

The Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 15, 2020, at 6:30 p.m. for a meeting held in accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. The Planning Commission Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers This meeting can be viewed online at www.murraycitylive.com. Public comments can be submitted via email at planningcommision@murray.utah.gov.

Present: Phil Markham, Chair
Travis Nay
Maren Patterson
Sue Wilson
Ned Hacker
Lisa Milkavich
Melinda Greenwood, Community and Economic Development Director
Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager
Zac Smallwood, Associate Planner
Briant Farnsworth, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

Excused: Scot Woodbury, Vice Chair

The Staff Review meeting was held from 6:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The Planning Commission members briefly reviewed the applications on the agenda. An audio recording is available at the Murray City Community and Economic Development Department Office.

Phil Markham opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He reviewed the public meeting rules and procedures and read the Planning Commission Meeting Opening Statement.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ned Hacker made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 17, 2020 and the October 1, 2020 Planning Commission meetings. Seconded by Lisa Milkavich. A voice vote was made, motion passed 6-0.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Sue Wilson made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for the Cazier ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) by Robert Cazier for a Conditional Use Permit at 388 East Hillside Drive. Seconded by Maren Patterson. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

IVORY DEVELOPMENT – 5448 and 5452 South 700 West - Project #20-108 and Project #20-109

Project #20-108 and #20-109 were presented together. Bryon Prince was present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a General Plan Amendment and

Zone Map Amendment for 5448 and 5452 South 700 West. Both parcels combined are approximately 2.74 acres, most of which is contained in one of the parcels. The property is currently located in Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) Zone and the request is to rezone it to R-M-15 (Multi-Family Low Density Residential), which is the same zoning as the condominiums located across the street from this property. Other zones in the area include R-1-8 (Single Family Residential) and C-N.

There are two parts to this application; the Zone Map and the Future Land Use Map that is part of the General Plan. The Future Land Use Map identifies and designates different parcels with different future land use categories. This particular property has been identified for Residential Business which supports different types of businesses. The only zone that Residential Business supports is R-N-B (Residential Neighborhood Business). If the property is going to be rezoned to R-M-15 the property needs to be re-designated on the Future Land Use Map to Medium Density Residential.

Neighborhood Commercial allows for single-family dwellings attached to nonresidential uses, utilities, hardware, variety stores, apparel, furniture, drug stores, medical cannabis, bookstores, sporting goods, restaurants, banks, real estate and insurance offices, dry cleaners, beauty salons, massage therapy, business offices, locksmiths, charter schools, and pet grooming. There are also some Conditional uses allowed in the C-N Zone that include convenience stores and gas stations, check cashing, assisted living facilities, commercial child-care centers, libraries, repair services, commercial printing, discount stores, shopping centers less than 10-acres, and veterinarian services. Several different companies have looked at this property trying to find a way to put a gas station on this property, however, none of them have been able to make that work.

The R-M-15 Zone allows for single-family detached dwellings on 8,000 square foot lots, two-family dwellings on 10,000 square foot lots, utilities, charter schools, and residential childcare. Uses allowed with a Conditional Use Permit in the R-M-15 Zone include attached single-family dwellings such as townhomes, multi-family dwellings (12 units per acre), bed and breakfasts, retirement homes, cemeteries, radio and television transmitting stations, schools, parks, and churches.

The main reason staff is supporting this change is because it allows the property to be developed to its highest and best use within the limits of the accessibility of the property. There is a lot of traffic on 700 West. As a result of that, the intersection at 5400 South and 700 West is very busy. A number of years ago, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) redesigned that intersection. It's designed to get people from the large residential area out onto 5400 South. In redesigning the intersection, UDOT put a high curb median, running southbound, that runs almost the full length of the property on the eastside of 700 West. As it stands now, access to this property is right-in, right-out only and that has been a problem for commercial development. A residential development will survive right-in, right-out only as a limitation, but a commercial development will not. UDOT will not change the intersection or grant an access from 5400 South to this property.

