

Minutes of the Design Review Committee meeting held on June 14, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. in the Murray Public Services Building Conference Room, 4646 South 500 West, Murray, Utah.

Present: Jay Bollwinkel, Chair
C.J. Kulp, Vice Chair
Ray Black
Fredy Pimentel
Mo Myers
Jim McNulty, Development Services Manager
Jared Hall, Community Development Supervisor
Brent Barnett, Citizen
Kathleen Stanford, Citizen

Excused: None

Mr. Bollwinkel welcomed all to the meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bollwinkel asked for approval of minutes from January 11, 2018. Mr. Kulp made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Seconded by Mr. Kulp.

The minutes were approved unanimously (5-0).

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. MCCD ZONE, Section 17.170, Density, Height, Open Space & Parking Discussion – Project # 18-64 and M-U, Section 17.146.130, TOD, Section 17.168.140 and MCCD, Section 17.170.130, Lighting Standards Discussion – Project # 18-65

Jim McNulty stated that the proposed test amendment to Section 17.170 is intended to clean-up some of the MCCD zone. In addition, Sections 17.146.130, 17.168.140, and 17.170.130 include lighting standard modifications. Staff has been working with the Murray City Power Department to discuss lighting in the downtown, MCCD, M-U and TOD zone to propose similar lighting standards in all 3 zones. The proposed new and updated standards will help the City to improve walkability, community development, neighborhood development and compact urban development that would include pedestrian level lighting. The City is planning a Civic Center to be developed and the current standards in the MCCD zone don't allow for much flexibility when building a City Hall, Police Station or a Library.

Mr. McNulty stated that the existing standards state that municipal, public and quasi-public buildings may have a greater set back as determined through the design review process. The proposed changes would include additional language stating the additional setbacks shall require the development of a public plazas, parks or open spaces and comply with the design standards of Chapter 17.170. This proposed language would loosen the standards that currently requires buildings to be placed closer to the street. This will also create a plaza and public open space that is more interactive and relates better to the public. Mr.

Pimentel stated that open spaces should contain more open grassy areas and less impervious surfaces. Mr. McNulty agreed and stated open space could include a plaza or even wider varieties of landscaping. Mr. McNulty addressed parking standards and stated the parking standards currently state that off-street parking is not permitted in the front setback area or between the street and building. Parking must be located to the side or rear of the building. The proposed change of language would apply to parking associated with 3 types of buildings; municipal, public or quasi-public buildings. These types of buildings may have located between the street and the building provided that the parking services multiple uses or planned multiple uses and would connect into the other public spaces and walkways. This would enable parking in the front setback of a municipal building that is currently not allowed. Mr. Bollwinkel asked if is on-street parking. Mr. McNulty answered that is correct but it would allow both on-street and off-street parking. It would look similar to the City and County Building that is downtown and the new City Hall in Herriman that have parking all the way around them. Mr. Pimentel asked if there will be any accommodation for cars with low emissions or charging stations. Mr. McNulty answered that the allowance is not in the ordinance yet, but the city is considering it. The proposed Murray Fire Station plans to install charging stations and bicycle racks to obtain the Silver LEED certification.

Mr. McNulty addressed the density standards and stated; the proposed change in language would allow a maximum density for a project to not exceed 80 units per acre. Previously the City has been asked to allow high density buildings with upwards of 120 to 150 units per acre. This is a concern for many of the elected officials. Murray City is more comfortable with 65 to 80 units per acre in various areas of the City. Murray is a centrally city in the valley and we provide a good transition between downtown and suburban areas. The City Council can choose to lower the proposed 80 units if they wish, but the proposed text here originated from them during a retreat in March 2018.

Mr. McNulty addressed the height standards and stated; currently there is no height limit in the MCCD. The proposed change in language would state buildings may not exceed 10 stories in height, or 135 feet or whichever is less. Buildings that are 6 stories or greater must have a 3rd floor podium which address the pedestrian nature of the street. A pedestrian scale façade must be provided, the tower portion shall step back. The required podium step back is a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 20 feet. Location and extent of a podium shall be determined through the design review process. The Gerding Edlen Group conducted a study in 2009-2010 in Murray City. Staff has reviewed this work as part of our based our recommendation.

Mr. McNulty addressed the parking standards and stated; buildings that are more than 4 stories in height, at least 50% of the parking shall be located within the exterior walls of the building, or within a parking structure within 750 feet of the main building. The new City Hall is not starting with a parking structure, but we are planning for them. Mr. Kulp asked if there will be any exceptions in the ordinance for ADA parking. Mr. Hall answered that they are already included in our parking standards, the same rule would apply here. Mr. Kulp stated that 750 feet way is too far for ADA parking. Mr. McNulty indicated that we always require the ADA parking to be in front of the building or main accesses to the building.

