

**MINUTES OF THE HOLLADAY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**Tuesday, April 1, 2008
5:00 p.m.
Holladay Municipal Center
4580 South 2300 East**

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members:

Paul Shupe, Chair
Gene Carr
Lori Khodadad
Richard Kimball
Cyrus McKell
Brad Scott, Vice Chair
Lynda Shields

City Staff:

Paul Allred, Community Development Director
Rick Whiting, City Planner

1. Field Trip and/or Discussion.

1.1 All Agenda Items May be Visited, and/or Discussed.

(18:17:45) The Commission Members discussed the Holladay Cove condominium conversion project. Fire protection issues were discussed.

Community Development Director, Paul Allred, reported that green space would be given up for parking and a hydrant needed to be shown on the plat. Commissioner Khodadad suggested the applicants should try to figure out a different parking configuration so they don't lose all if the green space. Mr. Allred suggested the Commission question the applicants and make sure they have looked at every alternative for locating other stalls on the site so that green space is not lost.

Amenities within the project were discussed. Commissioner McKell noticed there was a picnic/gazebo area. The Commission discussed with the applicants previously the possibility of shared parking with the adjoining property owners to the north and south. Mr. Allred commented that the applicants approached both adjoining property owners and asked to work out an arrangement for off-site parking. The property owner to the south initially agreed to work with them and allow six off-site stalls. They then backed out because of legal concerns about liability with other people parking on their property.

Outstanding items to be resolved were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that the applicants should be informed that they will not be able to record the final plat until the outstanding items are resolved. Before issuance of the final plat, the City will need its inspector to meet with the owners to go through the outstanding items point by point. Mr. Allred explained that the final plat will be handled at staff level. What was before the Commission could be approved subject

to conditions if so desired. He stated that technically the City has purview over the final plat and noted that final plats do not typically come to the Commission.

(18:26:00) Mr. Allred stated that this was the first condominium conversion in the City and they could happen over and over again. There were numerous apartment complexes in the area that had the potential of being sold off and condominiumized. The City now had an ordinance in place allowing it, however, it was fairly strict. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Shields, Mr. Allred explained that there was a state law requiring every City to have a plan for moderate income housing. Holladay's own study showed that approximately 18% of the total dwellings in the City were affordable at 80% of the area median income of Salt Lake County. Although Holladay is a high-end community, it is fairly affordable because there are a lot of affordable units in the condo and apartment complexes found in the city. He urged the Commissioners to be careful not to translate the concept of multi-family housing with affordability since that was often not the case.

Mr. Allred reported that the annual median income in the County is \$49,860. The figure for the City of Holladay was not known. Utility metering issues were discussed. It was reported that metering requirements was the only item the applicants did not comply with. Commissioner Carr suggested the applicants come back to the Planning Commission when they have complied with everything. At that point they could work with staff on the final plat. Mr. Allred commented that the applicants were anxious to obtain approval. Staff was willing to ensure that the applicants comply with certain conditions of approval before releasing the final plat. Commissioner Carr commented that once the preliminary plat is approved the applicants will be vested.

(18:38:17) Commissioner Shupe expected that parking will be an issue to be worked through. Mr. Allred did not expect it to be an issue since the City required the applicants to provide it. Commissioner Khodadad suggested the applicants make adjustments where necessary. Mr. Allred remarked that in reviewing the site, at least four stalls would be needed in the back. He suggested the applicants explore other possible options. Parking and open space issues were discussed.

The Oakmont Carwash proposal was discussed. Commissioner Shupe stated that the Commission would mainly be looking at the materials, architectural flavor, and colors proposed. Commissioner McKell asked if the Commission could impose some sort of requirement that whatever is done on the exterior conform to the aesthetics of the rest of the area.

Per the City's Code Enforcement Officer, Doug Brewer, it was noted that there was a huge problem with graffiti. The extent of the problem was not recognized because staff had worked diligently to mitigate it. Mr. Allred stated that graffiti was easy to remove from vinyl fencing but nearly impossible to remove from brick.

2. Agenda.

(19:06:06) Chairman Paul Shupe called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. and read the Commission statement.

2.1 Public Hearing/Decision – Condominium Conversion Preliminary Plat – Holladay Cove Condominiums.

(19:10:20) City Planner, Rick Whiting, presented the staff report and stated that the facility was existing on .84 acres in the RM zone. The proposal was to convert the existing apartments to condominium ownership. The density was slightly deficient, but because it is an existing facility and a legal non-conforming application, it was grandfathered. An 18-unit complex was proposed and the applicants were seeking preliminary plat approval and condominium approval. The existing structures were upgraded to comply with the requirements of the condominium conversion. Mr. Whiting mentioned that the applicants had been very patient and cooperative with the City in working through the creation of the condominium ordinance.

