

**CITY OF HOLLADAY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK MEETING  
August 2, 2005  
Holladay City Center, 4707 S Holladay Blvd.**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Planning Commission Members**

Cyrus McKell, Acting Chair  
Howard Diederich  
Brad Scott  
Paul Shupe  
Jim Palmer  
Gene Carr

**City Staff:**

Paul Allred, Interim Community Develop Dir  
Pat Hanson, Planner  
Alma Haskell, Planner  
Ken Millard, Consultant  
Rick Whiting, Intern

The meeting was convened in the council room at 5:00 pm.

Mr. Fitts thanked Mr. Millard for his years of service to the City. He then introduced Mr. Allred and told the Commissioners Mr. Allred would be formally appointed on Thursday at the Council meeting. There was a brief discussion on the status of the RDA study and the upcoming meetings. Mr. Fitts then excused himself.

The Commissioners left for the field trip at 5:25 pm and returned at 6:30pm. They visited all the sites listed on the agenda and took a brief tour of the properties at the end of Holladay Boulevard. They returned to the city offices at 6:35 pm for additional discussion and then adjourned to the Chamber at 7:00 pm. for the formal meeting.

**Discussion Items**

**1. Walker Lane Offices -05-2-03- 1927 E Sycamore Dr- Garage over 800 SF.**

*The Commissioners asked if staff could work with the applicant to get a better looking building. They had no other comments*

Commissioner McKell called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and Mr Haskell read the Chair's statement.

**Decision Items**

**2. Preliminary Plat for Cold Creek Estates - 6198 S Holladay Blvd.**

**Background:**

The applicant is submitting a PUD plan for two houses on this property. The Commission previously approved a stream setback exception for this development at the their May meeting. Following are the details of the proposed development.

**Site Data**

**Area:** 1.29 acres

**Setbacks**

Required:	Provided:
Front-30	Front- 30 FT

Side- 10/14 Side-20 feet between building envelopes  
Rear - 20/50 Rear - 50 FT setback from Cottonwood Creek

### Landscaping

Required: Landscaping plan

Provided: Landscaped setbacks and a 4 ft landscaped buffer on Holladay Blvd. in front of the fencing

### Parking

Required: 2 spaces per unit + guests

Provided: None shown but houses will probably have attached garages.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

**7/21/05** The Commission granted concept approval at the last meeting. The following were the conditions of that approval.

*Submit a preliminary plat and associated drawings which show proposed building heights, inventory of all existing significant trees and their locations on the property showing which trees will be removed, any proposed outdoor lighting, plans to mitigate any creek bank erosion along Cottonwood Creek, and all items listed on the preliminary plat checklist.*

The current submission meets the basic requirements for a preliminary plat. The submitted landscape plan does not indicate which trees are existing on the lot but staff feels that with the proposed landscaping scheme, any impacted trees will be replaced with new, healthy specimens. Plans for mitigation of creek banks will need to be approved by the Army Corps of Engineers and Salt Lake County Flood Control and will be reviewed by the City Engineer at the time of their submission. As for building heights, the applicant plans to build custom homes and staff feels that building heights will be regulated adequately by the height restriction and roof envelope restrictions in the ordinance. No specific lighting is planned for this development at this time but if any lighting above that normally associated with a residence is planned, those plans could be required with the building permits.

### **8/2/05**

The applicant submitted a detailed landscape plan as requested by the Commission. The City is in the process of designing a trail for the west side of Holladay Blvd and is also a gateway to the city. This corner will be impacted by the new trail. There will also be some realigning of 6200 S in the travel lanes to accommodate the new road off the Beckstrand property to make the travel lane and island line up. The applicant will need to work with the City Engineer on the corner and this issue will be dealt with by the final plat stage. Also requesting that the applicant make available some portion of their wall in this area to put the City logo or something since it is a gateway. Can be worked out at staff level during construction phase.

### **Discussion:**

*Mike Olsen - 6995 Union Park Ave.* Look forward to working with city and staff.

*Steve Luczak - co applicant.* Presented a preliminary design for raised, cut stone planter box for barrier between the street and pedestrian traffic. Provide planter and get drip system in place and work with the city on the landscaping. Offered to bring back a 30ft radius for this corner, but will create a problem with the power pole that is currently there and will have to be dealt with.

Mr. Millard commented that with the approval of this project it raises the priority of doing something to improve that intersection and the city will be working on proposed design.

Commissioner Diederich asked about the signs on their properties and if it is compliance?

Mr. Luczak responded it is 32 ft and in compliance. Did check on the ordinance and it is a 4x8 sign.

