



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL MIXED-USE WORKSHOP

Minutes

Tuesday, June 29, 2021

Murray City Center

5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah 84107

Council Members in Attendance:

Diane Turner – Chair	District #4
Brett Hales – Vice Chair	District #5
Kat Martinez	District #1
Dale Cox	District #2
Rosalba Dominguez	District #3

Others in Attendance:

Blair Camp	Mayor	Jennifer Kennedy	City Council Director
Jennifer Heaps	Chief Communications Officer	Pattie Johnson	City Council Office Admin
G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney	Danny Astill	Public Works Director
Briant Farnsworth	Deputy Attorney	Joey Mittelman	Assistant Fire Chief
Zach Smallwood	CED Associate Planner	Melinda Greenwood	CED Director
Jared Hall	CED – Division Supervisor	Corey Brand	Galleria Director/Owner
Chris Johnson	TNW	Gary Holland	Pointe at 53 rd /Owner
Christine Richman	GSBS Architects	Murray Residents	

Ms. Turner called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Introduction and Overview – Mayor Camp recapped about meetings held with Council Members six months ago to inquire about having their support of a TLUR (Temporary Land Use Regulation) moratorium, which was approved February 2, 2021. He reviewed the main reason for implementing the TLUR was to provide another option for properties in the City that were not conducive to high-density M-U (Mixed-Use) developments. He noted that the Council supported the moratorium because there were no other M-U choices at that time. He reported Ms. Greenwood and City staff worked hard to develop a new proposal, which was what they believed was a good solution for M-U developments. While devising the new M-U proposal other issues were resolved as well related to zoning ordinances.

Discussion on M-U (Mixed-Use) Ordinances – Ms. Greenwood reported concepts to M-U Ordinances were updated. She explained the proposal was to amend three existing M-U zones

and create two new M-U zones. Draft ordinances with the proposed text amendments would come from months of research, revisions, and code writing by staff. She noted the moratorium would expire on August 1, 2021 so her hope was to meet that deadline by moving forward with the revised proposal quickly, assuming there would be no major issues from the Council. After the workshop, staff would work to finalize a proposed ordinance and incorporate suggestions attained by the Council.

Ms. Turner asked how additional changes would be applied to new concepts moving forward. Ms. Greenwood thought staff had consolidated legitimate past concerns from the public and the Council, which came about when three proposed zone changes were questioned months ago; she felt all related issues like commercial space, buffers, diverse housing options, and density were well crafted into the updated proposal. However, if the Council had changes, they could be discussed during the public hearing.

Mr. Hall presented a power point to review new concepts and discuss the amendments. (Attachment #1) He provided reasons why M-U projects should be an option for Murray, where they should be located and how they could be implemented. A map was displayed depicting existing M-U zones located in the MCCD (Murray City Center District), TOD (Transit Oriented Development), and the M-U (Mixed-Use) categories. A detailed review of each category occurred. He noted that existing M-U zones are located near transit stations where the main goal is to revitalize these areas. A Future Land Use map from the GP (General Plan) was shared to explain that patterns of development are used as a guide to determine where future M-U projects will work best, particularly at proposed Node locations. Nodes are future concept development areas around and near regional centers, retail spots, neighborhoods, transportation, and bus station areas.

Ms. Greenwood said developers are often denied because the map does not always support proposed projects. Mr. Hall confirmed it was used as a guidepost to determine if projects would be presented to the planning commission for a rezone, which is what led them to create the following two new M-U zones:

- VMU (Village Mixed-Use) – Lower density located in localized shopping areas, further away from transit areas, and closer to Neighborhood Nodes.
- CMU (Centers Mixed-Use) – Medium to high density located at regional centers, TOD Nodes, and bus rapid transit/station areas.

The VMU and CMU zones are intended to provide residential housing to otherwise commercial area properties. New mixed-use development and redevelopment of properties in VMU and CMU zones would first require a zone change on subject properties. All mixed-use development in these zones would require a Master Site Plan review and approval by the Murray Planning Commission.

Ms. Greenwood described the VMU as more compact than the CMU, which would be a larger area. Mr. Hall reiterated both proposed uses would be implemented where commercial businesses already exist, but residential housing would be added to enhance commercial areas to help keep businesses vibrant. He said the residential component would be kept at a scale that does not have significant impact.

