

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

3
4 **Tuesday, June 19, 2007**
5 **5:00 p.m.**
6 **Holladay Municipal Center**
7 **4580 South 2300 East**
8

9
10 **ATTENDANCE**

11
12 **Planning Commission Members:**

13
14 Jim Palmer, Chair
15 Gene Carr
16 Howard Diederich
17 Richard Kimball, Alternate
18 Cyrus McKell, Vice Chair
19 Brad Scott
20 Lynda Shields
21 Paul Shupe
22

12 **City Staff:**

13
14 Paul Allred, Community Development Director
15 Alma Haskell, City Planner
16 Pat Hanson, City Planner

23
24 The pre-meeting began at 5:15 p.m.

25
26 **1. Pre-Meeting/Field Trip**

27 (17:19:14) Commissioner Jim Palmer asked if there was anything to report from the Council
28 with regard to potential appointments of Planning Commission Members. The Council was
29 informed that Commissioner Kimball would continue to serve as an alternate and Commissioner
30 Shupe's term would be renewed. Commissioner Scott's term was also expiring.
31

32 It was noted that a State mandate was coming forward from a State Land Use Bill concerning
33 elevations. 17% grades and 12-foot road widths would be allowed. The Legislature also passed
34 a bill mandating Fire Department regulations. The UFA was upset that they did not have the
35 opportunity to participate in any dialogue or discussion.
36

37 (17:22:45) Commissioner Palmer remarked that with regard to the Rosas business, Canyon Cove
38 Pilates, one written complaint was received. He requested that staff investigate it and follow-up
39 with the Commission. He asked that it be determined whether Evelyn Rosa planned to remain
40 on the site and operate a business. The matter was on the July 11 agenda. It was confirmed that
41 the conditional use on the property would run with the land and was for a home occupation. City
42 Planner, Alma Haskell, explained that if the use was not used for six months, it would become
43 invalid. City Planner, Pat Hanson, disagreed and explained that conditional uses run with the
44 land. Therefore, if the applicants chose to sell their house, the new owners could operate a home
45 occupation. Enforcement issues were discussed.
46

47 (17:26:24) Commissioner Shupe remarked that the soonest the matter could be dealt with would
48 be the end of July. The applicant was to be out of the home by August 15. Ms. Hanson stated

1 that she had dealt extensively with the homeowner and the situation had been going on for
2 months. Commissioner Palmer asked that staff verify that the occupant was in fact, moving.

3
4 (17:28:12) The agenda items to be addressed were discussed. Commissioner Palmer noted that
5 the Holladay Home for the Elderly was a residential care facility next to the duplexes visited by
6 the Commission during their last field trip. A permit was received from the County showing that
7 the project came in under annexation. It had been one year and the applicants wanted to renew
8 it.

9
10 Mr. Haskell explained that the project was approved by the County for a 71-bed facility. The
11 building appeared to Commissioner Shields to be an old house. Mr. Haskell explained that the
12 property had numerous sites to build on.

13
14 Commissioner Palmer asked if the City was obligated to grant the one-year extension. He stated
15 that the use was granted by the County and the Commission never had an opportunity to review
16 it. He asked if what was proposed was the type of project that would have been approved in
17 Holladay. Commissioner Diederich thought modifications would have been required.

18
19 (17:30:25) In response to a question raised, Mr. Haskell explained that the original plans
20 approved by the County included apartment-type arrangements.

21
22 Commissioner Diederich recalled the site when the Commission visited the Nunley Court
23 project. His understanding was that there would be a similar type of drive out that would tie into
24 the adjoining use. The result would be more uniformity along the street. Mr. Haskell stated that
25 the issue was discussed recently with the TRC. It was thought that the dedication would be
26 required at the building permit phase. The result would be the ability for pedestrians to walk up
27 and down Highland Drive safely. Mr. Haskell suggested that might be one of the conditions of
28 extending the conditional use permit.

29
30 Commissioner Palmer remarked that the elevation at the mid-point of the truss was 35 feet above
31 the lowest grade. Outside of phasing, he stated that the height was 42 feet and would not meet
32 the zoning ordinance. Ms. Hanson stated that currently the applicants have a conditional use
33 issued by the County. She stated that the permit was set to expire on June 30.

