

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

Wednesday, November 7, 2007

5:00 p.m.

**Holladay Municipal Center
4580 South 2300 East**

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members:

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

City Staff:

Paul Allred, Community Development Director
Alma Haskell, City Planner
Patricia Hanson, City Planner

1. Field Trip and/or Discussion.

1.1 Wander Woods Subdivision – File 07-1-17 – 4901 South Wander Lane – Lot Split.

(17:45:55) City Planner, Alma Haskell, identified issues with the project in addition to the fire access and trees. Power and gas utility availability letters were needed in addition to the corrections provided to the applicant on the plat. He noted that the applicants returned staff's corrections earlier in the day with the redlines.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Scott, Mr. Haskell stated that with regard to road slopes the applicants were allowed 10% on public streets, large private streets, and lanes. 12% was acceptable for driveways. With regard to how to proceed, his impression was that the applicants were ready for a vote of the Commission.

With regard to grading concerns, Mr. Haskell stated that the applicants had not yet submitted grading plans, however, that was something that would be required at the building permit phase. The applicants would be required to meet whatever codes are in effect at that time. He noted that the buildable area on the back lot was about 30 feet wide. Although it was not as wide as some other lots, it was still possible to build a 3,000 square foot home there.

Street dedication issues were raised. Mr. Haskell reported that the applicant was dedicating 25 feet of the right-of-way. Sidewalk was required on the north end. The property was zoned R-1-10.

With regard to a large tree on the site, Mr. Haskell commented that the code does not require the applicants to preserve the tree, although that was the desire of both the City and the applicant. Staff agreed to do what they could together with the Fire Department to preserve it.

1.2 Poulos Valley View Estates – File 07-1-16 – 2526 East Valley View Avenue – Three-lot subdivision.

The above matter was withdrawn from the agenda.

1.3 Cottonwood Mall Master Site Development Plan – 4835 South Highland Drive.

(17:53:27) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, reported that during the regular meeting he would review what had taken place with the project to this point. The plan was to first allow General Growth to make their presentation and then briefly review the staff report.

Commissioner Palmer explained that the intent of tonight's meeting was to conduct the public hearing and listen to the concerns of the public. He expected to hear from a variety of individuals with certain concerns. The goal was to listen to those concerns and determine whether there was a way to address them.

Commissioner Palmer suspected that most of the members of the public had seen a previous presentation and that most would understand general information about the plan. He suggested staff focus on the specifics of what was new, why the plan was created the way it was, and how it functioned. He stated that neighborhood meetings on a project of this size would allow issues to be worked out in a small group setting. The role of the Commission during the public hearing was to listen.

(18:08:39) Access issues were discussed. Commissioner Palmer asked about the allocation summaries showing the maximum and minimum square footage. He asked General Growth representative, Kris Longson, what would happen if each of the four segments were to be built to the maximum square footage and whether a total square footage of 4.8 million square feet would be possible? Mr. Longson responded that that was always a possibility. He explained that the project would be built over several years. The commercial portion would be built out with the associated residential above the retail by the year 2010. Almost half of the housing would be above the retail. With regard to the residential phasing, the market could change and flexibility was necessary to create the best development. Commissioner Palmer thought it was important to determine the maximum size of the commercial and residential combined numbers. In his experience, when maximums and minimums are listed, the City tends to always get the maximum.

Mr. Longson explained that the phasing plan would be market dependent. The goal was to complete the commercial core and its associated residential units by 2010. Parking issues were discussed. Commissioner Carr asked if there would be a charge for parking in the garages. Mr. Longson said that stopping for a payment booth is inefficient for what little revenue is generated and they do not plan to charge for parking. Mr. Longson stated that while today there was no charge for parking, in the future that could change.

Commissioner Palmer asked Mr. Longson if he planned to update the parking analysis. Mr. Longson responded that the intent was to follow the traditional neighborhood development, which encouraged people to walk rather than drive. Commissioner McKell asked Mr. Longson what his perception was of the density of the parking. Mr. Longson suspected that people would

learn to use Main Street, which was designed with at least 15-foot sidewalks. He also noted that the design was done block-by-block.

(18:26:13) Commissioner Shields thought the density was “sad”. It seemed to her like what was proposed was the creation of a city within a city. She felt hopeless about the situation but wanted to go on record as saying she wished General Growth would think about reducing the density and the building heights. She was particularly bothered by the theaters because it would create such a high impact. She thought the theater across the street could be buoyed up and improved. She viewed the proposal as overwhelming and something that will impact the area where she lives a great deal. Mr. Longson stated that they were not bound to do the theaters. She thought the mall area should be different from other places and not just a replication of something that exists in many other places. Commissioner Shields thought a development with more grass and less density would be different. She acknowledged that some of the things the developer was doing were wonderful. Her concerns had to do with the number of residential units and the height.

Commissioner Palmer remarked that he had never seen an application with as much detail as this one. He suggested the applicants address concerns to the extent possible. He doubted there was anyone in Holladay who did not want to see the mall redeveloped. The applicants simply needed to define what it should be.