Mr. Whiting explained that Planning Commission approval was required to assure that the applicant meets current applicable ordinances and regulations relating to condominium projects with the caveat that there are elements that are grandfathered. Mr. Whiting reported that an independent professional inspector inspected the property. Dean L. Webb & Associates was identified as the consulting engineer who worked through Sunrise Engineering to accomplish the inspection and prepare a Property Condition Report. Initially there were a number of items that were deficient with the condominium code. The applicant had since corrected most of them. The remaining items were listed in the staff report. The applicant advised Mr. Whiting that all of the items had since been corrected and addressed properly. It was noted that thorough confirmation must be completed prior to final plat approval.

(19:14:31) Mr. Whiting reported that parking was the remaining issue that had been addressed as presently proposed and determined to be adequate with 36 parking stalls. He stated that water meters were called out in the City Code to be required for each individual unit, which is cost prohibitive to accomplish. Mr. Whiting stated that it was generally understood that that was not common practice in condominium administration. Staff was comfortable recommending that that this one particular requirement be waived. He noted that each unit readily provided individual shut off valves for water, gas, and electrical services as required by the City Code. Tenants were provided with notice of vacation. Mr. Whiting estimated that five tenants remained who were properly noticed that the conversion was imminent and they will need to find other housing or participate in the purchase of condominium units.

Mr. Whiting reported that the applicant had organized a homeowners' association whose purpose would be to manage the common areas, the water distribution and billing, and other site related functions such as snow removal and landscaping. The applicant would act as the HOA until a sufficient number of units are sold and the authority for managing them can be transferred to the HOA. The applicant provided documentation for staff on the details of the HOA organization. Mr. Whiting reported that adequate parking had been provided for under the current site plan. The applicant held a neighborhood meeting in 2007 and those in attendance indicated that they had their questions answered. There seemed to be a general approval of the project on the part of the neighbors and public in the area. Most recognized that condominium ownership may provide more stability in terms of move-ins and move outs and would benefit the neighborhood. Staff recommended approval of the proposal subject to the findings contained in the staff report.

Mr. Whiting reviewed the Property Condition Report to give the Commission Members an understanding of what transpired in that regard. The general condition of the building indicated no apparent problems. The walls were determined to be in good condition. The roof, rafters, and floors were determined to be in acceptable condition. The mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems were upgraded to meet current City code. The useful expectancy of the project was expected to exceed an additional 40 years.

(19:19:41) Given the grandfathered status of the project, Mr. Whiting reported that it generally met ADA regulations. There were a few specifics that were not able to be met. The primary one was wheelchair access to the second floor. The grandfathered status of the project allowed that requirement to be waived. The condition of paving or surface material on driveways, parking areas, sidewalks, and curbs appeared to be in satisfactory condition. Paint and exterior surfaces also appeared to be in satisfactory condition. There was also a report of deficient wood on decks that was replaced.

Commissioner Carr asked about the grandfathered status of the project and noted that they were originally constructed as apartments. He asked if the grandfathering could be applied to the new condominium use and ownership configuration. Mr. Whiting confirmed that the City Attorney was consulted on the matter. Mr. Allred stated that when the applicants originally came to the City there was no condominium conversion ordinance in place. The applicants provided the City with a draft ordinance and appeared before the City Council on a couple of occasions. Significant discussions took place at the Council level about what should and should not be grandfathered in. He stated that the proposed ordinance allowed flexibility and found a middle ground that requires applicants to comply with certain aspects of the International Building Code. Applicants, however, could not bring old buildings up to the existing code at a reasonable cost. The intent of the new ordinance was to strike a balance between new codes and old buildings. Mr. Allred explained that a tremendous amount of upgrading and updating of the units was done without demolishing or significantly altering them structurally.

The public hearing was opened.

(19:26:30) The applicant, Devin Overly, and his father were present. Together they represented Metaview Development. They specifically work in Salt Lake and Utah Counties and were local residents with an interest in the local economy. They had done many other successful conversions in Salt Lake City, Orem, Provo, and others. This one, in particular, had posed its own particular challenges. He had found staff to be very helpful and they developed a relationship over that last year working on the project. Mr. Overly stated that he was not a qualified building inspector and noted that one was hired specifically for the project. He was comfortable claiming that they had gone above and beyond the minimum requirements. He and his father had been successful in the conversion business to this point. Due to the extended periods of time that it had taken them to get to this point, they needed to see the project move forward. They had owned this non-income producing property for over one year.