34
35 (17:35:58) Commissioner Palmer's understanding was that approval was optional and asked if it
36 would be permissible to impose other conditions. Ms. Hanson stated that any changes would
37 require the applicant to go through the formal hearing process. She explained that what was
38 requested was just an extension of the conditional use permit. It was noted that the neighbors
39 were not noticed. The proposed extension would be valid for one year. Commissioner
40 Diederich thought this would be a great opportunity to bring the project in under the City.

41
42 Commissioner Scott asked what benefit there would be to the City for going along with what the
43 applicant's proposed. Ms. Hanson responded that the City would get 72 beds. Additional
44 property taxes would also be generated. Commissioner Palmer was concerned about the
45 additional traffic on Highland Drive. He asked if additional conditions could be imposed on the
46 applicant. Ms. Hanson stated that they could be if the neighbors were noticed. Commissioner
47 Palmer thought it was important to hear from the neighbors who did not speak when the matter
48 went through the County. He wanted more detail with regard to the project itself and was
49 concerned that if the request was denied, the applicants would pull a building permit the

1 following morning. He thought the City had the ability to modify the project and get something
2 that would be of bigger benefit to the neighborhood.

3
4 In response to a question raised, Mr. Haskell explained that the building permit submitted by the
5 applicant was just for one phase and proposed 72 beds. He explained that the height was
6 specified on the conditional use permit. Any change to the setback of the driveway might be
7 challenged by the applicant since it was allowed by the conditional use permit. He explained
8 that the City would have some authority in that regard as it was the City's right-of-way.
9 Commissioner Palmer stated that even if the Commission wanted to approve the request, there
10 were some open questions that would need to be resolved.

11
12 Commissioner Palmer asked that staff work over the next week to build a file and try to improve
13 the project. He recognized that it was not one that would occur under the City's ordinance as
14 written today. A question was raised with regard to the typical length of time allowed by a
15 building permit for construction. Mr. Haskell responded that significant progress must be made
16 every six months.

17
18 The next item on the agenda was identified as the public hearing on Title 13. Noticing issues
19 were discussed.

20
21 The next issue would be Planning Commission policies and procedures. Commissioner
22 Diederich questioned how the policies and procedures proposed by Commissioner Carr were
23 different from what had been used in the past. Ms. Hanson responded that previously the
24 proposed language was not included. She stressed the importance of the language being in
25 writing.

26
27 (17:46:18) Commissioner Diederich commented that when he read the Title 13 language, he
28 noticed that the first few pages were formatted differently than subsequent pages. Other
29 discrepancies were identified.

30
31 Pervious surface and alternatives were discussed and workable parameters were identified.
32 Commissioner Palmer thought it was important to understand the practical applications. It
33 seemed to him like people should be allowed to do what is reasonable.

34
35 **2. Agenda**

36 (18:07:16) Commissioner Palmer called the regular meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. and read the
37 Commission statement.

1 **2.1 Holladay Home for the Elderly – 04-2-11-01 – 5959 South Highland Drive –**
2 **Extension of the Existing Conditional Use Permit.**

3 (18:09:40) Alma Haskell presented the staff report and stated that the Holladay Home for the
4 Elderly was given a conditional use permit by the County Planning Commission on June 30,
5 2005. On June 30, 2007, the conditional use permit would expire unless an extension is granted
6 or a full building permit is submitted. The applicant also applied with the City for a building
7 permit in early 2006, however, it was delayed due to funding issues. A subsequent application
8 was submitted for a partial building permit for just one portion of the building, which was not
9 pursued. The Planning Commission had the option of extending the conditional use permit for
10 one year if determined to be appropriate. Issues discussed at the recent work meeting were
11 recapped. They were street improvements and where they are located in relation to the 80-foot
12 wide right-of-way. The County’s conditional use permit showed the sidewalk staying at the 33-
13 foot half width right-of-way. Another issue had to do with significant trees that might be in the
14 right-of-way. Height issues were also addressed.

15
16 (18:12:50) The applicant, Debra Miller, gave a brief history of the project and stated that they
17 performed three market studies. With regard to phasing, the applicant expected the project
18 would take two years to complete. 78 beds were proposed within the project. Commissioner
19 Carr asked Ms. Miller if she had done a market analysis. Ms. Miller replied that she had. The
20 loan would be a HUD guaranteed loan.

