

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

**Tuesday, April 17, 2012  
6:30 p.m.  
Holladay Municipal Center  
4580 South 2300 East**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Planning Commission Members:**

Les Chatelain, Chair  
Lori Khodadad  
Spence Bowthorpe  
John Garver  
Troy Holbrook  
Paula Lowry  
Matt Snow

**City Staff:**

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

The Work Session commenced at 6:30 p.m.

**PRE-MEETING/WORK SESSION**

(18:35:10) The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. With regard to the Orchard Hollow Rezone, City Planner, Rick Whiting, stated that the property is allowed three building lots under the current zoning. The property owner, Simone McGinnis, would like to subdivide the property into four lots. She has asked for a re-zone to R-1-10 to develop four 10,000 square-foot lots. Said property is sloping. Mr. Whiting visited the site with Cheryl White from the Fire Department and reported that the property complies with the Code for the zone change. The property is bounded on two sides by R-1-10 zoning. Mr. Whiting informed the Commission that if the City Council chooses to adopt the zone change, it will not create a zoning island. He noted that the zoning on the south side of the property has larger lots. It is the Planning Commission's responsibility to recommend approval or denial to the City Council.

Commissioner Lowry questioned rumors about the property to the east being sold to the LDS church and becoming a stake center. Mr. Whiting indicated that he had heard the rumor, but stated that it is unfounded. Clarification was sought with respect to the current driveway and it serving as a right-of-way for access to the property. Mr. Whiting stated that there would be access on the existing parcel. He also presented the pre-conceptual subdivision plans.

(6:42:51) The Cottonwoods Luxury Apartment PUD was next discussed. Mr. Whiting stated that the property currently consists of a large medical plaza as well as a second smaller building. The owners, Jeff and Clark Cannon, wish to tear down the existing building and replace it with a luxury apartment development. The project will be largely housed in two main buildings with a third smaller building that will contain eight units on the upper floor. The main floor will have a swimming pool, spa, and amenities for the tenants along with an administrative office. The Cannons feel they need to develop at the maximum density for the project to work. The overall

property was described as 3 ½ acres with the intent being to incorporate three different parcels.

Staff addressed the issue of how to achieve maximum density without tearing down the third building and develop residential. Staff met with the City Attorney and discussed the possibility of designating the project as a PUD, which would allow the density to be spread throughout the entire property. A second possibility would be to place residential units in all of the buildings, which would make them at least partially residential. The owners were seeking feedback with their main concern being density.

At a neighborhood meeting, the three residents in attendance expressed their opposition to the project. Ingress/egress would be off of 5600 South with a possible a crash gate for EMS/Fire access off of Highland Drive. Mr. Whiting offered to provide the Commissioners with a rendering of the architectural style that would be pursued. A question was raised with regard to the executive summary and the 176 parking stalls without shared parking and 140 with. Mr. Whiting indicated that the details would be worked out later in the process.

(6:56:36) City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, introduced agenda item number 3. He reported that the Council recently initiated a text amendment that pertains to two sections of Chapter 13-Residential Code. One pertains to the calculation of front yard setbacks and the other to the calculation of the building corridor. During the moratorium, the Council proposed a temporary regulation, which has been in place since the previous Tuesday. This places temporary regulations on how setbacks are calculated. The Council asked staff and Planning Commission to consider an amendment. Further details on the subject were to be discussed during the regular meeting.

Community Development Director, Paul Allred, reviewed the Sign Ordinance Amendment and stated that staff was satisfied with applying the basic sign regulations. He requested clarification on a few items, however. He reported on progress being made on the project.

*(6:59:59) Commissioner Khodadad moved to go across the hall to conduct the Regular Meeting. Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **CONVENE REGULAR MEETING**

Chair Les Chatelain called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Orchard Hollow Rezone – 4245 and 4257 South Holladay Blvd. – Planner: Rick Whiting.**

(19:11:10) City Planner, Rick Whiting, presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a rezone from R-1-15 to R-1-10. The R-1-15 Zone comprises residential single-family dwellings on maximum 15,000 square foot lots. The R-1-10 Zone allows for corresponding 10,000 square foot lots. The request asked that the City Council, who will make the ultimate decision on the matter, to increase the density on this particular parcel, which would have allowed three homes to be built and up to four homes with the zone change.