Mr. Cox clarified that scale meant density. Mr. Hall agreed scale refers to density, parking, and intensity overall with a good density/commercial ratio. Ms. Greenwood noted a zone change and GP amendment would be necessary for determining whether to apply a VMU or a CMU to specific areas. The zones would be used to guide conversations with developer proposals. Mr. Hall said the VMU and CMU would be most appropriate in transit corridor areas that are already developing as mixed use, like the MCCD, TOD, and

the M-U categories. So it was determined that three acres sites are most appropriate for rezones. Ms. Greenwood agreed and referred to the Node map; she said it was not their intention to change existing neighborhoods but to enhance existing commercial areas.

Ms. Dominguez commented that staff should also keep in mind that older neighborhoods do exist and should also be enhanced along with new commercial/residential projects. Because older neighborhoods have aging infrastructure, she felt it was important to enhance what the City already has in order for old and new concepts to co-exist.

Mr. Hall reviewed eight development standards for the VMU and the CMU. At least five of the eight goals must be met before future developments are considered. Ms. Greenwood confirmed any type of application would undergo scrutiny from the proposed set goals. She explained goal requirements were created from concerns about adequate buffers, connections to surrounding neighborhoods and from past dialogues about providing other housing type options.

Mr. Hall spoke about the development process for both proposed and existing zones and discussed the differences between those processes. He clarified that the proposed VMU and CMU zones would exist outside the core of the City, so a size restriction of three acres or more was established.

Ms. Dominguez affirmed the Council would need to approve zone changes from what they are now in order to consider new VMU and CMU projects. Mr. Hall confirmed after a rezone, approval of an MSP (Master Site Plan) would be required to develop a project. Applications would first be reviewed by the planning commission where the MSP Agreement containing various required components and provisions would be recognized. Ms. Dominguez asked if the MSP was similar to an MOU (Memo of Understanding). Mr. Hall agreed in the past an MOU was used, which is now referred to as an MSP and is technically the same. He explained MSP Agreements would be presented to the Council so that oversight of development would include governmental control.

Mr. Hales understood that the MSP Agreement would prevent approved VMU and CMU projects from changing during the construction phase. Ms. Greenwood stated the TLUR forced them to devise more options within the allowance for M-U projects, so staff would determine where projects are best placed throughout the City, along with density, housing type and commercial components that correlate with the agreement. She felt the MSP was responsive to the concern of having a builder construct something other than what was initially agreed upon. If approved, the VMU and the CMU would provide a total of five mixed-use options instead of just three, and the required amendments would include new VMU and CMU options.

Mr. Cox concluded that by having an MSP Agreement within a proposed VMU zone for a parcel like RC Willey, density would be reduced, and a general idea would be gained for what could be constructed, instead of the unknown. Ms. Greenwood said without an MSP, that site could see a development of 40 du/acre (dwelling units per acre), which was concerning. But with the proposed new zone options a project could be 20-35 du/acre. Mr. Cox thought the MSP Agreement was similar to a Development Agreement. Ms. Greenwood explained the thought for devising the MSP was to codify Development Agreement items and require a zone change, which was more transparent for the community than the Overlay Development Agreement previously suggested. A brief conversation followed about what is currently allowed in the TOD zone.

Mr. Hall reviewed components of the MSP Agreement, what the applicant must provide and what the MSP would govern. Required elements within the MSP were discussed. He noted that many, but not all proposed projects in the existing M-U zone would require an MSP; and the City always required commercial components as part of mixed-use projects, which would not change.

Commercial use requirements were listed related to collector and arterial roads, horizontal mixed-use, and the reduction of calculated commercial requirements allowed in the proposed VMU and CMU zones. Mr. Hall said live/work units could fill some required commercial space, but only a limited amount of the total requirement. He noted current residential density in the M CCD and TOD, which is 100 du/acre in the M CCD and unlimited in the TOD. Proposed density for the M CCD is 80 du/acre east of State Street, 100 du/acre west of State Street, and 100 du/acre in the TOD.

In the MCMU (Murray Central Mixed-Use zone) the density currently ranges from 40-100 du/acre depending on distances from the Murray Central TRAX Station. It is suggested that the current MCMU zone be divided into an MCMU-West zone that would allow 40 du/acre, and an MCMU-East allowing residential density ranging from 40 to 80 du/acre. Density development ranges from 1/8 of a mile, up to one half mile.

Ms. Martinez felt density reductions were drastic for the proposed MCMU East and West subdistricts. Mr. Hall said the walkability component was the single most important component for the use of the Murray Central Station. Mr. Cox understood densities would increase as properties are situated further from actual TRAX station platforms. Mr. Hall confirmed.

