

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

**Tuesday, October 21, 2008
7:00 p.m.
Holladay Municipal Center
4580 South 2300 East**

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members:

Paul Shupe, Chair
Gene Carr
Lori Khodadad
Richard Kimball
Cyrus McKell
Lynda Shields

City Staff:

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

FIELD TRIP

1. **All Agenda Items May Be Discussed.**

WORK MEETING AND DISCUSSION

2. **All Agenda Items May Be Discussed.**

Planning Commission Chair Paul Shupe called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and read the Commission statement.

AGENDA ITEMS

3. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 3.1 **Mimi & Me Creative Dance – Home Occupation with Customers Conditional Use Permit – Planner: Pat Hanson – (Discussion and Possible Decision).**

(19:15:20) City Planner, Pat Hanson, presented the staff report and stated that this application is for a home occupation with customers. This business was brought to the attention of the City because a neighbor called and was concerned about children being dropped off across the street from the home causing traffic concerns on Shadow Wood Circle and Viewmont. The applicant, Mimi Jones provided the Commission Members with a letter outlining her business activities. She operates a dance studio in her basement with a maximum of 12 children that arrive at one time. Classes are taught primarily on Tuesdays with one additional class on Wednesday. Her clients are children between the ages of 3 and 6. As part of the application process for the business license, staff had the fire department, the health department, and the sheriff sign off on the application. To date, staff had obtained nearly all of the sign offs for the business license.

Ms. Hanson stated that Mrs. Jones will have to make some modifications to the studio entrance because it is currently accessed through a garage. In compliance with the Fire Code and Uniform Building Code, she will have to separate the entrance to the dance studio from the garage, as primary access is not allowed through a garage area. Mrs. Jones plans to build a wall

and segregate the entrance by adding a new door. If the conditional use is approved, staff will require the modification be completed before the conditional use permit and business license are issued.

(19:17:53) Ms. Hanson commented that staff was in support of the application. She reported that home occupations make up a significant portion of the community's economic base and are good for the community. The staff report contained findings to support the approval as well as conditions staff recommended be added to the conditional use permit.

Ms. Hanson stated that there was some discussion with the applicant about the spacing of the classes. Staff felt that 15 minutes seemed like a very short time in which to drop off and pick up 24 children. Ms. Hanson stated that it could potentially involve 48 car trips in a 15-minute period. Mrs. Jones stated that the scheduling was critical for the children since most have other conflicts in the mornings. Staff suggested that if the 15-minute spacing is allowed that it be evaluated again in six months or one year to make sure that it is not forcing people to park and drop their children off across the street. Staff wanted to make sure that such small children do not have to cross the street on a regular basis to get to their class. Ms. Hanson stated that Viewmont is a rather busy street serving as a residential collector. As a result, it carries more traffic than other streets.

(19:21:55) Staff felt that the hours of operation should remain as 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays to make sure there is no conflict with activities that might take place at the church in the evenings or on weekends.

Commissioner Kimball reported an ex parte communication he had with Mimi Jones. He spoke with her on the telephone the previous week about the nature of tonight's proceedings. He assured her that the Commissioners are real people who are sympathetic to everyone in the community.

The applicant, Mimi Jones gave her address as 2369 Shadow Wood Circle. She felt the business would be a great addition to Holladay City. She stated that many of the children come to her because they are too young for some of the larger studios. It has been a service to them and the community. The type of dance she teaches is similar to what is taught at the University of Utah by Virginia Tanner. Mrs. Jones agreed to comply with the rules and regulations set out by the City. She stated that she primarily teaches one day per week. She had spoken to the parents and has been supervising the traffic movements in and out of her driveway. The parents have to physically pick up their children after class. She has an area where the children sit and play until their parents arrive. She remarked that 15 minutes would be enough time between classes. She estimated that at least half of the children carpool which minimizes the traffic. Parents have signed a statement indicating that they understand the drop off/pickup policy.

(19:27:30) Mrs. Jones stated that typically parents do not stay and watch the classes and no recitals are held in her home. She reported that there are three parking spaces in her driveway. Commissioner McKell asked if there is an area in front of her home facing south for pickup. Mrs. Jones stated that the parents were instructed that they could park there as well where she estimated there are three additional spaces.

Commissioner Shupe opened the public hearing.

(19:28:51) Kia Workman gave her address as 2166 East Arbor. Her daughter had taken instruction from Mrs. Jones and was in her third year of instruction. She stated that Mimi Jones was very responsible and would never put any of the children in danger. Mrs. Workman had never seen children cross the road in the three years she has picked up and dropped off her daughter. Typically parents pull into the parking spots or the church parking lot and use the sidewalk rather than cross the street. Parents also have the option of dropping children off on Shadow Wood Circle. Commissioner McKell asked Mrs. Workman if she had ever been concerned about the traffic situation. Mrs. Workman stated that she had not. She remarked that many carpool and she had never noticed a problem.

(19:30:59) Anne Marie Hopkins gave her address as 2416 Shadow Wood. She stated that Mrs. Jones business has been a benefit to those living on the street. It brings the neighbors together and has created a sense of unity. She was surprised to hear that there was a complaint. Mrs. Hopkins stated that she comes and goes from her home often and rarely sees anyone not parked in Mrs. Jones' driveway. Occasionally they will park in front of her home but the result is almost no impact. She had seen nothing but positive impacts in the neighborhood as a result of the dance studio.

(19:32:30) Jason Jones gave his address as 2369 Shadow Wood Circle. He stated that several weeks ago when he received the letter from the City he was shocked because they had never had the courtesy of having a neighbor knock on their door and express a concern. They immediately contacted the City and have done their best to comply with everything that has been requested. Mr. Jones stated that home-based businesses are great for the City. The Fire Marshall visited the Jones' home and indicated what improvements need to be made to comply with the request. Mr. Jones assured the Commissioners that they will comply with whatever is required. He stated that they have four children and he considered his wife's business to be a hobby. He commented that his wife is a ballet major from the University of Utah and has danced professionally. The studio was something that was requested by the community. They had lived in the neighborhood for four years and the business has grown little by little during that time. Commissioner McKell asked Mr. Jones if he anticipated the number of classes will increase in the future. Mr. Jones responded that he did not. He stated that as a mother, Mrs. Jones has a limited amount of time.

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

(19:37:38) Commissioner Shields moved to approve the Mimi & Me Creative Dance Studio home occupation at 2369 East Shadow Wood Circle subject to the following:

Findings:

- 1. The proposed use at this location provides a service to children in the neighborhood and in the City in general which contributes to the general well being of the community.***
- 2. A use under the circumstances of this particular case will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the people living in the neighborhood.***
- 3. The proposed use will comply with the regulations specified by the ordinance as well as the fire safety and building codes as they apply to this particular case.***

Conditions:

1. *The business shall not have more than 12 children at any one time.*
2. *The classes shall be spaced so that there is ample time for all drop offs and pick ups to be accommodated within the driveway and the curb side parking adjacent to the home. The classes are currently spaced 15 minutes apart which can be reviewed by the Planning Commission in one year if there are complaints.*
3. *All fire and building safety code improvements to the structure must be installed prior to the issuance of the business license.*
4. *The hours of operation will be limited to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.*
5. *There shall be no recitals hosted at this location.*
6. *All pick ups and drop offs will be around the home's periphery so no children will be crossing the street to get to the dance studio.*
7. *This approval shall be reviewed again in one year or upon receiving any complaints.*

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

(19:40:29) Commissioner Shupe expressed appreciation to Mrs. Jones for her cooperation.

4. CONTINUED ITEMS

4.1 Planner: Pat Hanson – (Discussion and Possible Decision) Ordinance Discussion – Proposed Land Use Table and Associated Definitions.

4.2 Planner: Jonathan Teerlink – (Discussion and Possible Decision) Section 13.14.070(B)(1b) Amending the Method for Calculating the Building Corridor; and

4.3 Section 13.14.080 Amending “Lot Coverage” to Include Purpose Statement, Definitions for “Impervious Surface” and “Permeable Paving”.

