



MURRAY  
CITY COUNCIL

## MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL RETREAT

---

The Murray City Municipal Council met for a retreat on March 7, 2018 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

### Council Members in Attendance:

Diane Turner, Chair	District #4
Dale Cox	District #2
Jim Brass	District #3
Brett Hales	District #5

### Excused:

Dave Nicponski, Vice-Chair	District #1
----------------------------	-------------

### Others in Attendance:

Blair Camp	Mayor	Jan Lopez	Council Director
Doug Hill	Chief Administrative Officer	Jon Harris	Deputy Fire Chief
Jennifer Heaps	Comm. and Public Relations Director	Mike Terry	Human Resources Director
Tim Tingey	ADS Director	Paul Brown	MOCA
David Hart	MOCA	Kathleen Stanford	Resident
Pattie Johnson	Council Office	Jim McNulty	Development Services Mgr.
Brad McIlrath	Community & Economic Development	Brent Barnett	Resident
Stan Hoffman	DPRE	DeLynn Barney	Resident
Janice Strobell	Resident	Eliot Setzer	Resident

1. **Call to Order** - Council Chair Turner called the Council Retreat to order at 12:05 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. The following discussions occurred:

### MURRAY CITY CENTER DISTRICT (MCCD) AREA OVERVIEW – Tim Tingey

Project Manager Mr. Hart, with MOCA, was introduced, who is under contract with the city to facilitate the new city hall building and assist with Murray City Center District (MCCD) planning.

Mr. Tingey presented a slide show and maps to provide a broad overview of the MCCD and discussed issues the city is facing. The following was explained:

- Initial planning was established in 1980s.
- The MCCD was considered an urban renewal area for many years.
- Initial impediments that still need to be resolved, were realized in the early 70's.
- Vision began in 2009-2010.
- The city worked with Gerdin Edlin in 2011, who identified concepts and provided the overall MCCD vision.
- Public input was received and 13 public meetings occurred in conjunction with the General Plan process.
- The MCCD ordinance was adopted by council in 2011 that included all current design standards.
- Challenges in development include: environmental problems, utility issues, and property assemblage – that includes many property owners.
- If development was easy, it would have occurred many years ago.
- The overall focus of the MCCD is redevelopment.

The MCCD would create opportunities for redevelopment and growth, density, open space factors, and parking - with commitments from the RDA to provide parking for the area. Mr. Tingey said concepts and renderings were a reflection of City Code Section 17.170.010, approved by the council.

The purpose of the MCCD is to provide a mix of commercial, civic, and cultural center areas identified in the General Plan, by providing a true downtown area to complement the hospital to the south, as well as, encourage pedestrian oriented designs with a development model focusing on sustainability. Transit oriented elements are included, due to close proximity of the Murray TRAX station and Frontrunner. The hope is to include restaurants, promote street life activity, and provide a vibrant area.

Urban design is important, as well as, creating economic niches for new business opportunities, including historic preservation. In order to appreciate mixing historic structures with new buildings, a photo was shown of downtown Philadelphia, where Hilton Home 2 Suites was constructed near a historic building. Opportunities exist within the ordinance, to preserve old buildings in the area, however, many would not be preserved if specific criteria was not met.

Mr. Tingey reviewed required design concepts as follows:

- Attractive architecture and streetscapes
- Wide sidewalks for open sidewalk dining
- Preservation of open spaces, including green corridors connecting to nearby creek trails
- Capitalize on transit opportunities
- Building design and scathing
- Primary entrances must face the street
- Functional plazas and pedestrian ways
- Entries must occur every 75 feet
- Functional entries must be oriented close to public streets
- Entries must be covered with canopies
- Corner buildings require entries on both street facades
- Set-back elements must include landscaping
- Buildings along street sides require windows and large blank wall areas are not allowed
- Building height minimum west side of State Street - 40 feet, or 4 stories
- Parking and land to provide parameters for buildings, related to scale restrictions
- Building height limitations of 50 feet near residential zones, with modifications of 35 feet for Center Street
- Podium step-back requirements to address the pedestrian nature.

The desire is to create a place for residents to live, work, and play, by mixing a quality of neighborhood services, entertainment, and local small food services.

#### **CITY HALL SITE VISIONING** – Tim Tingey, David Hart and Paul Brown, MOCA

Mr. Tingey mentioned a portion of Mayor Camp's recent State of The City Address, when a 40-year old newspaper article was noted. Mr. Tingey said even at that time, there was a need for a new city hall facility, and therefore, the vision was not a new idea. A power point was shared to explain the following details:

#### Development Progress

The focus for redevelopment and constructing a new city hall has been challenging because the city was not looking at a clear vacant lot, with all utilities in place, ready for construction. In addition, since the City Hall Committee first considered the project five years ago, the city has had four different mayors, with four separate visions, providing three different site options.

#### Progression Time Frame

- 2014 - Agreement in place with THINK Architecture to complete programming and site information
- November 2015 - Selection of developer and architectural team J.R. Miller
- January 2016—March 2018 - Programming, site evaluation and land acquisition

#### Site Concepts and Options

- Evaluated other sites outside of MCCD
- Previous option was to develop east of current city hall site
- Four reasons the primary focus shifted to west of State Street
  - To reinvest in west side of State Street
  - Provide an anchor project west of State Street
  - Current city hall site is owned by RDA and development tax value potential is high
  - Great need to address parking issues west of State Street
- Property acquisition is targeted on the west side. If public input does not support city hall development on the west, there is still a need for public facilities and parking.

