

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

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

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members:

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

City Staff:

Paul Allred, Community Development Director
Rick Whiting, City Planner
Pat Hanson, City Planner

The Work Meeting commenced at 6:25 p.m.

1. Field Trip and/or Discussion.

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

(18:25:42) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, introduced new City Planner, Rick Whiting. Mr. Whiting came to the City from West Valley City and worked previously in Summit County as a Circuit Rider Planner. Mr. Whiting also served as Intern on the City's monster home study in 2005.

Mr. Allred invited the Commission Members to visit the City offices or attend Technical Review Committee meetings at any time. Changes instituted on a staff level were described that would improve efficiency. Staff welcomed input from the Commission Members.

Village Center issues were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that the logistics involved had been enormously time-consuming and difficult. Signage and parking aspects of the project were described. A tenant in one of the buildings was irritated with the signage regulations and as a result, put up a temporary sign that is illegal. The City worked with him but could not come to an agreement and has not strictly enforced the ordinance. The City has taken a soft approach to temporary signs. Signage requirements were reviewed. The City has never allowed off-premise signs.

(18:43:04) Mr. Allred stated that a citizen raised concerns about construction signs on the mall property. He explained that the RM-U zone has different rules for signs than other zones.

Commissioner McKell remarked that the annual report looked good. He recognized the work that went into it. Various agenda items were discussed.

Mr. Allred commented that staff did their best to be accommodating and provide good customer service. But he did not mean to indicate that staff would acquiesce to applicants. They wanted to work closely with the public and develop cooperative relationships.

(18:58:51) Minutes issues were discussed. Mr. Allred remarked that staff reviewed the minutes line-by-line. Ways to more effectively edit and modify the minutes were explored. City Planner, Pat Hanson, stated that there is a bill on Capitol Hill that would require minutes to be approved within 14 days of a meeting.

2. Agenda.

Vice Chair McKell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and read the Commission statement.

2.1 Verizon Wireless – 96-2-01-02 – 4720 South Holladay Boulevard – Conditional Use Amendment for Co-Location on Existing Telecommunications Monopole.

(19:09:00) Pat Hanson presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a co-location on an existing telecommunications tower. Typically co-locations are approved by the Community Development Director, however, because the monopole is located in the Village, the matter has to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as part of the HV zone requirements. The application was reviewed by the Design Review Board for compliance with the Design guidelines. The Board's opinion is that because there would be a small equipment shelter added to the site, it should be as non-descript as possible and blend into the background. Some of the Board Members suggested that since the HV zone requires colors and materials to be approved, they felt earth tones would blend in better with the surroundings. The three proposed fencing colors were displayed.

Ms. Hanson reported that the applicants would not increase the height of the monopole and just add a second array to the pole itself. The fenced area around the foot of the pole, however, would increase. The Technical Review Committee and the Design Review Board spoke with the applicant extensively about landscaping. There was a thought that if they could landscape in front of the fence it would obscure the building better. After conducting further research it was determined that landscaping is not feasible in the area because of the lack of water connections. There is, however, a long-range plan for the cleaners to build a new building in the northern section of the site plan that would be much larger than the existing building. It would obscure the site even more since the new building would be in front of the cell site. Ms. Hanson stated that landscaping would be a significant investment that may or may not accomplish what is desired.

(19:18:05) Pete Simmons was present on behalf of the applicant, Technology Associates. He reiterated that their proposal is to co-locate on an existing tower in the Holladay Village area. When they looked at the site they talked to staff about ways to improve their proposal. They decided to move forward with recommendations from the Design Review Board and construct a stick built building that would ultimately be behind a six to eight-foot tall Trex fence. In their discussions they found that the code gave them some leeway to use a variety of fencing materials ranging from a wood fence to a masonry wall or wrought iron fencing. They initially considered a wood fence that would blend in with the existing vegetation and help hide the building. It was determined that because the building and fencing would be earth tones, there was no need to install landscaping on the project.

Mr. Simmons stated that the property owner's plan for the site is to eventually demolish the Holladay Cleaners' building and redevelop it on the north side, which would ultimately hide the proposed facility. He also noted that there were no available irrigation connections near the site

to water any potential landscaping. An irrigation connection would have to be run from Holladay Boulevard.

Commissioner McKell asked Mr. Simmons to clarify Technology Associates' relationship with the dry cleaners. He noted that the cleaners have a water source. A small amount of landscaping would require only a small feeder water line. Mr. Simmons responded that in talking with the property owner, the actual water main connection to the property is in the front of the building on Holladay Boulevard. In order to get an irrigation system to the facility they would have to cut up sidewalk, road, and asphalt to bring water in for a small landscaped area. In his discussions with the Design Review Board they decided there was no need because of the plans for the building and fencing. Mr. Simmons explained that the fencing would be a of a Trex material that is a plastic composite. It has a long life span and requires very little maintenance. Mr. Simmons explained that the Design Review Board liked the idea of a wood fence but not the maintenance that would be involved and how it will weather. Alternatively, they recommended a wood composite design that will last longer and look nicer.

(19:26:25) Commissioner McKell opened the meeting to public comment.

Sam Frampton gave his address as 4966 Marilyn Drive and identified himself as the property owner. He stated that when Mr. Simmons first approached him on behalf of Verizon, he was interested because he has Verizon phone service, which has terrible coverage in Holladay. He is interested in Verizon having a presence in the area so he can get decent cell service. The proposed building will contain emergency equipment so that the cell service will be operable even during a disaster or emergency. With regard to water, he stated that if the applicants want to provide a water source to the site, he will be cooperative.

Commissioner McKell asked Mr. Frampton about his plans to rebuild on the site. Mr. Frampton explained that a new building would not restrict access to the equipment shelter. The building's location is planned for the north side of the property. Their biggest challenge is the Reagan billboard on the property and the term of Reagan's lease. He stated that seven years remained on the lease. Their plan is to develop sooner, if possible.

There were no further public comments. The meeting was closed to public comment.

(19:30:50) Commissioner Shupe asked if the DRC considered changing the color of the pole. Ms. Hanson stated that there was quite a bit of discussion on the matter. She explained that the pole is owned by another telecommunications company, not Verizon. As a result, Verizon does not have the authority to change the color of the pole. Their only option is to co-locate on it.

With regard to the proposed Trex material, Commissioner Carr did not know if the Commission could approve the use of a material that is not provided for in the design guidelines. Commissioner Kimball stated that now would be a good time to add an additional material to the plan. Ms. Hanson explained that the proposed material is of higher quality than vinyl and much more durable than wood. Commissioner Shupe reported that it is a recycled product containing various materials, including wood. He stated that there is no question that it is a better product.

Commissioner Carr remarked that what is approved would provide the standard for the entire Village and not be limited to the small area behind the dry cleaners.

Commissioner McKell was concerned about the lack of direction with regard to a small amount of landscaping along the fence. He stated that a small water line would be adequate to provide water to it. He commented that there should be some off-surface drainage going from the east to the west. He suggested there be some concern for an opportunity for a water line from the existing dry cleaners. Mr. Simmons stated that per the direction of the Design Review Board, it was determined that in the area landscaping was not necessary since the building would blend in with the existing vegetation.

Commissioner Kimball remarked that he is comfortable with the request without landscaping. He viewed landscaping as an added cost for the applicant in an area that is not highly visible. Commissioner Khodadad pointed out that because it is not a residence or a place of business only very few people will view the landscaping. Commissioner Shupe remarked that it also might not be a good idea to introduce water underneath the pavement. Commissioner McKell wanted to ensure that the Holladay Village remains attractive into the future. Mr. Frampton stated the site access required into the area will make it more difficult to landscape.

(19:39:25) Commissioner Kimball moved to approve the co-location conditional use based on the following:

Findings:

- 1. The use is needed to better serve the citizens of Holladay.***
- 2. The application meets or exceeds the requirements of the HV zone.***
- 3. The application has been forwarded to the Commission with recommendations of approval from the TRC and the DRB.***
- 4. The proposed use will have no negative impact on the surrounding properties.***

Recommendations:

- 1. Fencing, building materials, and colors shall be as shown to the Planning Commission at this meeting and shall be approved with the building permit by the TRC.***

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

2.2 Spring Creek Terraces PUD – 06-2-09, 1930 East Nunley Court – Conditional Use and Preliminary Plat for an Eight-Unit Residential Planned Unit Development.