(19:42:40) City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, stated that what would be added to the lot coverage ordinance were three specific definitions for impervious surface, permeable paving system, and porous surface. Commissioner Shupe stated that percent coverages were the primary issue and how the percentages can be increased in exchange for doing various things. Mr. Teerlink stated that as the Code is written, there is coverage for a building and a percent for both building, driveways, and other impervious areas. The previous ordinance as written does not define what impervious is. As a result, staff has resorted to companies that offer new and inventive ways to provide a porous or permeable surface. Mr. Teerlink noted that similar types of ordinances are being adopted nationwide. Many landscaping and architectural companies are developing paveable surfaces that are either porous or permeable. Staff wanted to establish an impervious surface definition, a permeable paving definition, and a porous surface definition to be added to the ordinance so that they know what can be used where. Mr. Teerlink stated that staff would also like to add to the ordinance a strong purpose statement. The previous statement was good at one time but needs to be strengthened.

Commissioner Shupe asked if ponds and swimming pools are part of the definition. Mr. Teerlink recalled that during the work session the Commission discussed the possibility of

changing the language to exclude swimming pools and manmade ponds with artificial liners, which would be counted in the same calculation as a lawn area.

(19:48:32) Mr. Teerlink stated that the issue is multi-faceted. It can be a storm drain impact issue because there are existing storm drains that in most cases the City does not have the means to improve or expand on. The storm drain systems have a limit and when more residential lots are covered with paving and the new water is sheeting into the storm drain system, it backs up. The intent was to get more water into the ground so that the natural percolation works and groundwater and aquifers used for drinking water are recharged. Mr. Teerlink stated that cities handle the situation differently. Some count swimming pools and manmade ponds with artificial liners against a property owner and include them in the lot coverage calculation.

Commissioner Shields stated that she has a swimming pool with a cover on it and whenever it rains the water on the cover is dumped onto the grass. Mr. Teerlink stated that some other cities don't count pools against the lot coverage. Commissioner Shupe stated that at a previous meeting, several residents felt that they were restricted from doing swimming pools, ponds, or water features since they are considered impervious. He suggested the Commission be sensitive to the residents of the community as far as what they ought to be able to put in their yard. A water feature or swimming pool will not percolate into the ground. For a storm event, however, they could be considered detention ponds. He suggested the Commission weigh the decision carefully with regard to limiting citizens versus replenishing the aquifer.

(19:53:03) Commissioner McKell suggested there be some modification to the language. He referred to page 7, line 34, and stated that it lists negative implications with regard to impervious surfaces without any modification with regard to swimming pools. Mr. Teerlink showed a photo of a 50-ton dump truck on a permeable surface paving system. Commissioner Shupe stated that staff was proposing a way to do water features or swimming pools with a permeable surface or the planting of more trees. He stated that using a permeable paving or porous surface that can withstand the weight of emergency vehicles that require access would be helpful. Community Development Director, Paul Allred, stated that porous pavers have worked very well. They have been engineered and the City Engineer could sign off on any plan that comes in. He commented that the pavers are not only attractive but environmentally friendly as well.

Mr. Allred stated that staff would need to understand the mathematics behind the paving systems since not just any paving system will be accepted in the matrix as a credit. It will be important when installing a system that will drain since the specs must be available from the manufacturer on how much it actually lets through. Mr. Allred explained that that is one of the reasons pavers are not given quite the weighted credit that trees are in the matrix. They are, however, ranked very high as a desirable instrument to allow for additional impervious area because they should have a runoff co-efficient. The City was looking for systems that in a five or ten-year rain event will capture 80 to 100 percent of the water that falls.

Mr. Teerlink described the specs based on an area one square foot in size. He explained that uncompacted gravel has a 12% porosity. The City Engineer is comfortable with 10% to 12% porosity per square foot for the paving systems. Most have a porosity rate or percentage to them that would have to be approved by the City Engineer. Mr. Allred thought it made sense that if there is a large area of surfaces where the water can't get through; water will tend to be pushed to one specific spot which will create a problem where the ground becomes saturated.

