

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

**Tuesday, August 28, 2007
7:00 p.m.
Holladay Municipal Center
4580 South 2300 East**

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members:

Jim Palmer, Chair
Gene Carr
Richard Kimball, Alternate
Cyrus McKell, Vice Chair
Brad Scott
Lynda Shields
Paul Shupe

City Staff:

Paul Allred, Community Development Director
Alma Haskell, City Planner
Pat Hanson, City Planner
Clarence Kemp, City Engineer

1. Agenda.

Chairman Jim Palmer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He explained that the items on the agenda involved either changes to the zoning ordinance, zoning map, or general plan. The municipal law in Holladay stated that the Planning Commission is a recommending body with regard to those changes. He explained that Planning Commission hearings are held to get public input. That input would be included in the Commission's discussions and recommendations and passed on to the City Council. The City Council, in turn, would hold another set of hearings. The hearing process was described.

Community Development Director, Paul Allred, explained that the purpose of tonight's meeting was three-fold. Three public hearings would be held. The first would be on the City's general plan, which called for the land use that should be in the City. The intent of the change was to accommodate the proposed development on the Cottonwood Mall property.

The second item would be to consider a new zone as no zone existed to accommodate the developer's proposal. The proposal was to develop a mixture of uses and put them all together on one site. That was not traditional zoning and more closely resembled a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). Instead of trying to take the old zone and make it fit the new plan, the City decided to create a new zone that would better fit what was proposed on the site. It would be called the Regional Mixed Use Zone. He explained that the Cottonwood Mall was a regional use where people would come from outside the City.

(19:05:32) The third item would be a public hearing to consider whether or not the zoning should be changed from C-2 commercial to the new zone R/M-U. He explained that each of the three separate items described would be held in three separate hearings.

1.1 PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION – Amendment to the City of Holladay General Plan – Appendix E – Cottonwood Mall Master Plan.

(19:07:30) Maunsel Pierce stated that he and his wife had been residents of Arbor Lane since 1973. They had a long history and involvement with the Mall ownership and management. He spoke both as a member of the neighborhood group immediately adjacent to the Mall and as an officer in Cottonwood, Inc., the owner of a 10-foot wide buffer strip along the west side of Arbor and Memory Lanes. They were just beginning their negotiations with the new Mall owners regarding the strip and were unsure how lasting or binding the agreements would be if the strip was included in the RDA. The Commission was asked to exclude the strip from the RDA during their negotiations. They were encouraged by statements 1.6 and 1.7 of the City of Holladay Plan to protect the surrounding neighborhoods from negative impacts of commercial use and limit vehicular access to Memory and Arbor Lanes. The residents wanted to ensure protection of the quiet neighborhood flavor along Arbor and Memory Lanes. It seemed to Mr. Pierce that applying conditions to the rezone would help to assure permanent protection of the neighborhood. He stated that there was a need to review the current agreements, conditions, and covenants protecting their neighborhood. He remarked that a binding agreement currently existed between the Mall owners and Cottonwood, Inc. restricting development within 100 feet of the west sides of Arbor and Memory Lanes and restricting vehicular ingress and egress between the Mall property and Arbor and Memory Lanes. The agreement was attached to a quitclaim deed for the 10-foot buffer strip. In addition, the conditions and covenants attached to the rezone of the Jack and Edith Walker property in 1992 prohibited commercial building and vehicular ingress and egress to Arbor Lane. The immediate residents and Cottonwood, Inc. strongly urged the Commission to rezone the east side of the Mall property with conditions that reflect the City's policy statements. He specifically recommended:

1. There be no commercial building within 100 feet of the west side of Memory and Arbor Lanes beginning at 4800 South and continuing around the Mall property.
2. No commercial ingress or egress to Memory and Arbor Lanes beginning at 4800 South and continuing around the Mall property at the west end of Arbor Lane.

Mr. Pierce stated that recommended conditions would not prohibit residential building in the area or prevent the four proposed single-family residential driveways on Memory and Arbor Lanes.

Commissioner McKell recalled Mr. Pierce commenting about having a restriction to access Memory and Arbor Lanes and had seen reference to it in some of the writings in the proposals. He asked Mr. Pierce what he saw as restricted access. Mr. Pierce responded that Arbor Lane was very narrow, particularly as it nears Highland Drive. He thought something needed to be done there. He knew that a traffic survey was done, however, they did not yet know the results. They thought the current traffic level was excessive.

