

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Thursday, September 17, 2015, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present: Phil Markham, Chair
Buck Swaney, Vice Chair
Gary Dansie
Tim Taylor
Scot Woodbury
Travis Nay
Karen Daniels
Jared Hall, Community & Economic Development Manager
Ray Christensen, Senior Planner
G. L. Critchfield, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

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

Phil Markham opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He reviewed the public meeting rules and procedures.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Daniels made a motion to approve the minutes from August 20, 2015. Seconded by Mr. Taylor

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

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest for this agenda.

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for Q & A Auto Sales, Christian Auto Inc., and Kaile Oasis Massage, LLC. Seconded by Mr. Taylor

ICE HAUS – 7 EAST 4800 SOUTH – Project #15-112

David Morris was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for outdoor dining to be added to the existing operations on the property addressed 7 East 4800 South. Municipal Code Section 17.170.050 outlines the process for review of applications located within the Murray City Center District (MCCD). New construction within the MCCD requires the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Planning Commission after the project receives review and recommendation from the Design Review Committee. A public hearing is required prior to issuance or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The Murray City Center Design Review Committee reviewed the proposal at their meeting on August 29th, 2015 and voted to forward the proposal to the Planning Commission with a recommendation of approval.

The Ice Haus is a bar and grill operating under recently changed ownership. The owners have requested a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow an outdoor seating area for dining, situated just in front of the existing building in an unused portion of the parking lot. The area would be separated from the parking lot by a small wrought iron fence, and house three long tables with attached benches for seating. Neither the building nor the façade are being modified as a part of this proposal. The only change proposed is the addition of the seating area, which would be 27 feet wide by 27 feet long. The area is open to the sky and can be accessed from the interior of the business. The site plan indicates the addition of wood posts to support a partially open, removable overhead covering. The floor area is proposed as stamped patio concrete and is surrounded by a 42 inch high wrought iron fence. Also located in this area is an exterior stair case leading to a second floor entrance accessing the stage inside the business. No changes to the landscaping have been proposed. The property frontage on 4800 South is currently buffered by a landscaped park strip containing several trees. Three small planter boxes are proposed on the west line of the seating area to form a barrier/buffer to the parking lot. There are no other landscaped areas on site. The MCCD requires that the property conform to the "applicable standards" of Section 17.68 and to the design guidelines of the MCCD. The MCCD guidelines promote relation to the street and pedestrian experience which would not be served by providing additional landscaping adjacent to 4800 South frontage. The planter boxes are an appropriate addition in order to provide a small, effective area of interior landscaping on site. The subject property is one of four businesses located on this parcel, sharing access and parking. Access is provided from an alley off 4800 South, which is indistinguishable from the adjacent parking lots on the west and east. One parking stall is eliminated in the area proposed for outdoor dining, leaving a total of 29 parking stalls on site, including two ADA accessible stalls. The overall parking and site flow for vehicles is not impeded by the proposed outdoor seating area. There is no parking lot lighting on site, but there are several wall-mounted lights on the building itself. No additional outdoor lighting has been proposed in connection with the outdoor seating. Based on analysis of the design review guidelines Staff and the MCCD Design Review Committee recommend that the Planning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness allowing the addition of an outdoor seating area on the property located at 7 East 4800 South subject to conditions.

Mr. Markham asked Mr. Hall if there is any regulation concerning amplified music in the area outside of the building. Mr. Hall stated the only regulations the city has involve the hours, after 10 o'clock they would need a permit to play music outdoors.

David Morris, 5778 Walden Glen Drive, stated that he is excited to be in Murray. Mr. Morris stated that the business has been a bar for a long time and feels that it's nicer than any bars that have been there so far and would like to continue going in that direction. Mr. Morris stated that outdoor dining is really important right now. Mr. Morris stated that he is going with a German theme with an outdoor beer garden and communal seating. Mr. Morris indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

Mr. Markham stated that his concern is the music and it affecting the surrounding businesses and other areas and that it is something to be sensitive to. Mr. Morris stated that his neighbor across the street is a bar and the neighbor next door is also a

bar. Mr. Morris stated that live music would be inside the building which has concrete walls and he does not plan on making loud music outside on the patio, it's supposed to be a nice place to sit back and unwind and enjoy a Sunday afternoon.

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for outdoor dining to be added to the existing operations on the property addressed 7 East 4800 South subject to the following conditions:

1. Any exterior lighting and parking lot lighting should be shielded and should not spill onto adjacent properties.
2. The applicant shall remove any illegal signs from the property and right of way.

Seconded by Mrs. Daniels.

Call Vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A _____ Phil Markham
A _____ Gary Dansie
A _____ Scot Woodbury
A _____ Travis Nay
A _____ Karen Daniels
A _____ Tim Taylor

Motion passed, 6-0.

Mr. Swaney joined the meeting.

PLANET FITNESS – 6022 SOUTH STATE STREET – Project #15-121

Keith Larsen was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit approval for a health fitness club to be located at the property addressed 6022 South State Street. Municipal Code Ordinance 17.160 allows gyms and athletic clubs (LU #7425) within the C-D Zoning District subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The applicants propose to convert 21,500 square feet of an existing commercial retail space into a health and fitness club. An additional 14,900 remaining square foot space will be unaltered and remain as storage and dock area. The applicants have indicated that the storage/dock area may be used for future expansion of the proposed health and fitness club. Based upon the limited amount of parking provided at this property the applicants would need to receive Planning Commission approval for any future expansion of the health and fitness club. The proposed 21,500 square foot health and fitness club would include cardio, circuit and weight lifting equipment with other areas designated for synergy, abdominal exercise and stretching, and a 30 minute workout area. All other space will be used for men's and women's locker rooms and a small area located near the front desk for spa treatments.

The proposed health and fitness club and Goodwill Store are located on the same property and share parking and access. In order to ensure that sufficient parking is provided for each use, a parking analysis for each business is included with this report. Goodwill was approved with a conditional use permit in October of 2012. Based upon that approval the total amount of parking spaces required for the store is 96 spaces. The submitted site plan for that request shows the removal of the 16 parking spaces located along the south side of the building in order to provide a drop-off area for donations. A copy of that site plan has been included with this report and based upon a site visit those parking spaces have been removed for the donation area. Murray Municipal Code Section 17.72.070 does not include specific parking standards for health and fitness clubs, but does grant the planning commission authority to base the parking requirement on the nearest comparable use standard. According to the "Parking Generation, 4th Edition" manual from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the average parking supply for health and fitness clubs is a ratio of 5.7 parking spaces for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. According to the submitted site plan, the applicants have calculated the parking demand at a ratio of 1 parking space for every 200 square feet of floor area, which would equate to 5 parking spaces for every 1,000 square feet of floor area. Although the parking calculation provided by the applicants is slightly less than the average supply observed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Staff has determined that the ratio of 1 parking space for every 200 square feet is sufficient for the proposed use.

The proposed 21,500 square foot health and fitness club would include 19,000 square feet of exercise area and 2,500 square feet of storage area. Based upon the 1:200 sq. ft. parking ratio, the 19,000 square foot area would require 95 parking spaces. Parking for storage and warehouse areas is calculated at the ratio of 1 parking space for each 750 square feet of floor area. For the 2,500 square feet of fitness storage and the additional 14,900 square feet of storage/dock area, 23 parking spaces are required. Based upon these calculations, a total of 118 parking spaces must be provided for the proposed health and fitness club. The submitted site plan shows a total of 238 parking spaces provided for this property. Based upon a site visit, review of conditional use permit for Goodwill, and analysis of current parking and landscaping standards the total amount of parking spaces that are available is less than indicated on the site plan. The following design standards and modifications to the parking layout reduce the total amount of parking spaces provided from 238 spaces to 218 spaces:

- The 16 parking spaces shown on the site plan which are located adjacent to the south side of the Goodwill building have been removed in order to provide a donation drop-off area.
- In order to provide egress for the donation drop-off area, 1 parking space has been eliminated from the parking area directly south of the donation area.
- Review of the site plan shows that only 26 not 27 parking spaces are located to the rear and west end of the tenant spaces.
- Murray Municipal Code Section 17.68.040.B.2 outlines standards for interior landscape standards for parking lots with fifty (50) or more parking spaces. According to these code standards, all parking spaces must be located within seventy five feet (75') of a landscaped

area. In order for all of the front parking spaces to be located within 75 of landscaping, a parking island will need to be installed at the center of the middle parking area that complies with the standards for parking islands outlined in Section 17.68.040.B.2b.

Overall Parking Summary

Tenant	Parking Required
Goodwill	96 Parking Spaces
Planet Fitness	118 Parking Spaces
Total Required:	214 Parking Spaces
Total Provided:	218 Parking Spaces

Murray Municipal Code Section 17.72.070 provides parking standards based upon the types of uses and for ADA parking. According to this code section for every 201-300 total parking spaces provided, seven (7) must be reserved as ADA parking spaces. Based upon the submitted site plan and the site visit, six (6) ADA are provided on-site, therefore one (1) additional ADA parking space will need to be provided for the businesses located at this property.

Based upon the review of the parking layout and applicable parking standards, Staff determines that sufficient parking is provided for the existing and proposed uses. The existing building complies with the minimum setback and height requirements of the C-D Zoning District. Based upon a site visit, analysis of the submitted plans and review of landscape standards for commercial properties outlined in Section 17.160.100 and Chapter 17.68 of the Murray Municipal Code, specific improvements to the interior and perimeter landscaping will need to be made. Interior landscaping is provided by parking islands located in the front parking area of the property. As stated in the parking analysis section of this report, Murray Municipal Code Section 17.68.040.2a requires that all parking spaces be located within seventy five feet (75') of a landscaped area. In order to comply with this standard, one (1) new parking island will need to be installed at the center of the middle front parking area that complies with the minimum standards for parking islands listed in Section 17.68.040B.2b. The subject property consists of two (2) frontages on the east and west and one (1) property line bordering a residential area to the south. According to Section 17.68.040.A1, front setback areas shall include, "three (3) trees, five (5) 5-gallon shrubs, and ten (10) 1-gallon shrubs per one hundred (100) linear feet of frontage." All areas not occupied by drive accesses must be landscaped according to these standards. Based upon the site plans, aerial imagery and a site visit the Main Street and State Street frontages will need to have the landscaping modified in order to comply with this standard. It is important to note that existing plant materials may count to meeting this requirement. The following table outlines the required amount of trees and shrubs required for the two frontages:

Street Frontage	Trees	5-Gallon Shrubs	1-Gallon Shrubs
<i>State Street</i>	4	7	14
<i>Main Street</i>	12	20	39

The south property line is located adjacent to single family residential uses and according to the landscaping and fencing standards for the C-D Zone (Section

17.160.100.C & 17.160.110), ten (10) feet of landscaping shall be provided with a six foot (6') high solid masonry wall along the south property line. The ten (10) foot buffer landscaping is already provided along the south property line, however a masonry wall will need to be provided in order to comply with this standard. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of the health and fitness club for the property addressed 6022 South State Street subject to conditions.

Mr. Woodbury asked for clarification on some parking stalls that were shown in the presentation.

Keith Larsen, 1655 North 200 East, North Logan, indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and the landlord was surprised at the conditions and they were concerned about number 5 and 6. Mr. Larsen stated that the landlord applied for a conditional use two years ago for Goodwill and conditions 5 and 6 were not required then. Mr. Larsen asked the timing on when the conditions needed to be met.

Mr. Hall stated if the land owner is going to potentially redesign the site in a significant way that might alter where they need different landscaping. Mr. Hall stated that staff does have a methodology in place to take deferrals for some improvements. The landscaping changes for example, staff could grant a license on a conditional basis with a deferral for those improvements, and that happens a lot this time of year.

Mr. Markham asked Mr. Hall if a motion was made to approve the conditional use, how staff would deal with conditions 5 and 6. Mr. Hall stated that the commissioners wouldn't need to do anything different in the motion because it is an administrative function.

Mr. Woodbury asked Mr. Hall if the condition for the masonry wall was there when Goodwill was approved. Mr. Hall stated that he did not know.

Mr. Swaney asked Mr. Hall about the nature of the fence shown in the presentation.

Mr. Nay asked if Mr. Hall could discuss the rationale in the parking island and which spots are not compliant with landscaping as compared to where they would be putting the island in. Mr. Hall stated there is not a particular spot and that the islands are all compliant with the landscaping ordinance, other than the missing one. Mr. Hall stated there is a requirement that all parking stalls be located within 75 feet of landscaping, which is usually accomplished with those islands. In this case they are all located within 75 feet of islands except for a few right in the middle where we are missing a landscaping island that would accommodate that. Mr. Hall stated that the number of required shrubs and trees, don't have to be spread out at a certain level, there is just a number that needs to be met, the trees could be clustered, there is no way to say where the trees are missing, they are just missing. Mr. Markham asked if the landscaping plan did have to be approved and Mr. Hall stated that yes, it does need to be approved. Mr. Nay asked about the property along the South side and if it was bermed up as well and if Mr. Hall knew how high the wall would be. Mr. Hall stated that it could be 8 feet with the berm. Mr. Taylor stated that this is one building, and asked Mr. Hall why there was a property line splitting the building. Mr. Hall stated that it was designed that way and it has been constructed as two buildings sharing zero-lot

lines. Mr. Hall stated that in the C-D zone the only setback requirement is from residential zoning and from State Street.