Mr. Hall said there is no specific project in mind for this property that could be considered at this meeting. An application would come later if the property is rezoned by the City Council after the Planning Commission makes a recommendation. There are residents in the area that are concerned because they don't know what is coming. He added that Ivory Development is interested in putting in townhomes, so that would likely be the project that goes on this property.

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to

the City Council for the requested amendment to the General Plan Future Land Use Map to re-designate the property and for the Zoning Map amendment to rezone from C-N to R-M-15.

Mr. Nay asked if it would be possible to make a left hand turn from the very south end of this property. Mr. Hall said it is possible but difficult. The shopping center across the street on 700 West allows left hand turns onto 700 West. This makes it tricky to add a left hand turn to this property. Mr. Markham added that the left hand turn out of the shopping center is a protected merge lane that works itself onto southbound 700 West. He doesn't see a way to introduce competing traffic going the opposite direction.

Mr. Hall said subdivisions in Murray City are only allowed on a public right-of-way. In order to create single-family lots on this property, a public road would need to run from 700 West down into the property. UDOT has precluded that public right-of-way from being put in because it would be too close to the intersection at 5400 South and 700 West. A townhome development would get approved by UDOT because it only requires an access road and it would not be a public right-of-way.

Mr. Markham said the only way something else could be proposed there would be if one or two of the property owners to the south were willing to sell their property to a developer. Mr. Hall replied there has been some attempt to do that, but it hasn't gone well. Mr. Markham asked how many units are allowed with a single access on a piece of property. Mr. Hall replied engineering standards would allow 30 single-family home lots or 100 multi-family units. The density allowed in the R-M-15 Zone is 12 units per acre. This property is 2.74 acres so the overall density that would be allowed is 30 units. Once the developer configures the property it will probably end up having less than 30 units.

Mr. Nay said the City's setback standards are 25 feet. He asked if that was something that could be considered along 5400 South. Mr. Hall said this project may end up being a PUD (Planned Unit Development) project which will allow staff to vary the setback and give greater buffering to the units to the south and push the project towards 5400 South.

Mr. Hacker asked what the closest distance to the corner of 5400 South and 700 West that a property access could be put in. Mr. Hall replied UDOT doesn't want to allow any property access closer than 300 feet to an intersection. This property is only 270 feet long so the access will be as far to the south of the property as possible.

The meeting was open for public comment. The following comments were read.

Dean and Diane Bentley – 740 West Quaking Aspen Drive, Murray, Utah

With regards to the application to amend the zoning designation of the property addressed as 5448 South 700 West in Murray from Neighborhood Commercial to R-M-15 Medium Density Multi Family Residential, we are pleased a change would be made from Neighborhood Commercial but very concerned about the ramifications of changing the zoning to Medium Density Multi Family Residential.

Our primary concern is the diminished or total loss of privacy which very likely will occur due to a planned development of that nature on the property. Secondary to that would be light pollution and the lack of proper property maintenance that might result with medium density multi-family units, as well as traffic concerns with improper or insufficient access to the development.

Medium Density Multi-Family Residential allows for two-story townhomes, row houses, or duplexes. With any of these adjacent to our property we would experience a diminished if not total loss of privacy. We have our doubts that should such a housing plan be submitted that we would have any voice with regards to the placement of the structures. Though such structures would maximize profit for the developer it would surely decrease the value of our homes. Thus, we would advocate for a change to low density residential instead. It would be in keeping with the almost 100% of the dwellings for several blocks to the south of 5400 South. Low density residential also provides safe, walking friendly neighborhoods that invite play and social interaction which is the glue that binds communities.

What's even more concerning are the permitted conditional use structures in this zoning designation which include among others, bed and breakfast inns, retirement homes, independent living or congregate care (all of which are usually up to three stories, and low-rise multiple family dwellings which could be up to three stories or the allowed 40 feet high. From Salt Lake County Assessor records it appears that the majority of the planning commission members, if not all, live in low density residential developments. We believe that you would express equal dismay if such structures would be allowed to go up adjacent to your homes.