Commissioner Palmer asked about the tree near the driveway. The current site plan shows a new tree and he thought they were trying to save the current tree. What is the health of the pine trees? Staff suggested a city gateway sign, is he ok with that?

Mr. Luczak responded they are trying to save the tree and feel it was mislabeled. Met with an arborist and right now they do not have beetles but a few have another pine disease and have contracted with him to come out and spray all the trees. Also need to get water to them. They are fine with the city gateway sign and even suggested this when project first went into staff. Want to come up with something nice.

Commissioner Diederich commented to staff that as that intersection is designed can we address the issue of pedestrian traffic over the bridge to the west?

*William Young - 2781 E 6200 S.* Spoke in favor of application. One concern about erosion along the creek, which is significant. Hopes it will be addressed in a natural way, ie boulders and not a concrete wall. Something needs to be done about the corner on 6200 S by the bridge.

*Caryn Summers - 2781 E 6200 S.* Appreciate being personally talked to by the developer. There is historical significance to that corner (Knudsen Grove Corner). Asked if is possible to see plans for any decks or anything that might overhang the creek. Talked about idea of doing a flashing yellow light right around the bridge ("S" curve).

7:29:40 Commissioner Howard Diederich moved to approve the application with the following conditions: 1) erosion from creek be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer; 2) any efforts to substantiate the creek be done in a natural way; 3) make the corner available for a city gateway sign and accommodate the trails. Commissioner Palmer seconded the motion. The Planning Commission roll call vote was as follows: Commissioners Shupe, Palmer, Diederich, Carr, Scott and McKell in favor. The motion to approve passed by a unanimous vote.

### **3. 2300 E Townhomes- 4565 S 2300 East (7:32:15)**

#### **Background:**

The applicant would like to build a dwelling group on the two properties at 4565 and 4569 South 2300 East. The one lot is zoned RM and the other, R-2-10. In order to maximize the density on this project, this applicant has included two, single family lots on Clearview/Russell. With the Clearview properties, the area of the project will exceed the one acre minimum requirement for a PUD. The Commission may review the project in light of flexibility allowed by the PUD ordinance.

The following are data for discussion;

#### Site Data

Area: Total 1.48 acres

RM- 16,021 SF

R2-10- 16,437 SF

R1-8 - 32,234

Density Calculations:

16, 021 SF zoned RM: 4 units allowed/ 4 units requested  
16,437 SF zoned R2-10: 2 or 3 units allowed/4 units requested

32,234 SF zoned R1-8 - 4 units on public street / 2 units on a private street - requesting 3 units - *There are two existing houses and the site plan shows 1 additional house*

Building data:

2 Fourplexs, two existing houses and one proposed house  
Overall Building height- 35FT

Setbacks

Required:	Provided:
Front-25/30	Front- 19.5
Side- 8/10	Side- 15 FT
Rear - 30	Rear - 15

Coverage: RM zone restricts coverage of the lot by structures to 50%. *There are no coverage calculations on the site plan.*

Landscaping

Required: Front Setback  
Provided: Plan required

Parking

Required: 2 spaces/unit + .5/unit for guests  
Provided: 2 spaces/unit + 5 guest spaces (*additional guest parking spaces are shown but are located in the front setback area which must be landscaped*)

**Staff Analysis:**

The PUD ordinance requires the applicant have a design team to work through the issues of site layout and building design. In reviewing this submission, it is evident that there are difficult issues regarding slope, openspace and the inclusion of the single family homes that will require more than the standard layout that has been submitted. Staff recommends the Commission postpone any decision on this matter until such time as the staff can meet with the applicant’s design team and work through this site plan. Issues that need resolution at this time are:

1. The applicant has shown two open spaces but one is located in the side yard of the proposed single family home. We don’t see that this will ever be accessible for the occupants of the townhomes. The openspace in the front yard will only be accessible to about half the units. The site plan does not indicate whether each unit will have fenced rear yards or not but staff feels the openspace should be more centrally located.
2. There doesn’t seem to be any provision for community trash receptacles.
3. Units are designed to be located across the 5 to 6 foot rise at the rear of the property. It appears that grading for the connection to Clearview may force these two units to be built higher than the adjacent units. Depending on the overall height of the buildings, this could present a problem with the height restrictions in the zone.
4. Guest parking will be restricted in the project. Two stalls, located adjacent to the new house, will not be accessible to the visitors to the townhomes. For the eight townhome units, a minimum of 4 guest stalls would be needed and the stalls need to be disbursed throughout the project. The site plan shows five stalls that could work.
5. The homeowners of the single family homes will want to have their yards fenced separate from the PUD. This will preclude any openspace being used to mitigate the density of the townhomes.
6. There is an existing masonry fence separating these properties and there is no indication of whether this fence will be demolished or not. There is a security gate at the east end of the townhome properties that would create a barrier between the public street and the private street. Depending on the location of the fencing, this will create at least, a perceived barrier between the single family homes and the townhome reinforcing the inaccessibility of the openspace from the townhomes.
7. There is an existing home on Russell Street that will need to be subdivided away from the two houses

on Clearview. Density calculations should be based on a number that does not include this house. It will never be part of the PUD.