#### Land Acquisition Progress

- Prior to 2015 - 11 parcels purchased, negotiated by city RDA
- Since 2015 - 23 parcels acquired. No formal eminent domain process initiated.
- Five properties left to acquire

#### MOCA's Presentation

Mr. Hart worked with the mayor, city staff, and members of the City Hall Committee, to consider options for locating the new city hall on the west side of State Street. A power point was used to share his analysis and concerns, related to initial plans that included constraints, opportunities, and new proposed options.

#### Observations and comments regarding initial plan:

- Several utility lines run through the area and need to be moved - which is costly.
- The MCCD would see increased density.
- Hanauer Street will be extended and become a connector from Vine Street to Main Street.
- Poplar Street will transition, and/or disappear.
- Historic structures on the site will be restored and preserved.
- If located on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue - the facility would straddle a very large, underground utility line. The ability to relocate the line would need to be determined.
- Parking, and a parking structure need to be sited, possibly to the north and surrounding the facility. Mr. Hart felt initial plans reflected a great deal of parking in general.
- Property acquisition challenges were having an impact on trying to accomplish the plan.
- Open green space/park is located in the center.

An important factor for any public building is the use of outdoor areas surrounding a structure by incorporating green open space into the design. Mr. Hart shared photos of other city hall plans, as scenarios for the council to analyze - some were constructed 25-50 years ago. The following developments were noted:

- Minneapolis, Minnesota, City Hall - Located in the center of a city block, with the entire center very much built out - to the edges of the street. The only preserved open space was in the center area of city hall, noted as a red plaza area. Additional government buildings surrounded it.
- Salt Lake City Hall and Washington Square—The facility is located at the center of a park, surrounded by green space. From the first of spring, until the end of fall, the green space is utilized for public events and gatherings, which could extend east to the city library, and public safety building areas if necessary. He noted parking was very scarce.
- South Jordan City Hall - Located largely in a commercial shopping area, a promenade is created down the center that includes businesses on both sides. The area has parking challenges, small scale neighborhoods scaling around the city center, with front and back entries in and out of the city hall area.
- Sandy City Hall – The area is a larger promenade with a similar situation to South Jordan, however, parking is dispersed, and more green space is seen around the building. Other business-type buildings surround the facility.
- West Valley City Hall - Located on a corner, associated with commercial development, has abundant parking to the rear, with transit oriented elements to the west. The building situates next to street edges and no public open space is offered.
- West Jordan City Hall – Allows a similar promenade, although, the majority of the surrounding area contains parking lots, and a nearby library. The open space component is a park located nearby to the west.

Mr. Hart provided several new siting options and said the first thing MOCA considered for the new facility, was to locate the structure in a park-type setting. New sketches and diagrams were shared to express various layouts for the building, including different options to address parking issues. The following options were shared:

1. Push parking towards 4800 South for easy access, allow green space in the center area, provide public buildings to the south, and other developments surrounding the area.

2. Turn the building, orienting the facility towards Hanauer Street, and provide parking to the west.
3. Poplar Street would become an access road, rather than a through street. It would serve State Street developments, as well as, access city hall and other public buildings on the block. Open green walking space would be provided near historic buildings.
4. The facility would be placed horizontal to 4800 South. Open green space would be created in the center of the area, and at the center intersection of Hanauer and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Public activities would occur near historic buildings, and other public developments would be constructed south of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Parking would be dispersed.
5. Locate city hall on the corner, similar to West Valley's concept. This places more emphasis on the building, and less emphasis on any sort of public interaction, and would allow for parking on the site.
6. Locate the building in an L-Shape configuration, towards 4800 South, which would provide additional future development, such as, a library, or winter garden area. Green space would be seen along the west side of Hanauer, as well as, surrounding the historic buildings.

Option 6 above provided for parking areas dispersed throughout the MCCD and were large enough that a parking structure could be situated on one in the future as other sites were developed and to meet needs from increased density and economic development. Mr. Hart suggested that parking dispersed throughout the MCCD would encourage a walkable community where citizens could move about, walking, shopping and stopping at cafes was part of an active community, which provided an enjoyable downtown area.

Mr. Hart said the new plan should be flexible enough to allow for development on State Street, with the option to add parking. He explained the RDA was the best vehicle for allowing that to occur, which was a common practice in other cities, including SLC where many parking structures were developed by the RDA and allowed shared parking.

Futuristic Observations – Mr. Hart made the additional comments and recommendations:

- Since the MCCD ordinance requires buildings to be situated along street edges, MOCA believed it was a positive idea for commercial buildings, and the majority of other government facilities. Commercial and retail should front street edges, and encourage commerce and public access. Having shops to the edge of the street, with large sidewalks, where citizens walk, shop and dine, makes a city active.
- City hall should provide an alternative feel with a more government-type function, by offering public space around it. Encouraging city hall to be different is favored, as opposed to pushing the building right to the street edge.
- By providing public open space for activities, such as, farmers markets, protests, gatherings or marathon finish lines – the open space is a public benefit to any community.
- Placing city hall in a public open space would enhance the MCCD. Other public buildings, such as, a library or museum, should be placed at the streets edge - to take advantage of distributed parking. It also encourages citizens to walk, and enjoy moving through a community.

- Parking should be enhanced with good landscaping, which during warm weather, can provide shade to hot cars. Parking lots should not become a large sea of asphalt, which is also a challenge when it comes to snow plowing.

Renderings created by Paul Brown were presented to convey several visions of open spaces in the downtown, and how building set-backs would appear providing the walkable community. Mr. Hart felt the city was moving in the right direction, with regard to density, and said the encouragement of a city hall project would make the MCCD come together in a vibrant way.