Ms. Dominguez inquired about how specific measurements for distance were determined for proposed density. Ms. Greenwood said staff carefully considered and measured the distance of several routes leading away from TRAX stations, all of which were walkable. Mr. Hall said development areas near TRAX stations are complicated because there are only two places for crossing the tracks. He said the 40 du/acre is significant and plenty of density, and roughly twice that of which is allowed in the City's highest multi-family zone. Ms. Greenwood noted the K-mart project would be 40 du/acre, and the Murray Crossing project near the Vine Street TRAX station is 68 du/acre.

Mr. Hall stressed if the proposed concepts presented were not suitable, staff needs to know soon. Ms. Greenwood reported draft versions of the ordinances were close to completion.

Ms. Dominguez said time to consider the new proposal was important to her. Ms. Greenwood said based on today's feedback staff would present the same concept to the planning commission on July 9, 2021, followed by a public hearing on July 15, 2021. The Council would learn of any changes made by the planning commission on July 20, 2021 during the Committee of the Whole meeting; and consider the final proposal tentatively that same evening during the Council Meeting.

Mayor Camp mentioned the density of the Stillwater Apartments located on 5560 South Vine Street, which was confirmed to be 30 du/acre. Mr. Hall said that since M-U developments include commercial components, he believed a 40 du/acre commercial M-U project, although larger, would not appear to be as dense residentially. He noted that base requirements for lower residential density proposed for the VMU would allow between 25-35 du/acre.

Ms. Turner asked for clarification about an affordable housing piece. Mr. Hall explained as part of property management, 15% of a VMU residential project could be reserved for tenants making 80% AMI (Average Median Income), or 10% reserved for tenants at 60% AMI.

Ms. Greenwood explained the difference between housing affordability, and affordable housing, which is regulated housing. For example, a townhome is more affordable than a single-family home, but *affordable housing* means that an entity like the Salt Lake County Housing Authority is involved to help attain below market rates for those qualified as *low income*. She said that income diverse neighborhoods cannot be regulated - but by offering different housing options, there is an opportunity to encourage *affordable housing* units at M-U developments, which cannot be required in City code.

Mr. Hales led a brief conversation about costly townhomes and twin homes not being affordable by even those not seeking affordable housing benefits. Ms. Dominguez asked how the affordable housing reserved amount of 10% to 15% was achieved for VMU projects. Mr. Hall said it was only suggested by utilizing other municipal codes related to du/acre. Ms. Martinez asked if affordable housing could be made mandatory for a portion of a project. Mr. Hall was open to the idea; however, he did not feel it was necessary because there were other options for providing affordable housing in the City. He felt everything about the updated M-U proposal would improve housing affordability but agreed it would not provide additional affordable housing.

Mr. Hall said the CMU would have similar categories and requirements to the VMU but would offer between 35-45 du/acre; he noted that 45 du/acre was significant density requiring four amenities. Ms. Greenwood confirmed residential amenities in higher density projects include things like a workout room, swimming pool, clubhouse, sports bar for social gatherings, dog parks, outdoor plaza area, and community gardens.

Mr. Hall presented information about parking allowances based on the Urban Land Institute standards, and other elements. A table was displayed related to parking requirements for studio, 1, 2 and 3-bedroom units, as well as, parking structures, off-street parking, visitor parking, reserved parking rates and parking for commercial businesses that would be included in the M-U. He described various options for residential buffering's, which focused on separating buildings, structure height, site design, landscaping, and fencing.

Ms. Greenwood said it was determined that Murray City as a society was not yet the location where citizens would choose not to drive a vehicle. Therefore, M-U developments would not be implemented to deter people from owning vehicles, and parking requirements would be carefully considered. Ms. Dominguez agreed the transition in Utah would take time and incentives would create change.

Mr. Astill commented that the impact to City public works was thoroughly vetted and staff approved of the proposed density. A discussion occurred about the reality of increased construction costs, parking needs for M-U residential projects, possible parking options, and affordability components so that people who want to live in Murray can afford to do so.

There was a discussion about block length as related to factors that impact pedestrian activity. Mr. Hall stated that public space and access would not change, however, the VMU and CMU would see more flexibility with how much of a frontage road would be taken up by the building, versus access to it.

Therefore, a curbside management plan would be required in all M-U zones for drop-off and pick-up, residential deliveries, emergency services and public transport services. The conversation continued about parking code requirements for the proposed project on 4800 South and State Street, where planning is still underway, and a parking analysis would be conducted.

Staff would present a final proposal to first the planning commission on July 15, 2021, then report back to the Council during a Committee of the Whole meeting on July 20, 2021 followed by final consideration during a public hearing at a council meeting.

Adjournment: 4:25 p.m.

Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator III