

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

3  
4 **Tuesday, June 5, 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 Richard Kimball, Alternate  
17 Brad Scott  
18 Paul Shupe  
19 Howard Diederich  
20 Cy McKell

11  
12 **City Staff:**

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

21 The meeting was called to order at 6:26 p.m.  
22

23 **1. Field Trip/Discussion.**

24 (18:26:23) At the conclusion of the site visit, Commissioner Palmer asked if there were any  
25 items the Commission Members wanted staff to follow up on. Commissioner Scott remarked  
26 that the wires on the telephone were electrical. The decision was whether to wait to do the  
27 turnaround when Spring Court goes in or not. It seemed strange to Commissioner Palmer for a  
28 developer to develop two duplexes and be required to construct a fire turnaround for what is  
29 essentially a long, private street.  
30

31 (18:27:17) City Planner, Alma Haskell, suggested the Commission wait to see what the Unified  
32 Fire Authority says. He explained that turnarounds are planned and may not happen for a long  
33 period of time. He agreed to inquire with the Unified Fire Authority as to possible options. He  
34 explained that there was a defacto turnaround at the end of the road. It was not to standards as to  
35 width of the road and the radius of the curves, but it was closer than many other private streets he  
36 had seen.  
37

38 (18:28:05) Commissioner Diederich asked if there would be any type of buffer getting off the  
39 street similar to what had been required of other projects. Commissioner Palmer asked if he was  
40 referring to a deceleration lane. Commissioner Diederich responded that it would be something  
41 allowing motorists to pull to the side and provide an entrance of some kind. He thought anything  
42 done off of Highland Drive should have some type of buffer area for motorists to pull out or for  
43 pedestrians to use.  
44

45 (18:28:51) Mr. Haskell reported that the Holladay Home for the Elderly was being built on the  
46 other side of the road. His recollection was that they were required to construct some type of  
47 deceleration lane. Commissioner Diederich recommended they be uniform, if possible. He also  
48 recommended that any sidewalk be tied in. Commissioner Carr thought the plan looked very  
49 similar to the Cecelia project.

1  
2 **1.2 Holladay Oakmont Car Wash – File 07-2-06 – 4034 South 2700 East – Conditional**  
3 **Use Permit Amendment for a New Car Wash.**

4 (18:30:19) It seemed to Commissioner Palmer like the applicants were proposing a lot of asphalt.  
5 Impervious coverage issues were discussed. In response to a question raised by Commissioner  
6 Palmer, Mr. Haskell explained that the commercial zones require that only a certain portion of a  
7 lot be covered with buildings.

8  
9 (18:31:17) Landscaping requirements were discussed. Mr. Haskell explained that a certain  
10 amount of landscaping would be required in the parking area as well as the setback area.  
11 Commissioner Scott recalled that a similar requirement was imposed on Holladay Cinemas.  
12 Enforcement issues were discussed. Mr. Haskell stated that he had not been able to find a  
13 conditional use permit on the Oakmont Plaza yet. The applicants would be required to provide  
14 some landscaping, at least for the car wash portion. There was talk about dividing out the car  
15 wash portion onto a separate lot.

16  
17 (18:31:54) Commissioner Diederich suggested the applicants be required to at least water the  
18 front strips. It was noted that a family had owned the property for quite some time.  
19 Commissioner Palmer suggested the applicants be asked to calculate what the ratios are today.  
20 Commissioner Diederich thought the landscaping could help buffer the noise on either side of the  
21 vacuum between the houses to the north and east.

22  
23 Commissioner Palmer suggested the project be looked at as a package. It seemed like the  
24 applicants had already realized it would have to be brought into compliance.

25  
26 (18:35:46) Commissioner Diederich asked if there were any regulations about noise within a  
27 commercial area. Mr. Haskell responded that there were. City Planner, Pat Hanson, planned to  
28 send the matter on to the Salt Lake Valley Health Department for a recommendation. He  
29 thought that was one of the items they would make a recommendation on. Commissioner  
30 Palmer's understanding was that it was a countywide standard.

31  
32 Mr. Haskell stated that there might be requirements on sound proofing in the walls that may need  
33 to be followed that the applicants might otherwise not know about. Commissioner Diederich  
34 asked if the building materials could be required for the car wash. Mr. Haskell was unsure how  
35 much the City could require. He reminded the Commission Members that it was a conditional  
36 use. Commissioner Diederich thought brick should be used to ensure that it couldn't be seen  
37 from the road. He didn't want the wash bays to be visible to passing motorists. Some type of  
38 masonry was recommended.