(20:04:40) Commissioner Shupe stated that the property owners will be affected by the restrictions placed on swimming pools and ponds. He asked for the Commission's opinion with regard to counting them or not counting them as an impervious surface. Percentage calculation issues were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that at a previous meeting there were complaints that the percentages are unduly restrictive and should be increased. Another property owner with two acres thought 25% was too restrictive. There were property owners on both ends of the spectrum with both large and small lots who believe the percentages are too low. It was noted that the percentages allowed by the County are much higher. Mr. Allred suggested the Commission determine whether the percentages currently allowed are too restrictive and whether the proposed tradeoffs too much or too little.

Mr. Allred explained that, according to Mr. Teerlink, most of the permits staff deals with are a challenge for property owners. The Commission should determine whether the requirements are too restrictive or the City is experiencing a paradigm shift. It was Commissioner Shupe's opinion that 35% is so restrictive that it only allows for a driveway, sidewalk, and a 10' x 10' patio in the back. A 5% increase would not make much of a difference. He contended that a 10,000 square-foot lot would not allow for a swimming pool. Commissioner Carr thought that perhaps it shouldn't. Commissioner Shupe just wanted to outline what the implications of a 10,000 square-foot lot would be. Mr. Allred discussed the land values in Holladay. In most neighborhoods anyone who tears down a home and puts a new one in is going to pay a premium for both the house and the lot. Many people who have the ability to move into the City will be disappointed if they are not able to have a pool. For example, a gentleman at a previous meeting was upset that he paid \$350,000 for a small 1945 home on a small lot. He wanted to put a larger home on the property and was concerned that he was already restricted as to the size of the home he can build. He did not want to now be told that he can't have a pool. In another instance, someone with a two-acre lot wanted to put a pool in but could not. The City has restrictions on the house size and does not allow someone to have a tennis court and a swimming pool on a two-acre lot because of the percentages. Mr. Allred could see that as being a practical obstacle to reasonable development and suggested that perhaps the percentages are a little low. When the percentages were developed they were like any rule that is developed. He commented that there is not a lot of science in planning and zoning like there is in other disciplines. Mr. Allred suggested the Commission perhaps consider increasing the percentages or keep them as they are but allow for greater tradeoffs.

(20:11:51) Commissioner Shupe suggested focusing the percentage on swimming pools and water features. He tended to think they were too restrictive but perhaps to get a consensus among the Commission they could let swimming pools and water features not count, leave the percentages where they are, and see where that falls. He doubted that the City Council would budge on the percentages. Commissioner Carr questioned whether a swimming pool really is an impervious area. Commissioner Shupe suggested that as a compromise giving property owners the ability to put a swimming pool in without being penalized for it.

Commissioner Kimball stated that there were multiple goals to be achieved. For example, they don't want to add to the storm drainage, they want to recharge the aquifer, and they want to protect riparian habitats. He suggested those goals guide them. Commissioner Kimball did not view swimming pools as objectionable. Commissioner McKell explained that a swimming pool may be considered impermeable yet the concrete pad surrounding the pool is not. If it were permeable the problem of the adjacent vegetation could be solved which would make the pool

less detrimental. It seemed to him that staff should have some opportunity to make adjustments based on design and other factors and not be strictly 40%. Commissioner Khodadad was of the opinion that everyone should have the right to put a pool on their property. Commissioner Shupe stated that the percentages only allow up to 40%. What he recalled from the public debate was that swimming pools were especially desirable.

(20:16:45) Mr. Allred asked for general direction from the Commission and suggested the matter be discussed again. He established the following facts for consideration:

- The EPA monitors storm drain water.
- The City wants to limit the amount of water that goes into the storm drain.
- The State of Utah owns all of the water in the state and there are often competing interests from the state level.

Mr. Allred explained that the City has competing interests in that they want to recharge the aquifers and protect groundwater sources but at the same time they need to get the water out to lakes and streams. He questioned whether the message was that they don't want it to get there through the storm drains but rather through catching it in the ground. If that is the case, they comply with the competing needs of being environmentally sound and getting the water eventually to where it needs to be.

It seemed to Mr. Allred that generally the consensus was that the percentages are pretty arbitrary and that most of the feedback from the public is that the allowances are too restrictive and that the Planning Commission and staff are generally supportive of the idea of being more flexible through the following two mechanisms:

1. Increasing the amount of impervious area as a percentage; and
2. Increasing the amount of impervious area through a bonus program.