(19:41:11) Pat Hanson presented the staff report and stated that the matter before the Commission is for preliminary plat and conditional use approval. The concept plan was reviewed in September 2006. Since that time the applicants had been working through a list of conditions set out in the concept plan. They have shown that they can meet those conditions. The Technical Review Committee reviewed the preliminary plat and approved it in January. The Fire Prevention Officer reviewed the 2006 approval and determined that the project is significantly the same and the approval remained valid. Staff also was provided with construction drawings showing the drainage calculations.

Ms. Hanson stated that the Technical Review Committee originally had concerns about Nunley Circle being a private drive. Staff did not have a clear idea of who had access and who was responsible for maintenance of the road. The applicant submitted to staff a copy of their

maintenance agreement for the private drive that was recently signed by the property owners. Staff stated that the applicants had proven that they had a right to use the road.

Ms. Hanson reported that the overall project is zoned R-2-10 and the request met the density calculations. Approximately half of the project will be landscaped and the buildings and impervious surfaces will cover the remaining half. Two parking spaces will be provided for each unit in individual garages. Four additional guest spaces will be provided to comply with the regulations of the zone. The individual homes have approximately 2,200 square foot footprints. Ms. Hanson remarked that one of the requirements of the conceptual approval is to submit a detailed landscaping plan, which has been provided. One change was made to the original proposal. The applicants opted to do away with the pool and instead, set aside some of the area for a community garden.

A sight-obscuring fence is proposed around the perimeter except along Nunley Circle where there would be a wrought iron and decorative fence. Ms. Hanson stated that the applicants originally proposed a 15-foot perimeter setback for all structures. In November, the applicants asked if the buildings could be shifted slightly to the east so that the area proposed for the detention basin could be expanded. The new site plan reflected that change.

(19:50:27) The applicant, Brent Hansen, stated that they attempted to comply with everything set out in the conceptual approval. Maintenance and snow removal costs were discussed. The proposed materials would include stone on the front and architectural shingles.

Commissioner McKell opened the meeting to public comment.

(19:56:12) Don Vanderlinden identified himself as the neighbor to the west. He is not in favor of high-density housing in the area. He commented that the neighborhood had a high water table problem and the basements of many of the homes have flooding issues. He wanted to make sure the applicant was aware of that. Commissioner McKell stated that there is a collection pool on the property. Mr. Vanderlinden stated that at one time there were plans to run roads through his field for the Willows of Holladay development. That is not something he would permit to happen. He made it clear that there would be no access across his property for the project now or in the future. In response to a question raised, Mr. Vanderlinden stated that his property consists of a three-acre open field where they keep their horses.

(19:59:28) Mel Romney was present on behalf of the Willows development to the south of the proposed property. He asked why the building is shifted to the east. Ms. Hanson responded that it is to increase the size of the detention basin to allow the applicant to hold all of their water on site. Mr. Romney stated that the current design seemed more “wallish” than the last design. That is a problem for the adjacent property to the south of the development since those impacted would be looking at walls. When they saw the plan in 2006, the project appeared to have more variation. Commissioner Carr stated that what is proposed is an improvement over the 2006 plan. Mr. Romney stated that that is probably the case, however, the neighbors would have no view corridors.

There were no further public comments. Commissioner McKell closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Shupe identified potential changes since 2006 as the pool/cabana being changed to a garden area and the perimeter setback on unit number 4 being reduced from 15 feet to 10 feet. In response to a question raised, Ms. Hanson clarified that colors and building materials were to be determined tonight since they are part of the concept plan. She explained that what is proposed is a PUD and conditional use. As a result, the Commission is to make a decision on the request.

Commissioner Carr could see that a lot of work had been done on the project. Commissioner Kimball asked if basements were planned for the units due to the high water table. Commissioner Carr stated that basements were standard in the area. Commissioner McKell recognized there were problems in that regard throughout the area. He thought that problem could be managed somewhat by diverting the water into a detention pond. Ms. Hanson stated that part of the building permit approval might be that they would have to have a hydrologist's report if there is a concern about the water table. She is confident that adequate information would be available at time of building permit issuance.

Commissioner Carr referenced the fourth finding contained in the staff report and stated that the request does not comply with the PUD chapter that requires a minimum of three acres. The proposal does not include three acres, however, it was approved at a time when that was not part of the ordinance.