While row-houses and townhomes and duplexes create more affordable options for home buyers, these by nature are more often than not stepping-stones into single family dwellings. The average length in number of years of ownership for such dwellings is far less than for single family homes thus resulting in greater turnover, less concern and care for the maintenance of properties, and an overall less stable and less safe living environment, all of which affect the quality of life in our area and the value of our homes.

Again, we feel that low density residential is far more in keeping with the present make-up of the area and that a different designation would have a tremendously adverse effect upon the value of our homes and neighborhood.

E. Marcus and Rochelle White – 776 West Quaking Aspen Drive, Murray, Utah

Thank you for the opportunity to give input to the request for rezoning on the property that borders our homes and neighborhood. Also, thank you to those who have taken their time to answer questions and assist us in our part of the process.

The future of this property has always been of interest to the neighborhood and also a concern for many years. It was inevitable that at some time it would be developed and the wonderful quiet farm bordering our homes would be no more. It is not our intention to say, "not in our neighborhood", but it is imperative that we, whom will be most impacted, have an opportunity for dialogue and respectfully considered in the decision process.

With limited knowledge of what Ivory Development's plans for this property look like, it is extremely difficult to know how to address several of our concerns. We understand your hands may be tied concerning disclosure and also because plans may not have been fully presented. Unfortunately, this pretty much leaves us "blindfolded" while trying to see or determine what the future looks like. This is quite frustrating. So, with this limited knowledge, following are a few of the concerns and issues we hope will be considered by Murray City and Ivory Development:

Privacy: Ultimately, privacy is of utmost importance. We respectfully request a plan for generous setbacks from our property lines that are non-intrusive and consistent with the longstanding personal privacy we currently enjoy with our neighbors.

Consideration of the impact on our property values: We have invested much of our hard-earned money, sweat and time into our properties. It is a legitimate and serious concern that this very important personal asset be preserved and protected.

Height and Density: Again, privacy and property valuation impact should be considered.

Pollution: Light and noise pollution from increased traffic and building structures.

Aesthetics: A development that reflects the care and character of our outstanding neighborhood. A development with quality finishes, green space, fencing, etc.

Owner Occupied Residences: This consideration is very important to maintain the integrity of our neighborhood. We would hope to see owner occupied residences with an 80% owner occupancy stipulation for the development.

Traffic Flow and Access: It is no secret that access is a serious issue for this property. Our concern is the number of cars forced to make a right onto 700 West. The current design of the road is optimal. It has alleviated accidents and optimized traffic flow. It would be a travesty to alter the current design. Anyone exiting the property that will need to go west on 5400 South, east on 5400 South, north on 700 West or wanting to enter the property while traveling north on 700 West, will be seriously impacted. The concern is that these cars will then use our neighborhood as a U-turn or turn-around access. This is a scary thought.

Again, thank you for your time, concern and consideration. We love Murray. Our family has been a part of the fabric of Murray for four generations. We have a vested interest in seeing that the unique and outstanding character of our wonderful city continue well into the future. We look forward to respectful dialogue and cooperation as we move forward to a positive outcome for our neighborhood, those residents who will moving close to us and for Murray City.

Regina Napolitano – 746 West Quaking Aspen Drive, Murray, Utah

I have brief questions:

1. There appears to be about a six-foot space between the north property lines of the homes bordering the lot and the south property line of the proposed lot. What is proposed for that space?
2. Has Ivory Development provided plans for what they intend to build on this site if the zoning change is approved? If not, would a different zoning change--say to low-density/single-family—be acceptable?
3. What is the proposed timeline for construction, from start to finish (e.g., begin December 2020 and end June 2021)?

Rex Morrey – 584 West 5465 South, Murray, Utah

My name is Rex Morrey and I live at 684 West 5465 South, just around the corner from this property. I am opposed to any change to this property that will increase traffic in the area. Currently, because of the traffic island on 700 West I have 15-20 cars u-turning in my driveway every day in spite of signage requesting they not turn there. This has caused damage to my concrete.

