



Memorandum

PLANNING DIVISION

DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Ailin Leon, Associate Planner, ailin.leon@slc.gov, 801-535-7768

Date: May 12, 2026

Re: PLNPCM2026-00091 10th East Senior Center Rezone Staff Report - Addendum
- Additional Consideration Standards

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and consider the additional consideration standards that were omitted from the May 7th Staff Report and make a recommendation to the City Council as noted in the Staff Report.

BACKGROUND:

The [Staff Report](#) for the 10th East Senior Center Rezone published on May 7th unintentionally omitted consideration standards 7 through 11 from [Attachment E \(page 19 of the report\)](#). This memorandum serves as an addendum to that report. The additional consideration standards and Staff's analysis of those are in the table below. As noted in the findings below, these considerations do not impact Staff's recommendation as they are primarily aimed at residential or commercial development proposals and generally not applicable to the request.

Zoning Map Amendment Consideration Standards 21A.50.050.B.7 through 11:

7. The proximity of necessary amenities such as parks, open space, schools, fresh food, entertainment, cultural facilities, and the ability of current and future residents to access these amenities without having to rely on a personal vehicle;

Finding: This consideration is not directly applicable to the proposal.

Discussion: This consideration is intended to ensure that new development is in an area of the City with adequate amenities to serve residents without having to use a personal vehicle, such as a car. In this case, the proposed rezone to Public Lands will help ensure that the property will be used for parks, open space, or cultural facilities, and will provide such amenities in walking distance to the neighborhood in the long term.

8. The potential impacts to public safety resources created by the increase in development potential that may result from the proposed amendment;

Finding: The increase in development potential of the site, for larger public uses, is unlikely to substantively increase the need for public safety resources.

Discussion: This consideration is intended to ensure that new development, particularly residential or commercial development, can be adequately served by public safety resources, such as fire and police services. In this case, the property is in an area with a high level of such services, and no new services are likely to be required to serve potentially larger public uses on the property in the long term.

9. The potential for displacement of people who reside in any housing that is within the boundary of the proposed amendment and the plan offered by the petitioner to mitigate displacement;

Finding: Not applicable.

Discussion: This consideration is not applicable to the proposal as there is no housing on the property.

10. The potential for displacement of any business that is located within the boundary of the proposed amendment and the plan offered by the petitioner to mitigate displacement;

Finding: Not applicable.

Discussion: This consideration is not applicable to the proposal as there are no private businesses on the property. The rezone will support the continued use of the property for public uses.

11. The community benefits that would result from the proposed map amendment, as identified in Section [21A.50.050.C](#);

Finding: Not applicable.

Discussion: 21A.50.050.C notes that “Each petition for a zoning amendment that is initiated by a *private property owner* shall identify a community benefit(s) provided by the proposal that would not otherwise be provided without the amendment as provided for in this section.” This petition was initiated by the Mayor. As the associated standards only apply to privately initiated rezone proposals, identification of a community benefit from that subsection is not required for this proposal.