(20:07:28) Commissioner Carr moved to approve the preliminary plat and conditional use subject to the following:

Findings:

- 1. The preliminary plat shows significant compliance to the conceptual plan and has been sent to the Commission with a recommendation of approval from the TRC.***
- 2. The project is compatible with development in the area and will not be detrimental to properties in the neighborhood.***
- 3. The project will provide additional housing in the community for those residents who desire smaller houses, little or no yard maintenance, security and privacy, and other desirable amenities.***
- 4. The use as proposed is desirable and necessary in the City and at the time of application, complied with the PUD chapter and the City's General Plan.***

Recommendations:

- 1. All structures within the project shall be located inside the setbacks as proposed on the drawings submitted with this staff report and dated January 24, 2008.***
- 2. Installed landscaping, fencing, and amenities shall comply with the Landscape Plan submitted with this staff report and dated August 20, 2007.***
- 3. Building elevations, footprints, building materials, and colors shall comply with those submitted to the Commission and dated January 24, 2008.***
- 4. The developers must comply with the items listed in the geotechnical report specifically those pertaining to the construction of the basement foundations, design, and drainage.***

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

2.3 Larsen Subdivision – 07-1-02 – 4558 South Russell Street – Concept and Preliminary Plat Approval.

(20:13:40) Rick Whiting presented the staff report and stated that the proposal is for a three-lot subdivision located to the north and east of City Hall behind a new twin home development. The proposed project would create one new building lot at the end of Clear View Street on a total of .76 acres between the three proposed lots. The home that fronts onto Russell Street is included in the plat. Major issues in the past with the subdivision proposal had to do with drainage, fire safety, and situating the new home properly on a new lot. The Technical Review Committee is satisfied that development is appropriate for the area and meets the City’s codes and ordinances. The new home would need to be sprinkled because it exceeds the distances for the Fire District. There would also need to be drainage basins on Lots 1 and 2. Each lot meets the area requirements for the zone but the new lot would need close examination at the building permit stage. Staff recommended that if the subdivision is acceptable that the Planning Commission approve it with the stipulation that the building pad placement be worked out at the building permit stage rather than implied in the approval now. Staff recommended approval of the proposal as a concept plan and a preliminary plat. Mr. Whiting reported that there had been some minor corrections to the drawings. There should also be a condition stipulating that a neighborhood meeting be held. He noted that a neighborhood meeting had not yet been conducted. He suggested approval be subject to the neighborhood meeting being conducted before final approval is granted.

(20:18:16) The applicant, Clark Larsen, gave his address as 4565 Clear View Street. He commented that the proposal is consistent with the neighborhood. He explained that Clear View Street over the years was created by taking the backs of lots from 2300 East and Russell Street and running a street down the middle. He wanted to do something similar.

Commissioner McKell noticed that there was a lot of space between Lots 1 and 2. He asked whom it would be used by and how it would be accessed. Mr. Larsen stated that it would be accessed from his lot. The project is to be inhabited by his family with his daughters living in the two proposed homes. If that were to change at some point in the future, they would do a boundary lot agreement and assign that piece either to the home to the east, the home to the west, or split it between the two rather than keep it on their lot. Mr. Larson clarified that all three lots had access to it presently. That was intentional to allow it to be used as a garden or children’s play area.

Reference was made to a proposed garage on the site. Mr. Larsen stated that the Unified Fire Authority said it had to be separate from the house to satisfy their requirements. It would also have the advantage of having a much shorter driveway that would reduce the amount of hard surface and leave them more landscaping.

Commissioner McKell opened the meeting to public comment. There were no members of the public wishing to speak. The meeting was closed to public comment.

(20:25:20) Commissioner Scott asked for clarification of the middle piece between Lots 1 and 2. He asked if Mr. Larsen could change the boundary without having to change the plat. Ms. Hanson stated that once the plat is recorded, any changes would require the applicant to go back through the plat amendment process, as with any lot line adjustment.

