance with the commercial development plan. Any disputes regarding a commercial development plan, its implementation or modification shall be resolved in the manner specified in Section 4.2.7 and 4.2.8.

2.5.6.1 Modification of the Commercial Development Plan. Master Developer may apply to the Administrator to have the commercial development plan modified. Such application shall follow the same process and requirements outlined in section 2.5.6. If a commercial development modification is proposed due to a shortfall in the actual square footage to be built, the timing thereof, or a conversion of commercial development to another use, as compared to the existing commercial development plan. Master Developer is required to submit a modified commercial development plan with an associated market study to justify the shortfall, timing modification or change of use.

Staff has reviewed the proposed language and finds that it would fit in with the overall design and intent of the Master Development Agreement. Provisions in the Master Development Agreement regarding the requirement of the developer to fund any municipal services shortfalls already provide an incentive for the developer to install the commercial components of the Planned Community, however the new proposed language would bolster that by

requiring more specificity from the developer regarding the location and type of commercial space proposed for construction in each Community Structure Plan.

PLANNING RECOMMENDATION

Regarding the general plan amendment: The planning commission recommended approval as drafted and proposed by the planning staff.

Regarding the proposed rezone: The planning commission recommended approval of the rezone and P-C zone plan, subject to the following:

1. The building height limits in the Town Center and Institutional districts should be changed from "N/A" to "To be determined through the Community Structure Plan or Project Plan approval process."
2. The development agreement entered into between the County, the developer, and the MSD should place the responsibility on the developer to ensure that infrastructure system upgrades, including transportation, storm drainage, water, and sewer (both on and off-site) are constructed.
3. The development agreement should require that the timing of critical infrastructure improvements is such that development does not outpace the installation of the needed improvements, meaning that improvements are installed concurrently with the phase(s) of development causing the need for said improvements.
4. The development agreement should also address the need for municipal service provision to the properties as agreed upon by the Municipal Services District (MSD).
5. The development agreement should require that a plan be in place regarding the future governance of the property through either annexation or incorporation.
6. The water availability should be confirmed by the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District before the County Council takes action on the rezone.

Regarding the proposed Master Development Agreement (MDA): Planning Staff recommends approval as drafted with the addition of the additional language regarding commercial development plans, and inclusive of all attached exhibits.

File #30650
Aerial Map





File # 30650

General Plan Amendment/Rezone/PC Zone Plan Summary

Public Body: Salt Lake County Council
Current Zone: A-2 (Agriculture), M-2 (Industrial)
Proposed Zone: P-C (Planned Community)
Property Address: approximately 6300-8500 West and 12400-13100 South
Planner: Todd A. Draper, AICP
Applicant Name: Doug Young on behalf of Olympia Land, LLC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Olympia Hills is a 933 acre Planned Community development that is proposed for an area of Southwest Salt Lake County. The revised application is to rezone the property from A-2 (Agricultural)/M-2 (Industrial) to PC (Planned Community).

The development is intended to have a mixture of residential types (single family, townhomes, condominiums, apartments and other dwelling types). The property would also have commercial/office uses, and a 100-acre Utah State University Extension project called the Bastian Agricultural Center. The revised application request is to have a maximum number of residential units of 6,330. While a PC zone does not impose a direct density on the property (just a maximum number of dwelling units), the maximum number of dwelling units of 6,330 divided by acreage of 933 acres, results in a maximum of 6.8 units/acre.

The original application for the Olympia Hills development was heard and approved by the Salt Lake County Council in May and June of 2018. The original application requested a maximum number of residential units of 8,765, or a maximum of 9.4 units/acre. The approval was followed by concern from residents, and the three ordinances approving the proposal were vetoed by then Mayor Ben McAdams.

After the veto of the ordinances, Salt Lake County Council conducted a Growth Summit, a series of presentations from various experts on subjects of concern raised by residents about the original application. After conducting the Growth Summit, the County Council passed Resolution 5577 on May 21, 2019, stating findings of facts related to the veto and establishing parameters for how Salt Lake County would process a revised application. An administrative zoning determination was also submitted

which provided concurrence from the County Zoning Administrator with the County Council resolution. Salt Lake County also prepared an Oquirrh View Existing Conditions Report to document the existing conditions in the surrounding area.

