

Minutes of the Planning Commission Study Session held on Thursday, August 18, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present: Travis Nay, Chair
Maren Patterson, Vice-Chair
Scot Woodbury
Buck Swaney
Sue Wilson
Tim Tingey, ADS Director
Jared Hall, Community Development Manager
Brad McIlrath, Assistant Planner
Kelly Gillman, CRSA
Melissa Fryer, CRSA
Eliot Setzer, citizen

Excused: Phil Markham

Travis Nay opened the meeting and welcomed those present. Mr. Nay indicated that this is a work session for the planning commission to review the draft of the Murray General Plan. This is not an open meeting for the general public.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the minutes from August 4, 2016 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Swaney.

A voice vote was made, motion passed, 5-0

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 Advanced Auto Sales and Parris RV. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion.

A voice vote was made, motion passed, 5-0.

STUDY SESSION OF THE 'DRAFT' GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Hall explained that this will be an overview of the proposed draft general Plan. Any suggestions or corrections will be noted by the consultants. There will be another study session with the City Council on September 22, 2016 followed by public hearings. He introduced Kelly Gillman and Melissa Fryer from CRSA Consultants.

Kelly Gillman, representing CRSA, the consultants, presented an overview of the draft Murray General Plan. This process began in October of 2014. The draft has been a result of information from Zions Bank Public Finance, Hales Engineering, three Open Houses, Steering Committee meetings, five Focus Group (Community & Culture; Downtown & Transit Oriented Development; Economic Development; Neighborhoods; Bikes, Trails and Transit) meetings, city

official input, a survey and the website www.planmurray.com. Thousands of mailings were inserted into utility billings announcing the open houses.

Initially there were twelve initiatives proposed for the General Plan, but later was decided that was too many and condensed the twelve into five. The plan focuses around these Five Key Initiatives which are 1- Murray City Center District; 2- Create Office Employment Centers; 3- Livable + Vibrant Neighborhoods; 4- Linking Centers/Districts to Surrounding Context; 5- A City Geared toward Multi-Modality.

Mr. Gillman explained that Zions Bank researched information on economic factors which has the key sales and "leakage" of sales. Murray City has an overall capture rate of 291% which means more money is spent in Murray City than elsewhere and equates to \$944,097,603 in gained sales of goods and services purchased by residents outside of the City.

The Administrative & Development Services of Murray City also administered a scientific survey in November of 2015 which allowed residents to provide feedback on perceptions and attitudes of the community and provided a means for gaining input and valuable data to analyze on issues related to the general plan. The city randomly selected 1500 residents to participate in the survey with a 23% response rate.

There are two sections to the plan. The first section is geared toward citizens and developers and the second section is the detailed technical information required to satisfy state code and will be utilized more by city staff.

Mr. Swaney asked about the difference in demographics from 2015 to 2030 and where we're going based on the demographic information. He and other planning commissioners agreed that it would be helpful to have a summary page that indicates why this information is important and how it influences the General Plan.

Mr. Swaney commented that the population in Murray City is stable but the household size is decreasing and how do we address that issue, and do we need to look for a smaller product, a more dense product, and possibly that should be noted in the core transit area(s). He asked what how the city is addressing the density demands with this updated General Plan?

Mr. Woodbury commented that one of the key demographics is that Murray has the second highest median age in Salt Lake County and how does that influence the General Plan?

Mr. Swaney commented that Initiative #4 is not crystal clear how it differentiates between Initiative #3 and #5 and could be clarified better. Mr. Hall explained that Initiative #4 refers more to linking the downtown area with the T.O.D. area.

Mr. Swaney commented that on page 33, the key landmarks are not indicated on the map. On page 36 the fourth paragraph there are extra words that make it difficult to understand and could be condensed. He asked about the relationship between the regional transportation plan for the Wasatch Front and the Murray General Plan as indicated on page 37? He suggested that the information be brought more into the plan. Mr. McIlrath responded that the city staff specifically asked that information to be more general so as not to make it seem "mandatory" for those plans. That can be a double edged sword to include specific plans in a General Plan such as bicycle plans, etc. Mr. Hall commented that the regional transportation plan changes from time

to time and it may be better to reference the plan generally. Ms. Wilson commented that the bike lane plans should be included in the General Plan. Mr. Hall responded that the difficulty with putting specific projects in the General Plan, is that the projects are based on budgetary approvals and constraints and unless it is the political will of those in position to approve funds, it may not be wise to include those projects in the General Plan.

Mr. Swaney commented that it is much nicer having bike lanes on Vine Street and it feels safer now that some have been installed. However, east Vine Street is a street corridor that needs to needs to transform and has two schools, Woodstock & Oakwood elementary, yet there is no sidewalks for the children. Ms. Wilson stated that the sidewalk plans should be included as expressed by Mr. Swaney. Mr. Hall responded that a General Plan should call out other plans such as the city's Master Transportation Plan, but not be included. He stated that the intent of a General Plan is not the same as capital improvement plan or a strategic plan. However, statements like "walkability in neighborhoods" would be appropriate. Mr. Tingey stated the map on page 51 "Multi-Modality" shows current and future bike routes along with neighborhoods nodes. Mr. Swaney asked what ensures that the "Multi-Modality" map on page 51 actually gets implemented and referenced in the future, such as automatic mechanisms. Mr. Swaney suggested that wording be added such as "during capital improvement budgetary processes that the need for multi-modal improvements are to be considered".

The draft Future Land Use map and current Future Land Use maps were displayed by staff. Mr. McIlrath stated the future land use map has less mixed use than the existing future land use map. The proposed future land use categories are: City Center, Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial, Professional Office, Business Park Industrial, and the residential future land uses have been consolidated into Low, Medium and High Density Residential which includes both single family and multi-family. New zoning ordinances will need to be drafted and adopted, after the General Plan is adopted, to coincide with the new future land use classifications.

Mr. Swaney asked if the population growth is absorbed into the future land use classifications and if it specifically identified in the plan. Mr. Hall responded that the absorption of population is not specifically called out in the General Plan and will need to be absorbed in the T-O-D, the MCCD and Mixed Use districts due to the city being built out without many remaining vacant properties. The T-O-D, MCCD and Mixed Use don't have density limits and can therefore be the best possibility for population absorption.

Ms. Wilson stated that her concern with density is the crime rate. Mr. Hall explained that the percentage per resident does not increase with higher density, it is simply that there are more people in a small area that seems to be a higher rate of crime, but the "percentage" is basically the same. Mr. Gillman stated that the chief of police was in some of the steering committee meetings, but that he did not express concern with the proposals, but he indicated that the higher crime rates actually has more to do with management of such properties. Also, design elements in a project can help with crime more than density itself.

There was a discussion regarding the location of the proposed future land uses. Another new proposal is "community nodes" and "neighborhood nodes" which are generally located on busier intersections. These nodes do not specifically identify certain properties but a general area. Mr. Swaney suggested moving the proposed neighborhood node at 1300 East 5600 South further to the east to Van Winkle Expressway and 5600 South, due to the high school dominating the area

around 1300 East.

Mr. Swaney asked if the mixed use requirements recently adopted are incorporated into the draft Future Land Use map. It was indicated that the mixed use zoning ordinance may need to be modified in the future but it is unknown at this time. New zoning ordinances will need to be drafted once the general plan is adopted. If the goal is to bring more daytime population into Murray City, multi-modal transportation options will definitely be critical in this effort.

Mr. Woodbury asked about the future land use for the mobile home park on west Winchester Street. Mr. Hall responded that the thinking is to keep it similar to what it currently is for residential low density and something in between multi-family and single family larger size lots. There is a neighborhood node at the intersection of Winchester Street and 700 West that is a proposed change. Neighborhood commercial could be located on the south-west corner of Winchester Street and 700 West. There was discussion about possibly expanding the commercial neighborhood further to the south from Winchester Street along 700 West. If anything different is proposed at this particular time, it may be perceived that the city is supporting potential projects for the mobile home park which happens to be for sale at this time. The city has taken a neutral stand on this particular issue.

Ms. Wilson asked if the Winchester and 700 West area is a superfund site. It was indicated that this is not a superfund site but the area further to the south that is in Midvale City was a superfund site.

It was suggested that the Fashion Place transit stop area possibly have a community node and be changed to a mixed use rather than professional office.

Mr. Swaney asked about the areas targeted for revitalization and if there could be map included showing those areas. Mr. Tingey responded that possibly those areas could be shown on a map as this process progresses. Outside of an RDA area, the incentive may be through density.

Mr. Woodbury asked if there is a vision for parks and open space areas. Mr. Tingey responded that type of specific information is included in the City's Park & Recreation Master Plan and not necessarily in the General Plan, but that the General Plan could reference the Parks & Recreation Master Plan.

It was proposed that the pie shaped property at the southwest corner of the IMC campus be changed from Mixed Use to Professional Office so as to be the same as the IMC campus since IHC owns both properties and is more in line with the actual use. Mr. Nay stated that IHC owns their property and buildings that they operate and also their physicians are employed by IHC and are not independent.

Mr. Swaney suggested having an appendix of sorts showing the projected time line with projects and which city division would be responsible the projects. Mr. Hall responded that the various city divisions are not in favor of having this as part of the General Plan because it would be perceived as being required to accomplish certain goals or projects which may be not possible due to budgetary issues that are beyond their control. Mr. Tingey stated it may be reasonable to have a priority list, but there would need to be flexibility and it would be based on funding which is approved by the city council.

Planning Commission Meeting

August 18, 2016

Page 5

Mr. Gillman summarized the meeting stating that there does not appear to be any major concerns from the planning commission regarding the draft General Plan thus far. He will take the comments from the planning commission and the input from the open house next week and will then make the appropriate changes.

Mr. Hall stated there will be a final General Plan Open House on August 25th from 6 to 8 p.m. at city hall. The hope is to have the General Plan adopted by November of 2016.

The study session was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Jared Hall, Manager
Community and Economic Development