(19:28:58) Commissioner McKell stressed the importance of neighborhood meetings and realized one was held in 2007. He asked for the specific date the meeting was held. Mr. Overly was unsure and was asked to provide the specific date for the record. He stated that many

improvements had been made to the project over the last year. He could not imagine that the community could be any unhappy than they were when the project was originally proposed.

Commissioner Shields had some concerns with the parking and hoped there was some way to preserve the small amount of green space. The Commission was told that the applicants approached the property owners to the north and south about parking. Mr. Overly stated that in the end they were not able to reach an agreement with the adjoining property owners. In addition, certain legal issues came into question. Commissioner Shields stated that she had worked as a realtor in the past and sold properties that had no parking. Mr. Overly stated that their experience was that the property owners on both sides were not comfortable with the idea. His preference was to preserve more green space, however, they were at the point that it was a smarter decision for them to simply comply and pave the spaces. The time factor had become more important to them.

Commissioner Khodadad asked if the proposed parking configuration was the only option and if some spaces could be placed in other areas in order to keep some of the green space. Mr. Overly stated that the site was already very tight. Possible options were discussed. He commented that he wanted to keep the playground set and move it against the north fence and include some green space for children to play. He stated that they had spent a significant amount of money on landscaping to this point. He expected that in the end they would have to pave over some green space in order to make the parking work. He commented that because the area is tucked away from the street, they considered offering some covered parking spaces, which would be an attractive feature to the owners. By adding the additional spaces, the covered parking would not detract from the appearance of the project. In addition, they would be able to offer something they were not able to before. They decided against canopies as they would obstruct the view of the buildings.

(19:37:05) Commissioner Khodadad asked if the intent was to pave the entire back portion of the project. Mr. Overly responded that it was their intent to pave as little as possible to accommodate the ordinance and leave as much green space as possible. He noted that the area in the northeast corner was professionally landscaped and there were flowerbeds there that could be preserved and maintained.

Commissioner Carr stated that the Commission was told that there were five exceptions to be adhered to. Mr. Overly stated that the items set out were fairly insignificant and did not involve anything more than a few hundred dollars' worth of basic maintenance. It was confirmed earlier in the day that those items had been taken care of. Commissioner Carr stated that the Commission cannot not give a definitive approval until it is confirmed that those items are complete. Staff recommended that all of the items be completed before the final plat is released. If the matter is not required to come back for final plat, staff strongly recommended that the Commission let the applicant and staff know that there is an expectation that there will be a sign off in the field by the City's Inspector, Kevin Hammond, working with either the applicants' engineer or John Hanson to make sure that all of the items are complete. Mr. Overly remarked that staff informed him that they may be able to obtain the Commission's approval tonight and move on with the final gatekeeper being staff.

Commissioner Shupe clarified that parking was the only item that was determined to be incomplete. Mr. Overly confirmed that that was the case and stated that the issue came up in their office earlier in the day. They would also be willing to fully pre pay the cost of the parking, which was \$10,000 to complete, and provide documentation to staff to that effect. He explained that he had been through the bond process before and found it to be very time consuming. He went through the process with Salt Lake City on a much larger project and the project ended up being delayed by nearly four months while the bond was put in place. It made sense for \$2 million worth of construction but for \$10,000 they were happy to provide proof that it has been paid for and will be done. Timing constraints were discussed.

(19:42:58) Commissioner McKell noticed that a homeowners' association was organized and asked if a draft of the CC&Rs was available. Mr. Overly stated that a draft was available as well as a copy of the HOA bylaws.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kimball asked about the location of the fire hydrant. Mr. Allred reported that there was no hydrant proposed on the site and it was located on the adjacent property to the south in close proximity to the property. Staff had a lengthy discussion earlier in the day with the Unified Fire Authority about the matter. There was concern that there is approximately 2,000 feet of property along Highland Drive in the approximate vicinity that does not have a fire hydrant. On the far south end of the 2,000 feet, the subject property was very close to a hydrant. Staff suggested it be shown with a broken line to show approximately how far it is off site. Staff expected that it was within 100 feet.

