



## Murray City Municipal Council Murray City Planning & Zoning Commission General Plan

---

The Murray City Municipal Council and the Murray City Planning & Zoning Commission met at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 22, 2016, at the Murray City Center, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah for a General Plan Presentation and Discussion.

**Council Members in Attendance:**

Blair Camp, Council Chair  
Dave Nicponski  
Jim Brass  
Brett Hales

**Planning & Zoning Commission Members in Attendance:**

Philip Markham  
Sue Wilson  
Travis Nay  
Buck Swaney  
Scot Woodbury  
Maren Patterson

**Members Excused:**

Diane Turner                      Council Member

**Others in Attendance:**

Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrator	Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Susan Nixon	Community Development	Elliot Setzer	Citizen
Mark Boren	Community Development	Tim Tingey	ADS Director
Jared Hall	Community Development	Ted Eyre	Mayor
Brad McIlrath	Community Development	Janet Towers	Chief Administrative Officer
Pattie Johnson	Council Office	Susie Petheram	CRSA
Kelly Gillam	CRSA	Scott Aylett	Zion's Bank

Tim Tingey welcomed everyone to the General Plan meeting. Following introductions, he outlined the agenda with the timeline, presentation of the draft plan and discussion of the future land use plan, which is a big part of the process. The format is open questions and discussion for council input prior to going into the public hearing processes. The planning commission has had one study session, when they provided a lot of input, which was incorporated into the plan.

Jared Hall commented that the study session that evening would provide further input and the planning commission would have one more work session before going to a Committee of the Whole and the public hearing stage. There would be public hearings at both the planning commission and city council levels, which should go through the fall with the city council

considering adoption just after the first of the year. That will involve three to four more meetings including the public hearings.

Mr. Tingey introduced the planning consultants of Susie Petheram and Kelly Gillam from CRSA and Scott Aylett from Zion's Bank.

Ms. Petheram reviewed the process to get to this point of the formal public document noting that Scott Aylett of Zion's Public Finance and Hales Engineering helped with the finance and transportation portions. The project started in October of 2014 ensuring an open process involving the public for feedback and input.

Giving vision to action, one primary goal was to be more integrated into nature. Understanding the relationship between land use, transportation, economics, housing and neighborhoods were crucial to incorporate into the plan.

Regular meetings with staff, the steering committee and focus groups helped identify general and specific goals and then bringing it to the public at four different open houses helped layer these suggestions together.

The plan integrates the areas of focus to assist as the city makes decisions for the next five to twenty years. These are the initiatives captured and supported by the plan elements.

- Land Use/Urban Design
- Transportation
- Economy
- Parks and Open Space
- Nature/Environment
- Housing
- Community, Culture & Preservation

The plan vision and overall goal is to:

“Guide growth to promote prosperity and sustain a high quality of life for those who live, work, shop and recreate in Murray.”

Murray has a regional draw for work, shopping and recreating due to the presence of great parks and the Jordan River Parkway.

Basic demographics were identified and a dedicated website was created with an on-line map where people could leave comments. Many comments about the cemetery were made, which is a little unusual. The data gathering continued through the first open house and focus groups and 12 Guiding Initiatives were developed.

- A Cultural Core/District in the City Center
- Revitalize and Stabilize neighborhoods
- Connect Downtown and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Areas
- Link Intermountain Health Care to Surrounding Context
- Enhance Neighborhood Nodes
- Create Office/Employment Centers
- A City Geared Toward Bikes and Pedestrians
- Connections Within and Through Murray
- Life Cycle Housing in Neighborhoods

- Transitions and Buffers
- Main Street District
- TOD Uses Geared Toward a TOD Demographic

The draft plan development included a stakeholders meeting with the city department directors, who helped to identify key response areas for fire and police. This was very useful, as were the third and fourth open houses where about 60 people attended each event. Using direct comments and objectives of participants went a long way to create transparency. Pictures expressing ideas were very beneficial in explaining the concepts of low, medium and high density development. The images helped bridge the communication gap and create understanding of the impact on neighborhoods and the linkages between areas.

The structure of the plan documents includes, part one, which is a more user friendly citizens guide to the plan and part two, which includes the traditional plan aspects with the future land use map and is used by the planning staff as they review applications and monitor progress, using the detailed goals and objectives.

The five key initiatives were presented.