Ms. Turner favored option #6 and felt the L-shaped configuration of the building was more inviting than a large model facade. Mr. Brass and Mr. Hales agreed.

Mr. Cox noted limited parking for Salt Lake City Hall, and Washington Square – even with mass transit stations located near the facility, parking was always a challenge. He felt if parking in the MCCD was sufficient for businesses, employees of city hall, and for visitors – he favored a walkable community, and liked the concept of dispersed parking.

Mr. Hart explained four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, was considered a healthy plan for parking – which he advised. He noted SLC recently experienced a reduction of two parking spaces, per 1,000 square feet on a given day due to increased density.

Mr. Brass favored option #6 and felt the layout would provide a different presentation, because it would not feel as though it was sitting in the middle of a shopping district. He liked preservation of green space and historical buildings, and sufficient space for a new library, with the option for expanding parking needs. He said the structure was a professional look for the city, and felt the L-shape configuration would not lack in much needed square footage. All council members agreed.

Mayor Camp stated regardless of where the city hall facility was sited, it was an important priority to get the cell tower relocated closer to the railroad tracks and away from the MCCD area.

Mr. Brass expressed concern about where the cell tower would be relocated and the great cost to do so. Mr. Hart understood the project would be costly. Mr. Brass said the property where the tower currently stands was not yet owned by the city.

Mr. Cox felt it was expensive but once the project was completed - it would no longer be a concern for many years to come. Mr. Brass agreed, and said the city should not avoid moving forward with development, due to the cost of moving the tower.

Mr. Tingey reported the application process was underway, with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to attain approval for its relocation. The process was time intensive, therefore, communication would be ongoing.

Mr. Hart asked if the council was comfortable moving forward with option #6. There was a consensus for moving forward in that direction.

**CITY HALL AND DOWNTOWN PUBLIC FACILITY PROJECT TIMELINES** – Tim Tingey

Constant challenges to the overall project timeline were related to the final acquisition of five properties. Mr. Tingey reiterated 11 parcels were purchased prior to 2015, and 23 were purchased since then to facilitate downtown planning. The following comments were made related to timelines:

- Putting money aside for relocating the tower was important, due to the length of the project.
- Keeping other projects moving forward is important. Purchase and sales agreements with UTA would be presented to UTA Board this month for final decisions. Simultaneously, the city would submit DEQ applications for voluntary cleanup.
- Seven communications occurred with Strauser property owners last week to finalize land acquisition, which was getting closer.
- Renderings would be presented to Day Law Office group, and the Fraternal Order of Eagles to facilitate final acquisition of a lane, and their parking areas.

Mr. Brass asked if anything was preventing the city from moving forward with city hall building designs. Mr. Tingey said no, other than cell tower relocation details, which he felt would take about one year to achieve.

Mr. Cox asked if UTA would be assisting with the cost of remediation. Mr. Tingey explained UTA would become a co-applicant with the city, and would reduce the price of the property \$200,000 to help cover those costs. In addition, if overall remediation costs excessively surpass what can be afforded, the city has the option to pull out the project.

Mr. Tingey said government projects were most time consuming, due to public involvement with siting the city hall facility. However, he was optimistic that properties would be acquired in a timely manner to facilitate the following timeline:

PROJECT/TASK	DESCRIPTION	TIMELINE	EXPECTED COMPLETION
Property Acquisition	Purchase of 5 final properties in the area	Ongoing to summer of 2019	August 2019
Hanauer Street Design	Preliminary work last Fall – final design begins in April	Design work through the summer of 2018	August / September 2018
Fire Station	New construction of Station #81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Property acquisition is contingent on addressing environmental issues on the UTA site.</li><li>• Construction drawings are completed and building permit review is underway</li><li>• Construction will begin July 2018</li></ul>	May / June 2019
Hanauer Street Construction	Development of Hanauer Street between 4800 South and Vine Street	Construction will be in conjunction with new city hall beginning in Summer of 2019	Fall 2019
City Hall	Development of a new City Hall facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. A. Program and Project Parameters completed—Mid April, 2018</li><li>B. Architect contract—May, 2018—12 months of work (schematic design, design development, construction drawings)</li><li>C. Bidding 1-2 months</li><li>D. Begin Construction late Summer early Fall 2019</li><li>E. 2-year construction timeframe</li></ul>	Fall 2021
Library	Construction of a new City Library	Programming and site development begin Fall of 2018	Contingent on funding—within the next five years

Ms. Turner appreciated the visual timeline and understood the challenges. However, she expressed concern regarding the length of time city employees could safely remain at the current facility, due to the aging building and continual costly repairs.

#### **MURRAY CITY CENTER DISTRICT CODE ANALYSIS** - Tim Tingey and Brad McIlrath

##### Density Discussion

Mr. Tingey commended staff for hard work on behalf of the city. He praised them for great expertise related to upcoming special projects, and presentations, in addition to putting forth great effort on a daily basis, by meeting deadlines, preparing weekly reports for the planning commission, and processing numerous applications related to building permits, business licensing, and conditional use permits.

He reminded the council of the retreat last fall, when density in the MCCD was first discussed related to the MCCD ordinance. As a result, a density study of the area was completed, which was presented in a power point by Associate Planner, Mr. McIlrath.

