

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

**Tuesday, January 5, 2016  
6:30 p.m.  
Holladay Municipal Center  
4580 South 2300 East**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Planning Commission Members:**

Matt Snow, Chair  
Jan Bradshaw  
Spence Bowthorpe  
Jim Carter  
John Garver  
Chris Jensen  
Marianne Ricks

**City Staff:**

Paul Allred, Community Development Director  
Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner

**PRE-MEETING/WORK SESSION**

Chair Matt Snow called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

Community Development Director, Paul Allred, reported that staff was recommending approval of the preliminary site plan for the Millrock Hampton Inn subject to resolution of unresolved issues. The plans were redlined and there were minor technical issues with the retaining walls, which were of most significant concern and are still outstanding. The public safety, fire safety, and pedestrian safety issues had all been addressed. There was still an issue with the walk down from the platform. The building heights were determined to be in compliance and the grades worked better as did the radius. The building architecture was also upgraded. Staff recommended that the south side face the neighborhood. Mr. Allred reported that the building is six-tone and predominantly stucco with accents. With respect to drainage, there were still concerns.

(18:51:49) Mr. Allred stated that there appeared to be an issue with one of the buildings exceeding the allowance in the development agreement for square footage in Millrock Park. The development agreement, however, gives the Planning Commission the authority to amend the agreement. Currently 490,000 square feet are allowed with the proposed development exceeding that by approximately 60,000 square feet.

The Bryson Subdivision was next discussed. Outstanding issues were identified including right-of-way and irrigation issues. City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, commented that there are no storm drain facilities on 4625 South, which requires the applicant to retain the storm water on site. The neighbors to the west are watching the situation closely and are most interested in what the home will look like.

(19:06:18) *Commissioner Jensen moved to adjourn the Work Session and continue to the Regular Meeting. Commissioner Bradshaw seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

## **CONVENE REGULAR MEETING**

### **1. Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.**

Chair Snow called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

## **ACTION ITEMS & PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **2. Millrock Hampton Inn – 3210 East Millrock Drive – Preliminary Site Plan Approval.**

(19:05:44) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, introduced Shay Smith from Forsgren Engineering, who will be acting as the City's new Civil Engineer. Mr. Allred reported that the Hampton Inn at Millrock is in its second stage, which is the most complex and difficult stage of the process. He was impressed during a very busy holiday season where the applicants were able to respond to countless redlines. While the drawings were good, there were concerns and the preliminary site plan requirements are numerous. A revised conceptual plan was submitted, which was given to the Technical Review Committee (TRC). With regard to drainage and water, the plan was deemed acceptable by the City Engineer. They applicants were proposing an in-ground storage system in the parking lot that will slow release into the drainage system on Lion Lane, which is a private road. Parking was raised as an issue of concern. The desire of the applicants was to provide more than half of the parking off site. Millrock Corporation, who controls the ground, has a shared parking agreement in place to allow the hotel to use the parking deck across the street.

Mr. Allred indicated that one concern is the fact that the area between the parking deck and the crosswalk and sidewalk is very steep and there is no handrail. The applicants have agreed, however, to provide a handrail. If people park on the top deck it makes sense for the sidewalk surface to be revised. Of utmost concern was the safety of pedestrians who will be crossing the street from the parking deck to the hotel. Mr. Allred reported that staff is pleased with the crosswalk. He noted that all of the utility letters have been received. There was, however, concern with a sewer line connection capacity issue that should be resolved. Sewage will be pumped uphill from the project. With regard to fire access, the radius was redone and the building lowered slightly to allow fire apparatus up the driveway and under the porte cochere. It was reported that there are two hydrants rather than three. One of the hydrants in the front was moved. Under the drive aisle going to the back of the building there will be an underground water retention system.

