

The Murray City Center District (MCCD) Review Committee met on Thursday, April 28, 2022, at 5:30 P.M. for a meeting held at the Public Services Conference Room.

Present: David Hunter, Vice Chair
Daniel Hays
Kiersten Davis
Jared Hall, Community and Economic Development Director
Zachary Smallwood, Senior Planner

Excused: Andy Hulka, Chair
Ray Beck

Public in attendance: Jonathan Oliver, applicant
Wyatt Oliver, applicant
Kim Anderson, architect
Michael Todd
Janice Strobell
John Belcher
Dani Potter
Todd Bradford
Kenneth Fairchild

Mr. Hunter welcomed all to the meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kiersten Davis motioned to approve minutes from March 31, 2022, and Daniel Hays seconded. Motion passed 3-0.

2. THE WYATT – 4930 & 4938 South Center Street – Project #22-061

Mr. Smallwood reviewed The Wyatt application for Design Review approval to allow the construction of a new residential building. New construction within the zone requires Design Review Approval by the Planning Commission after obtaining a recommendation from the MCCD Review Committee. The subject property is located on the west side of Center Street, north of Vine Street. There are currently two single family dwellings and a duplex on the site. The applicant proposes to demolish these buildings and construct a new residential building. The applicants are proposing a three and a half (3.5) story residential building at the subject property. The applicant states their intention to build twenty-six (26) for-sale condominium units. Section 17.170.050 of the Land Use Ordinance states that main entries to a building should provide a strong connection to the street. Building setbacks in the MCCD Zone are measured as distance from the back of curb. Buildings are required to be located between 12' and 25' of the back of curb. The result is an effective setback from property line between 0' and 13'. The setbacks are measured in this way to reinforce the importance of the public, pedestrian improvements and the necessity of the building's proximity in creating that environment. The applicants have shown the installation of the MCCD requirements of five feet (5') of park strip and seven feet (7') of pedestrian sidewalk. The City Engineer has asked the applicant to shift the building back to allow for the doors to the lobby space to not swing into the public right of way. This has offset the entrance to the building approximately nine feet (9') back. This meets the ordinance requirement that 80% of the building is located within twenty-five feet (25') from

the back of curb. The applicants will need to install city standard street furniture such as benches and garbage collection containers that have been previously installed on other projects. The applicant will need to provide a plan showing where they propose to include the street furniture. The applicants have decided to allow for additional on-street parking. They acknowledge that Center Street is a narrow road and they intend to install additional space for on-street parking in front of their building. It will meet the city standards for on-street parking. The applicants are required to have functional entries at seventy-five feet (75') on average. The applicant shows an entry at approximately sixty feet (60') on average. Staff does not have any concerns with the location of the entry for this building.

Functional entries must be oriented towards the street. Staff does not see any concerns with the way the building is oriented. The building faces Center Street as the primary street and all access both pedestrian and vehicular will come from Center Street.

The Land Use Ordinance requires that blank walls not occupy over 50% of the principal frontage and that windows not be tinted to such a degree that block visibility. Staff has reviewed these requirements with the applicant and they have stated that the windows will not be tinted to disallow visibility. For buildings that are located within sixty feet (60') of a residential district height is limited to fifty feet (50'). With the addition of on-street parking and dedication of a wider sidewalk, the applicant would be outside the sixty-foot height restriction. Staff and the applicant have worked together to provide a lower building regardless of the height allowed. At its tallest point, the height of the structure is forty-nine feet ten inches (49' 10"). The majority of the building is approximately thirty-seven feet (37'). This is about the same height that a residential structure in the R-1-8 zone would be allowed to build to.

Based on the number of units proposed there is a parking need of thirty-nine (39) spaces. The applicant has provided thirty (30). There are fourteen (14) mechanical stacked parking which totals twenty-eight (28) spaces and two (2) ADA accessible spaces. The applicant will need to address the additional parking need before proceeding to Planning Commission approval.

Within the MCCD Zone there is a bike parking requirement. 5% of the total number of spaces required must also be provided for bicycles. This results in two (2) required spaces. Staff encourages the applicant to provide additional bicycle parking within the structure to facilitate a more bike and pedestrian friendly atmosphere. Landscaping and amenity space is required at 15% of the total site area. The applicants show the total lot square footage of 14,374 ft². This requires 2,156 ft² of open and amenity space. The applicant has provided a total of 1,986 ft² (13.8%). The applicant will need to work with staff prior to being placed on a Planning Commission agenda to the 15% or greater required space. The applicant's proposal, which is located east of State Street, is in a unique area close to established single-family homes and other multi-family homes. There has been a mix of development types in this area. The applicant's goal of providing a smaller scaled project fits within the surrounding neighborhood. With some additional changes as outlined below, the proposed condominiums can fit into the area nicely.

