



COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Brian Fullmer
Policy Analyst

DATE: February 3, 2026

RE: **Zoning Map Amendment at Approximately 265 East 100 South**
PLNPCM2024-01377

Item Schedule:

Briefing: January 20, 2026

Set Date: January 20, 2026

Public Hearing: February 3, 2026

Potential Action: February 17, 2026

BRIEFING UPDATE

During a January 20, 2026 briefing the Council expressed support for family sized housing in the area. They discussed concerns from representatives of St. Mark's Cathedral and the surrounding community about a tall building blocking sunlight from solar panels on the church, and potential damage to the historic building resulting from construction.

The Council discussed differences between the proposed D-1 zoning and MU-11 and asked what could be developed under MU-11. They asked the applicant to look at potentially developing condominiums on the site to provide home ownership opportunities in the downtown area. The applicant was asked to consider changing the proposed tower orientation to reduce shadowing on the church's solar panels.

The applicant discussed difficulties with developing condominiums and that they no longer build them. They said building height allowed under current zoning will shade solar panels on the church and they are reviewing options to mitigate impact on the church.

Council Members expressed support for family sized housing in the area. They asked the applicant to work with representatives from the church on a proposal that will lessen their concerns before coming back to the Council for further discussions.

The following information was provided for the January 20, 2026 briefing. It is included again for background purposes.



ISSUE AT A GLANCE

The Council will be briefed about a proposal to amend the zoning map for an approximately 2.19-acre parcel at 265 East 100 South in Council District Four from its current MU-8 (mixed-use) zoning to D-1 (Central Business District). *Staff note: when the application was received the property was in the R-MU zoning district but is now zoned MU-8 because of the mixed-use zoning consolidation adopted in 2025.*

The applicant's stated objective is to construct a large mixed-use development with ground floor retail space, residential units above, and underground parking with a targeted ratio of one space per unit. D-1 zoning allows additional uses and height beyond the maximum 90 feet under MU-8.

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposal at its October 22, 2025 meeting and held a public hearing at which nine people spoke, mostly opposing the proposed rezone. Concerns included parking, changes in neighborhood character, potential property tax increases, and impacts to the St. Mark's Cathedral and pantry. One person spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for more housing in the city. **Planning staff recommended, and the Commission voted 7-1 to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council with the following conditions:**

- Building height is limited to 225 feet.
- The property owner will work with commercial tenants to mitigate displacement.

The Commissioner who voted against the motion did not state why she was opposed.

The applicant was amenable to the above conditions.

Goal of the briefing: *Review the proposed zoning map amendments, determine if the Council supports moving forward with the proposal.*

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. The Council may wish to ask the applicant if there will be an additional charge for resident use of the parking garage.
2. The Council may wish to discuss expanding the D-1 zone to the east.



*Area zoning map with subject parcel outlined.
St. Mark's Cathedral location indicated with red star.
Image courtesy of Salt Lake City Planning Division*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

As shown above, the subject property is located at the transition from D-1 to the west, and MU-8 to the east. Land uses on the block face are a mix of commercial, multi-family, St. Mark's Cathedral, and Hildegard's Pantry. Uses shift to primarily multi-family housing east of 300 East.

Conceptual drawings were submitted by the applicant and are included on pages 9-29 of the Administration's transmittal. Proposed community benefits include:

- 20% of housing units will be affordable for those earning 80% AMI or below. These will include one- and two-bedroom units, with one-bedroom units being prioritized. The units will be in locations that do not distinguish them from market-rate units.
- More than 8% of units will be three-bedroom family sized.
- 2,000 square foot restaurant, and 1,000 square foot coffee shop space for local organizations. Leasing incentive programs for the spaces, potentially with flexible lease terms or graduated rent structures, tenant improvement allowances for first-time commercial tenants, and/or reduced initial rent periods are anticipated.
- A private 35,000 square foot publicly accessible courtyard plaza with mid-block walkway.

It is important to note that if the zoning map amendment is adopted by the Council there is no guarantee the proposed development will be constructed. The property could be redeveloped with any use allowed within the zone or sold to another party.