(18:34:52) Commissioner Palmer asked about noise abatement and how the applicant would address it. Mr. Longson responded that they intended to comply with the noise ordinances that are in place. Commissioner Palmer thought there were things the applicant could do from a design perspective to orient noise so that it floats to Highland Drive rather than Arbor Lane. Mr. Longson stated that they had similar concerns since there would be residential in the commercial core. He acknowledged that the homes within the project would be the most affected by noise. Although noise abatement was not addressed in the plan, Commissioner Palmer was confident it would be a concern to the public. He thought efforts to make the documents consumable by the general public would work to the benefit of both the applicant and the City.

(18:50:13) Commissioner McKell asked about the relocation of the City Creek. His understanding was that it had to be done before the weather changes. Mr. Longson stated that they were still trying to get that done.

Commissioner Carr commented that he still has concerns about a 78 FT wide street running through the only significant public gathering space. He also made the point that the renderings do not bear evidence of the actual width of the street, making the street seem much narrower. He felt that some more thought should go into this part of the project. Mr. Garcia of GGP stated that the renderings were conceptual in nature and could be misleading. Commissioner Carr also asked about bicycle traffic. Mr. Longson responded that they were unsure how to address it. Bicycles were encouraged and a cycling event and cycling stores were being considered.

1.4 PC Policy and Procedures.

The above matter was not addressed.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION.

(19:06:20) Commissioner Palmer called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. and read the Commission statement.

2.1 Cottonwood Mall Site Development Master Plan – 4835 South Highland Drive.

(19:10:10) Commissioner Palmer was confident that everyone in Holladay was excited to see the project move from a concept to actual development plans. A first draft document had been prepared. No approval would be made tonight. The intent was to receive public comments. The Commission's goal was to understand the questions in order to address them in the plan.

Mr. Allred reported that the public hearing was required because the new RMU zone requires a master plan for the project to be developed. The document was known as the Site Development Master Plan (SDMP). It was a specific document meant to help guide the developer and the City in reviewing the subdivisions and phases as they go through the process. The document contained 25 elements required in the new zone. The City had been working with General Growth for the last four to five months. To this point, the city has approved a change to the general plan and a new zone, which required review and approval by both the Planning Commission and the City Council at public hearings. The process tonight was for the Planning Commission to review the proposed SDMP document, take public comment, and hear specifically from General Growth on the elements of the plan.

The Planning Commission will hold the public hearing and likely continue public comment for at least one more meeting. The Commission's next meeting would be held on Tuesday, November 20 at which time public comment will again be heard. The SDMP document was available in the City Offices where there were public comment sheets. Staff was also available to answer any questions. The City wanted to make sure the citizens felt involved in the process and had the ability to comment.

Mr. Allred described the tentative schedule. The Planning Commission would hear the matter at least a couple of times before finalizing their review of the document. At that time, a recommendation would be sent on to the City Council. He clarified that the Planning Commission does not approve the document and only recommends it to the City Council. The City Council, who is the governing body of the City, will actually approve it as a binding document. The City Council is tentatively scheduled to hear the matter in early December at their first meeting scheduled for December 6. If necessary, they will likely hear it one more time. Mr. Allred stated that the schedule at this point is to finish the SDMP before the end of the year. Next, the developer will commence working on items such as demolition and relocation of the stream. They would also proceed in the springtime to approach the City about subdivision approvals. Even after the Site Development Master Plan is adopted, the City staff and Planning Commission will review additional items such as subdivision approvals.

(19:16:30) Kris Longson thanked the City for the opportunity to present the site development master plan, which was derived from the requirements put in place in the new zoning. He expressed appreciation to planning staff who worked diligently on the project. Mr. Longson

commented on their open door policy. Anyone desiring more details was encouraged to contact Spencer Angerbauer. Also present was Planner Francisco Garcia from the firm of Duany Plater & Zyberk (DPZ) who are the town planners who prepared the master plan.

Mr. Garcia and Mr. Angerbauer presented the concept for the redevelopment of the Cottonwood Mall site as well as the site development master plan. Mr. Garcia explained that his firm was only part of a stellar group of people who over the past 1½ years had worked toward preparing the document and design to be presented tonight. As DPZ was the master planner for the site, it was worth noting that a large cast of characters was involved in the preparation. They worked to address as thoroughly as possible every detail involved in the project.

Mr. Garcia displayed images of other projects they had been involved with over the past 25 years. They selected those they believed were of similar character and scale to what was proposed at the Cottonwood Mall site. They took to heart the existing abutting conditions of the site and responded to that condition of adjacency in their design. Conceptual illustrations were displayed of what they envisioned the project to be.

(19:33:05) Mr. Garcia presented the details of the site development master plan. The total site acreage is 57 acres and today mostly comprised an asphalt sea of parking. The intent is to create something that would fit in very well with the adjacent area. Building heights were discussed. The restricted area shown in red on the chart on page 3 of the SDMP allow a maximum height of 40 feet from grade. He stated that that was comparable to the height of many nearby structures. In the limited area, a maximum height of 60 feet is proposed, or four stories. In that area, the property dips slightly and although 60 feet seemed rather high, he clarified that the four stories would conceal completely any parking structures that might be located behind it. He stressed that the 60-foot height would be from grade, which was key and kept it level with the development behind it. The open area shown in yellow showed significantly greater heights. That was done for two reasons; (1) because it was far enough away to be protected by the surrounding canopy, and blocked from the view of adjacent residential areas, and (2) the proximity to major corridors and thoroughfares warrants that height.