(19:14:15) Leo Sharp gave his address as 4953 Memory Lane. He was part of an informal group calling itself the Cottonwood Mall Neighbors who came together to express concerns and questions about the redevelopment of the Mall site. They had three concerns that were outlined by a variety of questions. They were curious as to whether a formal pro forma had been given to the City by the developer. It should outline the financial structure of the project, its former relationship with the City, and the community benefits General Growth was offering the City in exchange for development entitlements. They wondered if it was a new and enhanced tax base only or a financial commitment to offset the impact and mitigation to schools, the post office, infrastructure, City services, etc. They were also curious as to whether the developer was

expecting the City of Holladay to bond and finance all of the infrastructure improvements. Lastly, as part of the pro forma he wondered about General Growth's projected expenses and profits for the project. Mr. Sharp stated that another vital concern pertained to an environmental impact study. The group wondered if a thorough and complete environmental impact and mitigation study had been performed and what impact the project would have on traffic, parking, schools, City services, light, noise, demolition, construction, and pollution. They also wondered what the effects would be of substantially denser commercial and residential uses and traffic. They were curious to know what had been shown as an acceptable level of density and environmental impact on the entire community. He asked if there was a finite master site plan in place at present or whether the project would be a design build job defined only as it progresses in its scope. Mr. Sharp stated that the third part of their concerns pertained to the City of Holladay General Plan and amending, changing, or improving it. They were in favor of many aspects of the project and were opposed to very few.

They were in favor of the following:

1. The development of a unique mixed-use project with retail, office, and residential uses.
2. The requirement of distinctive architectural guidelines, pedestrian-oriented access, an on-site post office extension, and an abundance of green space with mature, existing, and new trees and landscaping as described in Article 1.3
3. Enacting regulations that protect surrounding neighborhoods from negative impacts of the new commercial and residential uses and traffic found in Article 1.6.
4. Preventing, not just limiting, vehicular ingress or egress from the project into the neighborhoods along Memory and Arbor Lanes, as mentioned in Article 1.7.
5. Implementing and enacting measures to control light pollution, noise buffering, and to reduce the project's key island footprint.

They were opposed to the following in the City of Holladay General Plan:

1. Sunday or 24-hour demolition and construction.
2. Existing regulations for hours of operation must apply to the project. It was suggested that the developer hire a Complaint Manager for City residents to contact in the event contractors do not comply with the ordinances. That would give them immediate access to an individual within the project that can respond quickly and mitigate problems as they may occur.
3. Taller buildings that might exceed current height restrictions and excessive or substantially denser residential development in the project.
4. Exclusive utilization of City bonded or supported funding for needed infrastructure upgrades. General Growth Properties ought to contribute financially and share in the burden of the infrastructure costs as a result of any pro forma input.
5. Because of the speed at which the project was proceeding, careful and calculated consideration and discussion should be given to all concerns being expressed with adequate time allowed to resolve them. The group trusted that the Commission, as City officials, would stand as their advocates to make the project viable and healthy for all involved.

(19:20:20) In response to Mr. Sharp's comment about limiting vehicular ingress and egress from the project in the neighborhood along Memory and Arbor Lanes, Commissioner Palmer asked if he objected to the driveways of the four single-family homes. Mr. Sharp clarified that he did not

and stated that those would probably be the only exclusions. He objected to the commercial portion of the project and the numerous single-family dwelling units along upper Memory Lane. It was their understanding from General Growth Properties that there would only be pedestrian access to the project as it borders the neighborhoods with the exception of the four large home sites.

Commissioner Palmer referred to Mr. Sharp's objection to the residential density. Mr. Sharp clarified that they were opposed to excessive residential densities. He realized that the project needed to be mixed use with a balance of retail, commercial, and more intense residential building. He thought a study should be done to determine the magnitude of the residential density.