Olympia Land LLC ("the Applicant") submitted revised application materials on July 2, 2019. Mayor Wilson directed Salt Lake County Planning and Development Services and other County staff to review the application, address public concerns, and comply with County Council Resolution 5577.

In addition to conducting the Growth Summit and preparing of the existing conditions report, Salt Lake County has partially funded and is participating on the Technical and Stakeholder committees of the Southwest County Vision Study (SWCVS). The SWCVS is evaluating growth strategies for jurisdictions to implement and will be concluded at the end of 2020. There have been many requests for Salt Lake County to address Olympia Hills' application after the SWCVS is completed. Salt Lake County is required by State law to timely process the revised application, so postponing consideration of the revised application until the end of 2020 is not an option.

As part of the Salt Lake County application review process, consultants were hired by the County, which were reimbursed by the developer pursuant to County ordinance. These consultants provided an independent review of the Olympia Hills revised application and made recommendations to County. The independent consultants were hired through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process as outlined through the Salt Lake County procurement policy. Competitive proposals were received, and a contract was awarded to Landmark Design for independent review of the Olympia Hills development application. Landmark Design has been part of the review, analysis, negotiation, and recommendations of this application. In addition to the independent planning consultant, Salt Lake County required at the developer's expense, an independent review of the developer-prepared Traffic Impact Study. Salt Lake County has an existing contract with Avenue Consultants through the Engineer on-call pool. Avenue Consultants reviewed the Traffic Impact Study and made recommendations to the County regarding the process and level of analysis used by developer's traffic engineers.

The revised application has been a unified approach with coordination of the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD), independent consultants, and various departments throughout Salt Lake County. Staff focused efforts on review of traffic impacts and mitigation, design standards, regional compatibility, sustainability, parks, trails, open space, and affordable housing. Three ordinances (General Plan amendment, PC Zone approval, and PC Zone Plan/Master Development Agreement approval) are required. The Master Development Agreement (MDA), and the accompanying Design Standards (DS) will describe the general conditions and requirements of the development. There was a direct effort within both the MDA and the DS to address the concerns from Mayor Wilson, County Council Members and residents.

The County Council will need to establish public hearings to receive feedback on the revised application. The recommended public hearing dates are January 14, 2020 and January 28, 2020 and both would be in conjunction with the regular County Council meeting. Once the Salt Lake County Council has set the hearing dates the current documents related to the revised application will be added to the project website (www.olympiahillsrezone.com) for review by the public. These are anticipated to be available on December 19, 2019. Salt Lake County, MSD staff, and consultants will present the review of the revised application to the Salt Lake County Council Committee of the Whole on January 7th, 2020.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Craig L. White, General Manager
Board of Trustees

FROM: Michael H Foerster, PE
District Engineer

DATE: July 25, 2019

SUBJECT: Olympia Development



Olympia is a new development currently located in Salt Lake County, west of Herriman at approximately 12900 South and 6400 West. They have proposed 6,330 Units on 937 acres which they estimate will generate peak flows of 4,200 gallons/minute.

The District injected these flows into its sewer model, to see how downstream capacities would be affected. It was determined at build out that South Valley Sewer District does not have sufficient capacity for this many units, plus the proposed surrounding densities without some downstream improvements. However, as necessary the District anticipates upsizing various pipes downstream of this development over time and will continue to collect impact fees for this purpose. Accordingly, the District does not object to the development being approved in phases over time.



G R E A T E R S A L T L A K E
**Municipal Services
District**

May 15, 2018

Salt Lake County Planning Commission
2001 S State Street, #N3-600
Salt Lake City, UT 84190

Subject: Proposed Olympia development

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I have been involved in discussions regarding the proposed Olympia development for the past few months. Since the property is in the unincorporated area of Salt Lake County, it is within the service area of the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District.