Mr. Whiting identified Simone McInnis as the applicant who wishes to develop the property as a four-lot subdivision. The parcel is one acre in size and falls within the General Plan designation for low-density residential, which allows up to four residential units per acre. A number of technical questions exist that should be discussed; however, the purpose tonight is to discuss whether the zone change is appropriate for this parcel. Various topographical, utility, and fire access issues exist that will be addressed later in the process. Mr. Whiting suggested the Commission focus on the density increase and the appropriateness of the zone change. The Commission should recommend approval or denial to the City Council.

(19:15:23) Mr. Whiting indicated that he has spoken to many individuals about the matter. He noted that Gerald Pascaldo expressed opposition to the project. Clay Anderson and Brian Rosander represented a number of residents who have asked to go on record as being opposed to approval of the request. Chair Chatelain reported that a second public hearing take place when the matter is heard by the City Council. Mr. Whiting stated that the common complaint was that the rezone would result in too many homes in the neighborhood, which they considered inappropriate. There was also concern about a nearby parcel that might be inclined to request a similar rezone to higher density if the request is approved.

The applicant, Simone McInnis, a 12-year resident, realized that increasing density sounds unappealing; however, she did not think that increasing it by one home would have a measurable impact on the community. Her main goal was to enhance the community. As a builder, she identified one of her strengths as infill. Her intent was to take the project on herself and not sell off the lots. The goal would be to create a cohesive environment that fits in with the surroundings. She realized hers is a transitional piece of property but stated that what is proposed adheres to the City's General Plan. The project would also increase the City's tax base, which will benefit the community long-term. Ms. McInnis stated that one driveway will be proposed rather than four accesses onto Holladay Boulevard, which would create a greater impact. The homes will be situated on the lot in such a way as to minimize the visual impacts of the homes.

Troy Holbrook assumed that the proposed layout takes into account the topography, setbacks, and size of the lot and that Ms. McInnis is comfortable with her ability to put four lots on the parcel. Ms. McInnis confirmed that that was the case.

Chair Chatelain stated that the Commission was being asked to identify in their decision-making process any potential harm that might occur. He asked Ms. McInnis if there would be a difference in impact on the property values of the surrounding area based on whether there are three or four homes developed on her property. Ms. McInnis stated that the lots are smaller and will result in a lower lot value but should not negatively impact the value of neighboring properties. In response to a question raised, Ms. McInnis expected the price point of the homes to be \$400,000 to \$600,000. The homes were expected to be 1,800 to 2,800 square feet in size.

Chair Chatelain opened the public hearing.

(19:25:00) Alexander Jueschke stated that he has lived on Grover Lane since 1962. When they purchased their home they were aware of the zoning and the home was built with the expectation

that the neighborhood would remain unchanged. He was concerned that the Planning Commission does not listen to the will of the citizens. He recalled a property on the corner of Holladay Boulevard and Gunderson Lane that was changed in spite of the neighbors' objections. He hoped that would not occur in this case. Mr. Jueschke was informed that the situation he referred to was addressed by Salt Lake County. Mr. Jueschke identified his home on the site map displayed.

(19:26:50) Clay Anderson reported that he lives directly across Holladay Boulevard from the subject property. Because of the elevations, he looks directly at the property and has for over 25 years. He recognized that it was a certainty that the property will be developed; however, he believed the current request makes it far too dense. Even though the land is terraced, he was concerned that there was the potential for four "starter castles" on the property. Mr. Whiting stated that the smaller lot will actually reduce the potential height of the homes. Mr. Anderson found that the propensity was to build homes as close as possible to each other with no yards.

(19:29:00) Carol Scott gave her address as 146 London Plane Road and stated that she has lived in Holladay since 1969. She considered the previous development on Gunderson Lane and Holladay Boulevard referred to by Mr. Jueschke to be one of the worst things that has happened in recent years. Ms. Scott described the various changes that have taken place over the years. Recently from 3900 South to 4500 South along Highland Drive and Holladay Boulevard, the County has allowed 244 apartments to be built. They have impacted the neighborhood significantly. She urged the Commission to respect the rights of the residents.

(19:31:24) Tim Barney gave his address as 1908 Longview Drive and stated that he and his wife have lived there for just over three years. They purchased the lot because of its size and tore down the existing home and built a new one. Mr. Barney had several concerns about the proposal. The first was that the proposed development will have a negative impact on property values. The Barneys recently made a substantial investment in their home and were concerned about how the rezone will affect them. He had several other concerns as well including topography and setback requirements in addition to safety concerns and how emergency vehicles will access the site.

(19:34:53) Ed Bailey was not opposed to development but was concerned about the impact it will have, which will be significant. He stated that higher density always reduces property values. He was also worried about fire truck access, elevations, and density. Mr. Bailey stated that when he built his home he had difficulty getting the right kind of permeable soils on his property, which was very costly. He expressed his strong opposition to the proposed rezone.

(19:38:28) Dana Nelson gave his address as 1889 Longview Drive on the lot immediately east of the subject property. He had an understanding of development and asked if the City holds fast to the 15,000 square foot requirement. Mr. Whiting clarified that two 15,000 square-foot lots would work on the property. Three would exceed one acre. Mr. Nelson studied the emergency access and thought it would be very difficult to build three homes on the site under the current zoning. His bigger concern was that even if the zone change was allowed and the applicant developed only three homes, a precedent would be set for neighboring properties. He expressed his opposition to the proposed zone change.

Mr. Whiting explained that one acre equates to 43,560 square feet. Three 15,000 square foot lots would total 45,000 square feet, which would exceed one acre. Therefore, the maximum density under the current zoning would be two homes on the property. Chair Chatelain clarified that the maximum number of homes that could be developed without the zone change would be two.

(19:43:43) Brian Rosander identified himself as attorney with the law firm of Parsons Behle & Latimer. He was present on behalf of concerned citizens. He noted that after a GRAMA request, Mr. Whiting was able to provide the TRC report. He was somewhat concerned by some of the assumptions that led to the staff observations and findings. He referenced the City of Holladay General Plan which states that physical characteristics of the site should be considered when analyzing a rezone. Mr. Rosander suggested further studies take place to ensure that the soil will accommodate four homes rather than one. As a result, he suggested that compaction, seismic, and fault issues be studied. Other issues should also be analyzed as well such as emergency access and lot placement to determine whether what is proposed is suitable. Mr. Rosander voiced his intent to submit a Memorandum in Opposition prior to legislative action being taken by the City Council.

(19:47:18) Joel Kittrell gave his address as 4231 South Holladay Boulevard and stated that he would be most directly impacted because his wall would separate his home from the proposed development. He noted that he received no notice of tonight's meeting other than from community involvement. The Kittrells moved to Holladay to an area surrounded by larger lots and lower density.

(19:49:23) Carol Zimmerman gave her address as 1946 Long View Drive. She was part of the group that helped get the property rezoned R-1-15. They worked through the County at the same time Councilman Pace was pursuing a rezone to his property to R-1-20. They tried to get the same zoning for their area but were unsuccessful. Mrs. Zimmerman stated that they have been happy with R-1-15 zoning and that she was a Member of the East Millcreek Community Council when Black Diamond made its proposal and promised 20 cars, light manufacturing, and no expansions. To this day Black Diamond has not fulfilled its obligation to plant all of the trees in the rear of the property. She expressed her opposition and stated that the desire was to maintain the quality of Holladay that exists on the southern end.

(19:52:13) Kyle Matsumura gave his address as 1899 Long View Drive and expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning. He supported maintenance of the current zoning. He was concerned that in order to make a profit, Ms. McInnis will have to reduce costs by building homes that are lower quality than those that exist on Long View Drive.