Because of the island, people living in apartments on that property will naturally need to turn down our street to access routes in any direction except straight south. Our street already has increased traffic from individuals trying to avoid the light at the intersection, many speed along our street, endangering children, pets, and adults walking in the neighborhood.

There also is an inordinate number of traffic accidents at the corner of 5300 South and 700 West. It seems that emergency crews are there every few days cleaning up an accident. Any increase in traffic in this area will only exacerbate the problems in this area.

Seth and Gerilyn Merrill – 5451 South Quaking Aspen Drive, Murray, Utah

I believe that changing the zoning to residential is a good idea. However, doing so without a firm plan for what will be built on the lot under discussion is a poor idea. It gives existing residents no way to provide feedback on a detailed plan, so that any plan can incorporate such feedback to create solutions that will promote harmony between the developer and existing residents.

In the absence of a specific plan, here is a list of major concerns I have as an existing resident whose property borders the lot under discussion. These principles apply whether the lot is zoned commercial or residential:

1. Privacy – Development of the lot under discussion will negatively affect privacy for existing residents. Affected residents have enjoyed privacy in their backyards for many years—some for more than two decades. Please require that any structures built on the lot are single story with basements, not two-story. Existing residents have fences along the back of their property, but if two-story structures are built the privacy benefit of the fence will be nullified, with new inhabitants gazing down into the yards, bedrooms, and living spaces of the existing houses.
2. Light and Noise Pollution – Please prevent bright, directed, or elevated lights from shining into the back of existing residents' houses. It is psychologically disconcerting to have a spotlight shine into the back of your house. Please place any new road construction on the 5400 South side of the lot rather than along the existing resident fence line, so existing residents are not sandwiched with traffic running immediately and proximately on both sides of their lots.
3. Traffic – 700 West is already a very difficult intersection, especially at peak traffic hours. For ingress, if the concrete median is removed so that new inhabitants can access the lot from 700 West northbound, it will hold up traffic during the day. For egress, if the concrete median is not removed, then new inhabitants of the lot under discussion will have no way to go north on 700 West without first going south—where will they turn around? If they are going to the freeway one possibility is that they will make a left turn onto 5465 South and then another left onto Allendale. But what if they are trying to go north on 700 West or west on 5400 South? A probable but very negative possibility is that they will head south and take the first right (west) onto Aspen Heights and then make a U-turn either:
 - a. at the first intersection in front of 5481 Quaking Aspen Drive
 - b. in front of the wide elbow in front of 5451 Quaking Aspen Drive and 740 Quaking Aspen Drive (cars already use it for this purpose infrequently)

- c. by completing a larger circle from Aspen Heights to Chaparral to Quaking Aspen Drive

None of those are desirable for existing residents.

If development of the lot under discussion is not handled carefully, it will lower the quality of life for existing residents, promote contention between residents, developer, owner, and city employees at future hearings, and depress property values.

I support the rezoning to residential—but a suggestion that may address the above concerns better than the existing proposal: rezone instead to R-1-8 (low density residential). That will simply extend the characteristics of the existing neighborhood—single family residences, long tenure per family—into the newly developed area.

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Prince said he understands that the project would be limited in height to a height that is comparable to other residential structures next to the property. The setbacks will prohibit the residential structures from being close to the residential property line. Ivory Development will work with staff on a subdivision design that will address the traffic and intersection concerns.

Mr. Hall said the six-foot space that is currently on the property will be developed. There is a lot more to do for this project and the public will be involved with those processes also.

Ms. Milkavich asked if there was a way to put a public road through the property so it could have single-family houses on it. Mr. Hall replied the minimum standard for a public road is 49 feet. UDOT will not give the City permission to put a public right-of-way on the property. However, UDOT has to allow a private access road to serve private condominiums or townhomes.

A motion was made by Ned Hacker to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the requested amendment to the General Plan Future Land Use Map, re-designating the property located at 5448 and 5452 South 700 West from Residential Business to Medium Density Residential.

Seconded by Lisa Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Maren Patterson
 A Phil Markham

Motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Markham stated this is a recommendation to the City Council. There will be another opportunity for people to address this in a public City Council meeting at a future date.