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a health fitness club to be located at the property addressed 6022 South State Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable building code standards and the applicants shall obtain a Murray City Building Permit prior to the commencement of any tenant improvements. The application for a building permit shall include the following:
 - (a) The applicants shall provide plans which are stamped and sealed by appropriate design professionals to include a code analysis and egress plan.
 - (b) The applicants shall have an engineer confirm that the roof is capable of supporting the loads from the new RTU and provide details. (Contact the Murray Building Official for additional information regarding required details.)
2. The project shall meet all current fire codes.
3. The project shall comply with the following requirements of the Murray City Engineer and the Murray City Engineer shall have the authority to determine the extent of which each standard must be met.
 - (a) The applicants shall obtain a UDOT site access review for the State Street Access.
 - (b) Damaged sidewalk along State Street frontage shall be repaired or replaced.
 - (c) The sidewalk through the access shall be upgraded to meet current standards.
4. One (1) additional ADA parking space shall be added to the front parking area in order to comply with the minimum standards for accessible parking as outlined in Section 17.72.070 of the Murray Municipal Code.
5. One (1) parking island complying with the minimum standards for parking islands outlined in Section 17.68.040.B.2 shall be installed at the center of the middle front parking area. This will ensure that all parking spaces are within 75 feet of a landscaped area as required by this section of the Murray Municipal Code.
6. A six foot (6') high solid masonry wall shall be installed along the south property line as required by Section 17.160.110 of the Murray Municipal Code

7. The perimeter landscaping shall be modified and shall comply with the minimum standards of Chapter 17.68 of the Murray Municipal Code. The following modifications outlined as 6a and 6b of this condition shall be made in order to comply with the minimum standards outlined in that chapter. Existing plant materials located within the front setback areas may count toward meeting the minimum standards.
 - (a) The Main Street front setback landscaping shall be improved to include the following:
 - (i) Twelve (12) Trees,
 - (ii) Twenty (20) 5-Gallon Shrubs,
 - (iii) & Thirty-nine (39) 1-Gallon Shrubs.
 - (b) The State Street front setback landscaping shall include:
 - (i) Four (4) Trees,
 - (ii) Seven (7) 5-Gallon Shrubs,
 - (iii) & Fourteen (14) 1-Gallon Shrubs.
8. The applicants shall obtain a Murray City Business License prior to the commencement of business operations.

Seconded by Mrs. Daniels.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A _____ Phil Markham
A _____ Gary Dansie
A _____ Scot Woodbury
A _____ Travis Nay
A _____ Karen Daniels
A _____ Tim Taylor
A _____ Buck Swaney

Motion passed, 7-0.

ASCENSION AT 53RD – 458 WEST 5300 SOUTH, 5199, 5201 & 5300 SOUTH GREEN STREET, 5200, 5220, 5224, & 5232 GREENPINE DRIVE, 5289 SOUTH COLLEGE DRIVE – Project #15-115

Bryce Baker was the applicant present to represent this request. Ray Christensen reviewed the location and request for preliminary and final subdivision approval for a five lot subdivision at the properties addressed 458 West 5300 South, 5199, 5201, & 5300 South Green Street, 5200, 5220, 5224, 5232 Green Pine Drive, 5289 South College Drive. Municipal Code Ordinance 16.04.050 requires the subdivision of property to be approved by Murray City Officials with recommendation from the Planning Commission. The applicant is requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval for a five lot subdivision. Representatives of Security National are planning a large multi-phase development for office, commercial buildings and including parking

structures, for multiple parcels of property that may take many years in the construction process. The applicants previously applied for and received a Conditional Use Permit for the first phase of development for a new six story office/retail building and parking structure. The information provided by the applicant indicates the proposed office/retail building will contain 198,586 gross sq. ft. The applicants are working with U.D.O.T. regarding the right-of-way, transferring a portion of the existing Green Street right-of-way, to allow for a realigned right-of-way to be dedicated to Murray City as part of this subdivision. The buildings shall comply with the required setbacks for the zone requirements. The applicant shall comply with the landscaping requirements for the development project. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends the Commission forward a recommendation for preliminary and final subdivision approval to the Mayor subject to conditions.