(19:53:30) Steven Anderson reported that he has lived on Grover Lane for more than 45 years. Throughout that time he has seen tens of millions of dollars invested in neighborhood real estate by people who had confidence in the type of neighborhood being developed. He asked that the Commission give consideration to traffic impacts. He felt that adding four more homes in the area will make the already dangerous situation even worse. He questioned why the burden of proof seems to be on established residents rather than the developer when the residents have their investment and the developer is simply looking to make a profit. He thought the burden of proof

should be on the developer who wants to change the character of the area. In addition, the City should proceed under the presumption that the current zoning is appropriate and there should be a presumption against changing it. Mr. Anderson appealed to the Commission to vote against the proposal.

(19:59:41) Phillip Blomquist gave his address as 1869 Long View Drive and stated that they were some of the first residents on Long View Drive to redo their home. Since then nearly all of the homes have been remodeled, torn down, or rebuilt. He asked the Commission to do the right thing for the community and not compromise the integrity of their homes and investments.

(20:01:10) Mike Malmquist reported that he and his family have lived in the neighborhood for just over 20 years. He expressed his opposition to the proposed rezone. He referenced finding number four in the staff report stating that approval of the request would not create a zoning island of any kind. Mr. Malmquist stated that the rezone would disturb the continuous line that exists. He was concerned that the neighbors can't envision how the homes will look on the site and suggested a conceptual site plan or reports be submitted to answer those questions.

(20:05:42) Jan Clark, a Grover Lane resident, stated that from her front porch she has a direct view of Ms. McInnis' lot. She opposed the rezone due to aesthetics and safety. She was frustrated by the fact that there are still no sidewalks and a problem with speeding. She did not want to add additional traffic to the existing situation.

(20:07:24) Paula Barney stated that she resides at 1909 Long View Drive. She travels Long View Drive daily and identified traffic concerns.

(20:09:56) Paul Ropner gave his address as 1945 Long View Drive and stated that he thought the discussion had to do with the entire area to the Gunderson property. He was concerned that if the subject property was rezoned it would set an extremely dangerous precedent. He considered it unfair to people who bought their homes in good faith to have the property rezoned.

(20:11:03) Julie Christison stated that she has lived in the area all of her life and currently resides at 1919 Long View Drive. She felt that purchasing a home in the neighborhood would be a great investment and she did not want to see it depreciated by the proposed four homes.

(20:12:20) Mike Karras reported that he has lived on Long View Drive for 44 years and resides on the side that would abut the Gunderson property. He agreed with the previous citizen comments.

(10:12:55) Mr. Anderson encouraged all of the Commission Members to visit the property. He remarked that it is easy to see that there is barely enough room on the site for two homes let alone four.

Mrs. Zimmerman remarked that she had heard in the past that sometime in the future there will be flood control down Holladay Boulevard. She suggested it enter into a setback proposed on the property as well. Mr. Allred stated that a grading plan will have to be submitted to the City Engineer for his review and approval.

(20:16:35) Kent Smith stated that he lives at the end of Grover Lane and commented on the site topography. He stated that the road will take out a large portion of the acreage. He personally questioned whether there was room for even two lots on the property.

Mr. Rosander asked for clarification on the access. Chair Chatelain stated that many of the project details will come forward later in the process.

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

(20:21:49) Ms. McInnis remarked that one misnomer was that she is using a driveway that is not hers. The other had to do with the topography of the lot. She understood that changes needed to be made to make the site accessible for emergency vehicles but was seeking approval of a rezone only tonight. The other issues would be dealt with at a later date. She stated that the homes on the next street over are very different than the ones on this street. She suggested the Council take into consideration what is near the property.

Mrs. Zimmerman stated that changes have taken place over the past five years and many homes were torn down.

Chair Chatelain explained that one of the challenges the Commission faces in many decisions is that the order of the information and the process do not match. The Commission was tasked with whether to recommend the zone change and not whether the proposed project will be successful or how many units can be built. Those determinations would be addressed later in the process. Chair Chatelain explained that the Commission is also bound by policy and regulations as opposed to the Council who has more freedom.

(20:26:10) Commissioner Khodadad asked about the kind of testing that has taken place on the lot and the due diligence that has been performed by Ms. McInnis. Ms. McInnis stated that she has owned the property for six years and has conducted extensive soils testing and fault studies. She noted that that was done before she purchased the property. In response to a question raised, Ms. McInnis stated that the lot is 1.01 acre in size and currently zoned for the construction of two lots.