A motion was made by Maren Patterson to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the requested amendment to the Zoning Map designation of the property located at 5448 and 5452 South 700 West from C-N, Commercial Neighborhood to R-M-15, Multi-Family Medium Density Residential.

Seconded by Lisa Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Maren Patterson
 A Phil Markham

Motion passed 6-0.

MCCD DESIGN GUIDELINES – MCCD Zone – Project #20-105

Zach Smallwood said this is a recommendation to the City Council regarding the repeal and replacement of the Murray City Center District (MCCD) Design Guidelines. The MCCD is approximately 100 acres located in central Murray. The Design Guidelines are best practices, used as a document to help review potential projects and provide direction to the Design Review Committee, the Planning Commission, staff and developers. The Design Guidelines are not requirements or a list of boxes to be checked off.

In 2019 the City's zoning ordinance was rewritten. As part of that update, the language referring to the Design Guidelines was changed to provide greater clarity. With that change, updated guidelines needed to be developed. Staff looked at the 2017 General Plan and the 2015 community survey to create the Five Shared Values where are: Authentic, Active, Inclusive, Multi-Modal, and Connected. Mr. Smallwood defined each value.

- Authentic – a real place. Somewhere where the citizens of Murray will gravitate towards and meet as a community.
- Active – a physically active place where people are physically meeting and gathering; a socially active place where people meet up to enjoy a meal or see a show; a mentally active place that creates interesting open spaces and architecture with innovative places that generate a lot of activity.
- Inclusive – a welcoming community.
- Multi-Modal – having additional ways to get to places.
- Connected – citizens value the ability to get to and from places that they enjoy with relative ease.

In addition, staff looked at other city's best practices in downtown development and came up with 18 design guidelines, which is a change from the 43 that were in the old guidelines. They are categorized into four broad areas: District Wide, Public Spaces and Streetscape, Development Site, and Architectural.

The District Wide guidelines include walkability, activity, and sustainability. Sustainability encourages the use of solar and energy to shade areas and generate power.

The Public Spaces and Streetscape guidelines include public spaces and streetscape. Streetscape is one of the most important aspects of any built environment. These are best practices in creating interesting and safe public spaces and a public realm that prioritized the pedestrian. Street trees provide physical barriers while also providing cover for pedestrians.

The Development Site guidelines include circulation, open space, active buildings, parking, neighbor awareness and meaningful light. Open space should not exclude the public and new developments should have a park and open space access. The development of large parking areas should be encouraged so they can be shared between multiple users. This will allow smaller parking areas immediate adjacent to specific uses.

The Architectural guidelines include design for potential, connection to the ground, connection to the sky, fenestration and porosity, express a clear, organizing idea, private space and materiality. Design for potential allows for converting the existing ground floor, or potential second and third story, uses. Fenestration refers to the windows and being able to see in and outside of a building. It provides a level of comfort to pedestrians and provides safety. Porosity refers to openings such as outdoor dining or a shortcut through a development or large block.

Staff is asking the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council to repeal and replace the MCCD Design Guidelines.

Mr. Hacker said he has been on the MCCD Design Review Committee and has seen the current guidelines help developers develop in the MCCD. Mr. Hacker stated that much has been taken away from the current guidelines that was a benefit to developers in the past. Mr. Smallwood asked if there were things Mr. Hacker would like to be put back in the guidelines. Mr. Hacker said the current guidelines start off with a process that helps the developers understand how to go through a process to get a new development or building. They talk about LEED Guidelines and historic fabric. Mr. Hacker feels the current guidelines really help those trying to do what the City has wanted in the MCCD to do it right. He feels that the propose guidelines don't go that far which is not as beneficial to developers.