Commissioner McKell questioned whether that would put too much of a burden on staff when people come in for permits. Mr. Allred suggested that perhaps the Planning Commission and staff together consider that the overwhelming public comment is to increase the percentages. They then ought to consider a bonus program of an additional percent. He asked if the percentages could be taken starting at less than 10,000 and increased by 5% to start with. The maximum could then be taken to an additional percent only upon showing that one can comply with the matrix.

(20:20:58) Mr. Allred stated that the percentages could be left as they are and allow a bonus program of up to 5% and take pools out of the equation. By allowing pools not to be counted against it would be a bonus. By allowing the percentage to be increased by following the matrix would be a plus. It benefits the homeowners in the development community and loosens their regulations slightly. Adding the bonus program through the matrix is another incentive that accomplishes several things. For example, it filters the water better, shades and cools homes, and results in better energy efficiency. The negative tradeoff is that there will be a cost involved. Mr. Allred stated that city planning departments should not just be concerned with the environment but also with what it costs to do business. They cannot be reckless in developing rules and regulations costs that are simply passed onto the consumer. Staff has a multi-faceted responsibility as public servants to plan for the public good. That includes having an eye toward what it costs people to do things. Housing is already overpriced and many can't get into homes.

Until the economy catches up to the technology it will cost more. Once it becomes generally accepted the cost should drop.

Mr. Allred suggested the percentages be increased, pools removed from the calculation, and an additional percentage allowed based on the matrix. Commissioner Kimball suggested the percentages be increased by 10 or 15 percent. Commissioner Carr commented that it is very subjective. Mr. Allred stated that there is actually some science to it. Mr. Teerlink stated that the APA has published several articles that were presented to them by planners and scientists. The specific volume of the journal was ordered by the city that addresses lot coverage and deals with urban heat, porous surfaces, storm water retention, and storm water drainage. The suggestions therein improve the environmental quality because more greenscape is planted that takes up carbon dioxide as opposed to increased amounts of concrete.

(20:25:51) Commissioner Shupe asked if the Commission would feel comfortable bumping the baseline percentages up 5 to 10 percent and then have another 10% bonus with the matrix portion. Mr. Teerlink commented that increasing the impervious coverage would be beneficial. Staff did not have concerns about the actual structural coverage. Commissioner Shupe wanted to recommend to the City Council something that they will at least consider. A straight coverage percentage was discussed. Mr. Teerlink stated that it would be easier for him to have one column versus two.

Mr. Allred suggested staff recommend to the Council, based on overwhelming feedback from the public, that they consider a bonus program with one total coverage. Commissioner Shupe suggested the Commission address the issue tonight and send it on. He clarified that the one column should identify the impervious column that exists now. Swimming pools and ponds should not be part of that calculation. It was noted that indoor pools would not count as impervious surface.

Steve Luzak of Kodiak America showed photos of various projects they have worked on. A home built on Pheasant Way included a pool with a paver design. The intent was to eliminate anything that would retain water. Mr. Luzak stated that each manufacturer may offer 15 different types of pavers but they all have different specs on how much leaching they allow.

(20:35:50) Commissioner Shupe understood that the Commission was in favor of one single percentage allowed column with the higher percentages. He asked what type of bonus the Commission was in favor of in exchange for the planting of trees or the use of pavers. Commissioner Khodadad was in favor of keeping two columns and increasing the percentages if pools are not counted. She did not want to encourage people to build a bigger house and have more impervious coverage but just add trees. Commissioner Shupe agreed but stated that there are complaints from citizens about all of the restrictions in more expensive neighborhoods.

Mr. Allred stated that staff liked the matrix program and they have thought it through. He suggested the possibility of eliminating the matrix and increasing the percentages. Commissioner Khodadad liked the idea of the matrix. Commissioner Carr thought the matrix was arbitrary. Mr. Allred did not want to make things too difficult. Commissioner McKell stated that they should start with an arbitrary figure that is much easier to work with than the matrix alone. He suggested they stay with the right-hand column plus the matrix which would provide for some design opportunities. Mr. Allred thought the matter should come back one

more time as it was still in a rough format. The discussion would help narrow the focus. The consensus of the Commission was to increase the percentage by 5% and eliminate the first or left-hand column and keep the matrix. Mr. Allred agreed that the matrix would need fine-tuning. The Commission was in favor of the matrix compensating for a 10% increase. A total of a 15% maximum possible increase was agreed to.