If the County approves this project, we look forward to providing our full range of municipal services to the Olympia community.

Respectfully,

Bart Barker

Jenny Wilson
Mayor

Catherine Kanter
Deputy Mayor of Regional Operations

Scott Baird
Department Director



Lupita McClenning
Division Director

Brittany Allen
Associate Division Director

Trent Sorensen
Chief Building Official

June 28, 2019

Olympia Land, LLC
c/o Doug Young
6150 S. Redwood Road, #150
Taylorsville, Utah 84123

Mr. Young,

As you are aware, on May 21, 2019, the Salt Lake County Council adopted a Findings of Fact Resolution Providing that Olympia Land LLC may Submit a Revised Application ("Resolution"). In that Resolution, the Council outlined in relevant part the following process for submitting a revised application:

1. Developer may present a revised proposal to the Salt Lake County Council by filing with the County Planning & Development Services Division a revised application with any revisions to its original application that it requests the County Council to consider;
2. The revised application shall be processed consistent with County Ordinances and State law;
3. To the extent additional agency review is required, additional review fees will be charged to Developer in accordance with the Council approved Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule.

Under Salt Lake County Ordinance Section 19.02.130, the director of planning and development services ("the director") or the director's designee shall be the administrator of the Salt Lake County zoning ordinance. Under the same section, the director or director's designee is responsible to administer application and review procedures. As the Salt Lake County Zoning Administrator, I am a designee of the director in administering the zoning ordinance and administering application and review procedures. As a person responsible to administer application and review procedures in the zoning ordinance, I am writing to state that I agree with and confirm the above process outlined in the Resolution for submitting a revised application and that the same is consistent with the Salt Lake County zoning ordinance.

Based on this process outlined in the Resolution, a revised P-C zone plan and any associated revised reports or information that you submit will be processed by our office as an amendment to a pending application rather than being processed as a new application. Should you submit an amended application, our course of action will be to review the proposal (both internally and with other County departments) and present the amended application with staff report to the County Council for reconsideration as soon as the departmental review will allow.

Should you or any other person or entity adversely affected by this decision administering the application and review procedure in the zoning ordinance wish to appeal the decision, you may file an appeal to the Salt Lake County Land Use Hearing Officer within 60 days of the date of this decision. Such an appeal should be delivered to the Salt Lake County Planning and Development Services Division, located at 2001 S. State St., N3-600, Salt Lake City, UT 84190, Attn: Wendy Gurr, and should set forth with specificity the reasons or grounds for the appeal.

If you have any questions, please contact me at cwoodward@slco.org or 385-468-6708.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Curtis Woodward".

Curtis Woodward
Zoning Administrator

19-6666

RESOLUTION NO. 5577 May 21, 2019

A FINDINGS OF FACT RESOLUTION BY THE SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL PROVIDING THAT OLYMPIA LAND LLC MAY SUBMIT A REVISED APPLICATION

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, Olympia Land LLC ("Developer") filed application number 30650 for general plan amendment and to rezone property to a PC Zone, dated February 5, 2018, for 931.8 acres of property described in the application and owned by The Last Holdout, LLC;

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2018, the Salt Lake County planning commission ("planning commission") recommended approval of the application for general plan amendment, application to rezone property to the PC Zone, and the associated PC Zone plan;

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2018, the Salt Lake County Council ("Council") passed a motion to adopt the following ordinances: 1) ordinance amending the Southwest Community General Plan, 2) ordinance rezoning property described in Application #30650 to the PC Zone, with the associated revised Master Development Agreement, and 3) ordinance approving a PC Zone Plan and the associated revised Master Development Agreement;

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2018, the Salt Lake County Mayor ("Mayor") vetoed all three ordinances referenced in the preceding paragraph;

WHEREAS, the Council did not exercise its right to override the Mayor's veto, as allowed by the Optional Plan for Salt Lake County Government, Section 2.10(9);

WHEREAS, the Mayor vetoed the ordinances pursuant to his executive duties, as outlined in Utah Code Section 17-53-302(12). The veto was not a legislative decision denying the application but an executive decision rejecting the ordinances that the Council adopted.