- City Center District
- Create Office/Employment Centers
- Livable and Vibrant Neighborhoods
- Linking Centers/District to Surrounding Context
- A City Geared Toward Multi-Modality

Part two involves the community planning elements. The chapters include land use, economic, and housing and each plan chapter is created separately so that it can be updated without disrupting the other chapters. Each chapter is represented by goals and objectives that make that initiative happen.

Getting into the Future Land Use Map, Ms. Petheram explained that the focus was to create flexibility and opportunities with a little streamlining, but also, more specific.

In residential multi-family you will notice a blurry line with just low, medium and high density housing depending on lot size and building type and not being quite so rigid in what can happen where, allowing more opportunity with different properties.

Industrial analysis showed this as a contributor to the tax base in Murray. And there are good pockets for industrial along the freeway and rail corridor. It could benefit from a little more design guidance and that's where the industrial business park designation was created to merge medical and technology around the IMC neighborhood. Having a little bit more design oversight will help these areas blend into the surrounding context better.

The same idea in general office exists with prospects to blend into a more urban general office zone providing opportunities to create centers that are more walkable and multi-modal; establishing a zone for that makes it an easier process. Developers are bringing these types of projects to the city.

One of the most interesting charts shows sales category and the 2013 capture rate. This is how Murray is able to meet the needs of its residents and workforce. It details what needs can be filled in Murray and what people must go outside the city to get. Also, many people come to Murray to fill various needs. We have great retail, however, a focus on Class A office space is lacking. Costco is in general merchandise and many of the stores in Fashion Place fall into

clothing, accessories and restaurant categories. This information helps to know what development to focus on in the future.

Mayor Eyre asked about the relationship between single family and multi-family housing. To absorb some of the growth and younger families may mean building up, however to maintain the neighborhoods, the city may not want to go that direction. Ms. Petheram suggested keeping a balance with livable vibrant neighborhoods and targeting multi-family in the transit oriented development and neighborhood node areas instead of leaking into stable neighborhoods. Being deliberate in planning is important. A chart shows acreage not units of each type providing an idea by zones. A guess would be that 60% – 75% may be single-family housing. The mayor explained that concentration of multi-family is the highest in the Salt Lake area with those numbers decreasing as you move away from that downtown area.

In Murray, we are looking for core urban areas while the neighborhoods are preserved. In some places, a duplex or townhome may fit fine within the neighborhood without creating a big change to the community.

Mr. Nicponski mentioned areas where rezoning might create development. The neighborhood nodes address this especially in some aging retail areas. Mr. Gillam pointed out areas in South Salt Lake around 2100 South and State Street where rezoning has encouraged high density housing that are high quality multi-family projects right up against single family neighborhoods. South Salt Lake went through a lengthy process to rezone and the existing residents are all in favor of the new development.

Some smaller housing types can be incorporated into existing housing neighborhoods. A separate chapter was created for moderate housing and that is something that will need to be updated every two years by state code.

Mr. Swaney asked what specifics were incorporated into the plan to be consistent with the Wasatch Front Choice plan. Intensifying around transit is key to the growth principles in the Wasatch Choice 2040, Ms. Petheram noted, along with the multi-modal plans for trails, to see how Murray fits into the regional development plans.

Mr. Tingey explained the importance of the Future Land Use plan and asked the attendees to split into two groups to discuss this map in detail. It is contained in Chapter Five of the plan.

One group was made up of Jared Hall, Susie Petheram, Susan Nixon, Janet Towers, Travis Nay, Phil Markham, Scot Woodbury, Frank Nakamura and Janet Lopez. This group talked about the departure of the specific land use zones and the categories that are now being grouped as more general and broad. Business park areas were pointed out and it was mentioned that the mixed use zones were pared back. Commercial existed all along State Street except where the City Center district was located. Mixed use opportunities were noted at transit districts. Everyone agreed on the idea of neighborhood nodes with retail close to neighborhoods where walking to a small grocery or coffee shop would be encouraged. These should be expanded to other areas and Mr. Markham suggested two additional locations where that concept would be a benefit to the community.

The second group was made up of Blair Camp, Dave Nicponski, Brett Hales, Jim Brass, Mayor Eyre, Tim Tingey, Brad McIlrath, Mark Boren, Buck Swaney, Sue Wilson, Scot Aylett and Pattie Johnson. The future land use map was explained with a focus on the new more general density designations. Mixed use zones were close to transit and the freeway with buffers in place. General commercial zones remained the same with a new zone for professional office projects. Industrial and business park industrial are new concepts as are the neighborhood nodes. All

present loved the idea of neighborhood nodes where mixed amenities would be encouraged as pedestrian friendly small shopping areas. Corner bakeries and bookstores would be good additions. The nodes are similar to the 9<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> neighborhood in Salt Lake and are urged to create unique neighborhood identities. In the city center area cultural events are envisioned where the downtown would be alive with evening populations.

