

Minutes of the Design Review Committee meeting held on November 29, 2011, at 5:30 p.m. in the Murray Public Services Building Conference Room, 4646 South 500 West, Murray, Utah.

Present: Design Review Committee:
Jim Allred, Chair
Darrell Jones
Jay Bollwinkel
Ned Hacker
Chad Wilkinson, Community Development Manager
Joshua Beach, Assistant Planner
Amy Goller, Administrative Assistant
Citizens

Excused: Steven Burt

Jim Allred opened the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were two meetings minutes to approve: February 22, 2011 and July 26, 2011. Darrell Jones made a motion to approve the minutes. Jay Bollwinkel seconded the motion.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed, 4-0.

II. BOARD REPORTS

No report was given

III. BUSINESS

There was a conflict of interest by Mr. Allred, due to the fact that he is employed by the architectural firm (ASWN). He will have no comment nor will he be making a vote.

Before the meeting got underway, Mr. Wilkinson reviewed the design guidelines for the MCCD. Focus has shifted from historic preservation to design and keeping in mind that compatibility of historic structures is still being looked at.

A. OASIS APARTMENTS – 4916 South Center Street & 152 E Court Ave – Project # 11-99

Tim Soffe, of ASWN Architects at 5151 South 900 East, was the applicant present to represent this request. Chad Wilkinson reviewed the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a 64-unit apartment building in the MCCD zone, at the property addressed 4916 South Center Street & 152 E Court Ave. The proposed building will have ground floor as well as surface parking and commercial space along Center Street with residential units on the upper floors. The proposed structure is 50 feet in height which complies with the maximum height standard of the MCCD zoning district. The applicant proposes a mix of studio and one and two-bedroom units. The commercial portion of the development will consist of office space with entrances on Center Street. Access to the property is from a single driveway on Court Avenue. The building

materials include a combination of brick and stucco elements and windows. The proposed elevations indicate balconies with a white metal railing. The project is subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission, and additional conditions addressing traffic, utilities, and other issues related to the overall site design will be addressed through a separate report. Based on analysis of the design review guidelines staff recommends that, with conditions, the overall design is consistent with the design guidelines and recommends that the Design Review Committee recommend approval of the design of the new construction proposed to the Planning Commission with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit elevations of all sides of the building for Planning Commission review and approval.
2. Entrances shall be covered or recessed in accordance with section 17.170.110.
3. Exterior lighting and parking lot lighting shall be shielded and not spill onto adjacent properties.
4. The applicant shall provide details on the screening of trash receptacles and any exterior mechanical equipment. Screening shall be of compatible materials with the main structure.
5. Provide street furnishings in compliance with the design guidelines.

Mr. Soffe showed a diagram of the exterior of the building showing that the entire first floor is built with brick. He then described the architecture of the remaining stories. The landscape is an urban landscape with highback curb, street trees, sidewalk and outside access to what could be used as commercial space. The building does not exceed 50 feet in height per code, four-stories above a level of parking and is 10 feet floor to ceiling. This type of building would be considered a revitalization and catalyst in that area by providing much needed bed capacity, promoting other commercial growth with increased employment in Murray City. The units range in size from studio to two-bedrooms with the majority being one-bedroom.

Mr. Bollwinkel asked about the landscaping specifics on the street side. Mr. Wilkinson responded by saying that this area encourages xeriscaping with a maximum on the amount of turf that can be used. Mr. Bollwinkel encouraged taller trees to break up the outer brick façade as well as popping out the vertical panels to create more visual definition. He also pointed out the harsh transition in height differential from the residential buildings to the proposed apartment complex. He was wondering if there somehow could be less of an abrupt impact.

Discussion was open for comments.

Mary Ann Kirk: "This is Peter Steele, our history board chair. We just actually came from our history board meeting. We actually like the building, I totally agree, the building I think is perfect for what you're trying to do. It's just our biggest concern is you're right on Center Street. I mean if it were west of, I mean we'd be going "yay!" Peter do you want to explain what the key concerns were?"