Parking issues were discussed. Mr. Garcia explained that a minimum of 2,643 parking spaces would be provided and a maximum of 4,421. The large amount of parking is intended to easily accommodate all of the traffic that might come to the site. The intent was not to adversely impact adjacent areas. Mr. Garcia remarked that all of minimums set forth were to some extent governed by market conditions. They had fine-tuned the plan to address the reality of the site today. They understood that as the project develops the market might fluctuate, which was a reality of development.

(19:37:18) The residential units were discussed. Mr. Garcia explained that a minimum number of residential units were set at 454 with a maximum of 614. That was found to be a medium to low density for a 57-acre site. The average density of dwelling units per acre is a minimum of 7.9 and a maximum of 10.9. Setbacks were set at an average of 45 feet from Big Cottonwood Creek to the nearest building. A protected zone of a minimum of 10 feet is required from the right-of-way along Memory and Arbor Lanes. A minimum 25-foot setback was required for four single-family lots over .2 acres each on Arbor Lane. With regard to the Creek, at present the

nearest building is right on the creek. The existing building and its foundation actually create the bed of the creek itself. Any proposed structures would be moved back significantly from the creek and involve reengineering of the creek to create a linear park for the benefit of all as a civic space.

The total open space is a minimum of 405,120 square feet and a maximum of 548,103. That equates to a minimum of 9.3 acres of open space and a maximum of 12.56 acres. The total square footage by uses is specified. The minimum for commercial is 579,000 square feet with a maximum of 772,000 square feet. The minimum for residential is 714,000 square feet compared to a maximum of 956,000 square feet. He clarified that all heights and measurements would be measured from the new proposed grade levels. When fully occupied the Cottonwood Mall consisted of approximately 600,000 square feet of commercial. Kris Longson clarified that the amount of commercial proposed is not much different from what existed originally.

(19:41:20) Mr. Garcia reviewed the mixed-use allocation summary, which provided the average percentage of the site that each component will occupy. Commercial buildings comprised 17%, residential buildings – 22%, landscaping and open space – 13%, and impervious structures for parking decks – 48%. Mr. Longson explained that the open space and landscaping area did not include the tree-lined streets, sidewalks, and landscaping that would go on the hardscape, which was considered impervious. All of the streets would feature street trees, different landscaping elements, and seasonal changes. It was clarified that the allocation summary includes the total square footage, not only the square footages on the ground level, but also additional stories. The open space itself covers an average of 22.5% of the overall 57-acre site. The site was both vertically and horizontally integrated and allowed for some efficiency. There was a clear block structure to the development proposed and a clear set of rights-of-way that define it. These blocks will be lined with mixed use, residential, office, and commercial uses.

Mr. Garcia discussed the three land use districts within the project and reported that the square footage of the open district area is 1,800,000 square feet, or 41 acres. A fairly substantial limited district buffer comprised 10.22 acres and a restricted district of 5.9 acres. The total was slightly more than 16 acres of land that was limited and restricted together, which is in keeping with the development proposed. Mr. Garcia described small park areas throughout the site.

Mr. Garcia described the district use table and the four development phases? He clarified that no office or retail uses would be allowed in the limited zone. It was only in the open zone that there would be a broad range of commercial and residential uses. The intent is for the commercial and residential uses to be mixed.

The conceptual phasing plan was shown. This demonstrates how the developers propose the site will be developed in four phases. It was their best estimate as to how site construction will proceed. Phase 1 includes the bulk of the commercial area; Phase 2 includes the lining of the garage areas and infill development to complete the main street corridor; Phase 3 will include more lining of garages and residential areas to the east; and Phase 4 consists of the low-density residential component of the site.

(19:54:20) Mr. Longson clarified that in terms of timing, the intent is for the commercial core and some of the residential in the commercial to be constructed and open by the fall of 2010 if they stay on their current schedule. The residential that would phase in after that would be market dependant. They hoped for the best, but the project will be phased to work with the market. At least the commercial core portion will be up and running for the benefit of the community and the City by 2010.

Mr. Garcia reviewed the open space and public gathering plan, which would happen throughout the site. It was broken down into hardscape and softscape that will be built as carefully designed pedestrian spaces. The arcade is a special type of space that is an urban version of a front porch and serves as an informal covered gathering space. The total of open space plus private streets comprises a minimum of 19.5 acres of open space and a maximum of 26.27 acres. That equates to one-quarter of the site being devoted to public civic space.

Stream setback issues were discussed. Mr. Longson commented that in no areas did they come close to the minimum of 40 feet along the main area of Highland Drive. The averages are well over 45 feet and closer to 50 to 60 feet throughout the whole site near the Creek. The stream alignment was described. The landscaping, the Creek, and more landscaping would abut Arbor Lane where today there is a building wall up against the street. Park space will be provided where there once was a commercial property. Mr. Garcia explained that the site's topography was taken advantage of to minimize whatever impact it might have, particularly in the more sensitive areas to the east and south.