The groups reconvened into one large discussion gathering and the floor was opened up for comments or issues.

Everyone liked the idea of the neighborhood nodes.

Mr. Swaney stated that this just looks like a zoning map and it would be important to know where energy needs to be spent to encourage redevelopment, investment and activity. It is not always easy to see what we are trying to do.

Ms. Wilson said on Woodrow there is a notch of single family housing and it doesn't seem to make sense where islands occur and office is surrounding. It would make it easier on the planning commission if a line could be drawn to eliminate that. Mr. Tingey mentioned that that particular property would be coming to the planning commission before the new general plan, however it is something that can be considered for other similar areas.

Mr. Woodbury mentioned their group loved the neighborhood nodes and added a couple of areas where more could be added for coffee shops and that sort of development.

Mr. Camp commented that the reduction of mixed use zones is a good call. He is in favor of that.

Mayor Eyre was impressed that a conscience effort was made to keep new development from harming existing development, such as creating downtown projects that are unrelated to Fashion Place Mall.

Mr. Nicponski said that for some vacant land it may be necessary to rezone to stimulate development.

Mr. Brass noted that Winchester is now residential neighborhood business (RNB) all the way down and that is positive. He wondered about a solution on 900 East so that Wheeler Farm is protected but development other than low density residential could be stimulated. Mr. Camp agreed with that and thought the same issue was evident along 1300 East.

Mr. Woodbury asked about the little sliver of land along 700 West that is designated RNB. It seems it might work better as residential because business access would be difficult there.

Mr. Swaney noted that there are areas that need maintenance to make Murray a better safer place. He pointed out Woodstock and Oakwood elementary schools and kids coming out on Vine Street where sidewalks are intermittent and children are not safe walking.

Ms. Petheram suggested that land use decisions can improve some of these areas, which need solutions and one thing that can be done on 900 East to make it conducive for single-family residential would be to create the complete street idea with bike lanes and trees. You can go to single lane streets with parking and bike lanes where homes are more desirable.

Related to the five initiatives and the land use designations, Mr. Tingey asked if there are any concerns. The mix of low density varied sized lots is new and he wondered if that was a

problem for anyone. Ms. Wilson mentioned how great it is to encourage first time home buyers with various sizes of lots, pricing and smaller homes for the coming generation who may not be able to afford living in Murray otherwise. She was very positive on the movement in that area.

Others agreed with that idea.

Ms. Petheram said the general feedback is positive and she is hearing that, as planners, they can even push a little more on the neighborhood nodes. If anyone has other specific suggestions she encourages that those be written down and submitted so they can compile the ideas and work with the Community Development staff to make updates and changes that seem universal.

Mr. Tingey said that with large planning efforts, the criticism often is that there has not been enough outreach. He stated that the public open houses were advertised in utility billing and on the website to cast a large net to obtain public input. It has been a great focus.

Mr. Swaney commented that the implementation pages are extremely vague. If one looks at the Salt Lake County general plan you will find very complete lists of things to do on implementation. He feels the departments and planning staff can more easily reach goals if the ideas say, for example, if we want to reach this goal in ten years, then now we need to implement \_\_\_\_\_. He would like to see a framework that gives people tools and directives rather than a general plan that sits on a shelf. Others agreed.

Mr. Brass stated the biggest stumbling block on implementation is funding. Mr. Swaney added that if the city needs more money, then that is a great measure on whether there is enough economic development to get things done.

Mr. Camp said what jumps out to him is the lack of green (open space/parks) on the east side of town and he asked if anyone looked at areas that could be used for neighborhood parks. No specific parcels were considered, although, Mr. Tingey noted there is a recommendation to look at a new parks and recreation master plan that would address that issue. The last one was done in the 1970s.

It was mentioned that a number of schools do provide some green space. And the canal trail in planning stages would add some green space on the east side of town.

Ms. Petheram replied that the lack of parks did come up in discussion. That east side was part of the annexation and they need to be brought up to speed with the historic areas of Murray that enjoy neighborhood parks.

Mr. Tingey thanked everyone, elected officials, the consultants and the staff for their time and appreciated all the comments and suggestions.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez  
Council Administrator  
Murray City Council