(19:22:10) Camille Pierce gave her address as 2052 East Arbor Lane. She supported mixed use but was uneasy about changing the general plan's residential intent of eliminating high-density creep. She was concerned that the proposed zone change would increase the opportunity for higher residential density. She was concerned that despite City representatives and the developer having met over a number of months, the project was first announced to the residents in July. They were now involved in the rezoning process. She thought the development process was moving too quickly. She wondered how much less protection the surrounding neighbors were accorded in the Cottonwood zoning document as compared to the Village Square document. For example, Section C of the Village vision statement stated that one important goal of the Village was preservation and enhancement of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. It also stated that care should be taken in the development of the Village to protect nearby residential users from adverse impacts such as increased traffic, spill over parking, noise, and light pollution. She saw nothing in the Cottonwood vision statement to that effect. She referred to the Village document, which included detailed guidelines about lighting. The Cottonwoods document included only one sentence. The Village document included a permitted uses heading while in the Cottonwoods document did not. In the Village zoning, it specified that structures should be environmentally sensitive. The Cottonwoods document stated that there should be a reduction of asphalt and increased landscaping. It did not, however, specify what materials the structures and other surfaces would be made of. It also did not commit the developers to replant trees and landscaping with a certain level of mature plants. She remarked that while the Cottonwoods vision statement states that traffic and its associated air pollution would be lessened, it assumes this would be accomplished by the project's residents walking and obtaining services within the development or taking the bus outside, thus reducing trips. She suggested the developer facilitate that by providing free bus passes to the buyers and residents. With new traffic lights proposed along Highland Drive, cars may be idling longer to wait for the lights or to get into the Mall. Well-synchronized traffic lights might help, however, it was difficult to determine what the ultimate air pollution affect would be. To her, the Cottonwoods document seemed rather rushed and incomplete compared to the Village Square document. She cared about the community and if there was to be a rezone to regional mixed use, she suggested the guiding document be thoughtful, complete, and include detailed written descriptions of protections. As a Cottonwood neighbor, she wanted at least the same protections as the City or Village Square neighbors to ensure quality of life.

(19:25:55) Steve Glaser gave his address as 2052 Arbor Lane. Generally, he was in favor of the general plan but suggested one specific amendment. He referred to Section 1.6 and suggested it be changed to enact zone regulations that support the proposed plan while protecting the surrounding neighborhoods from the negative impacts of the commercial use's higher density

housing and traffic. He wanted to see the identical amendment added to the last sentence of the Planning Objectives contained in Appendix E.

(19:17:25 Becky Wassum expressed excitement with the project. She thought it would be an economic boon for the City as well as a real draw to the community. She remarked that walkable neighborhoods were a nationwide trend. Neighborhoods that aren't walkable make life difficult for those in wheelchairs. She was concerned about adequate parking. She preferred it be underground but realized that would incur a greater cost. She thought it would be worthy of cost sharing. The height of buildings was discussed. She did not want to see them go much higher than the Macy's building and did not view large buildings as part of the character of the Village. Noise levels were of concern both during and after construction. She asked how the noise would be abated. She remarked that when the Mall was originally built, it was a revolutionary idea. She thought this mall would be the same.

(19:30:00) Alan Eastman identified himself as a newer Holladay citizen after having been annexed into the City the previous July. He gave his address as 5698 Park Place East. He understood the Arbor Lane residents' concerns with high-density housing. When he moved to his present home in a PUD, he was concerned that living in such a high-density area would be unpleasant. To his surprise, it had been a very nice place to live. The density of the housing was well offset by the amount of green open space and trees. He suggested the developer and the City look at some of the high-density housing already existing in the City, such as Park Place, to demonstrate to the developer how high-density and comfortable living can peacefully coexist.

(19:31:45) Doug Worsley gave his address as 2162 Arbor Lane. He was completely in favor of 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 provided that the conditions recommended by Leo Sharp and Maunsel Pierce were included. He wanted to make sure they were completely addressed and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City before any entitlements are given to the developer. With regard to the mitigation items contained in the environmental impact study, he thought the City should get some community benefits such as parks, schools, road enhancements, etc.

(19:33:40) Ron Spratling gave his address as 4250 South Rowland Drive. It seemed to him after listening to the concerns raised, that the citizens were not opposed to the project, they simply wanted some say in how it is developed. He agreed and thought it was a project that needs to be done but the question was how. He observed that as a part-time developer he was aware that CC&Rs play a significant role in making a project go smoothly. Without them, sometimes projects go askew and take a direction that was not intended. In moving forward, he urged the City to have good rules in place that set forth clearly what will transpire in the project. He suggested the City require the developer to build a high-quality, beautiful project that they can be proud of for years to come. He expressed special concern about the quality of exterior building finishes.

Commissioner Palmer remarked that the Commission envisioned entering into a development agreement with the applicants.

(19:36:37) Commissioner Carr moved to continue the public hearing. Commissioner Shields seconded the motion.

Commissioner Palmer reported that the public hearing would be continued as the plans were in the process of being drafted. Another hearing would be held at a future date and at some point, a

recommended document would be forwarded on to the City Council. With regard to comments about pro formas and monetary aspects, he remarked that the City Council, and the City Council acting as the RDA Board, would make that determination. The Commission would look primarily at land use.

Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

1.2 PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION – Amendment to the City of Holladay Zoning Ordinance to Add a New Chapter, 13.65 – Regional/Mixed Use Zone.

(19:38:05) *Commissioner McKell moved to open the public hearing on Item 1.2. Commissioner Shupe seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

Commissioner Palmer remarked that this public hearing would deal with the specifics of the zoning ordinance.

(9:38:46) Steve Glaser appreciated the City assembling the zoning document as quickly as they had. He understood that it was a draft document. As structured, he was concerned that it looked more like a site master plan that was being prepared by General Growth. If they were doing their job right, the first thing they would consider would be how to make the project work. Within the general plan, apart from the amendment suggested, there was discussion about protection of the neighborhood around the Mall, however, it wasn't in the zoning ordinance. It would be somewhere in the site master plan being prepared by someone whose job was not neighborhood protection. He was concerned that if the thinking behind the protection of the neighborhood waits until the submission of the site master plan, it could change the amount of thought that can go into it. He wanted to see much of that thought come in up front. He thought noise issues should be dealt with in advance as well as timing and demolition issues. He stated that when the City's zoning ordinance was passed it was tied to the County's noise ordinance. At that time, the County had some restrictions that applied to construction projects. Since then the County had determined there were no longer any noise restrictions that apply to construction. He thought there were things that could be done and suggested they start thinking about possible ways to mitigate noise during the construction process. They should also think about what could be done during the demolition process to ensure the health of the neighbors and protect the creek from sediment and trash. He identified density as a significant issue and one that would be the most difficult to discuss prior to the applicant's proposal. Traffic issues were discussed. He wanted to make sure that the project is of a size that will still allow traffic to flow freely on Highland Drive. He suggested that mitigation issues be discussed in advance to allow adequate time to address the matter properly.

(19:45:20) *Commissioner McKell moved to continue the public hearing and welcomed comments in the future once more information has been gathered. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

1.3 PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION – Amendment to the City of Holladay Zone Map – Rezone the Property in the Vicinity of 4835 South Highland Drive from C-2 to R/M-U.

(19:47:20) *Commissioner McKell moved to open the public hearing on Item 1.3, amendment to the City of Holladay Zone Map to rezone the property in the vicinity of 4835 South Highland Drive from C-2 to R/M-U. Commissioner Carr seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

Commissioner Carr clarified that the physical boundaries of the zone would not change from the existing C-2 shown on the map. The mixed-use aspect would be the major difference. Commissioner McKell viewed the matter as one that many in the City had been concerned about. He thought the points made with regard to items 1.1 and 1.2 reflected the fact that there was a general change in the combined use rather than just strictly commercial, which had impacts. He thought it would be important for people to recognize that difference.

Mr. Allred reported on progress made by staff to this point. He noted that the first item discussed pertained to the change to the general plan. He stated that any interested parties were welcome to a copy of the document, which was available at City Hall. Written comments were also welcome. If further clarification was needed, citizens were invited to contact staff directly. There had been many hours of discussion on the general plan change as well as the new zone. Much of what was heard tonight staff sympathized and agreed with. Staff had the community's best interest at heart in their work with the developer. He clarified that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to fulfill a legal obligation required by the City to have public hearings. The public hearings would remain open for discussion at a future date.

(19:52:50) Mr. Allred clarified that with regard to the new zone that had been developed, it was a multiple page document with lot of detail. It was a new type of zone that was being developed. He stated that the City was the applicant on the rezone, which was only for the property owned by General Growth.

Commissioner Shupe asked that Mr. Allred to explain how the RDA works for the benefit of the public. Mr. Allred thought the City Council or the City Manager were better qualified to speak in that regard. He stressed that it was a totally different issue from the land use issues being discussed. His preference was to stick to the land use issues tonight. Commissioner Palmer briefly stated that the Redevelopment Agency was an entity that can be formed by municipalities to deal with shifting tax monies from one entity to another to help with redevelopment of certain areas. The City Council was currently entertaining that issue.

(19:55:40) Mike Riley gave his address as 2175 Arbor Lane and stated that he had been part of the neighborhood meetings. He thought what was proposed was good for Holladay generally and for the neighbors personally. He realized that those living closest to the site would be most significantly impacted during the "pain" portion. He stated that they would go through a "pain" period and then a "gain" period where they would enjoy the benefits of the project. Those living further away would not feel as much pain during the construction phase, but he expected that all would be in a position to enjoy the gain phase. Tonight there had been a lot of uncertainty expressed. He thought that could be resolved by leaving as many options on the table as possible for as long as possible. He suggested to the developer that as quickly as the uncertainty and

doubt can be cleared up, the sooner all will want to move through the pain of the process in order to get to the gain.