Mr. Nay said he agrees with the current guidelines. He liked them and thought they gave very clear direction to what the City wants in the MCCD. However, the Salt Lake Valley just went through one of the biggest periods of economic growth and development, and there was very minimal interest from anyone in being able to move forward with a project in the MCCD. The current guidelines give such granular detail that developers aren't able to meet all of the requests in them. There is a new fire station and a new City Hall that follow the current recommendations. There is a proposed office building that may or may not come and we lost a Utah State building on this property. The current guidelines haven't brought anything forward, other than historic preservation. The MCCD is in the dead center of a massive metropolitan area. Historic preservation is great, but you can only preserve what's worth being preserved and no one is stepping up to preserve anything in this area. He feels like the current guidelines were a great attempt, but they just don't work.

Ms. Milkavich said she agrees with both Mr. Hacker and Mr. Nay. She likes the clarity and direction of the current guidelines, but she understands how they are somewhat confusing because it sounds like there are suggestions and standards within one document. She likes how

the proposed guidelines are written. She suggested using the format of the proposed guidelines and within that format address the desire to maintain some historical relevance with guidelines and not strict standards.

Mr. Markham said he is disappointed with the lack of progress and movement on the downtown project. However, guidelines, recommendations, and wishes place a lot of pressure on staff to see that the grand vision of what they want to have happen, actually happens. If a developer comes in who is politically well connected, has money and wants to push something through, the guidelines and vision get shoved to the side.

Mr. Smallwood said there has been a lot of disconnect between what these guidelines are truly supposed to be and what the zoning ordinance mandates. The zoning ordinance mandates certain things that shall happen; however, the guidelines help to guide the aesthetics and the feeling of the downtown. Mr. Markham said there is a place for regulation and there is a place for guidelines. He hopes the guidelines can be followed as they are envisioned.

Mr. Hacker said he also would like to see some additional development in the MCCD. He asked if it was the current guidelines that were preventing the development or if it was the stricter ordinance. He sees very little in the guidelines that tell developers what they need to do. They talk about things to try, think about and look at. Ms. Milkavich said that is why the guidelines are a good place to state the City's interest in maintaining some historical relevance. She asked if the ordinances dictate some of the historical things the City needs. Mr. Hall replied that the ordinance kind of has that, but not really. One of the biggest changes in the MCCD ordinance that was made last year involved historic preservation. The list of properties that were protected and considered significant buildings was kept, but the ability to have someone remove their building from that list was written into the ordinance. There could be references to historic preservation in the guidelines and there are references to historic preservation and the historic fabric in the ordinance, but the emphasis to keep those buildings was rewritten as a small incentive to keep them instead of a prohibition against removing them.

Mr. Hall explained that when the zoning code was rewritten, the elected officials directed his staff and the Design Review Committee to modify the design guidelines as well. The design guidelines section in the new MCCD ordinance says, *"The Murray City Council has adopted the Murray City Center District Design Guidelines. The guidelines shall be consulted during the review of proposed development in order to provide guidance, direction, and options which will further the stated purposes of the MCCD. Wherever practical, development should adhere to the objectives and principles in the design guidelines."* This does put the burden on staff to keep pushing people in the right direction as they are making applications and these guidelines are not full of demands. However, they allow staff to review proposals and be able to state how the proposal has addressed the guidelines. Based on the City's ordinance, these have to remain guidelines. They cannot put anything in them that is a standard or requirement.

Ms. Patterson said she has strong feelings about redeveloping the MCCD. She thinks the current guidelines restrict development, but they have a clear vision of what the MCCD is supposed to be. She is concerned that the new guidelines put the City at the will of the developer.

The meeting was open for public comment. The following comments were read.

Matt Parks and Rosalba Dominguez – Murray City, Utah

We live on the east side of Center Street, which is part of the Murray City Central District (MCCD).

After reviewing the minutes from the MCCD Board and the new proposed guidelines I have a few concerns.