(20:05:09) Mr. Longson discussed utility issues and gave a summary of the traffic impact study. Research indicated that 24,000 average daily trips would be generated daily on Highland Drive if the Mall were at its fully occupancy. The proposed project estimates a peak volume of 21,000 trips daily. The decrease in trips was a result of the mixed-use nature of the project. The peak times would vary because of the residences and all of the mixed uses throughout the site.

A parking analysis was also conducted with a mixed-use component of the project as a factor. A general parking guideline shows the required ratios of parking spaces per square foot of usable floor space. Parking consultants were able to apply a reduction factor that was reflected in the total numbers. They were able to apply it because of the mixed-use nature of the site. Mr. Garcia explained that the parking spaces provided for the offices and the residential side-by-side would be occupied at exactly inverse times. The office uses tend to be occupied during business hours and the residential parking occupied during off-hours. They were factoring that into the equation in order to avoid providing an overabundance of parking. Their intent ~~was~~ is to provide a safe amount of parking. The logic behind the shared parking approach was described.

Mr. Longson reported that another analysis was applied to identify potential areas for on-site parking. Methods to optimize the traffic flow within the project were described. The analysis anticipates traffic to flow within the streets of the development at 15 to 20 miles per hour.

(20:13:00) Mr. Longson showed the ingress/egress points within the commercial site. The main access points were identified as well as pedestrian accesses. He noted that there would be no commercial ingress/egress to any of the surrounding neighborhoods off of Memory and Arbor

Lanes. With regard to emergency access, the Fire Department was requiring a crash gate. The only point of access to the four single-family homes was off of Arbor Lane.

The architectural guidelines were reviewed. Mr. Longson explained that they included conceptual lighting standards. The applicants proposed that a complete signage criterion for the project be developed and submitted to the Planning Commission for approval. It would be very detailed with regard to signage. In the plan, one of the requirements was to have certain civil engineering drawings as part of the plan dealing with the grading, street layout, and the proposed utility locations. A statement was included with regard to General Growth's environmental responsibility. They were part of the pilot program for the LEEDS neighborhood development program. Judging by the principles included, if they were to choose to be certified, they would be between a silver and gold standard for what they were proposing to develop. With regard to the quality of the development, they provided additional information showing intent and examples. They also had written verbiage describing the architectural character and requirements for the different buildings within the project. It involved not only guidelines, but also something by which they would be judged when they submit their plan to ensure the quality of the development they were planning. Photographs of a variety of interesting architectural styles from around the world and within the surrounding community were presented.

Mr. Garcia explained that what is proposed is to remove a rather aged and obsolete enclosed mall structure. He stated that the area presently lacks a sense of place. They applauded the efforts of the City to develop a village center. The proposed Cottonwood Mall plan offers the opportunity to achieve something close to a traditional town center to a scale that is in keeping with the City. Numerous studies showed that the proposal would be well supported and well frequented by those living in the immediate vicinity of the site. It would have a regional dimension to it as well.

(20:21:56) Commissioner Palmer opened the public hearing.

A letter from Camille Pierce was submitted and made part of the record.

Tom Breitling gave his address as 4794 South 2124 East. He congratulated Commissioner Palmer for running a successful campaign for City Council. Commissioner Palmer thanked him and stated that he would leave the Commission as of January 1. Mr. Breitling commented that the Cottonwood Mall impacts Holladay as a City and wondered if the number of residences there would make the Holladay Village Center irrelevant. He asked what the maximum population would be. Commissioner Palmer responded that there was an expected range of 500 to 600. Mr. Breitling asked if any of the units would be condominiums or whether they would all be apartments.

(20:25:43) Barry Topham informed those present that both he and Commissioner Palmer were elected to the City Council. His thrust was to inform the citizens that they could be informed. There had been very little information provided to citizens. He visited all 1,800 residences in his district from I-215 to Highland Drive, from 4500 South to Casto Lane, and down Walker Lane. He estimated that he visited with about half of the residents and the other half were not at home. He was elected by a significant majority over a two-term incumbent that was behind the "cloak

or secrecy” that had gone on with the central Holladay project. He stated that before proceeding further, something must be sent out in writing to let them know what was anticipated. When he informed citizens that over 500 residential units were planned for the project, they were aghast. He commented that General Growth was not the “savior” of Holladay and would actually alter Holladay into something that no one could possibly imagine. He had worked as a physician for 40 years and had analyzed data. He could see that there would be serious problems if the project were allowed to proceed. He did not want to see the project fast-tracked or decided by the current City Council. He believed there were lame duck Council Members currently serving and thought it should be decided by the new City Council who would become operational in early January.