21
22 (18:20:40) Commissioner Diederich understood that the project was annexed but remarked that
23 there were some things the City would look to. Specifically, across the street there was a church
24 and school area. He stressed the importance of the right-of-way off of Highland Drive to allow
25 cars to get out of traffic and give space for children and others to maneuver. He expressed
26 concern with height. He asked Ms. Miller how she intended to address the City’s concerns.
27 Ms. Miller stressed that they welcomed input. She lived in the area and wanted to improve it.
28 One of the reasons she was happy with the design was because of the underground parking. She
29 also did not want to see the area commercialized and wanted the site to lend the building to a
30 more upscale neighborhood. She thought what was proposed would add character to the
31 neighborhood. She tried to maintain a residential feel and asked for input from her neighbors.
32 She was aware of only one person who was opposed to what was proposed. For the most part,
33 the neighbors were in favor of an upgrade of this sort. They did a traffic study and estimated that
34 there would only be 17 extra cars on the street.

35
36 (18:23:49) Height issues were discussed. Commissioner Palmer explained that because the
37 project was approved under the County, the measurements were done differently. In Holladay,
38 building heights were capped at 35 feet in residential zones. What was proposed showed 35 feet
39 to the mid point of the truss. He estimated the height would be 42 feet. Mr. Haskell explained
40 that the height was submitted as a building permit under what the County had granted as a
41 conditional use permit. The City would have honored that. The Commission’s question
42 pertained to the fact that the height of 35 feet shown under the County’s conditional use permit
43 was to the mid point of the trusses. The City’s method of measuring height was to the highest
44 point. The Commission viewed height as one of the considerations as to whether or not to
45 continue the application. Height would be measured from the lowest point on natural grade to
46 the highest point on the ridge. The County measured from the mid point of the truss. Holladay
47 had experience with people building trusses that were quite high. The rule was changed as a
48 result to a maximum of 35 feet. The Commission was struggling with the fact that the
49 application was approved by the County and later annexed into the City. He clarified that what

1 was approved by the County would not meet the City’s zoning ordinance today. Height issues
2 were discussed.

3
4 (18:27:42) Commissioner Shupe asked the applicant, Mr. Young if there was an ability to lower
5 the parking structure, which would lower the whole building. He responded that that would not
6 be possible due to water aquifer levels. He explained that the real plans showed 35 feet.

7
8 Set back issues from Highland Drive were discussed. Commissioner Palmer stated that the City
9 planned Highland Drive as an 80-foot road width, which would give the applicant 40 feet from
10 the centerline. The applicant was planning on 33 feet and a 66-foot right-of-way. Commissioner
11 Diederich stated that a development was approved next door that was required to meet the right-
12 of-way requirements referenced. From a uniformity perspective he thought it would be nice to
13 have both properties line up. More recent drawings were provided to the Commission showing a
14 height of 32 feet. The applicant believed the building was less than 35 feet in height from
15 natural grade for the entire structure.

16
17 Setback issues were discussed. Mr. Haskell stated that 40 feet would be needed from the
18 centerline of Highland Drive to the property line. The City would like the additional property to
19 be dedicated to the City and the sidewalk, curb, and gutter moved. Commissioner Palmer stated
20 that the concern was that Highland Drive be a uniform width. An additional 9 feet were needed.

21
22 (18:34:35) Mr. Haskell informed the applicant that the City Engineer would like the
23 improvements moved back to the 40-foot half width. The applicant stated that the intent was to
24 put a new sidewalk in across the front. Ingress to the project would be down Nunley and the
25 egress would be to Highland Drive. The applicant was willing to have the egress allow for one-
26 way traffic only with no left turn.

27
28 (18:40:26) Commissioner Carr asked if seven parking spaces would be adequate for the number
29 of beds proposed. The applicant explained that those spaces were simply to be used for drop
30 offs. Adequate parking was provided underneath.

31
32 Mr. Haskell stated that the City’s Traffic Engineer looked at the ingress/egress issue and wanted
33 the improvements moved back to the full right-of-way width to provide more room for a pull out
34 lane.

35
36 Commissioner Scott asked if the number of beds proposed was the number necessary to make
37 the building viable. He thought that was a lot of density for the amount of acreage. The
38 applicant responded that the building proposed was actually very spacious.

39
40 The applicant stated that the number of beds was reduced from what was originally proposed.
41 Mr. Haskell stated that originally 108 beds were proposed in 78 units. The total included staff
42 beds. He pointed out with the proposed phasing, 100 beds were planned in a much small
43 building. The first phase would allow for two people per room with 46 units. Commissioner
44 Palmer asked whether the proposed number of units or beds would have been allowed if the
45 application had been submitted under Holladay’s ordinance. Mr. Haskell responded that the
46 request was compared to the conditional use permit. If the number of beds was proportional to
47 the size of the phase, staff would be comfortable with the phasing. The applicant stated that the
48 number of beds would be reduced greatly in the subsequent phases of the plan.