Mr. McIlrath said density was a challenge in every community along the Wasatch Front, and in the United States, not just Murray. His research included analyzing regional growth strategies along the Wasatch Front, with the aid of the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC). He studied regional growth visions, by Wasatch Choice 2040, (soon to be called Wasatch Choice 2050), in addition to, examining density examples throughout the USA. Based upon those findings, a power point was used to explain the basis of his recommendations:

##### Density Defined

Mr. McIlrath said most developed areas nationwide are accustomed to single-family residential ownership and open spaces, therefore, the thought of increased density in Murray might be hard to get used to, which was common.

In order to preserve the open natural spaces left in the city, and to move forward with future growth - densifying is necessary. Therefore, the best way to increase density is to address height with building scaling and design, which is what the MCCD is designed to provide.

##### Two Types of Density

- Measureable Density - A specific measured number of units, allowed per acre, in a zone
- Perceived Density - Noted slightly more important than measured density, because it relates to how people feel in their environment, in terms of comfort.

##### Two Types of Measurable Density

- Net Density – A units-per-acre density measurement that includes only land occupied by residential use. It does not include public use areas, streets, parks or other uses.

- Gross Density – A units-per-acre density measurement that includes land occupied by public right-of-way, recreation, civic, commercial and other non-residential uses in the calculation. For example, a neighborhood density would fall under a gross density calculation.

### Urban Growth and IMC

The intent of the MCCD area is to provide complimentary uses and designs to the IMC area where the tallest hospital building is 15 stories high, without a 13<sup>th</sup> floor, and is situated in the center of the area. Initial renderings were shown depicting complimentary elements to the north of hospital.

### Visualizing Density

Photos were shared of various US cities, like Los Angeles, Phoenix, Las Vegas, Seattle, San Francisco, and Boulder, Colorado to explain examples of range and gross density, as related to units per acre. Levels of density were noted from 31.5 units per acre, up to 100.1 units per acre. A particular area near South Temple in Salt Lake City was noted as 54.8 units per acre. Mr. McIlrath explained there were good ways of planning for density, and bad ways of actually doing it, however, most cities are well designed to fit their type of environment. He noted some cities where density was very high, did not portray tall buildings because density was dispersed in a wide manner.

### Murray City Projects and Density

- Birkhill Apartments - 307 units  
Net Density: 66 units per acre  
Gross Density: 55 units per acre

The project has worked out well in terms of density, and provides an interior courtyard, plenty of open space, amenities, as well as, a club house.

- Murray Crossing – 293 Units /15,000 Sq. Ft. Commercial on ground floor  
Net Density: 65 units per acre  
Gross Density: 62 Units/Acre

This future project is being developed adjacent to the Murray Central Station and the new EMI Health facility, providing larger open space, with more roads around the site.

### Density and Design

It is imperative that density and design go hand in hand, in order for planning to be successful. Mr. McIlrath noted a key concept in the MCCD was access to public space, in order to offset increased density. He shared photos of downtown; Phoenix, Boulder, and San Jose, to give examples of how some cities were designed, regarding the following details and various options:

- Parking (tucked-under, structured, and underground)
- Open Space
- Access to public spaces (parks and plazas)
- Tree-lined streets
- Architecture (Provide a variety of design and avoid cookie cutter appearance.)

### Density and Alternative Transportation

According to WFRC, densities under seven units to the acre are not sufficient to support public transit. Therefore, Murray City's overall density was not adequate to support public transit, however, Mr. McIlrath noted in order for density to grow, public transit must be available. The following elements were reviewed:

- Density must be thought of regionally – which Wasatch Choice 2050 ensures.
- Density does not belong in remote locations.
- Density needs alternative transportation, and alternative transportation needs density.
- Consider the ½ mile rule\*
- 83% of the MCCD is within ½ mile of Murray.

\*The half-mile rule was explained as the distance most people are willing to walk, in order to utilize a public transit station. Mr. McIlrath conducted research in the MCCD area and found that parcels identified on the map for redevelopment were half a mile from the Murray Central Station.

### Wasatch Front Regional Planning

Mr. McIlrath explained Wasatch Choice for 2040 would be superseded by Wasatch Choice 2050 in June of 2018, where urban centers would be developed in West Valley, Murray, Sandy, Sugarhouse, and Provo. Based on population and location, Murray fits in line with these cities. Maps were noted to explain how Wasatch Choice 2040, which is currently in place and includes the IMC area, southward to Fashion Place Mall, near Interstate 2-15, would change according to Wasatch Choice 2050.

Mr. Tingey confirmed Murray's urban center planning would become more centralized in the downtown area and around the IMC area.

Mr. McIlrath explained planning would change due to the market, input from the cities, and in order to narrow the scope for street level development. Mr. Tingey said the revision was important because current zoning, from the MCCD to Fashion Place Mall, did not contemplate that type of density and would be modified by Wasatch Choice 2050.

Ms. Lopez noted the urban center would also include areas slightly further north of IMC. Mr. McIlrath confirmed the area would not be as wide either.

### Urban Centers – Identified by Wasatch Choice 2050

- Are the focus of commerce and local governmental services
- Allow average building height to be 4-10 stories (current height in MCCD is unlimited)
- Have densities between 20-100 units per acre
- Offer access to high-capacity transit (bus, light rail, street car, etc.)
- Designed in a cone shape

Mr. McIlrath explained urban centers are laid out similar to a cone-shape. Beginning with a center core described below:

- Core – Highest density, civic and government facilities, including taller store and office front buildings

- General - Surrounds core area, dense buildings, office space above commercial, does not require ground floor commercial.
- Edge –Surrounds general area, no commercial allowed consists of row and yard buildings, mainly flat range, where single-family residential areas reside.