The Council is only being asked to consider rezoning the property. Because zoning of a property can outlast the life of a building, any rezoning application should be considered on the merits of changing the zoning of that property, not simply based on a potential project.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Planning staff identified three key considerations related to the proposal which are found on pages 3-10 of the Planning Commission staff report and summarized below. For the complete analysis, please see the staff report.

Consideration 1 – How the Proposal Helps Implement City Goals and Policies Identified in Adopted Plans.

Planning staff found that the proposed zoning map amendment generally aligns with principles and goals found in *Plan Salt Lake (2015)*, *Housing SLC (2023)*, *Thriving in Place (2023)*, *Central Community Plan (2005)*, *East Downtown Plan (1990)*, and *Downtown Plan (2016)*. Planning also noted that they did not request a master plan amendment because the proposal is generally consistent with the future land use element found in the *Central Community Plan*'s high mixed-use designation of 50+ dwelling units per acre.

Consideration 2 – Proposed Community Benefit

As discussed above, the proposal includes 20% of the units, comprised primarily of one-bedroom and some two-bedroom, which will be affordable for those earning 80% AMI. Additionally, the proposal calls for more than 8% of units to be three-bedroom family sized. Finally, plaza, restaurant and coffee shop space are included in the proposal, with potential leasing incentive programs for the commercial spaces.

Consideration 3 – Compatibility with Nearby Properties

As shown in the image above, the subject property and those surrounding it are zoned MU-8. They were changed from R-MU as part of the 2025 mixed-use zoning consolidation. Both the current MU-8 and proposed D-1 zoning would allow the type of use anticipated for the property, though there are notable differences discussed below.

MU-8 zoning is intended for areas with mid-rise buildings, generally eight stories high or less. Maximum height in this zone is 90 feet, with design review required for buildings taller than 75 feet. D-1 zoning has a minimum building height of 100 feet and does not have a maximum height (though, as noted above, the Planning Commission recommended a 225-foot height limit for this property). Design review is required for buildings in the D-1 zone that are taller than 200 feet. D-1 zoning is typically located in areas with more intense uses found downtown. This zoning has additional permitted and conditional uses than MU-8. A table comparing the two zones is found on pages 52-57 of the Planning Commission staff report.

The tables below compare zoning and design standards for both the current and proposed zones. They are also found on pages 51-52 of the Planning Commission staff report.

CURRENT AND PROPOSED ZONING STANDARDS (21A.25.060 and 21A.30.020)

REGULATION	MU-8 (existing)	D-1 (proposed)
Building Height	Vertical Mixed Use: 90 feet, design review required if over 75 feet. Row House: 45 feet	Minimum: 100 feet. No maximum, design review required if over 200 feet.
Minimum Front	Ground floor w/residential uses:	None required.

Setback	10 feet. Ground floor w/non-residential uses: none required	If provided, it must include at least one amenity in 21A.30.020.C.1.a.
Maximum Front Setback	Ground floor w/residential uses: 20 feet. Ground floor w/non-residential uses: 10 feet	8 feet
Corner Side Setback	Same as front.	None required. If provided, it must include at least one amenity in 21A.30.020.C.1.a.
Interior Side Setback	None required	None required
Rear Setback	None required	None required
Open Space, Landscape Yards, and Landscape Buffers	A minimum of 10% of the lot area shall be provided as open space, unless otherwise specified.	If provided, it must include seating, landscaping or awning.

CURRENT AND PROPOSED DESIGN STANDARDS (21A.37.050 AND 21A.37.060)

REGULATION	MU-8 (existing)	D-1 (proposed)
Ground Floor Use %	75%	At least 90% of the ground floor must contain enhanced active use.
Building Materials: ground floor	At least 70% of street-facing façades must be clad in durable materials (excluding doors and windows).	At least 70% of street-facing façades must be clad in durable materials (excluding doors and windows).
Building Materials: upper floors	At least 70% of street-facing façades must be clad in durable materials (excluding doors and windows).	At least 50% of street-facing façades must be clad in durable materials (excluding doors and windows).
Glass: ground floor	At least 60% of the street-facing façade's ground floor must have glass between 3 and 8 feet above grade.	At least 60% of the street-facing façade's ground floor must have glass between 3 and 8 feet above grade.
Glass: upper floors	At least 15% of street-facing façades must have transparent glass.	At least 50% of street-facing façades must have transparent glass.
Reflective Glass	0%	None of the ground floor may have reflective glass. Upper floors may have no more than 50% reflective glass.
Building Entrances	Spaces between entries cannot exceed 40 feet.	Spaces between entries cannot exceed 40 feet.
Blank Wall Maximum Length	15 feet	20 feet