39  
40 (18:37:37) Mr. Haskell stated that the applicants were in favor of landscaping around the car  
41 wash it to make it look nice. He reported that studies showed that women are more likely to visit  
42 a car wash than men. Studies also showed that the better a car wash looks; the more likely  
43 women are to come back. Mr. Haskell's recollection was that there was one automatic bay and  
44 three self-service bays.

45  
46 From a noise perspective, Commissioner Shupe thought a masonry structure would inhibit noise  
47 more than a tin structure. Commissioner Diederich thought any car wash in the City should be  
48 required to have some type of masonry component so it looks like a car wash rather than a tin  
49 shed.

1  
2 (18:41:10) Commissioner Diederich remarked that Park City would require a car wash to have a  
3 certain look and feel. He thought the City could at least require a brick or cinderblock structure.  
4

5 The various agenda items were reviewed and discussed.  
6

7 The Oakwood Court subdivision was discussed. Mr. Haskell reported that one neighbor  
8 contacted the City about the subdivision. She wasn't necessarily opposed to the subdivision but  
9 her brother, who lives next door, probably would be because he likes larger lots. The woman  
10 was concerned about water service. It was noted that the applicants had obtained a water  
11 availability letter.  
12

13 (18:42:25) Mr. Haskell explained that the applicants could not build a home bigger than what the  
14 zoning codes allow. He stated that many of the larger homes being built in the City require two  
15 hydrants. The applicant, Mr. Lambert, believed that based on the homes proposed to be built,  
16 two hydrants would be sufficient. The matter was presented to the Fire Review Committee for  
17 review. He thought they would approve the addition of an extra hydrant and include notice on  
18 the preliminary plat indicating that if a larger home is built, a third hydrant would need to be  
19 installed.  
20

21 (18:43:09) Fire sprinkling issues were discussed. Mr. Haskell reported that fire sprinkling would  
22 only be required in low flow areas. Either way, a hydrant would be required. It was noted that  
23 the applicants previously received conceptual approval.  
24

25 (18:45:10) Title 13 issues were discussed. Commissioner Carr referred to excess right-of-way  
26 issues. He realized if there was a street nearby there had not been a lot. Mr. Haskell explained  
27 that the intent was to prevent the easement from passing into the right-of-way. It was already  
28 excluded from the lot area. He explained that oftentimes people want to do them just as  
29 easements, however, it would not really benefit them since it wouldn't count toward their lot  
30 width or lot area.  
31

32 Commissioner Carr next referred to 1304-468. He remarked that the most recent definition of  
33 setback in the latest iteration dated April 2007 was numbered 472 rather than 468. Ms. Hanson  
34 agreed to double-check the numbering.  
35

36 Commissioner Carr referred to pages 43 to 45 where reference was made to "anomalous lot". He  
37 questioned the meaning of the term. Mr. Haskell explained that most of the lots surrounding the  
38 proposed lot were very similar. The term involved the averaging of the front yards in order to  
39 preserve the streetscape. The intent was to keep the same streetscape along the property. The  
40 term "outlier" was defined. Commissioner Palmer understood the meanings of "anomalous" and  
41 "outlier" but thought a more succinct definition was needed.  
42

43 (18:50:09) Commissioner Carr thought the concept worked fine for a standard subdivision where  
44 all of the lots are the same. Commissioner Kimball pointed out that the idea behind the front  
45 setback was to not intimidate people walking along the road. Buffer issues were discussed.  
46 Mr. Haskell explained that the building corridor encourages people to build more in line with  
47 other homes along the backside. The averaging of the front setbacks encourages building in line  
48 with the other homes on the front side. Commissioner Diederich thought the language was  
49 nebulous. He suggested there be minimums and maximums specified when the Director is given

1 authority to make the decision. Currently, the language prohibits anything closer than 25 feet  
2 from the property line.

3  
4 Commissioner Palmer referred to language on line 49. He identified a lot on Walker Lane on the  
5 corner of a private lot. One of the City’s definitions stated that it was a corner lot requiring a 20-  
6 foot setback off of a private lane. Three other definitions indicated that it was not a corner lot on  
7 a private lane. Language ambiguities were identified. Ms. Hanson thought it was dangerous to  
8 include exceptions in the language since it could potentially cause more problems. For that  
9 reason, staff liked to be able to use common sense when exceptions come up.

10  
11 (18:56:18) Lot coverage issues were discussed. Commissioner Palmer noticed that the  
12 percentages in the table were adjusted. Commissioner Diederich referred to lines 59 through 65  
13 pertaining to the height of the main building or structuring transitioning down from the  
14 maximum height allowed to a required 20-foot height maximum in the rear yard. He asked for  
15 more clarification. Ms. Hanson clarified that the transitioning could be done at a 1-to-1 ratio.  
16 Setback issues were clarified.