(19:13:00) With regard to building design, staff asked that the building be upgraded in terms of its appearance. The building is overwhelmingly stucco and additional tile accents at the base of the building were to be extended vertically on both the north and west sides. The east side of the building will be hidden somewhat by the hill. With respect to the lighting plan, it was recommended that at the rear southwest corner of the site near the dumpster, that one of the lights be removed. Doing so will save money and create less light there.

Mr. Allred stated that there was concern that the civil engineering plan did not seem to correlate well with the geotechnical plan. It was considered to be a significant issue that needs to be

*City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 1/5/2016*

addressed. The development agreement was addressed in the pre-meeting and a motion was needed to allow the building to exceed the development agreement allowances of 490,000 square feet or exclude the property from the RDA or development agreement areas. The matter would need to be addressed at the next meeting. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary site plan upon resolution of the issues raised.

(19:17:36) Shay Smith reported that there were items on the geotech report that the applicants were asked to address. There were inconsistencies with the allowable wall heights and reference made in the report about perched water. In terms of the sequence of construction, Mr. Smith stated that the geotech report referenced that there needed to be a certain sequence of construction but did not give specifics. An email was received from the geotech who indicated that he met with the owners and they have a plan in place. A memorandum was expected to be received shortly giving answers to the outstanding questions.

City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, stated that there was bare, sloped landscaping, particularly in the front portion between the two drive approaches. To accommodate the pedestrian element of connection and the new turn radius for the fire apparatus to get around the first left hand turn before the porte cochere, additional retaining walls were needed. Modifications needed to be made to the landscaping plan although Mr. Teerlink's opinion was that currently it works better. In response to a question raised, Mr. Allred confirmed that all of the will serve letters have been received. In terms of architecture, he explained that the ORD zone specifies that all new buildings must be compatible and include materials already in use in the area.

(19:22:22) The applicant, Tyler Miles, gave his address as 304 East Saddle Drive in Midway. He reported that in terms of the walking surface on the parking garage, it is owned by KDS who they will work with to make the recommended changes. In terms of the sewer district, the property technically lies in the Mount Olympus Improvement District boundaries. They explored the possibility of going to the Cottonwood Improvement District. Both will accept them, however, Cottonwood is quite far away and the logistics did not work.

Project Architect, Dan Vanzeben, gave his address as 4067 North Juniper Lane in Eden. He stated that the process went quickly but was very thoroughly. With regard to the sewer, Mr. Vanzeben stated that because they have constructed these hotels numerous times and they know what the capacity is, they were able to provide information to Mr. Miles that was submitted to the district. With respect to the will serve letter, their line has capacity for the proposed hotel. The issue they would continue to work through with their Civil and Mechanical Engineers pertained to the plumbing from the building through the macerator and ejection pump and the line that takes it to the road. He confirmed that there is a five-foot lift to get into the area. Various aspects of the property were described. Mr. Vanzeben reported that they added tile to the vertical elements on the south elevation but did not add additional tile at the grade. The elevations of the adjacent homes were described. With regard to the additional tile to be added, Mr. Vanzeben stated that they will be mechanically fastened to the building. The column portions will go up 28 feet. The tile pieces are 18" x 18". In response to a question raised, Mr. Vanzeben stated that the mechanical system will consist of an attachment to the back of the tile that is screwed and locked into place to avoid relying on the adhesion of the grout.

A question was raised about what has been done different in this case from the minimum required by Hampton Inn. Mr. Vanzeben stated that additional colors were added. He explained that generally Hampton Inn requires three different stucco colors. They include one between the windows, the standard color around the body of the building, and accent cove lighting. In this case they added additional stucco colors to create more aesthetic breaks rather than a mass of the same color. While they allow a stucco, stone, brick, or tile on the lower level, the tiles being used have a higher quality look and a granite finish. The vertical columns for the infill on the front entry will also be done with tile as well on the north side facing the street.

(19:38:25) Mr. Allred stated that the project was reviewed in relation to the development agreement to determine if there was a dissonance between the two, which there was not. Additionally, there is no requirement in the ORD. In terms of the neighbors to the south, their view will be mid building. They are being impacted yet a decision was made to not add stone or tile to that side of the building. Mr. Vanzeben explained that his primary purpose is to satisfy his clients. For them, the most important elements of their building are the visual sides to those who will be patrons. Commissioner Jensen commented that he also has to answer to the community and would be concerned that the building resembles a typical tract home that looks great on the front with three sides that are plain stucco with no detail. He thought the neighbors deserved more and recommended more stone be placed on the south side.

(19:42:50) Mike Christensen gave his address as 748 West Heritage Park Boulevard in Layton and identified himself as one of the partners in the project. He understood Commissioner Jensen's concern and was not opposed to spending money if it is done wisely and will be viewed. Commissioner Jensen stated that the neighbors will see the south side of the building. Mr. Christensen commented that the tile wrap around will be below the sight line. Commissioner Jensen disagreed and stated that their view will be beyond mid building. Mr. Christensen stated that there will also be trees and landscaping. He considered it to be a cost equation. He could not see the wisdom in spending additional money for something that only two or three neighbors may see.

Steve Peterson gave his address as 6147 South Verness Cove in Holladay and stated that the materials used by Millrock included stucco with specks that glisten in the sunlight and give the appearance of stone. Mr. Peterson's preference was to buffer with landscaping. He clarified that what is proposed is a high grade stucco.

Commissioner Bradshaw noted that there is a lot of vegetation behind the homes that will block whatever is on the south side. Mr. Peterson reported that he had additional discussions with Bill Gordon who prepared the geotech report. His recommendation was that the retaining walls be between six and seven feet. The intent was not to exceed eight feet. In addition, the separation between the retaining walls will be a minimum of nine feet. Prior to the submission, Mr. Gordon had not completed his recommendation for the design. Mr. Peterson confirmed that their structural engineer will design the retaining walls, which will be part of their submission. In terms of the hillside slope, their plan was to keep it around 1.5-to-1.

With regard to lighting, Mr. Peterson stated that they want to meet the dark sky whenever possible. The lighting fixtures they are proposing have a horizontal cutoff and are LEDs. Closer to the hillside where the residential units are, there are zero foot candles and .2 levels of foot

candle. In effect, the lighting will be cut off at the property line. In response to a question raised, Mr. Peterson stated that the pole lights are on a 24-inch base and are 20 feet. Mr. Allred indicated that the ORD prohibits anything greater than 30.

Mr. Peterson commented that they are aware that there are development agreement issues that need to be discussed. He asked that the Commission consider granting preliminary and final site plan approval tonight recognizing that they will come back on January 19 to address the development agreement and other issues.

(19:55:04) Mr. Peterson stated that the reason for the square footage limitation was because in the beginning they were asking for 550,000 square feet and the Planning Commission wanted 250,000 to 300,000 square feet. They ultimately settled on 490,000 square feet, which was targeted specifically to the office space. Much of the property has since been sold. Of the two acres associated with Lot 5, they own the front acre and the City owns the rear acre. The City purchased the property from them years ago through the RDA with the intention of building a fire station there but ultimately chose not to. As a result, they entered into an agreement to buy it back. Mr. Peterson stated that originally five buildings were shown on the site plan. The fifth building was proposed where the hotel now sits. The original 2001 development agreement approved five buildings and included a parking structure that went across part of the school's property. Ultimately the applicants proposed fewer buildings and larger footprints. In 2003, the Planning Commission amended the development agreement and went to four buildings instead of five.