Street Facing Façade Maximum Length	200 feet	150 feet
Upper Floor Step Back – Upper-Level Front	N/A	10 feet
Upper Floor Step Back: Landmark Site	This requirement is intended to promote a transition in scale between new buildings and lower scale historic buildings. It applies to properties abutting local landmark sites that include buildings less than 50 feet in height. This does not apply when a right-of-way separates the properties. New buildings shall be designed so that no portion of the building within 25 feet of the abutting property line is taller than the height of a 45-degree angular plane extending from the top of the landmark building toward the new building.	This requirement is intended to promote a transition in scale between new buildings and lower scale historic buildings. It applies to properties abutting local landmark sites that include buildings less than 50 feet in height. This does not apply when a right-of-way separates the properties. New buildings shall be designed so that no portion of the building within 25 feet of the abutting property line is taller than the height of a 45-degree angular plane extending from the top of the landmark building toward the new building.
Lighting: exterior	Yes	N/A
Lighting: parking lot	Yes	N/A
Screening of Mechanical Equipment	Yes	Yes
Screening of Service Areas	Yes	Yes
Parking Garages or Structures	Yes	Yes
Public Improvements	Yes	Yes

Analysis of Standards

Attachment E (pages 58-61) of the Planning Commission staff report outlines zoning map amendment standards that should be considered as the Council reviews this proposal. The standards and findings are summarized below. Please see the Planning Commission staff report for additional information.

Factor	Finding
Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with and helps implement the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents.	<i>Complies</i>

Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance.	<i>Complies</i>
The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent and nearby properties due to the change in development potential and allowed uses that do not currently apply to the property.	<i>Complies</i>
Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.	<i>N/A</i>
The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.	<i>Complies, though some utility and drainage systems may need upgrades.</i>
The status of existing transportation facilities, any planned changes to the transportation facilities, and the impact that the proposed amendment may have on the city's ability, need, and timing of future transportation improvements.	<i>Complies, though a traffic impact study will be required at the design review or building permit stage.</i>
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.	<i>Complies</i>
The potential impacts to public safety resources created by the increase in development potential that may result from the proposed amendment.	<i>Complies</i>
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.	<i>Complies (no existing housing on property)</i>
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.	<i>Complies</i>
The community benefits that would result from the proposed map amendment.	<i>Complies</i>

City Department Review

Responding departments and divisions did not express opposition to the proposed rezone though some noted additional discussions will happen to outline requirements if the property is redeveloped.

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

- December 2, 2024 – Application for a zoning map amendment reviewed for pre-screen.
- January 15, 2025 – Application accepted.
- September 9, 2024 – Petition assigned to Sara Javoronok, Senior Planner
- October 22, 2024 –
 - Information about the proposal was sent to the Central City Community Council to solicit public comments and start the 45-day recognized organization input and comment period.
 - Planning staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners living within 300 feet of the project site, providing information about the proposal and how to give public input on the project.
 - Proposal posted for an online open house.
- March 12, 2025 – Early notification sign posted on the property by the applicant.
- April 2, 2025 – Applicant presented at Central City Community Council meeting.
- April 21, 2025 – 45-day public comment period for recognized organizations ended.
- October 9, 2025 – Planning staff posted notices on City and State websites and sent notices via the Planning listserv for the April 9, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Public hearing notice mailed.
- October 10, 2025 – The applicant posted a public hearing notice sign on the property with project information and notice of the Planning Commission public hearing.
- October 22, 2025 – The Planning Commission held a public hearing for the request and voted 7-1 to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning map amendment.
- October 23, 2025 – Ordinance requested from City Attorney's Office.
- November 21, 2025 – Planning received signed ordinance from the Attorney's Office.
- December 8, 2025 – Transmittal received in City Council Office.