Chair Chatelain stated that a number of people have indicated that the rezone would impact property values in the area.

Commissioner Khodadad was not convinced that there was adequate room on the site for four homes. She did not want to make a decision to change the zoning if four houses can't be built there. She wanted to see proof that the requested number of homes can be built on the property based on the topography and the road configuration.

Commissioner Holbrook stated that the Commission has had many circumstances where they have looked at changes to zoning. One of the things he was opposed to was spot zoning and unintended consequences associated with migration into larger parcels. His opinion was that a boundary was also established by the R-1-15 and R-1-10 zones and spot zoning for this applicant

has the unintended consequence of encroaching further into the lot. In addition, there is potential harm to the existing residents within the R-1-15 Zone. Unless there was a compelling argument otherwise, he would not support the rezone.

(20:34:57) Commissioner Lowry grew up in the area and stated that the property is a very emotional issue for her. She would have a difficult time watching the property be changed drastically. She was not comfortable with what was proposed and did not want to see the neighborhood divided.

Commissioner Holbrook pointed out that there was the potential for additional density further up. If there were a change from R-1-15 to R-1-10 and it was to encroach further into that space there would be a compounded effect of additional density on that parcel and additional traffic.

Chair Chatelain asked City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, to comment on whether the property would support four lots. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that it would and stated that it what is required is 70% of the lot width, which is at the right-of-way.

(20:42:10) Commissioner Snow agreed with Commissioner Holbrook's comments and understood that it is a highly emotional decision for the neighborhood. He tended toward not granting the rezone due to the possibility of spot zoning and setting a precedent.

Commissioner Bowthorpe agreed with the previous Commission comments and studied carefully the seven criteria. He was concerned most about the potential negative impact on the neighborhood. He believed that the impact on the surrounding lots, especially those to the south and east, would double the density. He was also concerned about the net result of the new development if the request were to be approved. That would require the Commission to consider the remaining Gunderson property and what might eventually occur there. He felt that what is done here will affect what is done with neighboring parcels at some future time. Commissioner Bowthorpe did not see an overriding reason to go forward with the request. He believed every property owner has the right to develop their property as they choose but ultimately zoning has been established on the property to maintain the quality and character of the neighborhood. He proposed it remain as it is.

***(20:47:42) Commissioner Lowry moved to recommend denial of the rezone request made by Simone McInnis pertaining to the property located at 4245 and 4257 South Holladay Boulevard and deny the rezone from R-1-15 as it exists to R-1-10. A recommendation should be made to the City Council that they take a very long look at all of the issues discussed tonight and all of the public input, especially with regard to meeting the soil impact, the traffic impact, the driveway, and the setbacks. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.***

The Commission took a brief recess.



## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **2. The Cottonwoods Luxury Apartments PUD Conceptual Permitted Site Plan Review – 5600 South Highland Drive.**

(21:04:15) The applicant, Jeff Cannon, presented the proposal and stated that they are proposing to develop multi-family residences on the corner parcel. One building has been updated and the second needs to be updated or have a change of use. The applicants feel that because the City of Holladay is developing new retail and commercial at the freeway entrance, a change of use would be warranted here. Within the RM Zone they can develop apartments and medical/dental uses are allowed as conditional uses. The intent was to develop 56 luxury residences on the property in three buildings. The goal was for the development to be the premiere luxury rental property in Holladay. The planned units will be 1,200 square feet in size and feature two bedrooms and two bathrooms. All will have fireplaces and washer/dryer hookups. What will set them apart will be the quality finishes. All will have solid wood cabinets, upgraded tile floors, carpeting, and granite countertops. Every unit will have a single-car garage, an additional parking space, and visitor parking.

Mr. Cannon stated that the price point will be \$1,400 per month and up. The proposed amenities will include a gym, indoor pool, and clubhouse. A rental product was pursued due to the large number of condominiums in the area. Mr. Cannon stated that a neighborhood meeting was held the previous night with five in attendance. Their concern seemed to be the fact that the property was proposed to be developed on the corner. There was concern with it being a transient community. Once the applicant informed those in attendance at the neighborhood meeting of the proposed rents, their concerns seemed to be satisfied. Another concern had to do with the property being developed and then falling into disrepair. Mr. Cannon stated that they will not allow that happen. Another concern had to do with clientele and the need for elevators for the elderly.

