

## Straw Polls

### MU Zoning Consolidation Discussion

4.15.2025

*The Council considered and supported the first 11 items during the 4.8.2025 Work Session Briefing*

	Issue	Yes	No
1	Allow drive through facilities for financial intuitions in Sugar House districts.	X	
2	Allow up to 150' in Sugar House area (south of 2100 south, 1300 E McClelland to freeway). MU11 type height ( <b><i>with the addition of the conditions outlined in the Granary Area sections</i></b> )	X	
3	Change max height for row house in MU-5 and above to 45 feet	X	
4	Clarify language to allow for “vertical stacking” in row houses. Request to include the change below  DWELLING, ROW HOUSE: A series of attached single-family dwellings that share at least one common wall with an adjacent dwelling unit and where the entry of each unit faces a public street. Units may be stacked vertically and/or attached horizontally. Each attached unit may be on its own lot. Proposed Chage: “DWELLING, ROW HOUSE: A series of attached <del>single-family dwellings</del> <b>residential units</b> that share...	X	
5	Remove language that requires roof pitch / height be similar to adjacent properties in MU-3. Proposed removing this in MU-3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff proposes removing this in MU-2 and MU-3</li> </ul>	X	
6a	Standardizing setback for similar zones  Urban House/Two-Family/Cottage <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Open Space: Revise all to 10% open space with 20% vegetation</li> </ol>	X	

<p>6b</p>	<p>Row House</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Front/corner side yard (min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MU-2/3: Maintain 5 ft in both, merge additional language about landscaping and hardscape.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Front/corner side yard (max.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MU-2/3: Eliminate maximum for MU-3 to match MU-2</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Rear Yard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MU-11: Make consistent with MU-5/6/8, by increasing MU-11 to 10'</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Open Space Area (min) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ALL 10% OS / 20% vegetation</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>X</p>	
<p>6c</p>	<p>Vertical Mixed Use, Storefront and Multi-family</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Front/corner Side Yard min <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MU2, MU3: Make both consistent, apply the 5' min. MU-2 standard to MU-3.</li> <li>▪ MU5, MU-6-MU- 8: Make all consistent, apply the variable use based 0' to 10' setback in MU-5/6 to MU-8.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Front /Corner Side Yard (max) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MU-2/3: No Max</li> <li>▪ MU-5/6/8: Apply MU-5/6 setback to MU-8.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Rear Yard: Merge rear yard language for MU-2/3.</li> <li>4. Open Space Area (min) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ALL 10% OS / 20% vegetation</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>X</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Add “Contractor’s Yard/Office (Indoor)” use to the Transitional Overlay as a Conditional Use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends including this use.</i></li> </ul>	<p>X</p>	