Mr. Tingey noted when comparing the current size of Murray's community, with what is expected in the future, the city already experienced a good deal of density, due to IMC and recent development surrounding it. Therefore, he reminded the council and stressed density was not contemplated in single family residential areas.

The WFRC recommends cities have the most flexibility with civic buildings within city template codes. In addition, open space was suggested around civic buildings, which, Mr. McIlrath felt MOCA had accomplished well, by depicting public spaces, such as gardens, plazas and courtyards in their plan.

### MCCD Achievements

Mr. McIlrath said based upon information from the WFRC and Wasatch Choice 2050. The following elements were achieved so far in the MCCD:

- Design Guidelines are in place to encourage good design of buildings and encourages open space.
- Residential is not allowed on ground levels of commercial buildings.
- Tree-lined streets and amenities
- Parking to side or rear of buildings
- No density limit
- No maximum height – podium step-back at third story, which creates visual interest and provides pedestrian scale.

### Staff Recommendations for the MCCD

- Ten story maximum height.
- 12 foot to 15 foot podium step-back at the third floor for buildings that are six stories or greater.
- Maximum project density of 80 units per acre.
- Open space requirement of 15%-20% for each project.
- Parking amendments:
  - Buildings that exceed four stories in height, 75% of parking to be provided in parking structure or within main building.
  - Parking associated with municipal or public buildings may be located between street and building if serving more than one use.
- Further study of ground floor commercial depth:
  - Ground floor depth of 50'.
  - No residential on ground floor, but commercial or tuck under parking for portion of buildings not along street frontage. (Further study on this recommendation would be conducted.)

Mr. Cox asked if street parking would be allowed in the MCCD. Mr. McIlrath confirmed, however, currently, it is not counted toward the minimum requirement. Mr. Cox wondered if streets would be wide enough to accommodate cars, and fire apparatus in case of emergency. Mr. McIlrath stated the MCCD requires 12 foot wide travel lanes, at minimum, in addition to, eight foot wide on-street parallel parking, and 12 foot wide sidewalks.

A lengthy discussion occurred related to development recommendations, when Mr. Brass commented on numerous details and shared several concerns. He addressed the need for a new ladder truck in the fire department, which was purchased to accommodate the height of IMC. He wondered whether public safety issues could be met efficiently with taller buildings, and how increased traffic, due to increased density, would affect maneuvering a large ladder truck in the area during an emergency situation.

He said horrific parking challenges in the Fireclay area were not anticipated during planning. He cherished small town charm, like his hometown in New Jersey, but when frequenting Time Square and Manhattan, he esteemed high density. As a result, he wondered if increased density was the direction Murray should go. He felt cities often get caught up in becoming something they are not – instead of concentrating on what they already are.

He cherished the existing historic look and feel along State Street when entering Murray from the north, and valued lives being saved at the IMC campus, as opposed to large iconic smoke stacks just sitting there. However, he wondered how much more of Murray's history would be lost in the city, due to a desire to become something new.

He noted darkened streets in larger cities due to tall buildings, where sunshine cannot reach trees, so he speculated how trees in the MCCD would be cared for along streetscapes. He agreed with recommended podium step-backs of 12-15 feet in depth, but wondered if 25 feet would be better.

He approved most recommendations, however, he thought enhancing what the city already had was important and he did not want to see the city lose its identity. He agreed density was necessary to support public transit, but felt it was necessary to provide various transit options, in order to deal with density. He feared jumping right into density, without having proper transit in place first, would create parking challenges far worse than those in Fireclay.

He pointed out the height of the Birkhill apartments, located in Fireclay, designed by Michael Brodsky - and felt the scale and design would provide a nice street front along State Street to complement existing historic buildings. He preferred the initial conceptual designs provided by Girding Eden because they achieved a historic feel he favored.

Mr. Brass said he cared about the city and did not want the MCCD to feel intimidating at night like it does in Fireclay. Therefore, since the MCCD was located in his district, and if the city was going to move forward with density, he made a request for more analysis, and implementation of planning - related to all of his concerns.

Mr. Tingey reminded Mr. Brass policies related to density, and the ordinance, approved by the council a number of years ago actually allowed for much more density than staff recommendations, and therefore, the proposal was intended to curb-back scale and density. In addition, he explained extensive design standards, created by Michael Brodsky were already incorporated into the proposal. He said initial plans by Gerdig Eden allowed for flexibility, but did not recommend anything less in density, than what was suggested.

Mr. Brass said he was not against density, and the proposal was a great step toward what the city needed. He realized density was necessary for younger residents who wanted to stay in Murray. He considered Murray a small town and questioned whether bigger was better, and he wanted to be sure plans were exactly what the city wanted. He stressed certain areas of the proposal should be reevaluated before permanent decisions were made.

Mr. Tingey believed since the ordinance was approved in 2010, decisions related to density were already agreed upon. He felt starting over, by removing the concepts of increased density would go against recommendations made by the WFRC, and Frontrunner and transportation development. He asked Mr. Brass for suggestions. If development for density was going to change, modifications should be realized immediately, in order for him to communicate with developer. He noted daily criticism coming from developers and builders because they are ready to develop projects. He said statistically, when downtown areas have no vision for density, they typically dye out.

Mr. McIlrath confirmed the proposed scaled-back density, because WFRC recommended a maximum of 12-story buildings in urban centers, which staff agreed might compliment IMC structures, however, seemed too high. In addition, WFRC recommended 100 units per acre, which was also pared back to create what is best for Murray, which was not to become a metropolitan center. Mr. McIlrath invited viewpoints regarding height and density different from the proposal.

Ms. Turner said density was an important reality the city was facing, which should be expected, in relationship to what millennials desire. For example, many desire walkable communities, biking instead of driving, and living in high rises, as opposed to owning a house with a yard. She felt it was the city's responsibility to provide density to meet those needs, with quality, stacked housing. She believed as long as design guidelines were adhered to, good direction would be attained responsibly, and limiting building height to 10-stories was acceptable. She realized condominium and apartment dwelling was not for everyone, but felt density would provide a good balance in diversity.

Mr. McIlrath addressed concerns related to public transit orientation and reported Murray Central TRAX station was within the recommended one-half mile of the MCCD, and the only station, other than SLC, to offer TRAX, bus, and light rail all together at one stop. Eventually, a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route would be available in the MCCD, traveling east to west, then to the central station, and out to Salt Lake Community College (SLCC). He reported bus route #47, beginning at the Fireclay station, traveling to 4500 South, then to SLCC, was recently rerouted to begin at the Murray Central TRAX Station to determine ridership. Personally, when riding Frontrunner daily, from Davis County, to bus #47 – he noticed the bus was always filled to capacity.

Mr. McIlrath explained unlimited density was allowed in the Fireclay area, but only six stories was constructed with the Murray Crossing apartment complex, including ground floor commercial. He said greater heights could be anticipated in the future, however, with the new proposal the limit would be capped at 10-stories.

Mr. Brass said State Street was a geographical boundary splitting the city into east-side, west-side concepts, and he wondered how it could all be incorporated into the MCCD. IMC seemed to be an island surrounded by a sea of cars. The challenges of walking safely across State Street, would intensify with increased population. Trying to envision proposed density in the MCCD, Mr. Brass

requested new renderings, and detailed pictures be presented in order to conceive a better idea of that vision.

Mr. McIlrath agreed, measureable and perceived density could be bad for the public - if not designed properly, however, when designed correctly, it was beneficial to the community.

Ms. Turner favored the idea of parking designs within a complex, which she realized could be expensive to affordable housing.

Mr. Hill acknowledged Mr. Brass's concerns and shared a meme, "I don't know what it looks like, but I'll know it is right when I see it." He affirmed analyzing drawings from an aerial view did not provide a realistic pedestrian scale view, but actual photos from a ground level perspective, rather than sketches, might provide a better visual for how six, and 10-story scale buildings realistically appear next to each other.

Ms. Turner agreed and felt set-backs could be better explained, regarding function and what could be achieved with different sizes and measurements.

Mr. Brass agreed the podium step-back was visually pleasing and would provide a diversity of architecture by preserving the look and feel of the 4500 South to Vine Street block, which would offer a more vibrant area.

Mr. Tingey noted step-back examples provided by Gerdin Eden, and said there were more examples that could be provided to the council for better understanding, however, he stressed the pedestrian scale was presented very well in preparation for adopting the initial MCCD ordinance.

In order to interpret versions of large scale, versus small scale streetscapes, Mr. Hill suggested a second review of MOCA renderings.

Mr. McNulty said density was also a matter of economics and explained most urban apartments built in the last 10-30 years, were two to three stories high, 20 units per acre, and provided two parking spaces, per unit. When apartments are constructed vertically, density increases, property values increase, and the cost for parking increases. He noted an overlay zone in SLC where density occurred along the TRAX line, but street parking was required. He mentioned cities not willing to increase density, like Bluffdale that considers anything higher than 8 units per acre high density; and Herriman, and South Jordan do not allow anything over 30 units per acre. He said Murray was a city with an opportunity to provide new communities, and housing for Murray's young adults, grandkids, and great grandkids. Futuristically, the city was equipped to allow density of 50-80 units per acre, which was still below WFRC's recommended 100 units per acre, and common in other areas along the Wasatch Front, from Ogden to Provo.

Mr. Hill reviewed four different building-scale renderings from MOCA. He noted current scale, consisting of one and two story buildings, which he feels everyone agrees more density than that is appropriate. Another rendering showed proposed 10 to 12 story facades, then another shows six and eight story buildings, more of a mid-range. What feels good for a historic downtown, he asked.

Mr. Hill then compared building-scale renderings from Gerding Eden that pictures buildings of three to six stories high. He asked the council if that concept felt good in the downtown or did the council want it higher. He said that is the value of looking at pictures to illustrate the scale and what feels comfortable.

Mr. Hales commented when comparing building illustrations, the mid-range felt more appealing to him.

Mr. Brass liked the depth on the podium as defined and favored the three stories along street fronts with set-backs that provided wider open streetscapes. By combining those two components an attractive walkable downtown could be accomplished in the historic areas, where people want to dine out on the street. Mr. Brass said he is not anti-density, however, by spreading and easing taller structures southward towards the hospital would be appealing.

Mr. McIlrath explained he arrived at conceptual 12 foot step-backs because typically, 12 feet was the height of one floor, and was equivalent to the length of the step-back.

Ms. Turner asked to see more visuals and detailed renderings of step-backs. There was a consensus that those measurements were acceptable in historic areas.

Mr. Hales said visually, regarding width of streets, undesirable traffic issues, and parking, - he hoped another Fireclay situation was not the outcome. He said as a father of five, none of his kids expressed a desire to live in apartments, but rather purchase a house. He said if future development included large scale apartments, he would support the idea by pure faith, because he was not aware of a strong desire among young people to rent.

Mr. Cox felt Fireclay left a bad impression on many, but believed density was the way of the future. With the increased population predicted in the Salt Lake Valley, and Utah – land for development is not abundant, therefore, elevating housing would be necessary. He said density was all about proper design, and maintaining the historic feel - while keeping density in mind. He advocated for natural light within open spaces for tree care. He said staff did a great job with the proposal and noted density would only affect a certain area in the city, and believed if we look into the future and ensure historic design, the downtown area could retain its historical value.

Mr. Tingey explained renderings of 6, 10 and 12 story building recommendations were provided to envision of what could happen in the city.

Mr. McIlrath said if the new city hall facility was developed as planned, with open space areas around it, in addition to, open green spaces near the historic mansion and chapel, taller buildings of 10 stories would be situated further west of IMC. He said by incorporating Gerding Eden's suggested design schemes, historic buildings in the area would be adaptively reused.

Mr. Brass added if certain historic buildings could not be saved, due to lack of historical, architectural, and significant features, constructing replicas with modern safety codes requirements, such as, fire sprinklers, would provide the city a longer lasting historic element.

Mayor Camp reaffirmed further analysis and detailed renderings would aide in the council's decision on how to move forward with density. Mr. Hales and Ms. Turner agreed.

Mr. Tingey said additional renderings from Gerding Eden were available for the council to further consider, but wondered if MOCA would need to reevaluate their recommendations and provide new renderings as well.

Ms. Turner clarified it was not necessary to start over with a new proposal, but providing new photos rather than sketches would help to better visualize 6 and 10 story buildings and 12 foot to 15 foot podium step-backs. There was a general consensus of that idea.

Mr. McIlrath would return to the council for further discussion, and said there were many buildings around the Wasatch Front he could photograph to provide those specific images.

#### **STREET LIGHTING** – Tim Tingey and Jim McNulty

Meetings occurred recently with the power department to review street lighting issues in the MCCD area. McNulty shared a power point to discuss proposed lighting standards in the MCCD.

#### **Fireclay District - Lighting**

Mr. McNulty shared photos of Birkhill Apartments on Main Street, where the current zoning ordinance within the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zone states 12 foot light poles would be utilized. However, an adjustment was made to install 16 foot light poles because 12 foot light poles were found to be too bright. He said 16 foot poles were better for pedestrian oriented sidewalks, and described poles with attached arm banners that would hold flower baskets during spring and summer. The ordinance would be amended to reflect the height change.

Appropriate set-backs were noted for future trees to receive natural sunlight, as well as, the TRAX station in close proximity and traffic signals were in place.

#### **MCCD - Lighting**

Photos were shown of an arterial design noted at State Street, and the corner of Vine Street, where 23-foot light poles would remain in place next to collectors and arterial road types. Arm banners were also mentioned on 23-foot poles to be utilized for city branding, and advertising events.

Mr. McNulty explained in order to be consistent in Murray City Code language, and because the TOD, Mixed Use (MU), and MCCD zones were all very similar, the objective was to achieve matching lighting standards in all three zones, therefore, proposed text was shared for the council to consider.

#### **Current MCCD Text (A, B and E) / Proposed Revision in Bold (C, D, F, G, and H)**

- A. Street and side walk lighting shall meet adopted city light design standards.
- B. Illumination levels shall not exceed IESNA recommended standards.
- C. **Lighting shall be provided for pedestrian ways that is appropriately scaled to walking. Light standards shall not be taller than sixteen (16) feet. However, light standards adjacent to State Street or 4500 South (major collector roadways) are allowed up to twenty-three (23) feet in height. Light standard height will be reviewed on a case by case basis by city staff.**
- D. **Lighting shall be shielded and directed downward to prevent off site glare.**

- E. All site lighting luminaries will conform to IESNA "cutoff" or "sharp cutoff" classification. City staff will provide additional details as needed.
- F. **An amber lamp color (3,000 Kelvin), or other color in consultation with the power department can be used for a project.**
- G. **For property owner installed private lighting, metal halide and induction lamp sources may be used subject to approval by the city power department and CED staff. Building facade lighting must be shielded and directed downward to avoid light trespass and illumination of the night sky.**
- H. **Banners may be attached to banner arms on light standards between sixteen (16) feet and twenty-three (23) feet in height. A top banner arm is required with a bottom eyelet, or eyebolt for a banner to be attached to a light standard (See Section 17.48, Sign Code). The bottom of a banner must be at least eight (8) feet above a walkway, surfaced area, or ground level below.**

Mr. Brass commented L.E.D. lighting should be encouraged, because of improved technology with better ways of directing light, utilizing less power, and more color choices were available.

#### **LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE** – Tim Tingey

At the request of Ms. Lopez a review of landscape standards and requirements occurred, and there would be no change to the ordinance. Mr. Tingey noted major modifications occurred in 2014-2015. The following elements were highlighted:

##### Commercial Projects:

- Formal Landscape Plan- Section 17.68.030: General Provisions: C
  - Any formal landscape plan which has been approved the city must be strictly adhere to;
  - Plans must show percentage of landscaping shown including trees, areas planted (shrub, flowers, sod), non-living features (paving, boulders, cobblestone, bark etc.) and watering mechanism;
  - Any proposed alterations in the approved plan, due to problems of species availability, plant size availability, or other circumstance, must be reviewed and approved by community and economic development division staff prior to implementation.
- Improvements - Section 17.68.030: General Provisions: D

When an area is required to be landscaped under the terms of this chapter, the requirement shall be met by the installation and maintenance of improvements as set further below:

- The installation of a permanent irrigation system as approved by the city, to ensure adequate coverage (80% efficient) of water to the landscape plants.
- Plant materials shall be selected from those species and varieties known to thrive in the Murray City area and shall adhere to the landscape design approved by the city.
- Water conserving landscape designs shall be used. All landscaping must be irrigated and planted with substantial live plant material and/or appropriate xeriscaping for the purpose of buffering, screening and beautifying the site.

- Types of trees shall have a minimum caliper (measure at 12 inches above the soil surface of the plant's root ball) of two inches and shall not require a support stake to remain upright.
- Shrubs shall be a mix of one gallon and five gallon containers, and shall be spaced as designated on the approved landscape plan.
- All plant materials used shall be in a healthy condition at the time of installation, free from mechanical injuries, insects or disease
- Required landscaping must be properly maintained and watered by an adequate irrigation system which includes backflow prevention, a rain shutoff device and identification of all irrigation equipment.
- Landscape planters within parking areas shall be irrigated with drip emitter or bubbler type systems only.

• Perimeter: Section 17.68.040: Requirements: A (e)

- Where a park strip is provided, the park strip shall be planted with low growth, which may include ground cover and shrubs not exceeding three feet in height. Park strip areas shall also meet the minimum landscape bed coverage of 50% at time of planting.
- Ground cover is required to provide 50% bed coverage at time of planting. Ground cover includes grasses shrubs and other low growing vegetation, but does not include trees.

Mr. Cox asked Mr. Tingey to explain appropriate xeriscaping and what he could do to create a xeriscape design in his own yard.

Mr. Tingey said in 2015 xeriscaping was approved in commercial areas, therefore, if commercial developers proposed significant xeriscaping, a detailed landscape plan would be needed to be submitted, in order to define what the area would look like. For residential areas 50% of landscape had to be shrubs or green planting, and watered with energy efficient mechanisms. He added all cement and rocks would not be acceptable.

Mr. Hill noted IMC landscaping as a good example of xeriscaping.

Residential Projects – Section 17.68.050: Requirements: A (e)

Whenever a residential dwelling is constructed, landscaping shall be installed in the front yard within one year from the date of the occupancy of the building. Landscaped areas shall consist of an effective combination of materials which may include trees, ground cover, shrubbery and xeriscape. All unpaved areas not utilized for access or parking shall be landscaped in a similar manner. All landscaping shall be maintained in a neat and orderly fashion.

Mr. Tingey noted a landscape plan was not required for residential projects, where xeriscaping was allowed.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT** – Jon Harris

A power point was used to discuss the council's role in the event of a disaster, as well as, to review the city's emergency plan following an incident, such as, an earthquake, severe weather, or pandemic strike.

Ensuring first responders are well trained to handle any disaster is priority, and plans were developed to make the city well prepared. Mr. Harris said Utah, as a state, excels in preparedness, by encouraging citizens to obtain 72-hour kits and have extensive water supply, as well as, become aware of evacuation routes for the city, at all times. In addition, a new program called "Safe Neighborhoods" was developed state wide, where elementary schools become shelters for those in need of housing, medical care, food and other support.

Emergency management plans include preparation for epidemic illness, drought, floods, long periods of high temperatures, and loss of power, for days upon end, which might not be considered a state of emergency. However, Mr. Harris explained even though considered small scale events, these episodes can create large disastrous situations for cities.

Emergency recovery is imperative for restoring a city to its operational activity, which includes getting businesses back in operation. Statistically, after major earthquakes and hurricanes 75% of businesses never recover. In addition, after extreme emergency situations, citizens should be aware, due to overwhelming situations, lack of ambulances, and minimum staffing, 911 responders are not coming. Mr. Harris understood the concept is hard to realize, and therefore, self-preparedness is vital. Shelters for animals, debris management, and building inspections were also noted as part of recovery challenges.

He reviewed regional support that includes surrounding cities, neighboring states, and explained federal procedures depending on the scale of the incident. He described step by step procedures within Murray City's Fire Department, related to damage assessment, addressing priorities, and making appropriate decisions in the city.

#### City Council Responsibilities

- Serve as liaison with residents in their districts, as well as, other cities, county, state and federal representatives.
- Survey problem sites to assist resident and mayor in finding solutions.
- Visit impacted areas to assist with special issues.
- Conduct public meetings to determine city action and public needs.
- Depending on duration of response and recovery - assist mayor in determining special legislation, policies and resolutions to help manage and restore the city.

#### ELECTED OFFICIALS COMPENSATION COMMITTEE – Jan Lopez and G.L. Critchfield

The purpose of the discussion was to create an elected officials compensation committee to make recommendations related to Murray City elected officials' total compensation.

Topics of discussion included: committee composition, term, staff support, duties, and compensation adjustments. Recommendations of the committee shall include:

- Annual salary for the mayor
- Annual salary for council members

- Benefits and other remuneration the committee deems pertinent

City attorneys will work on the final policy, which will be considered by the council at a future meeting.

**REVISIONS TO THE RULES OF THE MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL** – Jan Lopez

Ms. Lopez presented revisions to the rules of the Murray City Council.

Most changes related to the job title, from council administrator, to council executive director.

There was a change of the Budget and Finance Committee to remove limiting provisions, and the wording was cleaned up under vacancy & elected officials. Expenses related to neighborhood meetings, would be funded from the council office budget.

These changes will be presented at a council meeting for consideration.

**MURRAY CITY FUN DAYS PARADE OPTIONS** – Jan Lopez

Ms. Lopez discussed options for the Fun Day Parade. Council members like the idea of using a wagon from Wheeler Farm.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 3:35 p.m.

**Pattie Johnson  
Council Office Administrator II**