Mr. Allred asked if the applicants had looked at alternative paving materials instead of plain asphalt. He explained that alternative materials such as porous pavement and grass block, etc, are often suggested to homeowners who are struggling to meet the maximum amount of impervious area on their property. For a small area staff could provide suggestions on alternative materials that might not hold the project up. He stated that because of the applicants' grandfathered status, they were over 60% impervious, which was the maximum. With the additional pavement they would be pushing the limit higher.

(19:49:35) Commissioner McKell saw nothing in the site plan addressing the issue of runoff. He asked if the matter had been reviewed. Mr. Overly had similar concerns. He acknowledged the existence of the creek directly to the east of the property. Commissioner McKell noted that the creek was uphill from the property. Mr. Overly stated that the issue was addressed with his surveyor who could provide documentation to the Commission, if necessary. The surveyor informed Mr. Overly that it was not an issue and confirmed that detention was not being done on site. It was recognized that the site traditionally drains downhill to Highland Drive. Mr. Allred stated that it would increase the amount of water going down Highland Drive unless the applicants were to install a different type of material.

Commissioner McKell stated that if the amount of surface runoff is increased, perhaps the pavers would be a good alternative. Mr. Overly was aware of the problems that could be posed by

improper runoff and he had never noted any significant detention problems on the site. He remarked that the parking lot was recently repaved and the asphalt was in good condition.

Commissioner Carr stated that in the subdivision ordinance there is a requirement that there be a finished grade shown on the map. Mr. Allred reminded Commissioner Carr that they were considering a finished product. The new parking area would be done to feather with the existing grade. It would increase the runoff, however, by a factor of the square footage to be added in asphalt. To his knowledge, however, the City Engineer had not expressed a concern about creating an on-site detention basin for the runoff. He noted that the property is fairly steeply sloped from west to east.

Commissioner Scott asked if the cost of parking could be put into a cash account to be controlled by the City without the parking being completed. Mr. Allred stated that it would be done by security deposit. If the parking is not installed by a certain date it would be drawn upon. Commissioner Shupe was aware of multiple bonds available such as a letter of credit, an escrow, or cash bond. Mr. Allred stated that staff's desire was to go only with a cash bond. He viewed a letter of credit as the weakest option. Escrow was probably the second best option. Commissioner Kimball stated that the cash bond would probably be the quickest to implement and the easiest for the City to deal with.

(19:58:15) Commissioner Scott moved to approve the proposed condominium conversion preliminary plat to create Holladay Cove Condominiums, an 18-unit project in the RM zone on .84 acres subject to the following:

Findings:

- 1. The project meets the overall requirements for a subdivision including minimum acreage based upon grandfathered density.*
- 2. This project is in compliance with the provisions of the City's General Plan.*
- 3. This project will not be detrimental in any reasonable way to neighboring properties. The basic land use (multi-family residential) will remain the same – only ownership changes.*
- 4. The project, as proposed, is essentially neutral to the character of the neighborhood, however, upgrading exterior appearance and, presumably, reducing the rate of resident turnover through individual condominium ownership would likely be considered an improvement.*
- 5. Despite a code amendment granted by the Unified Fire Authority (UFA) as pertaining to pre-existing building placement and fire equipment access – satisfactory standards allow for maintaining health, safety, and welfare of residents in the project and in the general vicinity.*

Conditions:

- 1. Prior to final plat approval, the City shall make final inspections of all buildings and structures to determine conformance with code for remaining deficiencies noted above.*
- 2. The Property Condition Report must be recorded with the subdivision plat.*

3. *As a condition of final approval, the developer will be required to sign an agreement with the City of Holladay that indemnifies and holds the City harmless in the authorization of the condominium conversion.*
4. *The condominium development, with all documentation, shall be granted final approval by the City, upon recommendation by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and the Chief Building officer (CBO) that all requirements of the Planning Commission preliminary approval have been completed; the final plat and all required documentation have been submitted and approved; a cash bond only for parking deficiencies must be submitted by the applicant with the understanding that the applicant is able to proceed with sale of units prior to all deficiencies being completed.*
5. *The fire hydrant shall be marked on the site plan and flow tested to ensure its adequacy to provide protection for the residents.*
6. *The final plat shall be approved at staff level and is not required to come back to the Planning Commission.*

Commissioner McKell seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Paul Shupe-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Richard Kimball-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Discussion/Decision – Oakmont Carwash – Materials Change Amendment.