Bryce Baker, 5300 South 360 West, stated that he is happy to be here and this one more step in the process of redeveloping the site. Mr. Baker stated that he has been working with UDOT, he has read the staff report and the conditions and Mr. Baker doesn't have anything to add, the conditions seem standard and in line with what he has discussed with staff over the last year with the project. Mr. Baker stated that in terms of subdivision plats specifically, the road widths that are being outlined within the traffic study, the 3 lane profiles to accommodate traffic and he is in the process of a land swap with UDOT to straighten up the roads. Mr. Baker stated that the UDOT land swap is a two tier process and he is in the first tier. It's two public hearings the first hearing is scheduled in October the second is 4 weeks after that, which puts them about 6 weeks out from getting the approval from UDOT to do the land swap.

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to forward a recommendation for preliminary and final subdivision approval to the Mayor for the properties addressed 458 West 5300 South, 5199, 5201, & 5300 South Green Street, 5200, 5220, 5224, 5232 Green Pine Drive, 5289 South College Drive subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall complete the acquisition/property trade of the UDOT owned roadway and shall obtain any UDOT required permits associated with this transaction.
2. The project shall comply with all Murray Fire Department requirements.
3. The project shall comply with Murray Power Department and Water & Sewer Department requirements.
4. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the City Engineer:
 - a. Meet Murray City subdivision standards to comply with City requirements.
 - b. Provide Public Utility Easements, as per Murray City utility standards and requirements.
 - c. Provide a maintenance agreement for City approval for landscaped medians located in dedicated City right-of-way.
 - d. Provide a maintenance agreement for City approval for sidewalks located adjacent to dedicated roads that are within the Public Access Easement shown on the plat.

- e. Provide a declaration to record with the plat, if an Owner's Association is planned for the office park.
- f. Provide a security bond for all improvements within the dedicated City right-of-way.
- g. All roadway and utility improvements within the dedicated City right-of-way must meet City Standards.
- h. Meet the requirements of the Murray City Engineer for the recording of the plat at the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office.
- i. The existing easements and encumbrances within the currently dedicated right-of-way shall be vacated.

Seconded by Mr. Woodbury

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A Phil Markham
A Gary Dansie
A Scot Woodbury
A Travis Nay
A Karen Daniels
A Tim Taylor
A Buck Swaney

Motion passed, 7-0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS - SECTION 17.04 – Project #15-126

Ray Christensen from staff presenting. City Staff is requesting a text amendment to the Murray Land Use Ordinance amending Municipal Code 17.04 regarding adequate capacity or availability of public utilities for a proposed development. The purpose of the proposed text amendment is to state clearly within the code, that if the City determines that the capacity or availability is not adequate to serve a proposed development, an application for that development may be denied. In the Mixed Use District, Murray City Center District, and Transit Oriented Development zones there are currently no limitations on density or height. Potential projects and development applications must be evaluated in several ways, one of which is the availability and capacity of public services such as water, sewer and power. Murray city is currently examining the capacity of those systems and our plans and schedules for upgrades in different areas. As an outgrowth of some of the development applications and evaluations, staff is proposing that the City add some language to the Land Use Ordinance (Title 17) and the Subdivision Ordinance (Title 16) clarifying that the approval of development will not be granted if the proposal cannot be adequately served for sewer and water or other necessary utilities. The proposed code 17.04.150 to read:

UTILITIES REQUIRED:

The City may deny or delay approval of a development project if there is not adequate capacity or availability of public utilities for a proposed development.

Based upon the above findings and conclusion, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed text amendment to the Murray Land Use Ordinance Municipal Code 17.04.150

Mr. Taylor stated that his definition of a public utility would also include a road, so from a definition standpoint in the staff review section where it says "one of which is the availability and capacity of public services such as water, sewer and power", he would add roads or that roads would be considered a public utility. If a proposed development exceeded a capacity of the road and we couldn't cure it that would be reason for a project to be denied.