- The guidelines state that it received Community input. I would like to know how and when this community input was collected? Why has our neighborhood or community, including other community businesses or organizations, not been able to leave input in these new proposed guidelines? Where is the community buy in?
- How can we state in the new guidelines that the City is invested in diversity when the Mayor is fighting against founding a Diversity Inclusion Board? This could include giving insights into the makeup of business in order to diversify within our city limits. My inability to ascertain where and when stakeholder input was gathered is problematic, as it indicates a lack of inclusion in your data collection practices.
- Who wrote the new guidelines -was a firm consulted? Was a survey sent out to the City and the surrounding neighborhood or to those who live and do business within MCCD? As far as I know, I have not received one.
- There is a vast difference in how the new MCCD guidelines have been written and is not a true representation of how educated we are as a city or community. The new guideline appears vague at best. Vague guidelines benefit those with money and influence and disproportionately hurt preservation practices and marginalized communities
- The MCCD community has had its battles when it comes to the historical makeup or vision for the city. Does the Historical Board know that the list of historical homes will be removed from the MCCD guidelines? How is this information being communicated to all parties?

There are many things we would like to see and change within MCCD, but I believe we as a city and community should have the opportunity to have a voice in what happens within MCCD. Murray strives to be community oriented and involved in community feedback but up until this point all I have received a postcard to notify us of this public hearing.

Ms. Dominguez sent a follow-up email:

I want to clarify that the City Council has not asked for these changes, well at least the current body.

Brent Barnett – Murray City, Utah

I have been looking at the design guidelines booklet. It is really interesting and is full of good principles. Especially the values at the first. Starting with authentic, active, and inclusive. Those are really, really good.

The sad thing from a business / economic point of view is that we haven't thought hard about the economic vitality of the downtown. As most people recognize, if we had started better we would get a better result. I am a business consultant. And it is business and economics that drive the downtown success.

All the experts I have talked to say that downtown Murray is a fantastic place to create an intensive commercial district with shops and restaurants. But they have serious reservations about the City Hall. The City Hall is a nice design. The design is not the problem. The problem is that city halls

do not drive economic activity. Nobody comes downtown on evenings and weekends to hang-out at the City Hall. So, it is dead space. It is a squandered scarce resource. That space could produce so much activity because we have only a few compact blocks. We need more space and the City Hall -- as nice as it is -- has been put in a spot that will harm the downtown success.

Anyone who thinks about economic vitality can see that by taking such a huge chunk of our limited space in the downtown for the City Hall we severely limit the economic potential and our ultimate energy of the downtown. A downtown needs what might be called critical mass to create a vibrant district. Our Fashion Place mall is a good example. If you divide it by half or down to one fourth it doesn't have the critical mass. That should still be our concern.

We also need a good design firm that can create a real plaza right integrated with the shops. There is so much potential. Someone who has done plazas before. The guy that Millcreek has is particularly good. We need that input from people who have experience in the actual design of an active plaza.

Secondly we need a firm who knows how to bring in a lot of interesting shops and restaurants. Millcreek has some great people who are helping them put together their downtown. And I like Holladay's community director, Paul Allred as well. Paul would be delighted to give us an outsider's perspective if take advantage of it.

Thanks to our planners for all the great work on the booklet. Thanks to you the planning commission for all the great work you do.

Janice Strobell – Murray City, Utah

Thanks to the city staff for their work on improving the M CCD design guidelines to compliment the changes made to the downtown ordinance last year.

Tonight, I ask that the Planning Commission deny approval of the proposed M CCD Design Guidelines because:

- The proposed guidelines are far too broad for new development and miss providing guidelines for the bulk of the M CCD - existing structures.
- More review and input is needed to provide a better document incorporating guidelines for improvement to existing buildings along with new development.

The proposed guidelines do not provide a clear vision for all of downtown and thus the design guidelines are incomplete. "Where there is no vision, there is no hope" (George Washington Carver).

Planning Commission, your service is valuable for the future of our city. Thank you for your thorough evaluation of these downtown design guidelines and I ask that the proposed guidelines be returned to the staff with the recommendation to develop a more comprehensive design guideline and vision for all of downtown.

David Amott – Preservation Utah

It is delightful to read the newspapers of yesteryear and see Murray through new (old?) eyes. For over a century, thousands of articles in the Murray Eagle and other local publications document the hallmarks of a strong and thriving town (e.g. Murray's once-strong local identity, unique culture

and traditions, arresting landmarks / built environment, etc.). Sadly, over the latter half of the twentieth century, urban sprawl subsumed much of Murray and gradually remade swaths of the City into another Salt Lake Valley suburb. Up until the present, however, Murray still had a traditional downtown which distinguished the City from every community around it.