WHEREAS, the veto was not a final decision of the County on the application; neither County ordinance nor State law allows for an appeal of a veto of County ordinances;

WHEREAS, the Mayor's veto was a veto of three legislative ordinances; it was not a veto of the entire application or a denial of the same;

WHEREAS, the Mayor's veto resulted in the matter returning to the point in time before the Council's motion approving the three ordinances passed; the veto resulted in a failed motion;

WHEREAS, since the planning commission's May 16, 2018 recommendations, the Mayor's veto and residents expressing concerns, the Council committed to ask more questions and gather more information on growth in the greater Salt Lake County ("SLCO"), with added attention to transportation, water, power, sewer and air quality while balancing rapid population growth in SLCO, lack of affordable housing, and planning for parks/trails/open space for projected growth;

WHEREAS, in response to these concerns, the Council sponsored a two-part Growth Summit series. The first installment was held during the summer/fall of 2018 over a 3 month period and invited the following persons to address the following issues (among others): the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute: Population Growth (July 10, 2018); Housing Gap Coalition: Affordable Housing (July 17, 2018); Wasatch Front Regional Council: Transportation Planning (July 31, 2018); Central Water Conservancy District: Water Infrastructure Planning (August 7, 2018); Utah Department of Transportation: Transportation Planning (August 21, 2018); Rocky Mountain Power: Energy Infrastructure Planning (August 28, 2018); Utah Clean Air Partnership: Air Pollution (September 11, 2018); Utah Transit Authority: Transit Planning (September 18, 2018); South Valley Sewer District: Sewer Infrastructure Planning (September 25, 2018); Salt Lake County Parks & Recreation: Parks, Trails, and Open Space Planning (October 9, 2018); Salt Lake County Regional Transportation, Housing, & Economic Development: Long-Range Regional Planning for Salt Lake County (October 16, 2019); Utah State University: Proposed Agricultural Center for the subject property (October 23, 2018); and Horrocks Engineering: Regional Transportation Study of Impacts of Olympia Project (October 30, 2018);

WHEREAS, the Council held a second installment of the Growth Summit series in April and May of 2019, broadcasting LIVE on Facebook for residents and elected officials to watch and gather the information at their convenience. The following persons addressed the following issues (among others): Salt Lake County Regional Transportation and Development – Oquirrh View Existing Conditions Study (April 23, 2019); Daybreak – Planned Communities and UDOT update on Southwest road infrastructure (April 30, 2019); and Silicon Slopes – The Tech Industry and Planned Communities (May 7, 2019);

WHEREAS, it is not uncommon for a developer, after planning commission hearings where public input is received, to revise its application to address public concerns before going before the legislative body;

WHEREAS, the Mayor is responsible for processing land use applications, including revisions thereto, and to execute a development agreement;

WHEREAS, the Council is responsible for hearing rezone applications, and if there are associated development agreements upon which rezoning property is conditioned, the Council approves such agreements;

WHEREAS, returning to the point in time before the failed motion by the Council, the Council now has the following options under Salt Lake County Ordinance 19.90.030 with respect to the planning commission's May 16, 2018 recommendations: alter planning commission recommendations, deny planning commission recommendations, or remand to planning commission for further review and consideration;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Council makes the following findings from the Growth Summit series related to development of SLCO:
 - a. **SLCO Buildable Acres:** SLCO currently has only 33,000 buildable acres.
 - b. **Developable Land in SLCO:** 85% of the available/developable land that's left for future growth in SLCO is on the west side of SLCO.