Mr. McNulty addressed landscaping, open space, and plazas and stated; landscaping, open space and plaza standards in the MCCD do not have many requirements. The MU and TOD zones have requirements. The proposed language for the MCCD includes 15% of

the area of each project shall be developed as landscaped setbacks, public plazas, parks, open spaces or walkways. In addition, each project shall have a system of pedestrian walkways and sidewalks that will provide connections between building entrances, neighboring building entrances, sidewalks, parking areas, open spaces, and walkways. The City is trying to create walkable areas that are not only auto related and attract pedestrians.

Mr. Kulp asked what if an office building wanted to be develop in the M CCD and they wanted to have the same setback allowances that the public city buildings do, can we expand the requirements for them if they also want to install open spaces and connect walk ways. Mr. Hall answered that in the MU zone and M CCD there is a little bit of an allowance for an additional setback, but not as much as is allowed for the municipal buildings.

Mr. McNulty addressed the lighting standards and stated; lighting in the MU and TOD does not have many requirements and the City wishes to expand this section based on M CCD standards. The added language will state that lighting will be provided for pedestrian ways that is appropriately scaled to walking. Light standards shall not be taller than 16 feet. However, light standards adjacent to State Street or 4500 South which are major arterial roadways, as well as Vine Street, Main Street which are major collector roadways are allowed up to 23 feet in height. Currently, the City has a variety of lights, some street lights are located under powerlines and the City wishes to change that by removing and burying powerlines. Mr. Pimentel asked if the City plans to use any LED lighting. Mr. McNulty stated the City has some LED lighting in Murray Park, but the Power Department is not set on a complete change over yet. At this point there is nothing in the ordinance to require LED lights. Mr. Bollwinkel commented that everybody is switching to LED lights and encouraged the City to recommend LED lighting. Mr. McNulty stated that in order to make the complete change, the Power Department needs to build up a supply of replacement parts and that is quite costly.

Mr. McNulty addressed the banner standards and stated he would like to encourage banners in our downtown area. This would be useful to advertise special events and our show brand. The proposed language for banners would state that banners maybe attached to banner arms on light standards between 16 and 23 feet in height and a top banner arm is required with a bottom eyelit or eyebolt for the banner to be attached to the light standard. The bottom of the banner must be at least 8 feet above a walkway, surfaced area or ground level. This type of banner display is very common in many cities. Murray City banners will be required to have a slit in them to prevent tearing caused by the wind. Mr. Bollwinkel stated banners need to have somebody maintain them. Mr. McNulty commented that getting this approved has been difficult because the Power Department has seen good and bad with the banners. Mr. Bollwinkel stated the banners would be a great addition as long as somebody is committed to maintaining them. Mr. Black stated several other cities and universities have great banner programs and maybe we could copy one of them.

Mr. Bollwinkel requested revisions to the proposed parking language, and stated he is not comfortable with the parking in the front setback of the City buildings. He recommends that the material to be used should not be asphalt and wants an added requirement for upgraded concrete or pedestrian pavers. Mr. McNulty asked if stamped asphalt would be acceptable. Mr. Bollwinkel replied that the stamped asphalt in front of Capital Theatre is awful and discouraged using it. Mr. Hall added that the Wave project proposed using bulb

outs for it's on street parking and the area between the bulb outs was paved with permeable material. He asked if that would be acceptable. Mr. Bollwinkel answered yes, that is great. Mr. Pimentel stated we could require code to say permeable materials only. Mr. Bollwinkel stated he would rather it be made of pedestrian friendly material because it is in a pedestrian area. Mr. McNulty stated he will propose it to City Council because the proposed change would be up to them.

Mr. Bollwinkel suggested that when then the Banner proposal is put into ordinance that the City recommend a Banner Committee to oversee the upkeep and maintenance of them. Mr. McNulty replied that this proposal will be addressed with City Council, and they may want a Banner Committee. Mr. Bollwinkel stated that it is alright as long as somebody is responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Myers stated he has concerns about density at 80 units an acre and stated people who are jammed into a facility, one on top of the other, is not good for their welfare. Mr. Myers suggested that we require open space with this density level. Mr. McNulty stated currently there is no requirement for open space, but we are proposing 15% open space. Mr. Myers stated that 15% landscaping could be as little as a few parking islands, and wished it should be more open space for people to gather. Mr. McNulty replied that we also require amenities for the residents. Mr. Bollwinkel asked if we allow increased density shouldn't we require additional amenities. Mr. Meyers commented that he wants an open space requirement. Mr. Pimentel added that we should eliminate impermeable surfaces and encourage more grass. Mr. McNulty stated we are trying to soften the area with the 15% requirement. Mr. Hall added that the higher the density gets, the amenities that the City and others provide is increasingly important. The MCCD is only 97 acres and it is very important to control every aspect of the area because it's so small. People can live and be happy in high densities, but not without some type of amenity or place to gather. Mr. Myers asked if the overall plan is to limit the density until the area is built up with City amenities. Mr. McNulty answered yes, the idea is that we will look at these standards in years to come and possible make some changes, but right now we need to get some projects built to go through, test them out and see how it goes.