Mr. Peterson gave a detailed history of the property. He explained that originally the City's intent was to build a fire station on the rear one acre. Years later a parcel came available on Murray Holladay Boulevard and the City chose to locate the fire station there instead. At that point the other one-acre lot became surplus. When the State recorded the one-acre lot owned by the City they recorded Lot 5 consisting of two acres. The applicants approached the RDA Board and it was determined that the property would have to be subdivided in order to be recorded. When the property was sold Lot 5 was excluded. It was later concluded that the highest and best use of the property would not be an office building because of the shape of the lot and the difficulty with the site work. The highest and best use was determined to be a hotel. The applicants worked with several operators before partnering with this group. Their agreement is subject to obtaining the necessary approvals for a hotel.

(20:02:58) Mr. Allred stated that the RDA wants the hotel to move forward and has entered into an agreement to allow it in order to sell the property. He explained that the Planning Commission has the authority to amend the development agreement, however, because it involves the RDA, the City Attorney's opinion is that there will have to be an approval at their level. He noted that final approval cannot be granted tonight because staff has not yet reviewed it. Final approval can either be delegated to staff or addressed at the next meeting.

***(20:07:24) Commissioner Carter moved to approve the preliminary site plan for the Millrock Hampton Inn in the ORD Zone based on the following:***

**Finding:**

1. *The project meets the requirements for preliminary site plan for this use in the ORD Zone with the exception of the items highlighted previously.*

**Requirements:**

1. *The TRC should look at the final site plan and verify compliance.*
2. *A corrected preliminary site plan drawing shall be submitted showing resolution of the items mentioned herein above or as may be requested by staff or the Planning Commission.*
3. *A Final Site Plan, and any other documents/requirements shall be submitted to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) for review and approval to the Planning Commission unless such approval is delegated by the Commission to the TRC.*
4. *Action, as deemed necessary by the City Attorney, on the part of the Planning Commission and/or the City Council on the Development Agreement issues regarding this development.*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bradshaw. Vote on motion: Marianne Ricks – Aye, John Garver – Aye, Chris Jensen – Aye, Jim Carter – Aye, Jan Bradshaw – Aye, Spence Bowthorpe – Aye, Chair Matt Snow – Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

Commissioner Garver commented that he felt the design fell short in terms of architectural expression but understood that the decision tonight is not based on that. Commissioner Jensen agreed.

**3. Bryson Subdivision – 1981 East 4625 South – Amended Plat and Preliminary Subdivision Approval.**

(20:10:00) Mr. Teerlink presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a three-lot subdivision. The applicant has diligently pursued preliminary approval for the creation of a three-lot subdivision from two existing parcels. One of the parcels is Lot 9 of the Holladay Estates Subdivision. The lot was proposed to be vacated from the subdivision plat and added to the proposed three-lot subdivision. Preliminary approval from the TRC was granted and on October 20 the Planning Commission granted conceptual approval noting that it has the proper sizes and widths for three residential lots in the zone. In the meantime, the applicant was able to fine tune the lot lines in relation to utility issues that arose. Mr. Teerlink proposed that three motions be made tonight. One for the amended plat, another on the preliminary subdivision plat, and a recommendation to the City Council that a portion of an old cul-de-sac be vacated.

The applicant, Robert Bryson, gave his address as 1991 Cresthill, the contiguous lot to 1981 East 4625 South. They have lived in the neighborhood for the last 16 years. They purchased the property from the children of the neighboring property owners who have passed away. The Bryson's goal was to stay in the area and build a larger home. There has always been a strip of ground to a surplus garage that will be removed with the objective being to meet the R-1-10 zoning requirements for all three lots. Doing so will also enable them to provide a driveway to access the rear lot and maximize the front buildable space for the front lot. Mr. Bryson stated

*City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 1/5/2016*

that since the conceptual approval was granted they have had four other one-half acre lot owners to the west inquire about their options.

Mr. Bryson stated that in designing the site they found that the driveway ended up being proposed through a power pole. They have collaborated with Rocky Mountain Power who confirmed that the power pole could be moved one of two directions. Preliminary estimates were received and the Brysons were confident that it can be accomplished in order to move the driveway in the manner intended.