(20:28:50) Camille Pierce gave her address as 2052 East Arbor Lane. She appreciated the work done by the Planning Department and General Growth. There were many things she liked about the project, particularly the grocery store and burying of the utility lines. She also wanted to see the best possible site master plan for the Cottonwood development. She had spent a number of hours going through the plan and wanted to address trees and greenscape. She did not want any of the mature trees or shrubbery removed from along Arbor or Memory Lanes and she did not want to see them destroyed or put elsewhere. She explained that trees provide a visual buffer that is especially important with the phased construction because they will have nothing to block their view of the taller buildings until the single-family homes are built in the last phase. She also noted that trees provide habitat to a variety of birds and give the area a unique character. As the street name was Arbor Lane, trees were particularly important to its identity. She provided pictures taken along the neighborhood streets. In the past, General Growth told the neighbors that they would only retain the cottonwood trees along Arbor and Memory Lanes. There were, however, a number of other trees there. She was encouraged to hear that they would be more cautious about what they remove. She was concerned about transplanting because the survival rate was low. She was worried that if a mature tree is torn out, the one that replaces it will not be as wide or full or as high. She referred to a diagram shown earlier in the evening showing no vegetation along Memory Lane. She remarked that there were a number of trees there. She also wanted to see additional trees planted because in the years that Price and General Growth owned the property, several 40 and 50-year-old trees died. She wanted to see the neighborhood revegetated.

(20:32:30) Steve Glaser gave his address as 2052 Arbor Lane. To the extent that the master plan reflects what will border Memory and Arbor Lanes, he thought the project should uphold the standards that apply to the streets. For example, there were four single-family homes straddling the corner of Arbor and Memory Lanes. In the proposed master plan, the homes can be 40 feet tall, which was the standard for one-acre zoning in the City. He did not understand why those lots, which were smaller, should have that standard. Similarly, there were no restrictions on lot coverage that would apply to every other unit in the City. Setbacks were also being tailored to the project that would not be allowed elsewhere. He thought the homes straddling Arbor and Memory Lanes were particularly egregious in the sense that they don't have anything to do with the redevelopment other than the fact that they happen to be part of the same piece of property right now. Speaking only for himself, he was willing to give up the height restrictions, setbacks, and lot coverage if there were certain specific things in the redevelopment that General Growth were to comply with. Specifically, those things dealing with light pollution reduction, heat

island effects, water efficiency, and energy efficiency. If the applicants were to do those things, it would count for a lot. Mr. Glaser stated that there were several things with the specific plans that were erroneous. For example, with regard to parking it was mentioned in the applicant's presentation that there was to be no office space within the limited zone. The parking plans, however, allot a certain number of parking spaces for the office use. In terms of the number of parking spaces, there was one place that specified two spaces per townhouse yet in another place it referred to 1.5 spaces per townhouse unit. In calculating the number of parking spaces, the condominiums were to have one parking space per unit. A 20% reduction was also being given for the mixed use. In the calculation of the total number of parking spaces for residences, they used 1.8. He agreed to provide his comments in written form. Mr. Glaser thought the environmental part of the plan was incomplete and only addressed dust control partially. For the most part, however, the language was not binding. References were also made to drawings that were not part of the master plan. Because the master plan is a legally binding document, he thought it should refer to a standard and if there are certain specifics in the drawings, they should become part of the master plan. Noise was not addressed in the environmental portion. Commissioner Palmer explained that the City noise ordinance was the controlling ordinance. There was not a special noise ordinance that would apply. Mr. Glaser thought that during construction it was completely appropriate for all construction traffic to go in and be routed solely on Highland Drive and Murray-Holladay Road with some exceptions. He suggested that the idling of trucks overnight be prohibited. In the interest of time, Commissioner Palmer asked Mr. Glaser to meet with staff and/or General Growth during business hours and work through his concerns. He explained that this was the first step in the public hearing process. Mr. Glaser agreed to do that.

There were no further public comments.

(20:40:55) Mr. Longson read into the records two letters from residents who were unable to be present. The first was from Kevin and Gina Marcum who reside across from the proposed single-family homes. They expressed their full support for the development. The second letter was from Mr. and Mrs. Rice who live next to the Marcums. They felt General Growth was taking great efforts to make the project a place for all to enjoy. They hoped the project could move forward as quickly as possible.

Mr. Longson responded to questions raised. With regard to the maximum population, he stated that that was a difficult to answer. Commissioner Palmer thought it was safe to say that it would be somewhere between 750 and 2,000. Mr. Longson thought that was probably a fair guess. He stated that there would be condominiums and there could potentially be apartments. The current plan was for townhomes, condominiums, flats, and brownstone townhouse type developments. No apartments were presently in their plans but that did not mean that potentially they would not be developed if economically feasible. He thought it would add a nice mix to the project to include some apartment feature to the commercial core.

In response to a question raised about whether there would be a church within the project, Mr. Longson responded that there was definitely enough land and it was a possibility. The plan drawings, however, did not currently show a church. He pointed out that churches were one of

the permissible uses in the zones. With regard to noise issues, it was their full intent to restrict noise in their contractual documents.

With regard to LEEDS, Mr. Longson explained that as planned, the project would achieve almost a gold standard. The cost of having a project certified as a LEEDS project was described. The range was \$100,000 to millions just to pay the consultants and the subcontractors to document what was done and get the certification. As a company they were committed to being responsible and implementing the principles. He could not guarantee that they would actually apply for the official certification; however, they were part of the LEEDS-ND program and had submitted application. Whether they would follow through with the actual certification was undetermined although they would implement many of the principles.

Mr. Garcia gave a brief explanation of the LEEDS program. It was described as one of the foremost organizations whose charge it was to promote, identify, and uphold sustainable development. The effort of the organization was to set forth the LEEDS-ND program. The intent was to set forth a set of criteria that will allow proposals for development to be rated in terms of compliance with a set of principles. If complied with they would result largely in sustainable development. He reported that LEEDS stood for Leadership in Energy Efficient Design. He added that if the project were a mall of the standard sort they would not meet one of the prerequisites for LEEDS-ND and the project would not have qualified. The development approach was recognized as being conducive toward very sustainable development. Mr. Longson commented that nothing in the project had yet been certified under the LEEDS-ND because nothing had been determined yet and it was a pilot program.

Parking calculation issues were discussed. Commissioner Palmer asked staff to double-check the parking calculations.

(20:51:15) Commissioner Palmer suggested the public hearing be continued to a future date. He anticipated that at the next meeting they would review a revised document. The next draft of the document was expected to be available for inspection by Wednesday, November 14. The next Planning Commission Meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, November 20 at which time the public comment period would reconvene. Staff and General Growth were available in the meantime to work through specifics.

(20:52:52) Commissioner Shupe moved to continue agenda item 2.1-Cottonwood Mall Site Development Master Plan, until the next meeting scheduled for November 20. Commissioner McKell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously

3. Agenda Items.

3.1 Wander Woods Subdivision – File 07-1-17 – 4901 South Wander Lane – Lot Split.

(20:54:30) Alma Haskell presented the staff report and stated that the request was for one lot to be subdivided into two. The requirements in the area were 10,000 square feet per lot after rights-of-way are deducted. The proposal showed 10,031 on one lot and 11,858 on the other. The required lot width was 80 feet with both lots having 80 or more feet. After the required setbacks per the zone are taken away, there were sufficient areas for building homes. Utility availability letters were provided for water and sewer and the power and gas availability letters were

forthcoming. Tree issues were discussed. Based on the width of the street, staff suggested at least one street tree be planted. Fire access issues were discussed. Mr. Haskell reported that the red lines made to the drawings were returned to staff earlier in the day; however, staff had not had an opportunity to review them. Staff recommended approval of the Wander Woods subdivision conceptual and preliminary plats based on the following findings, conditions, and contingencies set forth in the staff report.

(21:01:00) The applicant, Mark Lambourne, reported that after meeting with Mr. Haskell earlier in the day, he approached the Unified Fire Authority about saving the sycamore tree, which was a staple of the property. The UFA agreed to grant an exception of 16 feet around the tree and then increase to 20 feet to the top of the lot.

Commissioner Palmer asked about the large spruce tree in the northeast corner of the back lot to the east of the existing home. Mr. Lambourne responded that based on the buildable area of the rear lot, that tree would not be impacted by any structure. He was very much in favor of saving all mature trees that are complementary to the property.

Commissioner Scott asked about the retaining wall in the front of the lot to the west of the existing home and asked if it would be retained. Mr. Lambourne responded that his desire was to keep it as it was.

(21:04:50) Commissioner Palmer opened the public hearing.

Wayne Coons gave his address as 4941 Wander Lane. His lot was .37 acres in size and he had tried but was unable to add on to his home without additional acreage. He was opposed to the subdivision of the proposed property. He was concerned about the slope of the property and asked if any soil stability studies had been performed. The surrounding neighbors signed covenants to limit all development to single-family dwellings. He had a studio apartment on his property that he could not use as a result.

Commissioner Palmer explained that the entire area was zoned R-1-10, which allows residential, single-family, and minimum 10,000 square foot lots. The proposal would have to comply with the City's zoning ordinances.

(21:10:19) Mr. Haskell explained that every home in the zone was held to the zoning regulations. He recalled that Mr. Coons came in prior to the changes to the codes in January to speak to staff. Mr. Coons was encouraged to come in and talk with staff again as there were new codes in place. Some were more restrictive and some were less restrictive.

Katie Ryser gave her address 4920 South Regency. They enjoyed a view of the mountains and questioned the proposed height of the east home. She wanted to know if it would affect their view. Mr. Haskell stated that the height limit would be 32 feet from the lowest point at natural grade to the highest point on the ridge. Commissioner Palmer suggested a note be placed in the file that when the property develops a determination be made as to the current natural grade. Mr. Haskell commented that staff was provided with elevation contours.

(21:12:44) It was determined that the property was not within the city's fault study area. As a result, there was no special geological investigation that needed to be done on the site. In terms of service for fire access, that was one of their main concerns. The fire district had its own standards in terms of how steep the road can be and how wide it has to be. Slope, width, and turnaround issues were discussed.

Nadine Guss gave her address as 4928 Wander Lane. She was appalled at what the City had allowed to happen on Wander Lane. On most days it looked like a construction area. With regard to the retaining wall she saw a possibility for someone to put a fence up and she did not want to look at one. She asked about the aesthetics to the front of the building on the Wander Lane side. Commissioner Palmer stated that the fence anywhere along the street would be limited to four feet tall from natural grade. Ms. Guss was concerned about the tree issues and the natural wildlife that exists there. By removing the homes they would create havoc in the yards of those who have to deal with the rats and displaced animals that come around. Her biggest concern was traffic. She stated that Wander Lane did not have room for construction vehicles to share the road with vehicles, walkers, kids, and dogs. She stated that someone would need to monitor the traffic.

Commissioner Palmer commented that the sheriff had a non-emergency dispatch number. If there were issues such as construction vehicles blocking roads, the sheriff was good about addressing those issues.

(21:17:51) Becky Airhart gave her address 4958 Wander Lane. While Wander Lane was torn up right now, they had several new homes that were going in. She saw the progress as an improvement. They had had several old homes torn down and replaced with new homes. A couple of empty lots were also being built on for the first time. The change brought new families and new life to the City. She was excited for the new subdivision and expressed her support for it.

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

(21:19:40) Commissioner Palmer referred to the general note on the plat, and noted that in the work session it was determined that the project location vicinity map was incorrect.

Commissioner Scott noticed that the project name was Hinkley Place on the drawings, however, the agenda referred to Wander Woods subdivision. The applicant indicated that the intended name was Wander Woods. Mr. Haskell clarified that the final name as recorded on the final plat was subject to the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office not having that already as a subdivision name.

Commissioner Scott was concerned that the property was not staked to show the actual lots. He also asked about the slope elevation of the front lot. Mr. Haskell explained that the grading would need to be shown at the building permit phase. It would have to be determined that any retaining walls proposed are correctly engineered. The City Engineer looks at all building permit plans and would require necessary standards. There were general grading standards adopted in

the supplementary regulations. Those were new as of January. The City Engineer would review any plan that comes in against those grading standards.

(21:29:20) *Commissioner Scott moved to approve agenda item 3.1, preliminary plat for the Wander Woods subdivision lot split contingent upon the following completions and findings:*

Completions:

- 1. *Corrections listed by staff on 11/15/07 are made. The corrected drawings as accepted by staff shall be made to the preliminary plat.*
- 2. *Electricity and natural gas availability letters must be furnished prior to submitting a final plat.*
- 3. *Unified Fire Authority access and hydrant/flow standards shall be met, both prior to submitting a final plat, and prior to issuance of a building permit.*
- 4. *The retaining wall in the front of the street on Wander Lane shall be no higher than four feet maximum.*
- 5. *The replacement of the trees in the public right-of-way shall agree with the City ordinance.*

Findings:

- 1. *The lot area, width, and setback requirements are met.*
- 2. *Right-of-way widths are adequate for the required road improvements.*
- 3. *Water and sewer availability has been demonstrated.*

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

3.2 Poulos Valley View Estates – File 07-1-16 – 2526 East Valley View Avenue – Three-lot subdivision.

The above matter was withdrawn from the agenda. It was expected to be heard at the November 20 Meeting.

4. Consent Items.

4.1 Approval of Minutes – Planning Commission Meeting – October 16, 2007, October 2, 2007.

(21:34:35) Due to the hour, Commissioner Palmer did not think it would be productive to review the minutes. He suggested the item be deferred. Commissioner McKell asked if it would be possible to have some instruction as far as making corrections and submitting them to staff if

they are not significant. Commissioner Palmer recommended the Commission Members redline the proposed changes and submit them to staff. Final changes could be made at the next meeting.

Mr. Allred encouraged any Commission Members who have detailed or general comments of any kind about the site development master plan to provide staff with any information as soon as possible so that staff can evaluate it and if necessary, forward it to the applicant. He commented that staff met with the applicant weekly to review where they are in the process.

Commissioner Palmer remarked on a comment made during the public hearing regarding the single-family homes being built along Arbor being held to the same standard as the residential zone and not a special zone granting extra height and setbacks. He suggested it be zoned the same as the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Allred counseled the Commission that they had already “crossed the bridge” on whether or not to zone the area differently. He commented that if the Commission wanted to go with the 32 to 35 foot height standard based on the size of the lot, they should remember that it is based on the size of the lot rather than the zone. Commissioner Palmer responded that the residential zoning standard within the RM-U zone should require the residential standard to be applied to the size of the lot, which would give the applicants flexibility. He clarified that his comments pertained only to the four single-family detached residences on Arbor Lane.

(21:39:29) Commissioner McKell referred to the two pages of principles and recognized that rewriting it would be a big job. He did not think the Commission or staff should do it but he thought it should be related to the site master plan. Mr. Allred responded that staff had mentioned that twice to the applicants who planned to rework it so that it flows and makes more sense. He also agreed to communicate to the applicants that the development needs to mirror what is across the street in terms of building height allowance and setback.

Commissioner Palmer disclosed that he had had some email communications with General Growth when they wanted to schedule a special meeting the previous week. He conveyed to them his view that the Planning Commission reviews the document after it has been written and completed and gone through staff review. The Commission did not participate in the writing of the document, as that was the applicant’s job. Mr. Allred expected the Commission would see numerous revisions to the document based on tonight’s meeting. At the next meeting the Commission would review the revised document.

Commissioner Palmer recognized that the 532 proposed residential units was an overwhelming number, however, if it is considered in the context of where it is located, the size of the site, and the traffic analysis, it seemed to work. He thought it was based on whether the Commission believed the applicant’s internal capture rate or not. If the internal capture rate is taken out, the project would definitely drive more traffic. Commissioner Palmer believed there was an internal capture rate in the type of project proposed.