A question was raised about a comparable project in the Valley showing what the applicants are trying to achieve. Mr. Cannon stated that one of the properties they have taken direction from was the Irving School House Apartments on 2100 South. The main building and the nine to 10 buildings behind it are not visible from 2100 South. Units rent for \$900 to \$1,600 per month. Mr. Cannon felt that based on market research their proposed asking price was on target.

(21:16:10) Timing issues were discussed. Mr. Cannon stated that their desire would be to begin construction by the end of 2012. A total of 56 residential units were proposed in addition to the newly remodeled building. Commissioner Khodadad asked how the density was configured. Mr. Cannon stated that they reviewed the Code and based on the density of 3.49 acres, they can achieve 56 residential units. Their desire would be to take the full acreage and develop it as a PUD with mixed uses. Zoning issues were discussed.

Chair Chatelain thought it would benefit the community as a whole to have higher end retail and residential uses. It was noted that at the end of last year there was a great deal of conversation about what Highland Drive should look like.

Chair Chatelain stated that his desire would not be for the development to turn into a “compound” with tall fences. He did, however, voice his support for the concept and thought it

would benefit the community. Mr. Cannon stated that their desire was for the project to resemble a park and for tenants to be happy to live there. Various rental/leasing options were discussed.

**3. Text Amendment to Ordinance 13.14.054 and 13.14.71 (Front Setback and Building Corridor) – Planners: Paul Allred and Jonathan Teerlink.**

(21:41:20) Mr. Allred announced that the Council declared a moratorium on certain portions of the building corridor such as calculation of the front setback, the depth of the highest part of the house, and the building envelope.

(22:00:57) Mr. Teerlink reported that the building corridor is a method by which height is controlled with regard to depth in a property. Prior to 2007 an applicant could go to the maximum height all the way to the rear yard property line. In 2007, the Council modified the graduated height requirement. To curtail the problem of second story windows looking into backyard properties, the Council decided to take the homes on either side and measure the depths of the homes. The average depth would be what would be allowed as maximum height.

Mr. Teerlink stated that staff was in the process of drafting modifications to the temporary regulation. They would be presented to the Commission at the next meeting. It was noted that the moratorium is for a period of six months. He noted that building permit applications were still being accepted under the temporary regulations. The goal was to make a decision within approximately one month.

**4. Sign Ordinance Amendment – ORD Zone – (Continued) – Planner: Paul Allred.**

(21:41:54) Mr. Allred stated that the Commission Members were provided with a proposal to move the regulations for the ORD Zone that would be compatible with what is allowed in the C-1 and C-2 Zones. The rules for office buildings were not changed. Exclusions were described, which included office buildings that would be subject to the same signage rules that apply elsewhere in the City. He asked that the Commissioners fully understand what is proposed prior to the public hearing. They were essentially piggy backing on an existing regulation and moving existing regulations over for retail and restaurant uses in the ORD from the C-1 and C-2 zones.

The public hearing was expected to take place at the second meeting in May. Noticing issues were discussed. Staff was directed to send notice of the public hearing to business owners in the ORD Zone with respect to the proposed change. Chair Chatelain asked that the proposed plans be made available on the City's website so that the public can study them prior to the public hearing. It was also recommended that the chart be made accessible to the public.

**MINUTES**

**5. Approve Minutes of the March 20 and April 3, 2012 Meetings.**

(22:08:11) Audio difficulties associated with a previous meeting were acknowledged. The minutes were reviewed and modified.

(22:09:21) *Chair Chatelain moved that the minutes be approved with changes forwarded to staff. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-*

*Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

6. **Updates or Follow-Up on Items Currently in the Development Review Process.**
7. **Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.**
8. **Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.**

**ADJOURN**

*Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to adjourn. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:10 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, April 17, 2012.*



---

Teri Forbes  
T Forbes Group  
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: June 5, 2012