(20:26:55) *Commissioner Shupe moved to approve the conceptual and preliminary plat for the Larsen Garden Subdivision. The name was to be changed from “Larsen Subdivision” to “Larsen Garden Subdivision”. Approval is subject to the following:*

Findings:

- 1. *The plat is appropriate for the area and the zone.*
- 2. *Adequate fire protection will be met by all lots.*
- 3. *The site, when built correctly, will be adequately drained and addressed at final plat.*

Recommendations:

- 1. *Minor corrections to the drawings regarding line width, clarification of lot lines, dates, etc.*
- 2. *Submittal of a title report and any CC&Rs for review.*
- 3. *Proof of neighborhood meeting being held to comply with code prior to final plat approval.*

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

2.4 Floribunda Heights No. 2 Subdivision – 08-1-08 – 2870 East Floribunda Drive, Concept and Preliminary Plat Approval.

(20:36:30) Mr. Whiting presented the staff report and stated that the lot was originally in the Floribunda Heights Subdivision. The applicants are proposing to remove their lot from the original subdivision and create a new two-lot subdivision. The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on January 21. The response from the meeting was favorable with the neighbors having their questions answered. The application meets the zoning requirements in every respect. The newly created lot would be served by its own private driveway as opposed to a right-of-way access or easement. It would be part of Lot 2 and connect with Floribunda Drive. The building pad would be determined at time of building permit application. The setbacks mirrored adjacent lots and provide adequate building capacity for a reasonably sized structure. Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions set out in the staff report.

(20:50:08) The applicant, Daniel Chard, gave his address as 2870 East Floribunda Drive. The property is .87 acre in size and the subdivision would have a back lot of approximately .37 acre. The existing lot with a home on it comprised approximately .5 acre.

Commissioner McKell noticed there is a home under construction just southwest of the property. He asked if there were any concerns with the two accesses potentially paralleling Floribunda Drive. Mr. Chard is unsure where they were proposing to put their new driveway. He stated that a neighborhood meeting was conducted that approximately 10 people attended. The applicant answered questions and informed those present of tonight’s public hearing.

Commissioner McKell opened the meeting to public comment.

(20:43:18) Mary Jo Owen gave her address as 2840 Floribunda Drive. She did not intend to comment but she thought staff’s characterization that there was a favorable response at the neighborhood meeting was misleading. The neighbors were told by Mr. Chard that the subdivision was already approved and it was not something they could have input on. The

neighbors were concerned with the proposal since there had been a number of subdivisions in their area. She stated that it is disappointing to see so many nice properties continue to be cut in half. It was clarified that properties can only be divided to R-1-10 specifications. Ms. Owen characterized the street as “sleepy”. She is concerned that properties on their street are changing and that large trees would be lost to accommodate the proposed driveway. She did not want to lose the appeal of the area.

(20:46:20) Grant Cannon gave his address as 2893 Old Colony Circle. He stated that his property abuts the Chard property in the rear. He commented that he had lived in the area for 25 years. The beauty of the area is what appealed to him when he purchased his property. He reported that in the last year there had been a couple of properties in the area subdivided. He is confident that when the Chards purchased the property they were drawn to the beauty of the lot rather than the aesthetics of the home itself. That is something that he wanted to maintain. He is concerned with the proposed division of the property and that the new lot rests on a slope overlooking his backyard, directly into his swimming pool. It would detract from his privacy and directly impact his property value.

With regard to the neighborhood meeting, Mr. Cannon stated that he was not informed of it until less than a week prior. It was held on a Monday morning at 8:00 a.m. He was unable to attend but his wife was present. She related to him that there were many negative comments made about the proposal and many of those in attendance were not in favor of what was proposed. Mr. Cannon hoped the Commission would look at the request from an aesthetic standpoint and realize that there is more involved than just monetary gain. If the trend continues in the neighborhood, the neighbors will be worried that they can’t get value out of their properties by selling them as single large parcels. They will feel like they have to subdivide which will ruin the flavor of the Holladay area. He asked that the Commission give the matter the same consideration that was given to the Holladay Village. Mr. Cannon stated that in looking at the shape of the property, there is a small frontage and the impact of a driveway would be huge.

(20:52:45) Mr. Chard referred to the letter submitted to the City, which did not indicate that the input received at the neighborhood meeting was favorable. He indicated that the meeting was held and questions were answered. He did inform those present that no vote would be taken at tonight’s meeting. He noted that his preference is for someone to purchase the entire lot with the existing home. Mr. Chard was asked why he decided to subdivide the property if his intent is to sell it. Mr. Chard responded that the home is located on the far north side of the lot and there is a very small area between the boundary line on the north side and the home. As realtors talked to them about the appraised value, they said that if sold as is, there is a high likelihood that a realtor or developer would subdivide the lot and resell portions of it.

In response to a question raised with regard to trees, Mr. Chard stated that there were two trees in the front of the lot that would obstruct the proposed driveway. There were several large, mature trees on the property. The number of trees that would be preserved would depend on the building plan.

Commissioner Scott clarified that Mr. Chard is trying to sell the property. Mr. Chard realized that if he did not do the division and take advantage of the possibility, someone else most likely would. Sentimentally, he would prefer someone buy the whole piece and build a new house on the lot.

(20:59:00) Ronald Butler gave his address as 2822 Sleepy Hollow. He stated that their access to canal water comes off of a parallel channel in the back of Mr. Chard's property. They had some concern that as a house is built that they may lose access to the channel. He agreed that they were moving to higher density in the area and it is no longer the same neighborhood they originally moved into. The repeated subdividing of property had had a negative impact on the neighborhood from the perspective of those who moved to Holladay for the rich tradition and uniqueness of the area. Mr. Butler stated that he is an eight-year resident and the property they live in was originally developed by Dr. Ray Thomas. At the time, the county imposed very stringent requirements on development.

Ms. Hanson stated that the area had been zoned R-1-10 since the late 1950s or early 1960s. She stated that there were areas in that section of the City that were zoned R-1-10 but developed with larger lots. Staff had suggested that it might be time to review the zoning in that area of the City. Staff believed the best approach is to look at the size of the lots as they are presently and rezone them so that they remain in their present configurations. She stated that staff is forced, in a way, to approve lot splits because there is no way to deny them since they meet the zoning. Without a petition to rezone the area, staff is at the mercy of what was inherited from the county.

There were no further public comments. The public comment period was closed.

(21:11:20) Commissioner Shupe asked if a future property owner might be able to develop three lots on the Chard property. Ms. Hanson responded that the applicants owned enough property to develop three lots. Procedural issues were discussed. It was clarified that what was required was for a vacation of a lot first followed by the creation of a subdivision.

Ms. Hanson suggested that any motion include the finding that no person will be materially injured by the vacation of the lot. If the finding could not be met, the request could be denied.

The applicant clarified that the proposal was not to allow him to develop. It is simply a proposal to extract the lot in question from the subdivision and divide it into two lots. He did not see where the concern over material injury came into the argument.

(21:24:50) Commissioner Shupe appreciated the comments made and stated that the Commission must look at the situation objectively. He stated that the two lots proposed by the applicant are a better alternative than three lots that might be subdivided and developed at a later point in time. He did not want to see the property sold and three lots developed instead of two.

(21:27:05) Commissioner Shupe moved to approve the vacation of Lot 5 of the Floribunda Heights Subdivision and approve the preliminary plat for Floribunda Heights Subdivision Number 2 for two lots based on the following:

Findings:

- 1. It meets all conditions and requirements of current ordinance; and***
- 2. Lot 2 includes a future driveway that allows access to Lot 2 without fire or safety issues.***

Recommendation:

1. ***A Certificate of Protection is required for storm drainage and irrigation facilities prior to final plat approval.***
2. ***Utility service letters are required prior to preliminary plat approval.***

Commissioner Carr seconded the motion.

Commissioner Carr stated that the Commission has no option but to admit that the applicants have complied with the law as it is written.

Vote on motion: Lori Khodadad-Aye, Richard Kimball-Nay, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Nay, Paul Shupe-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye. The motion passed 4-to-2.

3. Consent Items.

3.1 Approval of Minutes – Planning Commission Meeting – January 22, 2008.

(21:32:10) The minutes were reviewed and modifications made.

(21:39:21) ***Commissioner Khodadad moved to accept the minutes of January 22, 2008, as corrected. The motion was not seconded. Vote on motion: Lori Khodadad-Aye, Richard Kimball-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*** If there was no second – then they did not pass - Stephanie

4. Adjourn.

The Planning Commission adjourned by unanimous consent.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, February 5, 2008.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group, Inc.
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 3-4-08