(19:58:00) Howard Diederich gave his address as 4136 Camille Street. He thanked the Planning Commission for their time and effort. He reported that he grew up at 4999 Fairbrook Lane behind the Mall. After serving on the Planning Commission for the past four years, he was troubled by the fact that some Commissioners signed non-disclosure statements to work with General Growth in developing the project. One of his concerns was that it was an extremely aggressive delivery schedule. He stated that Gateway was done in a rushed manner to get done for the Olympics and now the infrastructure, facades, and walkways were cracking and falling apart. He was worried about the quality of the project with the schedule proposed. He hoped to involve community members in the design to the extent possible. He suggested the Design Review Committee be involved similar to how it was done in the Village Center to the extent possible. He thought involving others would result in a good project. Specific to the rezone he recalled that they were worried about buffer zones with the Village Center area. He saw no buffer area with this project. He understood that they were just making a change to residential but questioned whether they had thought about how that would affect the other areas. He thought it would make sense to use similar zones such as the Village Center. He urged the Commission to not let the City Council dictate what they want and instead let the Planning Commission and other citizens get involved to the extent possible.

(20:00:52) An unidentified member of the public hoped to have UTA from the beginning stages look at off-site parking with shuttles. She also suggested they find ways to mitigate traffic problems.

Mr. Allred clarified that what was proposed was a general plan change, a rezone, and a new section of the code to allow the development. The Site and Development Master Plan would be the controlling document for the project. That was expected to occur this fall. He stressed that the project would not be pushed through without adequate controls. Staff had been talking to the developer and their team at length about reasonable controls. The public would be allowed to speak again during that process.

Commissioner Palmer reported that there would be one other public hearing conducted as part of the plan involving relocation of Big Cottonwood Creek. Under the City ordinance, any building within 100 feet of the creek would be reviewed for a stream setback exception. The matter would undergo a special review by the Planning Commission and the City Engineer who would rely on other governing bodies such as the Army Corps of Engineers, to look at the geotechnical aspects of the stream location and impact. The Commission would verify preservation of riparian corridors, impact on the watershed, etc. He reported that a public hearing would be held on that aspect relative to relocation of the creek and having the creek approach within 100 feet of any structures on the site.

(20:04:45) *Commissioner McKell moved to continue the public hearing, discussion, and recommendations on the amendment to the zone map and the rezone of the property in the vicinity of 4835 South Highland Drive from C-2 to R/M-U. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Allred estimated that from staff’s perspective, the general plan portion would be ready at the next meeting scheduled for September 4. He expected the rezone and petition to rezone to be ready in the next two to three weeks. Commissioner Palmer remarked that in the meantime, the documents the public commented on would be modified and staff would post updated documents on the City’s website. The documents could also be obtained at the City Offices.

2. Discussion with General Growth Properties – Traffic and Density Studies.

(20:06:50) Kris Longson of General Growth Properties, reported that at the last work session they agreed to have their Traffic Engineer discuss traffic issues and studies conducted as well as density issues. Mr. Longson prepared a presentation from another project he recently completed in San Diego. Examples and illustrations of what they were required to build were made available. He noted that mailers were sent out to all residents within 1,000 feet of the project inviting them to an informational meeting held previously.

Mr. Longson remarked that Cottonwood Mall has a fantastic history and after growing up in the community, he realized it had always been a place that the community had gathered for numerous events. In preparing for the design and looking at the history of the project and community, he wanted to incorporate various significant aspects that had been a great part of the Cottonwood Mall and take it to a new level. The intent was to create a place of community. The proposed plan included approximately 17 acres of open space, not including roads and walkways. They proposed that the zoning be changed to mixed use and include more community and residences as part of the project. Different types of residences were proposed such as single-family homes, detached single-family homes, town homes, and condos, which would allow for a variety of architecture. In looking at the design concepts, they looked at local architecture and design and quality building materials as well as places outside the U.S. for inspiration. In sizing the plaza, the intent was to mirror some of the greatest plazas in the world that people like to visit.

Mr. Longson stated that the intent was to include a lot of the surrounding beauty of the mountains and create view corridors within the project. Going further into the project, the buildings would frame Twin Peaks. The site was laid out to take advantage of the natural beauty of the surrounding area. A layout of the proposed project was displayed. With regard to parking, he noted that underground parking was only being explored in one area. He noted that the above ground parking would be screened by various buildings. The 17 acres of project open space were discussed. Mr. Longson stated that some of it would include hardscape such as the plaza which would be a gathering area. Density issues were discussed.