1 (18:50:17) It sounded to Commissioner Diederich that for financial reasons, the applicants were
2 trying to get as many beds in the first phase as possible. The other phases would even
3 themselves out. He asked how many beds could be allowed in Phase 1 in order to meet the
4 City's requirements. Ms. Haskell responded that staff would ensure that there was the right
5 number of parking stalls based on the number of beds. 68 parking stall were required under the
6 County's conditional use permit with 108 beds.

7
8 Mr. Haskell confirmed that the Unified Fire Authority had looked at what was proposed. They
9 were asked to redesign the turnaround from how the County approved it. The building would be
10 sprinkled and hydrants would be added.

11
12 Road dedication issues were discussed. It sounded to Commissioner Shupe like what was
13 proposed and what was required were fairly close. It seemed to him that it might be in the best
14 interest of the applicant and the City to spend time addressing the matter. Commissioner Palmer
15 pointed out that the applicants had an expiration date of June 30. The Commission's action
16 would keep that open until the matter is resolved.

17
18 (18:56:40) *Commissioner Diederich moved to continue the matter but strongly recommended:*

- 19 1. *There be further review by staff with the applicant and that they take into*
20 *consideration the City's height requirements, which were discussed specific to 35 feet.*
- 21 2. *The request shall comply with the City's transportation guidelines.*
- 22 3. *The inclusion of a one-way drive-thru flowing from north to south.*
- 23 4. *The request shall meet the 80-foot dedicated road width to align the project up with the*
24 *other developments brought before the City.*
- 25 5. *The bed ratio for phase 1 shall be examined and determined to meet State and City*
26 *requirements specific to habitability and the County limit of 108 beds.*
- 27 6. *There shall be no left turns allowed at the end of the one-way drive.*

28 *Commissioner Scott seconded the motion.*

29
30 Commissioner Palmer thought it would beneficial for the Commission to be provided with a
31 colored rendering when the matter comes back for review showing the current plans with
32 elevations, colors, and landscaping.

33
34 Community Development Director, Paul Allred, remarked that staff had enjoyed working with
35 the applicant, Mr. Young. He thought there had been some confusion about what constitutes a
36 unit versus a bed. It was noted that a unit can have up to two beds. Commissioner Diederich
37 remarked that the County had approved 108 beds. He didn't want to see more than that.
38 Mr. Allred wanted clarification with regard to what constitutes a bed versus a unit. He explained
39 that 108 units might not equate to 108 beds. Commissioner Palmer suggested both be clarified.

40
41 *Vote on motion: Gene Carr-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Howard Diederich-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye,*
42 *Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner*
43 *Kimball did not participate in the vote.*

44
45 **2.2 Continued Public Hearing/Discussion/Recommendation – Amendments to Title 13,**
46 **Definitions, Supplemental Regulations and Single-Family Zone Standards.**

47 (19:04:10) Commissioner Palmer opened the meeting to public comment. There were no public
48 comments.

1 Mr. Allred recommended the public hearing be continued to allow staff more time to review the
2 issue and bring it back to the Commission.

3
4 (19:04:56) *Commissioner McKell moved to continue the public hearing. Commissioner Shupe*
5 *seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Gene Carr-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Howard*
6 *Diederich-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The*
7 *motion passed. Commissioner Kimball did not participate in the vote.*

8
9 **2.3 Planning Commission Policies and Procedures.**

10 (19:05:30) Commissioner Carr referred to the 500-foot radius from the premises and asked if it
11 was measured from the boundary. Mr. Haskell responded that that was how he had been
12 noticing it. Commissioner Carr suggested it be clarified that it was 500 feet from the outer
13 boundary.

14
15 Commissioner McKell referred to page 3, line 154, and suggested the words “and the staff” be
16 removed. Commissioner Scott noticed that on page 3, lines 126 and 128, were both b’s.

17
18 Commissioner Palmer referred to page 2, lines 96 and 110, and noticed they were both numbered
19 5. He stated that line 10 should be changed to a 6.