(20:16:16) Paul Channel was present on behalf of his father Reed Channel, the applicant. He stated that he had had to make some decisions on their proposed car wash. He commented that the City was experiencing a plague of graffiti. For him it was a very expensive problem as he was hit with graffiti on a regular basis. It seemed that 3900 South, 2700 South, and 4500 South were major runs for graffitiists. Mr. Channel reported that he was hit three times the prior week and the problem was costing him thousands of dollars. Every time he is graffitied, he calls the police and has them take a picture. It is documented so that when the perpetrators are caught they can be charged for each crime. The two individuals who hit him the previous week were students from Skyline High School. Mr. Channel planned to press charges and sue their parents. He stated that the previous week he was hit in 12 different places. It cost him an average of \$50 to \$300 to clean off every spot hit.

Commissioner Carr asked what the punishment was. Mr. Channel stated that the policeman informed him that offenders go to juvenile court and are given community service hours. If they are over 18, they can be charged with a felony if the violation involves a certain amount of money. Mr. Channel's problem was that he had a \$5 million investment in his building and car wash and he can't have graffiti. The previous week he spent several hundred dollars in materials, labor, and time removing graffiti.

(20:20:25) Mr. Channel stated that instead of decreasing, graffiti seemed to be proliferating. He had spoken to law enforcement and City officials and they were doing everything in their power to prevent it. Some of the neighbors in the area are elderly and don't have the means to clean it up. There was a graffiti hotline but they only remove graffiti from public boxes. Anything on private property must be taken care of by property owners.

The type of paint used and the area hit determines whether it can be removed easily. Mr. Channel stated that it can be removed from vinyl fairly easily. It was more difficult to remove graffiti from cement. On the wall near Granato's he spent 10 hours and about \$150 in chemicals trying to remove the markings but it was still showing through. Mr. Channel's last attempt would be to get a higher-powered pressure washer and take the cement off to remove it completely.

Mr. Channel stated that when the car wash was originally planned, they proposed brick wainscot up four feet and then vinyl, wood, and stucco on top. He explained that cement, brick, and mortar are very porous and absorb the paint. He realized that the City was already involved in a campaign to stop graffiti. The type of paint used determines whether it can be removed. Many times when cement or brick is tagged it is painted over, which did not look good.

Mr. Channel approached the City and wanted to change the material on the base of the car wash. Instead of brick he had two options. One was to leave the vinyl all the way down to the landscaping because it is easier to clean off than brick. He would then change the color of the stucco on top to match the canopy of the mall. Another option was to change the color of the stucco to match the mall with landscaping around it. Another option was to do a cast concrete base and seal it. It was noted that this option was cost prohibitive. The last option was to put stucco up four feet with four inches of foam and white stucco with a sealer. Mr. Channel's personal preference was to leave the vinyl with the maroon strip around the top. If he was confident that the graffiti would stop his preference would be to go with the brick option. Because of the present situation, however, it would be cost prohibitive and he would end up having to paint it. He thought that was a waste of money and a detriment to the look of the building.

Mr. Channel estimated that they were four weeks away from opening the car wash. It was also upgraded to a new system that is much quieter than the original one. It cost \$20,000 more but would be an improvement. They also installed a water reclamation system. Over the long-term he expected it to pay for itself.

As a property owner, Mr. Channel realized that he had to maintain the appearance of the property. If the perpetrators are caught he can seek restitution from their parents if they are minors or from the individuals themselves. He was receiving restitution from one individual from Tooele. He was paid \$10 per month for the \$3,000 worth of damage caused. Mr. Channel's insurance paid for the damage and he paid the deductible. Unfortunately, it had become a cost of doing business. For homeowners the cost was even higher because they usually have to hire a professional and pay \$30 to \$60 per hour plus materials for removal. Mr. Channel stated that it would save him money in the long run if he can use different materials.

Commissioner Scott suggested Mr. Channel choose his option and submit it to staff before it is approved. He remarked that Mr. Channel had done an incredible job on the car wash. He was comfortable that he was vested with the shopping center around the car wash. The City just wanted to make sure that it blends in. Mr. Channel agreed that he had a vested monetary interest.

Commissioner Shupe asked if there was a way to paint the vinyl to break up the wall of white. Mr. Channel stated that in three weeks his camera system will go in as well as an infrared camera that will work at night. He was also putting in a security system to help deter graffiti artists. He remarked that groups can do tens of thousands of dollars worth of damage in one night. Various methods of removing graffiti were discussed. Security issues were discussed. Mr. Channel stated that the backside of the building was so secluded that it can't be seen from any street.