Mr. Longson compared the densities of existing nearby projects to what was proposed. Some of the projects referred to were:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Hidden Meadows - 18.9 units per acre | Cottonwood Creek - 12.4 units per acre |
| Chateau Foret - 25 units per acre | The Cottonwoods - 6.7 units per acre |
| Cooper Apartments - 14.8 units per acre | Cottonwood Cove – 9.6 units per acre |
| Easton Condominiums – 13.3 units per acre | Memory Lane Apts – 25 units per acre |
| Tiburon – 17.6 units per acre | Viewmont Condos – 9.2 units per acre |
| Aix la Chapelle – 35 units per acre (sits on 7.24 acres with 256 units) | |

Mr. Longson reported that their current plan showed approximately 534 units, which they expected would be reduced as the square footages proposed in the plan were quite low. The

density was based on 1,600 square foot units to determine the number of units that would fit within the project. Studies were being conducted to determine the market demand. The proposed 534 units would be situated on more than 57 acres. The average density for the entire project was 9.4 units per acre based on the proposed 534 units. He stated that in Block L the density was proposed at 4 units per acre. He next referred to the corner near the cemetery, which was proposed at 7 units per acre. Block I was 5 units per acre and Block J was 4 units per acre. The greater density would be closer to the commercial buildings inside the project. The density on Block G was proposed at 12 units per acre, Block F at 14 units per acre, Block E at 18 units per acre, and Block D at 26. He explained that the density was concentrated around the commercial core.

(20:21:10) Project Traffic Engineer, Billy Haddoway, was present to address the traffic study. He remarked that the intent was to create a sense of place and balance between automobile, pedestrian, and bicycle activities. He stressed the importance of balancing transportation needs using things other than just automobiles. Transportation elements of the project were described. In the past, the focus was on building more capacity on the arterial. At the same time, that was where all of the big box stores wanted to locate. As a result, there was a natural conflict and the balance was lost between mobility for the automobile and access for others. Over the years they had done a poor job of communicating a message to drivers to drive the appropriate speed in the appropriate place. As they designed the project, they would be sure to make it safe for the community. Mr. Haddoway identified ways that pedestrians are impacted by speed. Reduced speeds would create a sense of place for pedestrians and keep them safer. Over the past 50 years, the focus had been on moving cars, however, that had been done at the expense of pedestrians. His goal was to help change that. Connectivity issues were discussed.

Mr. Hattaway remarked that at a recent neighborhood meeting, concern was expressed about any potential closing of Arbor Lane. He stated that there were ways to control speed and volume without closing the street. With regard to traffic data, a power center was considered. He explained that power centers are typically made up of various big box stores located near an interstate. During the peak hour, 4,400 car trips were anticipated with a power center in place. They looked at the ITE trip generation tables to analyze trip generation estimates. If the Cottonwood Mall was restored to its former glory, 24,800 car trips could be expected on an average day from destination shoppers and 1,844 car trips from passersby.

(20:37:44) Mr. Hattaway analyzed the proposed trip generation for the proposed project. The total was 29,000 trips per day with 3,150 during the peak hour. They typically saw 25 to 40 percent internal capture for projects like the one proposed. Based on the balance of housing and commercial they were comfortable with the estimated numbers. The trips would stay within the development. The daily trips were estimated to be 21,200 versus 24,800 and during the p.m. peak, 1,816 versus 1,844. The figures were based on a fully operational mall.

(20:40:03) Mr. Hattaway reported that there were concerns raised at the recent neighborhood meeting about neighborhood intrusion. They conducted a survey on the west side of the mall and based on that expected less than 1% of the traffic to use Arbor Lane and less than 2% of the total traffic to use the neighborhoods. About half of the traffic generated would be attributed to the actual residents of the neighborhood. Because they had heard concerns about the east side, they intended to conduct a similar survey in that area.

Mr. Longson reviewed the architectural guidelines to be incorporated into the project. The architecture was described as Early Californian, which was desired by the City and called for in the master plan. Sample renderings were also presented showing the various elevations. Photos of a finished project were displayed. The amenities incorporated into the project were described.

Adjourn.

(20:47:25) Commissioner Scott moved to adjourn. Commissioner Shields seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Richard Kimball-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, August 28, 2007.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group, Inc.
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 9-18-07