It has been sad to watch Murray's leadership flail around over the past few years in their efforts to pin down a community identity and corresponding development vision. Leadership in Brigham City, Helper, Price, Provo, or other Utah cities have worked together to polish their communities' built environments and promote their multi-layered physical, cultural, historic, and social identities. Murray's leadership, in contrast, has chosen to view their own civic architectural history as a barrier to progress rather than what it so easily could become – a stepping stone towards present and future success. So many of Murray's proposed design guidelines which aim to create "a truly authentic downtown" will merely make Murray look even more like the other cities in the southern end of the Salt Lake Valley.

I urge you to reject these proposed downtown design guidelines before you tonight. If you choose to approve them, we wish Murray good luck as this luck will sorely be needed.

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Markham asked if the public comments would be passed on to the City Council. Mr. Hall replied they would be. Mr. Markham said the comments have more bearing on the direction of the City Council. The city staff are simply responding to the directive of the City Council.

Ms. Milkavich said she thought it would be nice to have a map of the MCCD District in the new guidelines to use as a visual reference. She noticed that processes had been removed from the new guidelines. Mr. Smallwood said the processes are located within the City Code.

Mr. Hall said staff is not in a huge hurry to get this done. They would be happy to take more time and add things to the guidelines, but they need some more direction. He suggested that staff could take the new guidelines and compare them to the requirements in the code. The Planning Commission members thought that would be helpful.

Mr. Markham asked Mr. Hall to talk about the public participation that took place in designing the new guidelines. Mr. Hall replied they did not retain a consultant or conduct a survey. They used survey material from 2015 and 2016 when they did the General Plan. They also used references from older plans and other plans that had been done and these same themes keep coming up. The shared values directly reflect the five key initiatives that were adopted in 2017 in the General Plan. Given the scope of what the guidelines need to do and the fact that staff had rewritten the ordinance the guidelines were going to be based on, Mr. Hall didn't feel that they needed the help of a consultant because staff had the skill set that was needed to get this done. He added that the Design Review Committee had also been involved with this process.

Ms. Greenwood said the citizens who are on the MCCD Design Review Committee all reside in Murray and have a variety of expertise. Tonight's meeting is also part of the public process. They are here tonight seeking the public's input.

Ms. Patterson said she likes and agrees with a lot of the things that are in the new guidelines and that all the members of the Planning Commission want the redevelopment of downtown.

A motion was made by Sue Wilson to continue the MCCD Design Guidelines revision to the November 19, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Seconded by Lisa Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Smallwood.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Maren Patterson
 A Phil Markham

Motion passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Wilson said the R C Willey store is closing in January. She asked if that property is going to be for sale. Mr. Hall replied that is what he has heard. Ms. Wilson asked if the Shopko property was going to be redeveloped. Mr. Hall said yes, but there is nothing concrete for either property.

Ms. Milkavich asked if anything new is going on with the K-Mart site. Ms. Greenwood said the Memorandum of Understanding has been fully executed and recorded against the property. The developer is working on getting a demolition permit.

Ms. Greenwood said the committee that is working on the RFP for the property at 4800 South State Street have selected a firm. That firm will present their concept to the RDA Board at the November 17, 2020 RDA meeting. Hopefully at that time, the City will be able to enter into an exclusive negotiation agreement with them. That gives both parties time to completely develop the concepts for the site. The expectation is that within the next year, some projects will be coming through the MCCD and then to the Planning Commission using the new guidelines.

A building permit for the New City Hall was issued and we have closed on the bonds for the City Hall property. The cell phone tower relocation agreement has been signed and executed. The permit for the cell phone tower is also ready to be issued. Some good progress is being made in the downtown area.

Lisa Milkavich made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Sue Wilson.

A voice vote was made, motion passed 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.


Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager