

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

**Tuesday, May 15, 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

(18:46:34) Building height limits were addressed. Community Development Director, Paul Allred, stated that the current height limit is 35 feet, which is fairly restrictive for institutional buildings like Olympus High, Olympus Junior High, and churches within the Public (P) Zone. He felt that 35 feet was too restrictive and suggested that a Code or text amendment be applied for in order to provide more flexibility. The guideline was believed to date back to 1999 and was inherited from Salt Lake County. Mr. Allred proposed an amendment that would accommodate architectural elements up to a certain point and the height of buildings. He proposed an increase of 13 feet, which would increase the current height restrictions from 35 to 48 feet.

(18:56:19) The Commission next discussed the Residential Building Corridor. City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, stated that the Council passed under a moratorium, a temporary regulation regarding building corridors and the calculation of front yard setbacks. In a City where tear downs and rebuilds are prominent, there's an escalating depth to the houses that are reaching maximum heights. Mr. Teerlink stated that several details need to be addressed prior to making the temporary regulation permanent in the Code.

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING

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

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Sign Ordinance Amendment – ORD Zone – (Continued) – Planner: Paul Allred – Discussion of Possible Changes to Chapter 13.82 – Signs.**

(19:06:04) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, presented the staff report and stated that the above matter is a public hearing on sign regulations in the ORD Zone. He described the

process of addressing signage and stated that amendments were made to the ORD Zone last year in anticipation of the Canyon Slope Square development. In the process, the lack of signage regulations in the ORD Zone was recognized. Mr. Allred explained that the proposed regulations are fairly straight forward. Staff recommended adoption of the C-1/C-2 zone regulations as a starting point. In past Commission discussions, staff was encouraged to reach out to the property owners in the ORD Zone. A direct notice was sent out and input was received about the proposed changes. Based on input received from property owners and tenants in the area, Mr. Allred felt that the regulations proposed will most likely not satisfy their needs. That being the case, he recommended the Commission conduct tonight's public hearing and consider the input received. The matter should then be continued and staff directed to redraft some regulations and add in additional signage allowances to address the issues. He hoped to have the amendment completed by Labor Day.

Chair Chatelain opened the public hearing.

(19:10:33) Kevin Ludlow was present on behalf of Sequoia Development who is developing the Canyon Slope Square project, the Hyatt Place hotel, and various retail pads. Mr. Ludlow stated that Kevin Long from Coldwell Banker conducted research and he personally had discussions with Young Electric Sign in an effort to get input from them. Modifications were proposed. Mr. Ludlow stated that the ORD Zone is unique and to attract national tenants it will be necessary for the property to be accessible and easy to find. He proposed adding a section to the verbiage on Project Signs. With regard to size, he suggested the size be increased from 10% to 15%, which is similar to what is allowed in Sandy. In addition, businesses are allowed monument signs. Currently, the limit is 32 square feet with a maximum of 64 square feet, depending on the size of the building. Mr. Ludlow encouraged the Commission to increase that to 50 and 100 square feet.

Samples of project signs were provided and signage samples were presented with the specifics of each discussed. Mr. Ludlow stated that if the allowable wall sign percentage were increased, it would allow for advertising to appear on the wall signs as well. He stressed the importance of people being able to identify businesses located there. He noted that representatives from Young Electric Sign were unable to attend tonight's meeting. In response to a question raised by Chair Chatelain, Mr. Ludlow clarified that a minimum of 50 square feet was proposed for the monument signs in addition to one square foot for every 10 feet of frontage over 50 feet up to a maximum of 100 feet.

(19:21:14) John Barlow from the law firm of Mitchell & Barlow was present representing the owners of the two office buildings next to Mr. Ludlow's development. He and his clients agreed with what Mr. Ludlow was proposing with respect to signage. In addition to the one restaurant, his clients have an interest in office buildings. In terms of leasing, Mr. Barlow felt they were at a disadvantage due to signage requirements. He wants to be competitive in terms of leasing to prospective tenants. In working with Young Electric Sign Company and real estate brokers he found it easier to attract tenants with signage. Mr. Barlow suggested crown signage be adopted to allow them to offer it to some of their tenants. He also echoed Mr. Ludlow's comments on monument signage and hoped to increase it slightly.

Chair Chatelain asked Mr. Barlow how crown signage is granted to individual tenants. Mr. Barlow explained that it usually is offered to one tenant. In their case, they have a three-story building and a two-story building and they typically give the smaller tenants monument signage. An anchor tenant would take up a substantial amount of square footage in the building and likely would be offered the crown signage.

Mr. Barlow was asked to describe the signage needs of office tenants as compared to commercial tenants. Mr. Barlow explained that office buildings in other cities are able to offer tenants more visible signage, which gives the perception that the business is more established and serves as a marketing tool.

(19:27:20) Steve Peterson gave his address as 6147 South Verness Cove and identified himself as a General Partner in Mill Rock Development. He reported that Mill Rock employs approximately 2,000 people and to his knowledge they are the largest investor in Holladay other than the Cottonwood Mall in terms of investment in the community. Mr. Peterson stated that in their park they house the headquarters for some of the finest companies in the world. All have requested crown signage but they have been unable to offer it. His concern was that it is available across the street. As the gravel pits east of Mill Rock in Cottonwood Heights are developed in the future there will be crown signage. Mr. Peterson stated that if they are not allowed to offer something similar it will create a less competitive environment for them. He noted that the taxes they pay to Holladay are based on occupancy. It was estimated that they pay about \$1,000,000 in taxes per year that comes to the City and they are the number one source of tax revenue in a single property. If they lose tenants everyone will be impacted. Mr. Peterson proposed that they be allowed to have crown signage on each of the four faces of the building that is limited to no more than 25% of that particular face. They will then monitor internally who they allow that signage to go to. He explained that they would not offer it to anyone other than a full-floor tenant. This would allow them to compete with the Cottonwood Corporate Center, Beckstrand's new building, and Ralph Johnson's new buildings. Mr. Peterson stressed the importance of having a competitive advantage.

In response to a question, Mr. Peterson stated that he could not definitively confirm that he has lost tenants because of the City's signage policy. They do, however, have large renewals coming up and directly across the street there is 200,000 square feet of vacant space where tenants could get crown signage in Cottonwood Heights. Additionally there is 400,000 square feet of space going in to the east that could put them at a disadvantage as well. As a citizen and business owner in Holladay, Mr. Peterson hoped to keep the revenue in the City.

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

(19:28:31) ***Commissioner Khodadad moved to continue the ORD signage issue to a future meeting and direct staff to put together additional information on a proposal for signage with the matter to be discussed further at a work meeting. Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.***

Commissioner Lowry asked if a presentation was to have been made by Young Electric and whether that would have made an impact on any decision. Mr. Allred spoke to a representative from Young Electric who provided basic input but he did not speak or meet with her in person. He offered to solicit additional information from her. Mr. Allred did not expect her to have offered anything different from what was presented tonight. Mr. Ludlow also offered to contact Young Electric Sign Company.

2. The Cottonwoods PUD, CUP, and Conceptual Permitted Site Plan Review – 1951 East 5600 South.

(19:40:56) City Planner, Rick Whiting, presented the staff report and stated that the proposal has several components. The applicants, Jeff and Clark Cannon, own a 3.5-acre parcel that is currently configured in three parcels on the northwest corner of Highland Drive and 5600 South. It is a major arterial intersection with heavy traffic. The Cannons currently own the medical plaza that occupies an approximately 19,000-square foot office building. The nature of their tenancy is changing with the new IHC facility opening to the south. The Cannons wish to demolish the building and construct a luxury residential apartment community in its place. Also on the site is an 8,000 square-foot medical/dental building, which they propose to retain and use as a dental office building. The balance of the site would house the residential community.

Mr. Whiting noted that the proposal represents deference to the Highland Drive Corridor Master Plan recently adopted by the City Council, which encourages buildings to be pushed out close to the street on Highland Drive to create a street presence. As development occurs over time it will change the nature of the Highland Drive Corridor. Mr. Whiting described the following three components of the ordinance that have jurisdiction over the proposition:

1. The underlying RM Zoning.
2. The Planned Unit Development (PUD), Chapter 13, of the zoning ordinance. This provision allows the developer to have more flexibility in the design of the project. Some of the elements of the proposed project can be mitigated under the PUD. As part of the PUD the applicant is required to establish that they have earned the right to develop a PUD. It is not an inherent right that is granted to the developer. They must show that there are extra value features and components of the project that allow for it.
3. The Conditional Use Section, which allows the Planning Commission to establish requirements and conditions that regulate how the project is built and will operate on a daily basis going forward.

