

8. Ordinance: Zoning Map Amendment at Approximately 754 South State Street Follow-up

FYI – Project Timeline: (subject to change per Chair direction or Council discussion)

Briefing -

Set Public Hearing Date -

Hold hearing to accept public comment -

TENTATIVE Council Action -

Brian Fullmer reviewed the Zoning Map Amendment for 754 South State Street.

Council Member Dugan inquired about the definition of ground floor activation. Nick Norris stated the zoning code defined activation as retail shops/restaurants and only applied to buildings, not open space. Council Member Dugan asked if it also applied to cutouts in the plaza for food trucks, artwork, vendors, etc. Nick Norris stated ground floor activation referred only to activation inside the building.

Council Member Dugan expressed concern about access to neighboring buildings during construction and after the hospital opened; asked whether the City or property owner was responsible for maintaining access to neighboring properties. Nick Norris explained any existing legal easement was required to be maintained, however if it was not a legal easement it could not be enforced by the City.

Council Member Young questioned the next steps for the proposal and whether there were opportunities for community feedback regarding building design. Nick Norris outlined the next steps for the proposal, opportunities for community involvement/input and the design review process. Council Member Young reviewed the community preference for activation along the street level, and asked how a development agreement could ensure activation. Nick Norris reviewed the purpose of a development agreement, the process of approval and Council's role in the process. **Council Member Young requested clarity on the meaning of ground level activation, and how the development agreement would ensure the inclusion of those elements.**

Council Member Lopez Chavez expressed interested in pursuing a development agreement, stated the mental health aspects of a urban hospital for District 4 as an important part of the project.

Council Member Petro addressed a rumor in the media, Salt Lake City was not requesting the street activation for tax purposes, clarifying the request was to ensure the facility aligned with the neighborhood's character and street activation was a basic principle of Urban Planning.

Council Member Young stated having a health care facility in the area benefited the residents of Salt Lake City and it was important to ensure the facility not only benefited Intermountain Healthcare (IHC) but the surrounding businesses.

Council Member Puy supported bringing a healthcare option downtown but noted he could not back the plan unless the developer met the City's goals for activation and fit the proposal to the area and ordinance requirements

Brian Fullmer asked Council to consider the Straw Polls

Straw Poll

Council Member Lopez Chavez called the question: was the Council supportive of adopting an ordinance subject to the Planning Commission's review of the development agreement, which included ground floor activation, open space, and food truck parking as proposed by Intermountain Health, along with obtaining necessary design review and other potential approvals. The Straw Poll was supported by all Council Members present.

Council Member Mano asked if supporting the Straw Poll meant Council was supporting the activation proposal Intermountain had proposed and nothing more. Brian Fullmer stated that was correct however, Council could make changes to that proposal.

Council Members and Brian Fullmer discussed whether the Straw Poll was for additional activation, what Intermountain Healthcare was proposing and that the development agreement could be made to stipulate the site be used for an urban hospital since the would be tied to the land.

Straw Poll

Council Member Mano called the question stating: was the Council supportive of requiring the ordinances not to be published until the development agreement and any other required processes were approved by the Planning Commission and ratified by the Council?

Council Members, Jennifer Bruno, Nick Norris and Katherine Pasker discussed the Planning Commission's role in the design review process and clarified language in the Straw Poll.

Straw Poll

Council Member Mano recalled the question stating: was the Council supportive of requiring the ordinances not to be published until the development agreement received a recommendation from the Planning Commission and was approved by the Council. The Straw Poll was supported by all Council Members present.

Straw Poll

Brian Fullmer read the question: was the Council supportive of amending City code to add hospitals (including accessory lodging facilities) and ambulance services (indoor and outdoor) as conditional uses in the D-1 Central Business District? The Straw Poll was supported by all Council Members present.