Mr. Taylor stated that what seemed to be missing is the prospect of the developer providing the needed upgrade to the utilities so the development could go forward, the text doesn't leave clear space for a developer providing the additional capacity, and to be clear and even handed the text should encompass the possibility that the developer can add the required utility. Mr. Christensen stated that there are cases where that is done, and where the developer has put in utility upgrades there is usually an agreement with the City.

Mr. Hall stated that staff can look at it and assure that roads are considered by current definition, and if not we can suggest simple language to be added.

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed text amendment to the Murray Land Use Ordinance amending Municipal Code 17.04.150 regarding adequate capacity or availability of public utilities for a proposed development with the stipulation that staff work to make sure that the definition of public utilities includes roads.

Seconded by Mr. Nay.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A ___ Phil Markham
A ___ Gary Dansie
A ___ Scot Woodbury
A ___ Travis Nay
A ___ Karen Daniels
A ___ Tim Taylor
A ___ Buck Swaney

Motion passed, 7-0.

SUBDIVISION GENERAL PROVISIONS – TITLE 16.04.050.A. – Project #15-128

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed text amendment to the Murray Subdivision Ordinance amending Municipal Code 16.04.050.A. with the stipulation that staff work to make sure that the definition of public utilities includes roads.

Seconded by Mr. Nay

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A _____ Phil Markham
A _____ Gary Dansie
A _____ Scot Woodbury
A _____ Travis Nay
A _____ Karen Daniels
A _____ Tim Taylor
A _____ Buck Swaney

Motion passed, 7-0.

SUBDIVISION PLAT RECORDATION WITH COUNTY – TITLE 16.12.100 – Project #15-129

Ray Christensen from staff presenting. Murray City Staff are proposing a text amendment to the Murray Subdivision Ordinance amending Municipal Code 16.12.100. A. adding a requirement for subdivision plats to be recorded at the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office within one year of final approval by the Mayor. A six month time extension may be approved by the Mayor. The Murray City Subdivision Ordinance in Murray City Code Title 16 outlines the requirements for subdivision review. The Murray Planning Commission is required by State Code (10-9a-207) to conduct a public hearing and review all subdivisions of property within the City. The Planning Commission's role is to ensure that a proposed subdivision is consistent with established ordinances, policies and planning practices of the City. The Planning Commission acts as an advisory body to the Mayor and shall make investigations, reports and recommendation on proposed subdivisions as to their conformance to the general plan, zoning code and other pertinent documents as it deems necessary. Following the Commission's review and recommendation of a subdivision application, it will be forwarded to the Mayor for final approval. The plat is then forwarded to the Salt Lake County Recorder's office for review and recording. The current Murray Subdivision Ordinance Title 16 does not have an expiration date for the recording of a final approved plat at the Salt Lake Recorder's office.

The current code 16.12.100 reads:

RECORDATION WITH COUNTY:

When the mayor has approved the final plat, all required fees have been paid, and the subdivider has filed the approved agreement and bond required in this chapter, the plat may be presented to the county recorder for recordation.

The proposed code 16.12.100. would be changed to read:

RECORDATION WITH COUNTY:

When the mayor has approved the final plat, all required fees have been paid, and the subdivider has filed the approved agreement and bond required in this chapter, the plat may be presented to the county recorder for recordation.

The subdivision plat shall be recorded within one year of the final approval by the Mayor, or the final plat shall be null and void. The applicant may request a one-time, six-month time extension of approval for special circumstances.

Based upon the above findings and conclusion, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed text amendment to Subdivision Code 16.12 100 relating to the recording of a final plat.

The meeting was open for public comment. No Comment was made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Swaney made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed text amendment to the Murray Subdivision Ordinance amending Municipal Code 16.12.100.A. adding a requirement for subdivision plats to be recorded at the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office within one year of final approval by the Mayor. A six month time extension may be approved by the Mayor.

Seconded by Mrs. Daniels.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A _____ Phil Markham
A _____ Gary Dansie
A _____ Scot Woodbury
A _____ Travis Nay
A _____ Karen Daniels
A _____ Tim Taylor
A _____ Buck Swaney

Motion passed, 7-0.