(20:44:50) Commissioner Shupe did not want to rush the matter along but was concerned that the amounts are arbitrary enough that it could take months for the Commission to finalize them. Mr. Allred stated that staff could take the general concepts tonight, narrow them down, and bring the matter back one more time. The matrix still needed to be modified as it was unfinished. Commissioner Shupe asked that the revision be sent out to the Commission Members with the next packet so that they have time to review it prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Kimball suggested the possibility of having each item be assigned a percentage value. Commissioner Shupe liked Mr. Allred's idea of having one column with the higher percentage. The matrix would also be included and ponds, swimming pools, and water features would not be part of the calculation. Mr. Teerlink stated that the first column percentages for structures were integral to restricting the monster home ordinance. Mr. Allred commented that it could be argued that it doesn't matter what the percentage is because they are already governed by graduated height and the building corridor. Commissioner Shupe wanted to get something before the Council as soon as possible for their review. Rick Whiting suggested the matrix specify a limit of up to 10% maximum.

(20:53:27) Commissioner Shupe moved to direct staff to go back in written format and recalculate the percentage chart 13.14.080(B) as follows:

- 1. The columns be shall reduced to one with the inclusion of the higher percentage column.*
- 2. Outdoor swimming pools, ponds, or water features shall not be included as part of that analysis.*
- 3. Staff shall calculate more definitively on the matrix so that there are detailed percentages in the matrix that the Commission can decide upon.*
- 4. The matrix may be used to generate up to an additional 10% impervious surface area.*

Commissioner Shupe clarified that the intent of the motion was to increase the baseline allowance percentages by 5%. Mr. Allred clarified that the right-hand column could potentially be increased up to an additional 10% through the matrix.

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

(20:58:03) Mr. Allred stated that the City Council is very anxious to see the proposed changes but if the meeting was moved back one week it might impact the noticing schedule.

Commissioner Khodadad suggested meeting on Monday, November 3 or on Election Day, November 4. Scheduling options were discussed. Mr. Allred recommended there be a work meeting two hours prior to the Planning Commission meeting to consider what was discussed

tonight. Commissioner Shupe suggested the Commission meet on October 28 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and first address the lot coverage issues followed by the building corridor and building envelope issues. Once those issues are addressed item 4.4 could be discussed. He did not want to see the meeting go past 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Allred clarified that the intent is to address three items at the October 28 meeting including building coverage issues, the impervious surface area issue, and the issue regarding building over the top of the lot line. If no notice is required for November 5, which is the date the Commission planned to meet originally, the normally scheduled meeting will be cancelled.

Commissioner Khodadad thought too much time was being spent on each agenda item. She suggested the Commission Members research issues more thoroughly prior to each meeting and make a list of questions or comments to help minimize the time spent. Mr. Allred stated that it is very difficult for staff to provide the Commissioners with their packets in a timely fashion prior to the next meeting with only one week to prepare. Mr. Allred stated that the amount of research to be done by individual Commission Members is at their discretion. He commented that staff was a resource to the Commission and he invited them to contact staff at any time with questions or issues.

Affordable housing issues were discussed. Mr. Allred invited any interested Commission Members to attend the upcoming Utah APA conference. He stated that there was still time to sign up. Commissioner Shupe expressed appreciation to staff for their efforts.

4.4 Planner: Paul Allred – (Discussion and Possible Decision) Creating Regulations for Classifying Lots Where Dwellings are Built Over Property Lines and Requiring the Subdividing of Such Properties;

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 Minutes from October 7, 2008.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS – No Final Action to be Taken.

6.1 Updates or Follow-Up on Items Currently in the Development Review Process.

6.2 Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.

6.3 Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.

7. ADJOURN.

(21:16:40) Commissioner Shupe moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the City of Holladay Planning Commission meeting held Tuesday, October 21, 2008.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Teri Forbes". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath it.

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 11-18-08