This proposal is unique in that they are for-sale units. This would be a first of its kind in the downtown area. Allowing for condominium ownership in the downtown would allow for a different type of resident and increase the mix of housing types in the area. This project is developed at a scale that lends itself to walking and biking for the residents both in and

around the neighborhood. The proposal is being developed at a smaller scale to accurately reflect the neighboring single-family homes. With plenty of openings in the front façade to allow for neighborly connections, this project has the potential to grow the downtown in unique ways with the smaller scale, and for-sale nature.

Staff recommends that the Review Committee review the following for discussion on this project:

Walkability:

Staff has concerns about access to the bicycle storage area. It seems to be placed behind the building with little to no access. This will need to be addressed. There may be potential for bicycle storage in units or in common space. Bicycle parking should also be integrated into the street improvements as well as provided near the entrance to the building to encourage the use of bikes for multiple, quick back and forth trips. The applicant should consider differentiating the pedestrian crossing of the parking structure. This would allow for pedestrians and vehicles to be alerted to potential conflicts. Staff agrees with the addition of on-street parking as part of this proposal. It will help mitigate future issues with Center Street.

Sustainability:

The applicant has expressed a desire to place solar panels on the top of the building. Staff supports that goal and encourages the applicants to work towards that end. The utility plans that need to be provided can include plans for the solar panels.

Streetscape:

In the standards review, staff mentioned utilizing the on-street parking for loading/unloading. This should be used for deliveries, moving vehicles, and ride sharing.

Public Space:

The applicant should consider some sort of artwork on the building to help make the area stand out. Perhaps on the south or west elevations of the building see examples of this on page 26 of the Design Guidelines.

Open Space:

The amenity space that is provided for the future residents allows for it to be private without the perception of it being open to the public. It is placed on the rooftop area and facing west. The applicant will need to work to bring the open/amenity space into conformance with the Land Use Ordinance.

Parking:

The use of stacked mechanical parking is unique in this project. It allows the parking area to be smaller than what would normally be required in the zone. However, the number of parking spaces is still inadequate according to the requirements of the MCCD Zone. The applicant will need to work with staff to address this. A bike rack is required on site; staff recommends placing it near the entrance to the building for ease of use.

Neighbor Awareness:

Though the applicant is able to go higher in their design, they elected for a lower project to be more sensitive to the context of the neighborhood, which includes single-story

residential homes to the east. The building utilizes balconies to modulate the façade. Additionally, very strong structural relief gives the appearance of two buildings.

Light:

Proposed lighting of the building will need to be reviewed prior to being placed on a planning commission agenda.

Connection to the ground:

This proposed project has a material distinction connecting it to the ground and on the south side has sunken residential units that can see out and a lower second level that residents will be able to see out of clearly. This allows for the community to see what is happening on the street, and very directly connects the activity and living space of two floors to the street frontage and the neighborhood. The applicant has accentuated the primary entrance with a brick veneer. Staff suggests that the Review Committee discuss the potential addition of more brick and additional differentiation, perhaps with wood siding.

Connection to the Sky:

Staff feels this could be expanded on, with full ornamentation and a hard edge along the top of the building. If solar panels are not installed, sky lights, green roof, or other elements could be implemented to accentuate the connection.

Fenestration and Porosity:

The applicant has provided balconies for all units to allow for natural light and air to flow into the homes. The only blank wall on the project is for the parking garage opening. Staff does not have any concerns here.

Express a Clear Organizing Idea:

The applicant is proposing a mix of materials and a modern aesthetic. Staff suggests that the addition of more brick may help to better tie the project with its surroundings. Staff suggests this be a topic for the Review Committee to discuss.

Private Space:

The applicant has provided private balconies and operable windows across the project. The applicant may want to look into additional passive solar shading throughout the project.

Materiality:

As discussed in previous sections, the applicant has provided a pronounced entry. Staff thinks perhaps the materiality of the building could help this stand out more. Staff believes that there could be additions to the building to give it a more pedestrian and human scaled appearance. This could include more architectural banding, or canopies added to help enclose the space. Staff strongly suggests that the applicant look at the roof termination of the building. This could easily be expanded on to give more of a finality to the building. Visually, this will help incorporate the building into the neighboring homes.

Based on deficiencies outlined in the Staff Report; at this time Staff cannot recommend that the Review Committee forward the application to the Planning Commission.

3. OTHER BUSINESS

Design Review Committee
April 28, 2022
Page 5

No other updates or business was discussed.

Motion to adjourn made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Mr. Hayes. Motion passed 3-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jared Hall", written in black ink.

Jared Hall, Community & Economic Development Director