Peter Steele: "Yeah we, its mostly like Jay said, just the height of the façade versus the houses on the opposite side of Center Street. That is kind of the heart of the downtown

historic residential district. And so we're just concerned about your building and looming over them with the difference in height and the width of the street."

Mary Ann Kirk: "Well, we just wondered, is there a way to step up, because I know that originally you talked about that down on State Street. If there was a way to even, for the first part of it to just go back a little bit and then step up, so at least you have a sense that it's a transitioning part of the building. I know you're trying to get density with what you are trying to pencil out. Just on the Center Street side, if there was just some way to just go in and go up a little bit so it just creates a feel of back a little bit. I just don't know if that's possible. That was what I was trying to explore, if there was the capability of doing that. I think it might work better. I mean, if you were, see you're just looking at this all by itself, but if you were to put those buildings right next to it, if this whole Board were to look at what it looks like right across the street. I mean, those are one story little tiny, this is actually the biggest structure in the entire downtown area, aside from the hospital, there is nothing like it. To me it's an odd place to start the maximum amount, although it goes much higher than that obviously. I know that's what you're trying to get and I agree with that. Our Boards always agreed with this whole context of what you're saying. We agree with that, it's just that application right on that Center Street frontage, we don't want, we're very concerned about it encroaching onto the historic district, where all the sudden everybody starts saying, okay we're just going to sell out and then pretty soon you don't have historic district, so I'm just trying to figure out a way to make it work and do what you need to do with the concept."

Mr. Soffe responded by saying that the ordinance is written such that the buildings are meant to be pushed toward the street. The "step up" that was suggested by Ms. Kirk becomes very inefficient for this type of structure due to the fact that it is ground floor parking with an elevator up to an interior hallway running through the center of the building. So, if the building were to be pushed back in a "step like" appearance, it would become very inefficient.

Mr. Jones wanted to know what type of commercial tenant would occupy this building. Mr. Soffe suggested that professional office is more likely to occupy the space than retail. Referring to a live-work type situation, where the tenant would not only occupy a space in the commercial area, but would also live in the residential portion.

Mr. Bollwinkel asked about the signage aspect of the project. Mr. Soffe reiterated that those issues aren't really addressed at this phase of the project. Mr. Wilkinson added that the Design Review Board could require as a condition of approval that details such as signage be provided to the Planning Commission for their review. Mr. Bollwinkel suggested adding that as part of the conditions of approval, some dimension to the exterior of the building to break up the façade as well as providing obvious visual entrances to the commercial spaces.

Mr. Tingey noted that once the Design Review Board submits their recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission, it will be a public hearing and most certainly there will be a lot of people there, with public comment. Mr. Soffe suggested that the Design Review Board set forth some conditions in their recommendations to the Planning Commission so that those issues can be addressed and not hinder or postpone the scheduled December 15th date of the Planning Commission hearing. Ms. Kirk asked if

Mr. Soffe would be able to provide a drawing showing the visual impact of the size difference to show some perspective.

Mr. Bollwinkel made a motion to send a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission based on the following recommendations and the conditions that have been recommended by Staff.

Recommendations of Approval by Staff:

1. The applicant shall submit elevations of all sides of the building for Planning Commission review and approval.
2. Entrances shall be covered or recessed in accordance with section 17.170.110.
3. Exterior lighting and parking lot lighting shall be shielded and not spill onto adjacent properties.
4. The applicant shall provide details on the screening of trash receptacles and any exterior mechanical equipment. Screening shall be of compatible materials with the main structure.
5. Provide street furnishings in compliance with the design guidelines.

Recommendations of Approval by the Design Review Committee:

1. Include a cross section with the adjoining neighborhood with what the visual impact might be.
2. Include options on the building façade.
3. Include detail on lights, signs and awnings.

Seconded by Mr. Hacker.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed 3-0, with 1 abstention (Jim Allred).

IV. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Mr. Wilkinson asked if the Board was willing to make a meeting change in 2012 from the last Tuesday of every month to the last Thursday of every month for the year 2012. The Board agreed to the change.

Mr. Wilkinson took the time to introduce Josh Beach, the new Assistant Planner for Murray City and Amy Goller, the new Administrative Assistant.

Meeting adjourned.