8. The submitted drawing does not show the proposed boundary of the PUD and density calculations based on this site plan may not be accurate.

9. The transition from a public street to a private street will require some provision for traffic turn-around. This has not been shown on this plan. *The City Traffic Engineer has reported that the end of Clearview Street has been a problem for the snow plows, garbage trucks and other traffic for many years. This is an excellent opportunity to resolve this problem.*

10. Coverage calculations are absent so it is not clear whether they meet that requirement or not.

11. There is an active irrigation ditch at the eastern end of the townhomes property. This needs to be addressed.

Staff feels that this plan sacrifices design for density and at this time, we cannot support approval. This is a unique property and that it would be better project if staff could meet with the applicant and his design team to go over the above 11 items to meet the PUD ordinance.

### **Discussion:**

*Jay Rice - 4625 S 2300 E #201.* Met with planning staff and gone over the feasibility of this and felt he had support. Taking an RM zone, a R-2-10 zone and an R-1-8 zone and that give us 13.4 units or so. Gone through a couple of different drawings and felt concerns of staff were addressed. Feel this is a much needed project. Will not be used for rental purposes. Had meeting with neighbors last night and had about 10 residents showed up. The gate on Clearview will not be used by the residents in the PUD but for emergency purposes only. Have a playground, off street parking with one visitor stall per unit, more open space in the northeast area.

Commissioner McKell asked Mr. Rice to point out the parking spaces. What is the accessibility for the gazebo and BBQ area. Would there be room for a gate around the front and not impede traffic on 2300 E.

Mr. Rice stated it would be accessible and leveled out. If it is single gate will swing out 10 ft or 20 ft if it is double.

Commissioner Carr asked what the square footage would be for the units?

Mr. Rice responded that the main floor would be around 700-800sq ft, upstairs would be about 11-1200 sq ft and sell in the \$300,000 range. There are two main open areas.

Commissioner Shupe asked about the irrigation ditch that runs to the east, is that been planed for? Have you taken into account the grade change?

Mr. Rice stated that it does not flow on a regular basis and asked Mr. Larson to address that. Heights will be in the area of 25ft with an 8/12 pitch. Buildings are stepped up between units.

Commissioner McKell asked about the new home being so close to the picnic area and yet there is a lot of space uphill to the existing home. Any thought to utilizing that open space?

Mr. Rice stated yes and that this is only conceptual.

Commissioner Palmer stated that PUD status has to be earned based on the characteristics of the project. Why should this be PUD and what are the benefits to Holladay?

Mr. Rice responded that staff really like the idea of Clearview coming in and having that emergency access because it has been landlocked and is unused land. The additional landscape is (54%) plus

the additional open space.

Commissioner Scott asked Mr. Larsen if he fully understands what he is agreeing to with this PUD and if he has defined his area vs. the PUD open area. His land is being used to help the density and if he is allowing the owners in the PUD to use some of the facilities.

*Clark Larsen - 4565 Clearview St.* Understands that he will be locked into the PUD and one additional home and access to Russell. Have not yet worked out a HOA.

Mr. Rice addressed the PUD issue and doesn't know if it that's been explained. PUD's have lot lines and can fence in those lot lines. Private areas can be designated in CCR's.

*Kristin Martinez - 4558 Russell St.* Concern was if the land got rezoned commercial and is pleased to see residential going in vs commercial development. Not as much traffic and keeps integrity of neighborhood.

*Dave Robertson - McKenna Court.* Very pleased. Want to be sure the residential nature of the street is maintained as much as possible. Glad this is going to be residential. Making it a PUD seems to alleviate some of the previous problems. Likes the open space and whole environment of the area.

*Bob Peal - 4552 Russell St.* Will there only be one more single family home developed? If the answer is yes then he is in favor. Would rather see residential than commercial.

*Robert Rice - 4565 Clearview.* Will be building new home on upper lot so this obviously benefits us. Proposals look nice. Plan is for only one home.

Commissioner Scott asked how he would define his home lot and what is open area? What about fencing?