20
21 Commissioner Carr referred to page 2, lines 78 and 84, and suggested they be consistent and
22 both refer to the Commission Chair. Commissioner Palmer remarked that the difference was that
23 when someone is speaking, they are addressing the Commission as a body. Questions were
24 directed toward the Chair as a one-on-one interaction.

25
26 Commissioner Palmer referred to page 3, line 159, regarding the making of motions. It had been
27 his practice not to make motions. He followed that after seeing that that was how the County
28 operated. He thought that was a better way of doing it so that the chair does not dominate. He
29 remarked that in the past, chairs had made motions. There were times in certain cases where
30 chairs had made very good motions. He was unsure whether that should be precluded by policy.
31 He had done it just by practice. Commissioner Carr thought it was fairly typical for chairs not to
32 make motions.

33
34 Mr. Allred’s experience had been that the chair is in many cases the most effective motion maker
35 because he is often the most trusted and experienced planning commission member. He didn’t
36 want to see anything that would discourage a chair from making motions.

37
38 Commissioner Palmer suggested the language be softened to indicate that generally the chair
39 should not make motions. Commissioner Scott liked the way Commissioner Palmer had been
40 able to mentor and teach the other Commissioners. He would have tended to be more
41 intimidated by Commissioner Palmer’s experience, but it had been helpful that others were
42 encouraged to make motions. Doing so, he believed, had made them a stronger body.

43
44 (19:13:15) Commissioner Diederich stressed the importance of all of the Commission Members
45 being invested in the process and not overly reliant on the chair. He thought Commissioner
46 Palmer had handled the situation very well.

47
48 Possible language was discussed. Commissioner Carr thought all Members of the Commission
49 should be encouraged to participate and make motions. Commissioner McKell pointed out that

1 the language stated that *any* Member of the Commission may second a motion. It was suggested
2 that language be added prohibiting the chair from seconding motions. Commissioner Palmer
3 suggested other language be added to state, “Generally the chair should not make a motion”.
4 The Commission Members were comfortable with that suggestion.

5
6 Commissioner Carr referred to page 1, line 51, and suggested “Open Meeting Law” be changed
7 to “Open and Public Meetings Law”. He also suggested the citation be added. He next referred
8 to line 10 on the same page and suggested the alternate be prohibited from voting.
9 Commissioner Carr referred to page 2, line 59, and questioned the Commission’s function of
10 “preparing land use plans”. Commissioner Palmer remarked that the language was several years
11 old. Mr. Allred suspected it was from the 1940s or 1950s and referred to planning commissions
12 that didn’t have staff and actually prepared plans themselves. A possible modification was
13 suggested.

14
15 (19:19:14) Commissioner McKell referred to page 2, line 63, and suggested it be changed to
16 third person and the word “we” removed. Commissioner Palmer referenced page 3, line 150,
17 and suggested “petitioner” be changed to “applicant”. Mr. Haskell stated that the term
18 “petitioner” was used in other places in the document. Commissioner Palmer suggested all
19 instances be changed.

20
21 Commissioner Diederich referenced page 6, line 283, and questioned use of the term “applicant”.
22 He suggested it be changed to read, “The Planning Director shall send a written copy of the
23 Planning Commission’s decision to the applicant”. Mr. Allred recommended it refer to the
24 Community Development Department or staff.

25
26 (19:22:02) Commissioner Carr referred to page 6, line 281, and stated that some believe
27 decisions must be included in the minutes and that the minutes have to be approved before the
28 matter is finalized. Resulting problems were discussed. Commissioner Palmer suggested the
29 issue be resolved. With regard to legal issues, the City Attorney had stated in the past that the
30 written minutes contain the finality of an issue. Minutes issues were discussed. Mr. Allred
31 raised a fundamental fairness issue and stated that if the City does not approve the minutes in an
32 expeditious manner, an approval could be held at bay. Procedural issues were discussed.

33
34 Ms. Hanson stated that currently there was no guarantee as to when the minutes will be
35 completed. That made it difficult for her to send letters out to applicants. Mr. Allred stated that
36 because of scheduling and other issues, at times it could be 30 to 45 days before a set of minutes
37 is actually approved.

38
39 Commissioner Palmer suggested the addition of a qualifier stating that what was approved would
40 still be subject to final approval by the Planning Commission with the minutes. Mr. Allred asked
41 if there was an application before the Commission that is time sensitive, whether the City should
42 wait for the minutes to be approved before issuing a building permit. He questioned how staff
43 should handle applicants who come in within one or two weeks of the meeting and want to move
44 forward with a permit. He remarked that it could be up to two months before an approval could
45 be obtained if there were a glitch with the minutes or a problem with the meeting. Commissioner
46 Diederich recognized that sometimes approval of the minutes is postponed. From a process
47 perspective, Commissioner Diederich suggested motions be read back each time before being
48 voted on. Commissioner Palmer referenced page 3, line 169, and asked that the word “may” be
49 changed to “shall” and the phrase “at the request of a Commissioner” be stricken.

1
2 **3. Ordinance Amendment Discussion.**

3 **3.1 General Land Use Tables, Review of Proposed Table of Contents, New Zone**
4 **Designations.**

5 (19:35:55) Commissioner Palmer noted that the Council asked that the Commission bring back a
6 tree ordinance. Prohibited uses were discussed. It was noted that prohibitions would be included
7 in the tables of permitted uses and then specifically excluded.

8
9 Commissioner Palmer recommended that helipads be excluded. He explained that they could
10 become a serious problem. Because air space is regulated by the FAA, the City can't regulate
11 airspace. The City can, however, regulate the ground space.

12
13 **3.2 Chapter 13.82 – Signs.**

14 (19:34:05) Signage issues were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that the Mayor recently commented
15 that he was upset with construction signs in the City being too large. He asked staff to present a
16 modification to the Commission that would reduce that. Various types of signs were described.

17
18 (19:41:01) Commissioner Diederich asked who was responsible for removing signs after
19 political events. It was determined that the candidate was responsible. Commissioner Diederich
20 suggested that be specified in the language. He also suggested real estate professionals be
21 responsible to make sure signs aren't put in the public right-of-way. The language seemed
22 inconsistent to him. It was suggested that the chart specify a quantity with regard to real estate
23 signs.

24
25 Commissioner Diederich had seen a number of signs with reflective ink. It was noted that
26 electronic message boards were prohibited in Holladay. In response to a question raised,
27 Ms. Hanson stated that neon signs similar to the one at the Cotton Bottom were allowed.

28
29 Objectionable signage situations were discussed. Commissioner Carr referred to the Salt Lake
30 Sign Ordinance that contains illustrations, which made a big difference. Commissioner Palmer
31 felt strongly about including as many graphics as possible.

32
33 **3.3 Chapter 13. 71 – Minor Clarification for the HV Zone Standards.**

34 (19:55:15) Commissioner Palmer referenced the changes recommended by staff.

35
36 Mr. Allred remarked that at the last meeting he was asked to send notes to the City Council. He
37 did what was requested that same evening but had not heard back.

38
39 ***Commissioner Scott moved to suspend the rules. Commissioner Diederich seconded the***
40 ***motion. Vote on motion: Gene Carr-Aye, Cyrus McKell-Aye, Howard Diederich-Aye, Brad***
41 ***Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed.***
42 ***Commissioner Kimball did not participate in the vote.***

43
44 Commissioner Scott recognized that tonight was Commissioner's Diederich's last meeting as a
45 Planning Commissioner. Commissioner Diederich reported that he had served on the
46 Commission for four years and had enjoyed working with the group. He encouraged the
47 Commission to continue to culture development. He hoped progress could be made at the Mall.
48 During his time on the Commission he recognized that the City had grown a lot. He recalled
49 being told by the Council that the Commission was anti-development and not working well with

1 applicants. Within the first few months of serving on the Commission he found that that was not
2 the case. He hoped at some point the City would have a City Center and Mall that all can be
3 proud of. He remarked that the City had gone from having an income that was all Mall
4 generated to an income that is nearly all generated by residential. He hoped to see that changed
5 through the addition of more commercial. He commended staff for their efforts.

6
7 *Commissioner Shupe moved to thank Commissioner Diederich for his four years of service.*
8 *Commissioner Carr seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Gene Carr-Aye, Cyrus McKell-*
9 *Aye, Howard Diederich-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Lynda Shields-Aye, Jim*
10 *Palmer-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner Kimball did not participate in the vote.*

11
12 **6. Adjourn.**

13 *The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned by unanimous consent.*

14 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

15
16
17
18 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
19 *Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, June 19, 2007.*

20
21
22
23 

24
25
26

Teri Forbes
27 T Forbes Group, Inc.
28 Minutes Secretary

29
30
31
32
33 Minutes approved: 7-11-07