Mr. Pimentel asked if the 10-story height proposal is for all of the MCCD. Mr. McNulty answered yes. Mr. Pimentel stated he may not be comfortable with that, usually that is designated for certain areas because tall buildings pop up everywhere when it's allowed. Mr. Bollwinkel suggested 10 story buildings should be designated within ¼ mile of the TRAX station only. Mr. Hall stated that there are some height limitations east of State Street. Buildings 10 stories in height would be limited if they are within proximity to residential zones or east of State Street. Most of the MCCD is west of State Street. Mr. McNulty stated that is difficult to limit height restrictions based on specific cross streets. Mr. Hall added that this is a very small zone and it has very limited space for development as well. Additionally, if a developer decided to construct a building over 6 stories high the requirements get more difficult and expensive. That may keep the developments over 6 stories to a minimum. The Fire Department has also expressed they are very comfortable with allowing 10 stories.

Mr. Kulp stated that he was under the impression that the idea of the MCCD zone was to allow very high-density developments and asked where the proposed lower density originated. Mr. McNulty explained that the higher density is a concern to The Mayor and

Council. Per State Code, Murray City has to allow for low to moderate income housing and the requirements keep changing. Murray City will barely meet these requirements. We have to be careful about what we develop to stay in compliance.

Mr. Pimentel wondered what area most Murray City residents work in. Mr. McNulty answered generally speaking, we have a percentage that work in Murray City, but the biggest percentage work downtown. A lot of jobs are now in the south part of the valley as well, so they are traveling both directions for work. Mr. Pimentel asked what the average age group in Murray is. Mr. Hall answered that we skew slightly older and slightly higher income with slightly smaller household sizes than most of Salt Lake County.

Mr. Kulp stated he is slightly uncomfortable with allowing front setback parking for one City Hall building. Mr. McNulty replied that it is more than one building, it would be the Library, Fire Station and any other Civic type facilities. Mr. Kulp stated he is not worried about the Murray City buildings, instead other buildings that may be able to use these standards and it may not benefit Murray. Mr. Pimentel agreed with Mr. Kulp and wondered if rules for each type of municipal building would be better. Mr. McNulty replied that the proposed text makes allowances for municipal buildings, public buildings and quasi-public buildings and would not allow a private owner the same parking standard. Mr. McNulty reminded all that this is just a discussion. It has been contemplated whether or not to allow the Courts to be a part of the main City Hall building. At times the Court setting can bring a conflict to the building that we would not want to expose our residents to. If the Courts are separated we would like them to have the same parking standards. Mr. Meyers stated he still agrees with Mr. Kulp that we should not make an allowance for Municipal building to have front setback parking if we don't allow it for anybody else. Mr. McNulty replied that the Committee members are free to make recommendations about that and then the comments will be forwarded on to the Planning Commission and the City Council. Mr. Kulp stated he does not understand the need for front setback parking because it's difficult anyway. Mr. McNulty displayed the rough draft plans for the Murray City Hall and stated it has a parking concept which centers around the proposed open space area, public plaza and future parking structure. The proposed parking is not to be directly designated out on the street, instead it is proposed to be in the front setback and parked at an angle. Mr. Kulp stated that the proposed language used for the front setback parking did not plainly indicate it was in the front setback or allowed for parallel parking. He suggested that the wording be changed to indicate, no parking in the plaza and add requirements for angled parking. Mr. McNulty stated he would work on the wording. Mr. Hall stated that we intend to build parking structures in the future, but it is not an affordable option to build City Hall and the structures at the same time. The solution is to provide enough parking where we can get it until the parking structures are built. Mr. Pimentel suggested that we incentivize parking with the use of charging stations. Mr. McNulty stated that would be an additional text amendment to a different section of code, and it would have to be looked at separately.

Mr. Pimentel asked if there are any bike lanes. Mr. McNulty stated yes, we will have them and the City Engineer is working on that layout.

Mr. Bollwinkel made a motion to send a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission, subject to the recommendations discussed in the meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Black.

A Mr. Myers
A Mr. Black
A Mr. Kulp
A Mr. Pimentel
A Mr. Bullwinkle

Motion passed, 5-0.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hall mentioned we will have a meeting on June 28th with two upcoming agenda items.

Mr. Hall stated he needed to obtain a picture of each Board Member for the Boards & Commissions dinner in August.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.



Jared Hall,
Community & Economic Development Supervisor