Mr. Rice replied just exactly as it is shown. Have not discussed fencing, but does plan on it.

Commissioner McKell asked if he would like to see the new home further to the east?

Mr. R. Rice responded that they have not discussed exact locations, but can work it out.

*Heidi Gould - 4605 Clearview.* We were not notified about any of this happening and rumors were flying. Concerned about cut through traffic and want to make sure that the gate exists and does not let traffic through. Would also like to make sure they are kept informed.

Commissioner Carr asked if that gate will be accessible to maintenance vehicles? How will they turn around?

Mr. J. Rice stated that he heard that utility vehicles can have access.

Mr. Millard replied that one of the fundamental issues at the beginning of the discussion of this project with Kodiak was plain and simple, they would have to put in a turn-around and the Larson's would have to have a turn around in order to get a building permit. But by working together it would be possible to minimize the asphalt and maximize the landscaping and provide continuity. When it comes to utility vehicles it could be optional. Part of the area is serviced by public collection and the other by private collection. Keep the road closed and keep as much landscaping as possible to enhance the area, yet still function. That was the original idea for working together. Need to verify ownership. When it comes to turning around most vehicles will use the driveways, but emergency

vehicles will not. That is why the turn-around is required.

Commissioner Scott asked if by becoming part of the PUD will the trash systems will be combined as well as other services?

Mr. Millard responded that a PUD is a process for achieving a product. Product is essentially a subdivision and how we get there is important to achieve a certain objective. PUD is simply whatever it says it is and those who are part of it should have a HOA to control whatever is private and enforced internally.

*4581 Clearview.* Has no problem with the additional home, but feels that eight units is a bit much. Concerned that the gate will be left open.

Commissioner Diederich asked about some of the notes in the staff report. If there is not a way for visitors to come into the units they will come in on Clearview. What is the density calculations if we excluded the house on Russell.

Mr. Millard explained that calculations are on the plan and provided by Mr. Rice. Ms. Hanson is concerned about how the calculations were done. Our ordinance states that a PUD does not change the density. So the house on Russell Street has nothing to do with this PUD. Applicant needs to determine exactly how much of the lot on Russell will be taken off and subdivide it away. The ordinance then states if a home is accessed on a private drive it has to have a half acre, that is why this lot could never have had a house in any other circumstance. No problem with putting in a new home but it is direct opposition to what the ordinance states, but we need to make sure that when calculating the density, etc that we take away that part on Russell Street all together and get back to actual sq footage of what is going to be considered in this application. We need to have a very clear understanding of where that second house will go and how that ground will be used and accessible if we are going to count if for open space. Doubt that area shown on the east for open space will be accessible by those in the PUD. The fencing is so ambiguous in that area and we don't know where the gate will go. Do not see a single family home being included in the PUD. There are too many unanswered questions and answers are needed to those questions with the design team.

Commissioner Scott supports the idea and project and would like to see it work. But we do need answers.

8:21:30 Commissioner Palmer made a motion to continue this item subject to such time that it can be brought back with the recommendations from staff addressed. Encourage applicant to do everything possible to create a plan and the benefits. Need to also outline the height & elevation proposal. Commissioner Shupe seconded the motion. The Planning Commission roll call vote was as follows: Commissioners Shupe, Palmer, Diederich, Carr, Scott and McKell in favor. The motion to continue passed by a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Carr commented that the project does not support the purpose of a PUD. Feels the PUD ordinance needs to be reviewed to require a larger minimum acreage to do a PUD.

#### **4. Ordinance Discussions**

##### **4.1 Billboards**

In the County, billboards are permitted uses. City has a problem with all billboards. County has issued a permit and it may be a done deal. The City will try to get rid of it, if possible and will be on

the Aug. 16 agenda.. In addition they still need to have a permit from the County flood control and the State regarding the proximity to Cottonwood Creek. This is a legal situation and will meet with Mr. Hall for an opinion. Just moving the sign from the south end of the project to the north end, it is a relocation of a permitted use.

**4.2 Tree Protection Ordinance**

Commission discussed who would issue the permit and how do we decide who is an authorized professional? Always look at this issue during site plan review. A public hearing is scheduled for August 16 to discuss this issue.

**4.3 Other Business**

Mr. Millard thanked the Commission and he has enjoyed working with them. The Commission also thanked Mr. Millard for all his work.

**5. Adjourn**

Commissioner McKell moved to adjourn at 8:52 pm

*I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, August 2, 2005*

---

Patricia Hanson  
City Planner

---

Stephanie N. Carlson  
City Recorder

Minutes approved: 8-16-05