17  
18 **2. Agenda**

19 (19:02:20) Commissioner Palmer read the Commission statement.

20  
21 **2.1 Oakwood Court Subdivision – File 07-1-05 – 5781 South Highland Drive –**  
22 **Subdivide One Lot into Two.**

23 (19:05:20) City Planner, Alma Haskell, presented the staff report and stated that the Planning  
24 Commission approved the request as a concept in April. The applicant had completed enough  
25 detail that staff was comfortable bringing it back as a preliminary plat. After that it would be  
26 recorded as a final plat, at which time the subdivision would be made official. Staff would  
27 review the final plat and at that point the applicant could apply for building permits on the lot.  
28 The Architectural Review Committee reviewed the preliminary plat. Planning staff was satisfied  
29 with the preliminary plat and the staff report noted that the owner of the lane would need to sign  
30 on the final plat or record a specific easement for the applicant before the final plat is signed on.  
31 The applicant indicated in a letter to the City that he was willing to sign those documents.

32  
33 (19:06:24) Mr. Haskell reported that power and gas availability letters had not yet been furnished  
34 to the City, however, the water and sewer availability letters had. He noted that the power and  
35 gas utilities provided service almost anywhere they needed to. Staff had no doubt that they  
36 would be able to provide service in the proposed location. They just asked that the appropriate  
37 letters be submitted prior to recordation of the final plat.

38  
39 Mr. Haskell reported that the fire review was complete and indicated that some tree trimming  
40 might be required. One or two hydrants would need to be installed. If one hydrant was installed,  
41 the development would have two hydrants serving it, which would allow them to build up to a  
42 7,700 square foot home including garages, covered porches, and basements. The fire review  
43 indicated that two new hydrants would be needed for a total of three. The Unified Fire Authority  
44 was currently re-reviewing the situation to determine whether they would be satisfied with one  
45 hydrant.

46  
47 (19:07:40) Mr. Haskell reported that the City Engineer had reviewed the plat and was satisfied  
48 with the road design and the layout proposed. The Public Works Director had also reviewed the  
49 request. He recommended the street be renamed to avoid addressing all of the lots off of

1 Highland Drive. The applicant had been working with the surrounding neighbors to reach an  
2 agreement for the street to be renamed. If for some reason it could not be renamed, there were  
3 potential solutions.

4  
5 Mr. Haskell remarked that the City Attorney would review the title report when the final plat is  
6 submitted and review building permits at the appropriate time. He identified an issue on the  
7 preliminary plat with the fire turnaround encroaching slightly on the property to the east. The  
8 applicant indicated they would redesign and shift the fire turnaround so that it is fully on their  
9 property.

10  
11 (19:08:56) Staff recommended approval of the Valley View Estates preliminary plat based on the  
12 findings contained in the staff report.

13  
14 (19:10:27) Ryan Lambert was present representing the applicant. The intent was to submit the  
15 plat for preliminary approval. They believed they had met all of the requirements. He asked  
16 where the Valley View Estates name came from. They noticed the name was included on  
17 correspondence and clarified that the project was known as Oakwood Court. Mr. Haskell stated  
18 that the name confusion was an oversight. Mr. Lambert stated that the site had become slightly  
19 overgrown with vegetation. They planned to get the site cleaned up immediately.

20  
21 (19:11:50) Commissioner Scott asked about the easement for the turnaround. He noticed that the  
22 east side went onto a neighbor's property. Mr. Lambert stated that rather than deal with the  
23 encroachment issue, their preference was to move it entirely onto their property. Commissioner  
24 Scott asked Mr. Lambert if he had a problem with the additional UFA requirement pertaining to  
25 the possible need for a third hydrant. Mr. Lambert did not anticipate it being an issue. He had  
26 no problem with the condition being included.

27  
28 Commissioner Palmer opened the meeting to public comment.

29  
30 (19:13:10) Kimberly Avery stated that she lived at the end of the lane at 5777 South Highland  
31 Drive. Her concern was with the condition of the lot and was partially addressed by  
32 Mr. Lambert. She was appalled at the lot's condition and was concerned that it had brought the  
33 entire neighborhood down. She stated that the property had been in a rundown state for quite a  
34 while. The neighbors wanted to see it cleaned up.

35  
36 In response to a question raised by Ms. Avery, Mr. Haskell explained that if a home were built  
37 up to 7,700 square feet, two hydrants would be required. A structure greater than 7,700 square  
38 feet would require three hydrants. The applicants would still have to meet the zoning  
39 requirements when they submit their building permit. On the proposed lots, he thought it was  
40 theoretically possible to build a home over 7,700 square feet including the basement, main floor,  
41 upper floor, garage, and covered porches. Given coverage restrictions, he did not expect they  
42 could get much more than that. He reported that the intent of tonight's meeting was to determine  
43 whether the applicants meet the lot requirements. Staff would review the building code  
44 requirements at the time building permit application is made.

45  
46 (19:15:24) Commissioner Palmer remarked that the City recently amended the zoning code to  
47 address what was referred to as the "monster home" issue. To build a home in Holladay  
48 currently, an applicant must propose a house that is relative in size to the lot. Ms. Avery  
49 reported that as neighbors they talked about not having houses that are too tall. They preferred

1 homes to be on one level. Commissioner Palmer stated that two-story homes were allowed  
2 throughout the City.

3  
4 (19:16:44) Stan Avery gave his address as 5777 South Highland Drive. He thought a 7,700  
5 square foot house on a lot that is approximately .423 acres would create a situation where there is  
6 no side yard. He was concerned that it would not have any of the flavor of the existing  
7 neighborhood. In looking at the site and considering the location of the trees on the property,  
8 building a very large home would basically denude the lot. He expected that nearly all of the  
9 vegetation would have to be wiped out in order to build on the site. As a general contractor, he  
10 realized what it would take to place two homes on the property. Property line issues were  
11 discussed. It was determined that a legal description of the property would be needed to  
12 determine whether it included the lane. Mr. Haskell stated that the turnaround was about 60 feet  
13 beyond where the Avery's property ends. He explained that it was required that the right-of-way  
14 easement be granted before final recordation. It was also required that a title report be submitted  
15 for all of the property in the subdivision including the right-of-way. The City Attorney and City  
16 Engineer would review the report to make sure the applicants own all of the land.

17  
18 (19:21:10) Commissioner Palmer questioned why the matter was before the Commission based  
19 on the amount of title work to be done. Mr. Haskell responded that the title report work was  
20 typically done at time of final plat. Staff asked the applicant to indicate who owns the lane. The  
21 full title report would verify ownership and allow the additional home access via the lane. It was  
22 noted that the cost to bring the lane up to code would be borne by the developer.

23  
24 (19:24:13) Frederick Sorensen gave his address as 1609 Spring Lane and identified himself as  
25 the engineer on the project. He reported that the name of the lane was proposed as Hedgewood  
26 Court, which was approved by the County. He clarified that a 7,700 square-foot footprint would  
27 not be allowed and the applicants would be required to maintain the side yards and setbacks.  
28 7,500 for a basement, main floor, and upper floor would equate to around a 2,500 square foot  
29 footprint. He thought that was significant.

30  
31 Rudolf Hegewald gave his address as 5777 South Highland Drive and noted that there were three  
32 homes with the same address on the lane. He stressed the need to change the address to make it  
33 easier to distinguish between each of the residences. He was in favor of developing the property.  
34 In the past, the lot had been very minimally maintained with one house. He thought two homes  
35 would enhance the appearance of the lane. Because it was a private lane, there were no  
36 sidewalks. He reported that his home was 2,000 square feet plus the garage and sat on slightly  
37 more than one-half acre. He believed there was plenty of room for two such houses on the lot.  
38 He and his wife were in favor of what was proposed since the property was an eyesore in its  
39 present state. There was no fire turnaround, however, there was the possibility for the fire truck  
40 to turn into the property and back out again. He reported that there was a fire hydrant on the  
41 property line of two of the neighbors on the lane. If it became necessary to have two more fire  
42 hydrants there, it would be possible as there was a six-inch water line on the lane for five houses.  
43 He expected that the water pressure would be adequate.

44  
45 (19:28:23) There was no further public comment. The public hearing was closed.

46  
47 Commissioner Diederich recalled that water was running along the back of the site when the  
48 Commissioners visited the property. Commissioner Palmer responded that there was an  
49 irrigation ditch but he thought it was on the Oakwood side.

1  
2 Mr. Haskell reported that the applicant would need to sign the certification of protection of storm  
3 drain and irrigation facilities. It would indicate that they would not change the facilities or put  
4 additional water into them without the permission of the ditch company. When staff reviews  
5 building permits, they look at runoff and make sure that the additional runoff being created by  
6 the project is contained on site or going into an appropriate storm drain facility.

7  
8 Based on the preliminary information provided, Commissioner Palmer asked if there would be  
9 an issue of access onto 5775 South. Mr. Haskell responded that based on the deeds submitted by  
10 the applicant, it appeared that Mr. Hegewald owns that lane. Mr. Hegewald provided the City  
11 with a letter indicating that he was willing to allow the subdivision to access on the lane and for  
12 the improvements to be made. As a result, he saw no easement issue. If there was one, however,  
13 it would come up in the final title report review.

14  
15 (19:31:25) Commissioner Diederich noticed that the applicant didn't address whether or not he  
16 was going to try to preserve any of the trees in his development. Mr. Lambert stated that the  
17 trees would have a lot to do with the eventual property owner and what they would like to have  
18 done. Some of the neighbors like the trees and others do not. They had no desire to remove the  
19 trees at this point. He thought leaving the trees added value to the lot. He agreed to make every  
20 effort possible to keep them.

21  
22 In response to a question raised, Mr. Haskell reported that the UFA had found that the proposed  
23 pavement widening to 20 feet with the fire turnaround meeting the codes was satisfactory. They  
24 did indicate that some of trees would have to be trimmed up to a height of 13'6". They had no  
25 objection to the access as shown.

26  
27 He clarified that the project name was Oakwood Court subdivision. The street name would be  
28 Hedgewood Court.

29  
30 (19:34:55) *Commissioner Scott moved to approve Oakwood Court subdivision subject to the*  
31 *following staff findings.*

- 32 **1. Lot area, width, and setback requirements are met.**  
33 **2. Right-of-way width is adequate for the required road improvements.**  
34 ***Contingent on the following completions:***  
35 **1. Rocky Mountain Power and Questar Gas must agree to provide service. Water service**  
36 ***shall also be provided.***  
37 **2. The right-of-way must be included in the final plat, or the right-of-way owner must**  
38 ***record an easement (approved by City staff) at the County Recorder's Office to be***  
39 ***referenced on the final plat.***  
40 **3. Unified Fire Authority requirements must be met including that the number of**  
41 ***hydrants must be installed as dictated by the size of the future homes per fire codes.***  
42 **4. An easement must be obtained for the fire turnaround where it is not on the applicant's**  
43 ***property, or the turnaround must be re-aligned to be fully on the applicant's property.***

44 ***Commissioner Carr seconded the motion.***

45  
46 (19:37:55) Commissioner Palmer commented that one of the staff recommendations was to  
47 include a request for tree preservation although that was not something the City could require.  
48 Commissioner Scott had considered that but thought the market should dictate to leave as many  
49 as possible to get the highest price possible.

1  
2 ***Vote on motion: Howard Diederich-Aye, Richard Kimball-Aye, Brad Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-***  
3 ***Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed.***  
4

5 Commissioner Palmer advised the applicant that there was still some work to be done,  
6 particularly around the easement. He remarked that the City had a weed ordinance in place as  
7 well as an enforcement officer. When citizens see lots that are overgrown with weeds, they can  
8 contact the City who will follow up with the property owner.  
9

10 **2.2 PUBLIC HEARING – Amendments to the Title 13, Definitions, Supplemental**  
11 **Regulations, and Single-Family Zone Standards.**

12 (19:39:40) Commissioner Palmer opened the public hearing. There were no public comments.  
13

14 Commissioner Haskell suggested the public hearing be continued to give staff the opportunity to  
15 get the word out to the public. Commissioner Palmer closed the public hearing and continued it  
16 as an agenda item while they continue to develop Title 13.  
17

18 **3. Consent Items.**

19 **3.1 Approval of Minutes- Planning Commission Meeting – April 10, 2007, and April 17,**  
20 **2007.**

21 (19:41:35) *The minutes were approved as written, by unanimous consent of the Commission.*  
22

23 **4. Adjourn.**

24 (19:42:45) *Commissioner Palmer moved to adjourn to work session. Commissioner Shupe*  
25 *seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Howard Diederich-Aye, Richard Kimball-Aye, Brad*  
26 *Scott-Aye, Paul Shupe-Aye, Gene Carr-Aye, Jim Palmer-Aye. The motion passed.*  
27

28 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned to a work session at 7:42 p.m.  
29

30 **WORK SESSION**

31 Title 13 issues were reviewed.  
32

33 Lot coverage issues were discussed as contained on line 88. The combined coverage table was  
34 reviewed. Commissioner Shupe explained that the impervious coverage requirement remained at  
35 5%. The building itself would change while the impervious coverage requirement would remain  
36 the same. Staff talked about changing the requirement but was unsure what to change it to.  
37 Mr. Haskell thought there should be some reason for people to plant extra trees or install  
38 permeable surfaces. For the time being it remained unchanged. He explained that combined  
39 coverage included all structures and non-landscaped areas.  
40

41 (19:46:29) Commissioner Diederich referred to the purpose statement on line 85 and asked if the  
42 City had identified the community identity and aesthetics. He questioned whether it was defined  
43 somewhere or left to the Community Development Director. Commissioner Carr remarked that  
44 it was contained in the general plan.  
45

46 Impervious surface issues were discussed. Commissioner Palmer stated that some of the goals  
47 were to minimize storm drain impact, maximize green space, and increase percolation/water  
48 table recharge. He suggested a credit be given for water that is retained. Doing so would  
49 encourage people to achieve that goal. Community Development Director, Paul Allred,

1 acknowledged that there were numerous benefits to limiting the amount of impervious surface.  
2 As water percolates it filters the water and removes salts, solids, and oils. In the case of the  
3 situation on Russell, staff disagreed with the idea that the on-street parking was a problem rather  
4 that taking away the pavement. Staff's feeling was that it was a public street, which was built  
5 specifically for that purpose. Staff believed the benefit was greater to take out asphalt since  
6 asphalt was considered a toxic substance. It leeches into the soil because it is petroleum based  
7 and because of its color, absorbs heat and radiates it back out. Cement was also a regulated  
8 substance and contains chemicals. He explained that asphalt runs water more slowly than  
9 concrete and heats more. Concrete was more stable and does not leech materials into the soil as  
10 much. It also tends to reflect heat.

11  
12 (19:52:07) Mr. Allred stated that the City needed to do its part environmentally. If citizens are  
13 informed he was confident that they would participate. Commissioner Scott disagreed and  
14 thought the public was greater served by having cars parked on the property. The applicants  
15 could meet that requirement by laying down gravel. Safety concerns were identified.

16  
17 Commissioner Diederich had walked the sidewalks in the area many times and noticed that  
18 visibility was reduced when cars are parked along the side of the road. He suggested the  
19 possibility of a trade off and proposed having trees planted around the outside to buffer the area.  
20 Mr. Allred agreed and thought the matrix system described previously was intended to avoid the  
21 removal of pavement unless a person is adding on. If the applicant didn't already have an  
22 overabundance of pavement and was not changing the property, the issue would not have come  
23 up.

24  
25 Commissioner Scott thought the applicant was backed into a corner and wanted to get the project  
26 done. For that reason he agreed to the City requirements in order to begin. Commissioner  
27 Kimball thought trees could mitigate the absorption of the asphalt. Commissioner Palmer  
28 recognized that the asphalt area was quite large. He thought a two-lane approach could be left to  
29 the garage and put the eastern portion in gravel or paver blocks to keep cars off the street and  
30 increase groundwater percolation.

31  
32 (19:55:50) Mr. Allred thought it was important to educate citizens about the choices they make.  
33 He thought somewhere there had to be at tradeoff. He thought it was benevolent that the City  
34 was providing people with options so they can still live on their property within reason  
35 recognizing that changes must be made. Because of the amount of pavement on the site, he did  
36 not think the ordinance was unreasonable.

37  
38 Commissioner Shupe recognized the high cost of property in the City. Mr. Allred realized that  
39 lots were expensive in the City and that property owners have to maximize what they can get.  
40 Commissioner Palmer acknowledged that lots were expensive because Holladay is a nice place  
41 to live. If the market were to turn it on its head, it would no longer be a nice place to live.

42  
43 Mr. Allred suggested the possibility of eliminating the middle column. Commissioner Palmer  
44 referred to the new exceptions contained on page 120, line 97, and suggested possible exceptions  
45 and mitigations.

46  
47 (20:02:03) Mr. Allred stated that by enacting the proposed Title 13 regulations, word would get  
48 out and the City may take it a step further by providing materials on the City's website that  
49 promote these measures. He realized that they had to start somewhere.

1  
2 Mr. Haskell stated that a matrix was prepared showing which items met which goals. It looked  
3 to him like sumps and cisterns should perhaps should allow for a slight bonus. Sumps, cisterns,  
4 and retention basins were removed since people are already getting an impact fee reduction when  
5 they install those items. He noted that they were already required per the City codes. The metes  
6 definition and the xeriscaping were removed as they posed definitional hardships. That left only  
7 permeable paving and installing trees.

8  
9 Language in the document was reviewed. Ways the language could be clarified and simplified  
10 were discussed. Environmental issues were discussed. Mr. Allred explained that the population  
11 would continue to grow, however, it was not possible to manufacture more water or additional  
12 ways to store it.

13  
14 Pat Hanson reported on a conversation she had recently with Neil Lundberg. They did not feel  
15 the ordinance was very well organized. Mr. Lundberg provided various other sample tables of  
16 contents from other ordinances to show how they were organized. It seemed to her that the  
17 Centerville ordinance was a great model to follow since they have similar regulations. Using the  
18 Centerville model, she generated a table of contents showing how the City would reorganize the  
19 ordinance. The intent was to have a joint meeting with the Commission and City Council to see  
20 if all were on the same track. She explained that how the ordinance is organized is critical to  
21 how it is written. Some things in the ordinance seemed to be stuck in odd places. Those items  
22 would be shifted to places where they would be more accessible. Ms. Hanson stated that a lot of  
23 the work on the ordinance rewrite had been done. She believed that a significant number of the  
24 outstanding LUDMA changes could be easily resolved. During the last four legislative sessions,  
25 the subdivision ordinance had been changed. The first thing the Commissioners could expect  
26 would be a table of contents showing how the organization should work. After that they would  
27 start fleshing out the chapters.

28  
29 (20:28:38) Ms. Hanson reported that at the June 21 meeting, she had tentatively scheduled a  
30 recommendation on the policies and procedures. She asked that the Commission Members look  
31 at it and be prepared to make a recommendation to the City Council. She also mentioned the  
32 land use tables and stated that extra time was needed to work on them. A line-by-line review  
33 would be needed. She thought it would be helpful to conduct an additional work session.  
34 Commissioner Palmer thought a lot of the line-by-line changes could be done via email. He  
35 thought a line-by-line review was tremendously ineffective in a group setting. Ms. Hanson did  
36 not think that was the case with a land use table. She thought it required everyone working  
37 together and deciding on every issue. Mr. Lundberg suggested there be a definition for every  
38 land use in the table. As a result, the Commission needed to decide what uses would go in the  
39 table.

40  
41 (20:35:51) Commissioner Carr recognized that going through an ordinance page-by-page  
42 sounded daunting but agreed that that was the only way. Ms. Hanson recommended the first  
43 priority should be to finalize the table of contents and set the organizational pattern in place. The  
44 Commission could then move on and complete the land use table. Commissioner Palmer asked  
45 that Ms. Hanson distribute the language again and ask specifically for feedback. The matter  
46 could then be scheduled in upcoming work meetings with a dedicated session. He suggested  
47 they start with 30 minutes and see how much progress can be made. He thought trying to call a  
48 special session in the summer would be very difficult. He asked that Ms. Hanson start collecting  
49 the issues to be addressed in order to discuss them individually.

1  
2 (20:38:28) Commissioner Diederich stated that his term would expire in July. He agreed to work  
3 through the process until he is replaced. Commissioner Scott stated that his term was set to  
4 expire in July as well.

5  
6 Commissioner Diederich asked for an update on the Mall. Commissioner Palmer had not heard  
7 anything. Staff reported that they had heard rumors. Commissioner Carr thought what had  
8 happened represented very poor public relations.

9  
10 Mr. Allred reported that he looked over Ms. Hanson's outline on the reorganization of the  
11 ordinance earlier in the day and was happy with the way it was laid out. He thought as presented  
12 it would flow very well. He thought condensing it would make it easier to use and more  
13 understandable.

14  
15 (20:41:28) Mr. Allred reported that with regard to the Village there was a lot going on. The  
16 following day the category X traffic study was to be submitted. The release of federal funds was  
17 likely within 30 days. It would include millions of dollars that would allow the City to start  
18 looking at engineering and streetscape design. Aesthetic issues were discussed. Mr. Allred  
19 reported that Babcock Design had been meeting with staff and they had been looking at doing  
20 some entrance features and signs near entrances into the community. The ideas were forwarded  
21 to the Council. He encouraged the Commission Members to look at sketches that were provided.  
22 Babcock Design prepared cost estimates, proposed locations, and a variety of different types of  
23 signs. All had a theme and motif. Staff recommended the types of materials to be used, a map  
24 with locations, and some overall costs. Some of the federal dollars from the study could be used  
25 for signage within the study area. He thought things would start happening.

26  
27 (20:44:09) Mr. Allred was excited about the fact that they were looking at aesthetic issues. The  
28 City Council and the Mayor asked him to find some interesting and attractive street graphics. He  
29 presented them with some ideas and was directed to come up with something for the entrance  
30 features. He had spoken with Cowboy Partners and Babcock Design about streetscape issues  
31 and asked them to help put together some ideas. The outcome was that some sketches were  
32 done. Nothing was finalized or decided. He recommended the Commission Members look at it.

33  
34 Commissioner Diederich thought the Commission and public should be allowed to give input.  
35 Mr. Allred explained that no one was being excluded. They had been strategizing on their  
36 streetscape. Commissioner Diederich thought it was a touchy subject. Mr. Allred offered to  
37 email to Commissioner Diederich the draft concept with texture material being suggested. He  
38 reported that he had been serving on the Planning Commission for the past four years for this  
39 very reason. He wanted to be involved in something that would have an impact in the City.  
40 Knowing that he helped rewrite the code was not something he would take a lot of internal pride  
41 in as he drives through the City. He thought the Mayor and Council needed reminders.

42  
43 Mr. Haskell reported that the July meetings would be held on Wednesday July 11 and Tuesday,  
44 July 17.

45  
46 (20:51:34) Mr. Allred reported that the Mayor was very interested in "dressing up" the  
47 community. A tour was recently conducted with staff and the Mayor who was disappointed by  
48 the appearance of the main entryways into the community. Commissioner Carr was particularly

1 embarrassed by the appearance of the west side of Highland Drive. Mr. Allred reported that the  
2 Mayor was putting effort into improving the situation. City Hall issues were discussed.

3  
4 Commissioner Carr thought the major disaster was Cottonwood Mall. Mr. Allred was  
5 encouraged by what he had heard. He thought that as a community they were moving in a good  
6 direction. Some of the things that were of concern to the Mayor and the Commission Members  
7 would take a lot of money, time, and patience to fix. The Mayor recently directed staff to  
8 commence review of a tree protection ordinance outside of the right-of-way. He also wanted to  
9 reduce the size of construction and real estate signs.

10  
11 (20:56:13) Mr. Allred reiterated that there was a lot of discussion taking place on City Hall, the  
12 Village, aesthetics, design, and federal funds. Staff had been working very hard with the Council  
13 and the public on various issues. He reported that the City also had formed a Parks and Trails  
14 Committee. The Mayor asked eight or nine people to sit on the committee that had been meeting  
15 for the past two months. They looked at park and trail possibilities and how to create better  
16 facilities. He thought it tied in very well with what was being done with the zoning ordinance,  
17 the Title 13 efforts, and having a greener community. As staff, Mr. Allred had been with the  
18 City for about 20 months. He thought the last three months had been by far the busiest he had  
19 seen. He reported that building inspections would be done in house rather than being contracted  
20 out. That change was expected to be coming in the next few months. He encouraged the  
21 Commission Members to contact staff anytime they had questions.

22  
23 (20:59:50) Commissioner Diederich had concerns with the decision-making process in the City.  
24 He personally was aware that everyone that he helped annex in was unhappy. He heard often  
25 how people were disappointed with Holladay. They hear a great deal about the monster home  
26 ordinance but don't know why its there and how it benefits them. They drive the streets and see  
27 nothing happening with the Mall. When visual issues come up, the Commission finds that it has  
28 already been decided, designed, and paid for and they had no input. That was not why he first  
29 got involved on the Commission. He wanted to make a difference in the community. Mr. Allred  
30 reassured him that nothing was official and they had only done things that will help identify the  
31 City as a community along the edges and interior. For the most part, he believed the City was  
32 fairly clean, however, there were issues. He identified the storage of boats and RVs as a  
33 problem. The cleanliness of park strips on major arterials and collector streets was also of  
34 concern. He welcomed input.

35  
36 (21:01:57) Commissioner Carr suggested general growth do some kind of public relations.  
37 Commissioner Palmer stated that the City had spoken to them multiple times. Mr. Allred  
38 remarked that the City communicated with them regularly. Commissioner Diederich thought the  
39 City Center was terrible. Commissioner Palmer was concerned that it took over six months to  
40 complete. He drove it twice a day and thought it was poorly planned and poorly executed.  
41 Mr. Allred agreed to pass the comments on to Randy and the Mayor. He thought they could do a  
42 better job of promoting the positive things happening in the community. Commissioner Palmer  
43 suggested the newsletter include more information and less fluff. He viewed it as the only public  
44 relations that the City does.

45  
46 (21:04:25) Commissioner Diederich thought that the longer the City Center is delayed, the worse  
47 the situation gets. Mr. Allred responded that the administration was acutely aware of the  
48 frustration in the community surrounding the Village Center. Every week he heard comments  
49 from the Mayor and those who set the Council agenda about how frustrated people are with

1 Cottonwood Mall and the Village. He suspected that by February or March something would  
2 begin happening in the Village Center in terms of construction. They knew that the money  
3 should be released within about 30 days. At that time, they would start on the engineering. He  
4 reported that recently the City was victorious in court against Walgreen's. He viewed that as a  
5 big win for the City. Possible optional locations for Walgreen's were identified.

6  
7  
8 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

9  
10 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*  
11 *Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, June 5, 2007.*

12  
13  
14  
15 

16  
17  
18 Teri Forbes  
19 T Forbes Group, Inc.  
20 Minutes Secretary

21  
22  
23  
24 Minutes approved: 7-11-07