He further stated that in terms of public awareness of the redevelopment of the Cottonwood Mall site, everyone he had spoken to was vaguely aware of it. The City had published it in two or three different versions of the City newspaper and it had been on the City’s website. When Commissioner Palmer knocked on doors, he found that most citizens had no idea who he was

and who their City Council representative was. Many people lead very busy lives and do not pay attention.

Commissioner Shields commented that although a professional study was conducted, it still seemed impossible to her that the impact would be livable. She brought up the situation on Fort Union Boulevard and stated that so much traffic was generated there that it was not a pleasant place to drive. Commissioner Palmer explained that General Growth claimed that the Cottonwood Mall project would not do that. Commissioner Palmer stated that just because an expert says that something will be all right did not make it so. When there are over 500 residences plus the retail and theater it seemed to Commissioner Shields that a bottleneck situation was inevitable.

(21:46:30) Commissioner Kimball used a 300-unit condominium development near his home as an example and stated that the four accesses seemed to be manageable. Even with the retail, he did not think it would unmanageable.

Commissioner McKell suggested the applicants be clearer in stating that they do not plan to suddenly have everything built out and occupied. The units would have to be built and sold. Mr. Allred explained that they came up with an additional phase. In the previous plans the applicants had discussed three phases. As staff met with them and discussed how the residential units would be built with the parking garages, it became apparent that they needed to show four phases. He was more interested in knowing when the roads would go in to ensure there is sufficient ingress and egress to the site no matter which phase is built. In terms of the number of people who will live there, in looking at Holladay's demographics, the average home size provided an estimated figure of how many people will live there. The fact was that most of the units planned for this particular development were not going to be single-family homes with a yard. He did not anticipate it would be a child-intensive project in all likelihood. He anticipated perhaps 2 to 2.5 people per home. Commissioner Palmer expected a total of 1,500 new residents, plus or minus 500. Mr. Allred stated that, at build out this might represent only about 3%-5% of the City's total population. Also, the price point of the residential units within the project would not likely attract families with four and five children. Mr. Allred suspected that a number of people living within the property would work there as well. Commissioner Palmer viewed that as the internal capture rate.

Overall traffic pattern issues were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that he understood in looking back 20 years at the total traffic on Highland Drive, that it was about 38,000 cars per day. Currently, the traffic counts were about 28,000. It was projected that this project would take it back up to the previous levels. He was told the traffic consultants expect to see about the same amount of congestion as existed when the mall was really successful. He also remarked that Highland Drive would be rebuilt from Murray Holladay Road to Moormont. A landscaped median would be added in the middle as well as a new traffic signal entering Creekside. The result would be more access into the site. Rather than just one main access there would be four just from Highland Drive.

(121:52:50) Commissioner Carr stated that Highland Drive needed work all the way down to 5600 South. Mr. Allred agreed but commented that it would be done as money allows. From

what he had seen of the traffic study, he thought General Growth's conclusions were fairly plausible. It was noted that the traffic study was in the process of being reviewed by an independent traffic engineer, Dr. Joe Perrin.

Commissioner Palmer suggested the applicants provide a 3-D CAD model at the November 20 meeting or at a minimum when they go before the City Council. Commissioner Carr stated that the applicants must be honest in the illustrations and depict the streets as wide as they are shown in the street cross-section drawings.

Commissioner Shields was concerned when she read that the applicants planned for some of the buildings to be 100 feet high. They then compared them to the buildings at Mill Rock. Mr. Allred stated that the buildings at Mill Rock were about 80 feet tall. Commissioner Shields was concerned about the proposed height. Commissioner Kimball pointed out that they would be right in the middle of the project. Commissioner Palmer thought that height could be something the Commission would struggle with with General Growth. He agreed that 100 feet was too high. Mr. Allred commented that the applicants really expected it to be closer to 92 feet. Commissioner Palmer felt there was a general concern on the part of the Planning Commission that 100 feet seemed very, very high and they would like to see a 3-D model in order to understand how high it really is along with accurate street widths. He stated that a CAD model of the project would show what it would look like and provide a perspective.

(21:57:13) Mr. Allred commented on public notice and stated that he had never worked anywhere where there was enough public notice given. He realized it was impossible to satisfy every person. The public notice practice of the City was described. He explained that with an ordinance change, which has city-wide impact, a mailed notice is not sent to every residence in the City but rather a notice is placed in the newspaper and placed on the website. Commissioner Palmer thought the City needed to do a better job of communicating through the monthly newsletter. He viewed it as containing mostly fluff. That was something he was going to try to correct as a member of the city council. He estimated it would cost about \$10,000 per mailing to send a notice with attachments to everyone in the City. In order to do that, taxes would need to be raised to pay for it. Mr. Allred asked the Commission wherever possible to assist staff in explaining to residents and others how public notice works. Some people expected a mailed notice. Commissioner Palmer thought the City could create an email list. Commissioner McKell questioned how many people actually pay attention and read the legal notices in the newspaper.

5. Adjourn.

The Planning Commission adjourned by unanimous consent.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Holladay City Planning Commission meeting held Wednesday, November 7, 2007.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group, Inc.
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 12-4-07