LAND USE ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS – TITLE 17 – Project #15-125

Jared Hall from staff presenting. The Transit-Oriented Development and Mixed Use Zones were created a few years after the adoption of the General Plan in 2003. The purpose of each zone is to encourage compact, mixed use development including neighborhood oriented commercial and restaurant space. Design and community standards are intended to promote street life with high quality residential, office, commercial, entertainment and recreational uses located within walking distance of transit opportunities. The Sign Code (Chapter 17.48) provides sign standards for all zoning districts except the T-O-D, M-U and M-C-C-D zones. The M-C-C-D includes specific sign standards outlined in the zone chapter and design guidelines. Unlike the M-C-C-D, these proposed standards would be located in the Sign Code. Preparation

of the proposed standards has included research of sign standards of other mixed use and transit-oriented districts located in Salt Lake City, Ogden, Provo, and Sandy City. Staff also reviewed the sign standards and design guidelines of the M-C-C-D zone. The proposed additions incorporate many of the same standards used by the other municipalities and within the Murray City Center District. Prior to preparation of the proposed standards, Staff also reviewed each zone and the design guidelines of the Murray Fireclay District in order to evaluate the proposed standards with the purpose and guidelines of the respective zoning districts. Based upon that research and staff collaboration, the proposed sign standards are intended to be consistent with the design standards and pedestrian-oriented character of the T-O-D and M-U Zones.

Many of the proposed standards for the two zones are the same with some minor variations for detached on-site signs and sign lighting. Due to the desired pedestrian-oriented design of the two zoning districts, specific standards are proposed for signs that are not mentioned in detail for other zoning districts. For example, detailed standards are provided for awning, canopy, blade, projecting and hanging, pole and wayfinding signage which are not included for other zoning districts except the M-C-C-D. Staff is also proposing the adoption or modification of definitions in conjunction with the proposed sign standards. As stated previously in this report, standards regarding pole signs and the lighting of signage are different with the two zones. Each zoning district is intended to provide a pedestrian oriented design with like land uses which are compatible with that type of design, however uses and intensity differ between the zones. The T-O-D on the other hand includes a transportation master plan with specific street and pedestrian design standards, and district identification and design standards which jointly create a more intimate character and identity for the Fireclay District. The Mixed Use Zone allows for light industrial and higher intensity commercial uses than those allowed in the Transit-Oriented Development Zone. Based upon these differences in the two zoning district, Staff is proposing variations in similar sign types.

POLE SIGNS

Transit-Oriented Development

- Allowed only for properties that provide a plaza, outdoor dining or other similar areas. The sign must be located adjacent to said area.

Mixed Use

- Pole Sign may be up to 50 square feet in area for properties that do not contain a residential use.
- For properties with a residential use a pole sign may be allowed if the property includes a plaza, outdoor dining or other similar type area. The sign must be located adjacent to said area.

SIGN LIGHTING

Transit-Oriented Development

Mixed Use

- External illumination only for storefront, pole, and monument signs.
- Building orientation/identification signs may be internally illuminated if located above the top story of said building.
- No Restrictions to the type of sign illumination.

Mr. Taylor asked about window signs and stated that the electronic signs are prohibited, and wanted to know if a window sign is not an electronic sign. Mr. Hall stated that that would be prohibited. Mr. Nay stated that he couldn't have a For Sale sign and have an Open sign in the same window. Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Nay is correct and you would have to choose one sign, it goes to the question of visual clutter, you can hang things in your window and you can paint 50% of your windows.

Mr. Taylor asked what the difference is between a display sign and a window sign. Mr. Hall stated that the difference between those two signs was not treated in the draft.

Mr. Nay asked if he hung a sign 6 inches behind a window is it a window sign. Mr. Hall stated that yes, it is.

Mr. Hall discussed sign lighting in the T-O-D and M-U zones. Mr. Dansie stated that there is so many combinations of lighting and LEDs are very popular now and you have restaurants that want a neon open sign because it catches the motif of the store. Mr. Hall stated that the LED signs are popular and they are only going to get more popular. To exclude those 100% from the T-O-D and M-U zones is a big step. Mr. Hall stated that LED signs are excluded in the M-C-C-D zone, in the M-G and C-D zone you can have a LED sign with a Conditional Use permit. Mr. Dansie asked how this fits into all the billboards that are already in all those zones. Mr. Hall stated that they are non-conforming. There were some other questions, and Mr. Hall indicated that staff would try to address the comments in a re-draft for a future meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Markham mentioned the Boards and Commission Meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.



Jared Hall, Manager
Community and Economic Development