- c. **2017 SLCO Population:** SLCO population in 2017 was 1.13 million. Population growth included natural increase, which accounted for 10,630 new residents or 55% of growth, while 8,742 residents from net migration accounted for 45% of new residential growth.
- d. **2017 Housing Shortage:** In 2017 along the Wasatch Front, 111,455 housing units were built, while 162,288 new households were created, yielding a housing shortage of 50,833 housing units.
- e. **High Retail Leakage:** Retail leakage occurs when residents travel outside of an area to purchase goods and services. The lack of retail centers/services result in area residents travelling outside of the area for basic services, and therefore adding more traffic, losing sales tax/tax base for cities, and lowering the quality of life for residents.
- f. **SLCO Growth:** 78% of 185,776 new residents in SLCO in 2017 resided west of Bangerter Highway.
- g. **12600 South (from Mountain View Corridor to Bangerter Highway):** This section of 12600 South will not accommodate *current* or future traffic without mitigation. Currently 80,000 cars travel this roadway segment each day.
- h. **UDOT Planned Road Infrastructure for Southwest SLCO:** The following projects will alleviate much of the current east/west congestion in Southwest SLCO, creating 50% more UDOT green-rated travel upon completion of the projects:
 - i. Bangerter Highway Interchanges 6200, 10400 and 12600 South
Cost: \$184 million. Completion Date: 2021
 - ii. Mountain View Corridor – 4100 South to SR 201
Cost: \$355 million. Completion Date: 2021
 - iii. 5600 West SR201 to I-80, 2 lane to 5 lane
Cost: \$71.6 million. Completion Date: 2020
 - iv. Porter Rockwell Bridge – 1-15 Connection to 14600 South
with connection to Redwood Road and Mountain View Corridor (5 lanes)
Cost: \$50 million. Completion Date: 2022
 - v. 9000 South Widening – I-15 to Redwood Road (5-7 lanes)
Cost: \$34 Million. Completion Date: 2022
 - vi. R111; 7600 South Bridge – Widen Five Lanes
Cost: 5.2 million. Completion Date: 2022
- i. **Link economic development with transportation/housing decisions.** It is important to do the following: Create city centers that are planned well, which make density more acceptable to communities. Create/move jobs closer to home and transit for better air quality and quality of life. Build multi-family housing along mass transit routes, allowing residents access to more jobs closer to home and decreasing need for individual transportation.
- j. **Planned Communities designed for residents to “Live, Work, Play” is a major consideration for businesses looking to locate or expand in SLCO.** Given the current housing gap in SLCO – needed housing versus available housing – it is crucial for the residents of SLCO to have access to housing options that allow them to live in the community where they work.
- k. **Communities can design their Community to attract or detract from transit.** If good transit ridership is a goal for a community then it must plan for it now.

1. **Lack of road connectivity** has funneled traffic to major arterials for the majority of resident trips.
- m. **Density has become a flashpoint for future developments because some Developers have not done it well.**
2. Developer may present a revised proposal to the Salt Lake County Council by filing with the County Planning & Development Services Division a revised application with any revisions to its original application that it requests the County Council to consider;
3. The revised application shall be processed consistent with County Ordinances and State law;
4. To the extent additional agency review is required, additional review fees will be charged to Developer in accordance with the Council approved Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule;
5. The Council requests that the Mayor and Developer renegotiate the master development agreement if Developer chooses to submit a revised application for the Council's review. The Council asks that the following parameters be pursued in the master development agreement:
 - a. Complete streets
 - b. Street Connectivity, with many options beyond collector streets including small streets and smaller blocks, where streets *connect* versus *collect*
 - c. Plans for infrastructure and commitment for transportation, water and sewer
 - d. Minimum Open Space for Development 10%, with minimum Open Space and Common Area (as both are defined in the P-C Zoning Ordinance) totaling 20%
 - e. Mix of housing types within neighborhoods, including for various ages and price points
 - f. Mix of Housing options – with incentives for Affordable Housing and Rent/Buy
 - g. Design standards in the following areas:
 - i. Community wide (place making, centers, parks, trails and street connectivity)
 - ii. Site design (parking, building placement, walks, landscaping, lighting and signs)
 - iii. Architecture (basic massing, not uniform “cookie cutter”, doors, percentage of glass, mixture of architecture in residential and commercial construction)
 - iv. Design that encourages communities - not neighborhoods
 - v. Parking as a supportive element - not the central design
 - vi. Street parking
 - vii. Sustainable and energy-efficient design features
 - viii. Design standards review committee
 - h. Work with UTA and UDOT on future road alignments for long-term population growth
 - i. Multi-family residential areas clustered around Town Centers and Villages
 - j. Place holders for Transit right of ways, trail systems, schools and churches
 - k. Plan road connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods within and outside the planned community.
 - l. Transition edges of development to be compatible with adjoining communities
 - m. Incentives for meeting development standards and/or penalties for not meeting development standards
 - n. Parameters that the Mayor deems necessary before agreeing to execute the master development agreement


APPROVED and ADOPTED this 21 day of May, 2019.

SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL:


By: 
Richard Snelgrove, Chair

Date: 5/21/19

ATTEST:


Sherrie Swensen
Salt Lake County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Zachary Shaw
Deputy District Attorney

Date: 5-16-19

Council Member Bradley voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Bradshaw voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Burdick voting	<u>Absent</u>
Council Member DeBry voting	<u>Absent</u>
Council Member Ghorbani voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Granato voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Jensen voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Newton voting	<u>"Aye"</u>
Council Member Snelgrove voting	<u>"Aye"</u>



OLYMPIA HILLS

July 2, 2019

ELECTRONICALLY DELIVERED

Hon. Jenny Wilson, Mayor
Hon. Richard Snelgrove, Chair, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Shireen Ghorbani, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Jim Bradley, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Arlyn Bradshaw, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Michael Jensen, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Aimee Winder Newton, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Ann Granato, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Steve DeBry, Member, Salt Lake County Council
Hon. Max Burdick, Member, Salt Lake County Council

Dear Mayor Wilson, Chair Snelgrove and Members of the County Council:

Pursuant to Resolution No. 5577 of 2019 adopted by the Salt Lake County Council (“Council”) on May 21, 2019 (“Council Resolution”) Olympia Land, LLC, (“Applicant”) is pleased to submit this revised application (“Application”) for the development of approximately 931.8 acres of land (“Olympia”) owned by The Last Holdout, LLC in the southwest corner of Salt Lake County. The MDA recognizes and addresses all of the matters raised in the Council Resolution and, in addition, other matters raised regarding Olympia at various public meetings and in other public forums. The Applicant recognizes that while it will never be possible to make everyone happy about any development of any property the comments have helped improve Olympia for all stakeholders. Specifically, the MDA has reduced the number of units proposed in Olympia by approximately 36%. This reduction in the number of units, as well as the focus of Olympia on creating a live/work/recreate community and the recently-announced Utah State University significantly mitigate the concerns previously expressed.

The Applicant stands ready to work with the Council and its professional staff, as well as with all other stakeholders including local governments, the Wasatch Front Regional Council, Silicon Slopes, UDOT, GOED, USU, the Jordan School District and other service providers to continue to refine and improve Olympia so that it can become the jewel of a development that will provide optimal benefits for everyone involved. Olympia Land has worked closely with USU regarding a centerpiece campus facility with numerous community amenities. Also, Olympia Land has worked with the Jordan School District regarding the possibly donation of other lands and the reservation/sale of additional



OLYMPIA HILLS

properties.

The Applicant, along with all other responsible governmental entities and non-governmental organizations, recognizes that further growth is coming to the southwest corner of the Salt Lake Valley. The Applicant trusts that the County Mayor, the County Council and everyone else involved understands and agrees that master planned communities provide a better opportunity to manage the inevitable growth in a manner that optimizes the benefits to the community while mitigating over time and on a regional basis any potential adverse impacts.

Responses to Specific Issues in the Council Resolution.

The Master Development Agreement (“MDA”) (and the exhibits thereto, “Exhibits”) is intended to be submitted as a part of the process for the rezoning will address the issues raised in Section 5 of the Council Resolution as noted below. Of course, greater detail on these responses will be found in the Exhibits and the MDA.

a. Complete streets

Response: The Exhibits will recognize that streets serve more roles in the community than just corridors for transportation. Street layout and design can be a force for promoting a sense of community. Careful, quality design and layout provide opportunities to influence transportation choices and, also, to beautify the community. Street designs in Olympia will include, where appropriate, provisions for encouraging alternative transportation modes such as mass transit on major corridors, bus stops, BRT lanes along with bicycle lanes and parking. Streets will be, where appropriate, landscaped (including both alongside the streets and, potentially, in medians). Sidewalks will be widely used and incorporated in the landscaping sometimes in association with trail connectivity.

b. Street Connectivity, with many options beyond collector streets including small streets and smaller blocks, where streets connect versus collect

Response: As noted above, the Exhibits will recognize that various options encouraging neighborhoods requires multiple types of street design. Overly-wide streets are not appropriate in smaller neighborhoods for reasons including costs of maintenance, and snow-plowing as well as creating heat islands and increasing storm water runoff. Block sizes will take into account the type of development serviced by the various types of streets. The goals of the transportation system design will be to encourage the connections of residential neighborhoods with each other and with the commercial, institutional, recreational and other uses.

c. Plans for infrastructure and commitment for transportation, water and sewer

Response: The Exhibits will illustrate the backbone infrastructure necessary for Olympia and will create a process for ensuring during reviews of individual development projects that backbone infrastructure is sufficient for future master planned uses. The MDA will provide for “trigger” mechanisms to appropriately deal with the timing of the backbone infrastructure as those systems are driven by the development of Olympia and by other projects in the area that impact the same systems.



OLYMPIA HILLS

- d. *Minimum Open Space for Development 10%, with minimum Open Space and Common Area (as both are defined in the P-C Zoning Ordinance) totaling 20%*

Response: The MDA will provide a mechanism to ensure that all future development plans will comply with the required amount of open space. These Open Space and Common Areas (and, also trails) will be phased based on the timing of the various projects. Importantly, the Open Space and Common Areas of Olympia will recognize the unique benefits of the USU campus which is presently contemplated to serve as a significant public gathering place with features such as recreational and cultural amenities and other similar features. The many features of the USU campus that will work towards meeting these mutual goals are illustrated in a publication by USU entitled Bastian Agricultural Center and dated June 20, 2019 that was circulated at the groundbreaking for the USU project on June 22, 2019.

- e. *Mix of housing types within neighborhoods, including for various ages and price points*

Response: One of the benefits of master-planned projects on larger parcels of property is the opportunity to create multiple types of housing. Actually, having different types of product available at all times helps absorption and, thus, cashflow. The Exhibits will provide examples of how different housing products will be integrated into neighborhoods and also in relation to surrounding commercial or other uses. Also, housing units of different sizes, types and price-points may be integrated into mixed use projects.

- f. *Mix of Housing options -with incentives for Affordable Housing and Rent/Buy*

Response: As noted above, appropriate mixing of housing product types benefits not only the community but the developer as well. The MDA will recognize that appropriately located projects will try to take maximum advantage of any incentives (such as the Olene Walker Fund and tax credits) to help make housing available at all income levels. Both rental and owned products will be provided in various locations as driven by the market.

- g. *Design standards in the following areas:*

- i. *Community wide (place making, centers, parks, trails and street connectivity)*

Response: The Exhibits will include provisions for creating neighborhood and regional centers for activities to help foster a sense of place. Olympia intends to be a place with a “there, there”. As noted above and below, this will be assisted with street layout and with appropriate parks and trails.

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

Response: As noted throughout this response, the MDA and the Exhibits will carefully consider all aspects of site design including the issues referenced above, as well as integrated transportation planning, to make Olympia a vibrant community with its own sense of place where people of all income and age ranges are proud to live, work and play.

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

Response: The Exhibits will provide design guidelines to avoid typical suburban-style uniform housing designs where every home looks like every other home. Olympia will have a high-quality bias and encourage creative housing alternatives. The commercial, office and other



OLYMPIA HILLS

components will be held to a quality design standard so, again, standard suburban “strip” centers will be discouraged.

iv. *Design that encourages communities - not neighborhoods*

Response: As noted elsewhere, all of the aspects of Olympia including street design, parks, landscaping, trails and architectural features will be integrated to encourage the creation of a common identity for the area.

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

Response: While parking is, at least for the near- medium-future, necessary to support all of the uses in Olympia, the Exhibits will provide that parking is not the driving force in a design, but instead, fulfills its appropriate role as a sort of necessary evil. The design of surfaced and structured parking will incorporate landscaping and also accommodate alternative transportation modalities such as ride-sharing, EV-charging and mass transit.

vi. *Street parking*

Response: Street parking is appropriate in certain circumstances but not in others. Street parking will be carefully considered based on the types of uses and adjacent uses. Street parking will also consider the needs of bicycles and EVs.

vii. *Sustainable and energy-efficient design features*

Response: The Applicant recognizes that energy and water conservation features are positive selling points for all types of uses in Olympia. The MDA will encourage energy conservation by, among other things, ensuring that any design guidelines do not restrict, but instead promote design and construction elements such as solar panels, EV charging, xeriscaping and other similar features. Olympia hopes to coordinate the design and implementation of these important features with USU, the WFRC and other applicable governmental and non-governmental entities and service providers such as Rocky Mountain Power, Dominion Energy, and the South Valley Sewer District. The goal of Olympia is to be as high up the LEED scale as is reasonably possible.

viii. *Design standards review committee*

Response: All design features will be reviewed prior to submission of plans to the County by a robust and empowered design review committee including appropriate stakeholder representation.

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

Response: The MDA will provide that the Applicant will cooperate not only with UTA and UDOT on such features as mass transit such as TRAX and BRT but will also cooperate with other governments in the area and the Wasatch Front Regional Council to minimize what are, by definition, regional issues caused by the overall growth in the south end of the Salt Lake Valley and the north end of Utah County with all developments and governments paying their fair share.

i. *Multi-family residential areas clustered around Town Centers and Villages*

Response: “Density” will be “feathered” to have higher concentrations near more intense non-residential uses such as office and retail. Higher density housing may also be appropriate in



O L Y M P I A H I L L S

locations to support the USU and employment campus.

j. Place holders for Transit rights of way, trail systems, schools and churches

Response: As noted above, the street designs will consider, where appropriate, rights of way for mass transit. The entire Olympia project is also designed around the anchoring centrality of the USU campus and its key community-oriented facilities. Other developments will be designed to accommodate internal and connecting trails as well as parks that serve both neighborhood and community scale needs. School sites will be considered when designing transportation and other systems. Further, consistent with constitutional limitations, places for all religious uses and other community uses will be considered. Olympia has closely coordinated with the Jordan School District regarding approximately 120 acres of land in a mixed donation/purchase.

k. Plan road connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods within and outside the planned community

Response: As noted above regarding “a”, “b” and “h”, the Applicant will cooperate, and the MDA and the Exhibits will provide for cooperation regarding the design of Olympia to provide for the integration of all transit modalities to minimize transportation impacts in light of the regional issues caused by the overall growth in the south end of the Salt Lake Valley and the north end of Utah County with all developments and governments paying their fair share.

l. Transition edges of development to be compatible with adjoining communities

Response: The Exhibits will provide design guidance to recognize the types and intensities of land planning adjacent to Olympia and seek to minimize any adverse impacts on such planned or existing uses while carrying out the vision for Olympia.

m. Incentives for meeting development standards and/or penalties for not meeting development standards

Response: The MDA will have processes ensuring that what is committed to in the Exhibits for Olympia will be what is actually built in the future. Again, that is one of the primary advantages of doing large, master-planned projects with development agreements as opposed to piecemeal subdivisions where such assurances are not available. Under standard *Euclidean* zoning plans.

n. Parameters that the Mayor deems necessary before agreeing to execute the Master Development Agreement

Response: No additional input has yet been received but the Applicant is working regularly with County Staff to make sure that any input is incorporated into the MDA and the Exhibits. Of course, any input from the County Council will also be discussed and incorporated.

We look forward to presenting this to you at your earliest opportunity.

Respectfully,

Olympia Land, LLC