(20:43:26) Mr. Channel was asked about his lighting system. He explained that the lighting was very unobtrusive at night, however, the cameras can see about 20 to 25 feet in the dark. During the day they can see 50 to 60 feet. The parking lot lights were left on until 11:00 for his neighbors. Security lighting was left on 24 hours per day. He had to balance his lighting with the needs of his tenants and their security.

Commissioner Shupe asked what had been done on the existing buildings. Mr. Channel stated that he had matching paint that he used to paint over markings on the building. The north wall was block and had been a favorite target for some time. One issue was that if the graffiti is left and not removed, others will continue to mark in the same place. If it is painted over, many times offenders know it will be gone before anyone sees it and might not tag the same area in the future. The proposed car wash material was designed to allow graffiti to be removed easily. A chemical could be applied that would not allow the paint to adhere to the vinyl.

Commissioner Shupe opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

(20:51:30) Commissioner Shields thought it was unfortunate that the City had to build structures to be easy to care for because of vandals. Because of that, she agreed that something practical should be done to deal with it.

Mr. Whiting explained that what was proposed was an amendment to a conditional use permit to allow alternate materials for the building site. The Commission was looking to divert from the original approval that had a certain exterior component, to something that is more graffiti resistant.

Mr. Allred remarked that he was with the City's Code Enforcement Officer, Doug Brewer, earlier in the day and they went to 10 locations within one hour that had been tagged by vandals. Areas hit included fences, utility boxes, signs, and dumpsters. He verified that it was taking an enormous amount of the staff's time. Doug is spending a lot of time and energy communicating with the police department and getting proper removal materials. Some of the materials used by the taggers were resistant to solvents. The City was being forced in some cases to replace stop signs altogether because the solvent used to remove the paint eats away at the stop sign material itself. The problem had reached epidemic proportions. The solvent used earlier in the day took much of the paint off many of the areas but they were not able to spend the necessary time to get all of the vestiges off since it took several applications to remove all of the color.

Mr. Allred did not recall the materials presented being the ones approved by the Planning Commission on the architectural elevations the first time. He was surprised to see that most of

the building was constructed of vinyl. He recommended if the Commission chose to act on the matter tonight, that they make sure it is an amendment to the actual building materials submitted. Commissioner Kimball recalled that what was originally submitted was brick wainscot around the building. That was what he was asking to have altered. His preference was to use a material other than brick. The applicant suggested several options.

(20:58:09) Commissioner Khodadad suggested the building have more dimension or color to add more focal points other than white. She thought the awnings would help but also suggested planter boxes and pots that match the awnings to detract from the white.

Commissioner Scott stated that Mr. Channel should be given some leeway since the City cannot protect him from graffiti.

Commissioner Shields liked the idea of low-lying brick planters. Possible alternatives were discussed.

Commissioner McKell stated that there is foliage that surrounds a large part of Holladay Cemetery called pyracantha. Planting materials with thorns might prevent graffitists from getting close to structures. Commissioner Shupe's understanding was that a planter box arrangement along the east and west sides would be desirable because of the large wall areas.

(21:05:30) Commissioner Khodadad moved to approve the amendment to the conditional use of the original materials to be used on the building and allow the applicant to keep the vinyl on the building to alleviate some of the cost involved in removing graffiti. Staff should be left to make the final decision on the materials used. It was suggested that the applicant add landscaping and planters to break up the stark whiteness of the building. Commissioner Shields seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Paul Shupe-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Richard Kimball-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Consent Items.

Mr. Allred reported that three items were to be presented at the next meeting. They included a condominium project, a conditional use for a drive-thru coffee business, and a three-lot subdivision. Other forthcoming issues were described.

Mr. Allred reported that the intent was to hire a new administrative assistant very soon. They also planned to host the State of Utah Fall Planner's Conference. The first day of the conference would be at the University of Utah and the second day would be in Holladay. The conference was scheduled for November 6 and 7. Mr. Allred urged the Commission Members to participate and be a visible presence. They would be discussing very futuristic concepts in land use planning as it pertains to the scarcity of energy resources. He stated that the lack of fresh water and cheap energy will be the defining issues of the century that will be faced on a daily basis. The conference will address how that will affect land use planning.

Mr. Allred was of the belief that putting residential, commercial, and office uses together in a vertical area was a permanent trend. The intent of the conference was to encourage creative thought.

3.1 Approval of Minutes – March 18, 2008.

The minutes were not available for review.

4. Adjourn.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, April 1, 2008.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 5/20/08