8	<p>Areas unintentionally included as requiring activity use due to a code provision in the recently adopted MU-8 code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends removing “Richard Street, from Harvard Avenue to Kelsey Avenue” as an area requiring an “Enhanced Active Ground Floor Use.”</i></li> <li>○ <i>400 South, located between 500 West (start of rail overpass) and the I-15 interchange (~800 West), was unintentionally included in the requirement for a high activity use. Staff recommends excluding this area from the use requirement due to poor viability</i></li> </ul>	X	
9	<p>Delete the requirement for a 6' walkway between multiple buildings that are over 75' in façade length.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends deleting this requirement</i></li> </ul>	X	
10	<p>Add a prohibition on mature coverage counting toward the required park strip vegetation coverage of 33% in MU-8 and MU-11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends applying the requirement to other high-intensity MU zones, the MU-8 and MU-11</i></li> </ul>	X	
11	<p>Add a transition period to the MU zone adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends that the City Council include a transition period of 3-6 months where developers could still utilize the prior regulations.</i></li> </ul>	X	
<p><b><i>The Council will review items 12- 18b during the April 15 work session briefing</i></b></p>			
12	<p>Modify the height limit for "private directional signs" from 4' to 8'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends increasing the height so that private parking related signs can be at eye level.</i></li> </ul>		
13	<p>Include the proposed mapping changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff recommends including the following changes in the final draft.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>FB-UN2 Corners to MU-6 in Central 9th</i></li> <li>○ <i>Residential/Office (RO) Zone to MU-8 East Downtown and West Temple</i></li> <li>○ <i>Green Street/2100 South</i></li> <li>○ <i>Federal Property at 2100 S/Redwood Road</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<p>14</p>	<p>Modifications to 21A.10 public hearing notices to better match changes to State code that were adopted this legislative session. Planning staff included some changes to 21A.10 in the consolidation to address what the state code referred to as geographic areas and that cities could define what that meant. This year, the state introduced “ministerial” code changes that do not have to include mailed notices that the city would want to include in that section.</p>		
<p>15</p>	<p>Parking options from Planning Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any multi-family project over a certain number of dwellings could be required to include a mix of dwelling sizes. An example could include requiring any development with over 20 units to provide at least 25% of the units with 2 or more bedrooms. This would limit a concentration of micro-units in any given area and promote more family sized housing. It would require a text amendment and consideration for applying it to any zone that allows larger apartment buildings and buildings four stories or greater.</li> <li>b. Mico-unit projects over a certain number of dwellings could be required to have a parking minimum to help alleviate on-street parking pressures. An example could include a micro-unit project with over 25 dwellings be required to have a .5 parking ratio. This would require a text amendment and consideration for applying it to any zone that allows larger apartment buildings and buildings four stories or greater.</li> <li>c. A requirement could be added that buildings be limited to 30' in height if the existing ROW does not satisfy aerial fire access requirements and no modifications to park strips, on street parking, etc. are allowed. Or, the City’s consideration of removing on-street parking would only be allowed for projects that meet certain policy objectives such as affordable housing or family-sized housing. This could help reduce the expectation that property owners have about what can be built on their property and can address the perception that modifying the right of way by removing on street parking, narrowing a park strip, or removing street trees is essentially a public asset that is being “given” to a developer.</li> <li>d. If a project is required to remove on-street parking to comply with fire code, the project could be required to provide the same number of parking stalls on-site, with the City recording a public easement to ensure that the parking stalls are available to the</li> </ul>		

	<p>public and posted accordingly. Consideration should be given to the impact providing parking has on affordable housing, with possible exceptions for certain types of residential uses. This would require resources for enforcement.</p>		
16	<p>Request from the Public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Request to rezone property MU-8 instead of MU-5 for some parcels on North Temple. The constituent feels the MU-8 is better aligned with the project they would like to do. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Located at approximately 69, 59, 53, and 51 N Chicago, 955, 963, 973 North Temple and 62 North 1000 West.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
17	<p>Request from the Public</p> <p>Add kennel as permitted use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current zoning allows a veterinary clinic which they plan to include. The constituent feels adding "animal kennel" to the zone would provide additional clarity so they can operate seamlessly without regulatory concerns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Planning Staff recommends adding as Conditional to MU2/3/5 to match MU-6/8/11 if the Council would like to make the use allowed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
18a	<p>Legislative Actions</p> <p>Request the administration review interior blocks that were studied as part of the zoning consolidation, with narrow streets and have single family structures, and consider proposing a downzone for these properties.</p>		
18b	<p>Legislative Actions</p> <p>Request the Administration to analyze review and update parts of the Central City Master plan related to the State Street corridor with the goal of rezoning parcels to a higher density MU zoning district.</p>		
19	<p>MU-11 Additional Height Options</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Planning Staff would like to clarify two of the options allowed for 25' of additional height in the MU-11 zone in the Granary and Sugar House:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Revise the language from “100% ground floor commercial use” to the zoning term “100% ground floor Enhanced Active Use”</li><li>○ Revise the term “affordable housing” to “affordable housing in compliance with the Affordable Housing Incentives (21A.52.050)”</li></ul></li> <li>b. Planning Staff would like to verify whether the Council prefers to allow those developments to get a total of 61' of additional height using only the “Affordable Housing Incentives,” going from 125' to 186'. Or whether the Council would prefer those developments reaching that height also include one of the other options as well – a 20' midblock walkway or 100% ground floor enhanced active uses.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--