(20:16:24) With regard to the irrigation laterals, on the north boundary of the property there is a canal for which ownership issues were addressed. They collaborated with them about the arrangement between the ditch and the property owners with water shares along the property. They currently have a pipe through the lot but a significant number of homes along the ditch line have already filled the ditch in for various reasons. Regardless, Mr. Bryson was prepared to comply with whatever service level is required.

(20:20:10) *Commissioner Carr moved to approve the amended plat to amend the Holladay Estates Subdivision by vacating Lot 9 for the purpose of including it in the newly proposed Bryson Subdivision as Lot 3 subject to the following:*

**Findings:**

- 1. The removal of the Lot 9 Holladay Estates (Lot 3 Bryson) constitutes no harm to the existing subdivision; it simply relocates it into another plat.*
- 2. The owner of Lot 9 Holladay Estates (Lot 3 Bryson) and the abutting property owner are agreeable to joining their properties together to create a new subdivision plat for the purposes of sharing access, etc.*
- 3. The addition of the lot to be removed from the other plat is necessary and desirable for easier and safer access into the existing property to be divided.*

*Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Marianne Ricks – Aye, John Garver – Aye, Chris Jensen – Aye, Jim Carter – Aye, Jan Bradshaw – Aye, Spence Bowthorpe – Aye, Chair Matt Snow – Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

(20:21:07) *Commissioner Carter moved to approve the preliminary subdivision plat request for the Bryson Subdivision Lot 3 based on the following:*

**Findings:**

- 1. The Commission approved the conceptual on October 30, 2015.*
- 2. The subdivision complies with the City's construction standards for a preliminary plan for all lots in the proposed development in the R-1-10 Zone (regardless of whether or not the area of the City's right-of-way is included in the subdivision or not).*

*Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Marianne Ricks – Aye, John Garver – Aye, Chris Jensen – Aye, Jim Carter – Aye, Jan Bradshaw – Aye, Spence Bowthorpe – Aye, Chair Matt Snow – Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

*(20:21:54) Commissioner Carter moved to recommend that the City Council vacate a portion of the existing right-of-way, which is embraced in a cul-de-sac at the front edge of the lot. Approval was subject to the following:*

**Findings:**

- 1. The TRC finds that this portion of the City’s right-of-way has not now, nor has been for many years needed or used for City purposes.*
- 2. The road is complete and is in use in both directions and therefore won’t be needed for turnaround purposes.*
- 3. Vacating this area of the cul-de-sac will aid in any future improvements of this public street (i.e. curb and/or gutter).*
- 4. The area of the cul-de-sac, if vacated, will contribute to a larger lot area, more attractive shape of the front yard, more usable area, that this area has ostensibly already been in private use for many years, that the vacation of the space is a better option than entering into an agreement with the City for its use, etc.*

*Commissioner Bradshaw seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Marianne Ricks – Aye, John Garver – Aye, Chris Jensen – Aye, Jim Carter – Aye, Jan Bradshaw – Aye, Spence Bowthorpe – Aye, Chair Matt Snow – Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

**4. 2015 Minutes – November 4, December 1, and December 8.**

*(20:22:40) The minutes were reviewed and discussed.*

*(20:24:04) Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to approve the minutes of November 4, 2015, as proposed. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Ricks abstained from the vote.*

*(20:26:35) Commissioner Bradshaw moved to approve the minutes of December 1 Planning Commission Meeting minutes, as proposed. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Ricks abstained from the vote.*

*(20:28:26) Commissioner Bradshaw moved to approve the Planning Commission Meeting minutes of December 8, as proposed with the changes noted. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Ricks abstained from the vote.*

- **Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.**
- **Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.**



- **Calendar for Future Meetings on General Plan Update.**

**ADJOURN**

(20:30:26) *Commissioner Jensen moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bradshaw. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:30 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, January 5, 2016.*



---

Teri Forbes  
T Forbes Group  
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 2/2/2016