(19:46:45) Mr. Whiting stated that staff has performed an initial analysis of the project and to date it appears to meet all code and ordinance requirements. Many details will need to be worked out going forward. Staff recommended the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and consider the input received. It was not recommended that a decision be made this evening and that additional time be given for details to be resolved and for additional information to come forward.

Chair Chatelain opened the public hearing.

(19:49:40) The applicant, Jeff Cannon introduced his son Clark Cannon. Together they own a small family investment company. He noted that the family has owned the Cottonwood Professional Plaza for 18 years. Mr. Cannon stated that the property was purchased as a medical/dental complex; however, there is a surplus of medical and office space in the area. The applicants looked at various alternatives for the site and acknowledged that it is outdated and needs to be replaced. Economically it is not feasible to replace it with office space. The family has owned apartments throughout the valley and in other states since 1973. Mr. Cannon recognized that Holladay has an abundance of apartments, but no high end apartments. By adding a residential component to the property, they will supply a need that is not currently being satisfied in the community. The subject property is 3.49 acres in size with another parcel of a similar size across the street that is vacant or occupied by dated properties. The Cannons were looking to develop on the fourth busiest street in Holladay. It was reported that the median household income in Holladay is \$66,000. One compelling fact was that 63.6% of the households in Holladay are couples with no children in the home. The proposed project would serve this demographic. If developed properly along the lines of the existing remodel, Mr. Cannon believed they could make a significant contribution to the community.

Mr. Cannon indicated that the zoning of the property changed only because the City incorporated. Under the RM Zone there are allowed uses that include residences and duplexes. Among the conditional uses are apartments or multi-family development. The height and setback requirements were reviewed. Mr. Cannon stated that they cannot build the 56 units and still retain the dental office building. For that reason, the Planned Unit Development concept was proposed.

(20:10:08) Clark Cannon commented that the rents will be approximately \$1,400 with each unit having its own garage, three-tone paint, upgraded carpet, granite counter tops, and upgraded cabinetry. The clubhouse will feature an indoor swimming pool and hot tub, an exercise facility, recreational facility, and management office. Chair Chatelain asked how the applicants can live up to the luxury component promise. Mr. Cannon stated that the final plans will have to be approved by the City. The proposed project would be modeled after the Holladay Gardens Condominium Project on Holladay Boulevard. It will be built in the “parkitecture design” with stone and wood-like features and have a lodge feel. There will also be an on-site manager and staff.

(20:15:41) Troy Winegar identified himself as a dentist who currently practices on the proposed property. He was present representing four other dentists who have offices on the property. For the last 18 years he has conducted his business in Holladay and wants to stay here. He did not feel the proposal put forward by Mr. Cannon would be conducive to their business. It was suggested that they purchase the newly remodeled building; however, they did not feel that the mixed-use nature of the property would benefit their businesses. They preferred to have their own entrance, parking, and grounds. They did not feel it would work well to share that with a residential development. If the proposal is approved, the dentists would vacate their businesses and relocate. Dr. Winegar also expressed concern about parking and access issues as well as overall visibility. He has a lease for approximately one year and would like to stay beyond that time. The dentists have entertained the idea of buying into the building but it is a major

collective effort for the dentists in the complex to do so. Dr. Winegar was discouraged by the project and the way it has been conducted over the past few years. He stated that it was becoming increasingly difficult for the dentists to be enthusiastic about maintaining their businesses here.

(20:22:25) A. Tom Nelson gave his address as 2155 Pheasant Way, approximately 1 ½ blocks east of the subject property. He has resided in the community all of his 79 years and is a fourth generation Holladay resident. Mr. Nelson also serves as Chairman of the Historical Commission of the City of Holladay and is very familiar with the area's history. He has been actively involved in four of the incorporation efforts. The one common thread people united behind was planning, zoning, and conditional use. They continually dealt with a non-responsive County Commission. Mr. Nelson thanked the Commission for their efforts. While he did not object to what was proposed somewhere else, he had concerns with this use at this location. He described the uniqueness of the area and considered it the last place in the City that such a development should occur. Mr. Nelson was concerned that the value of properties will plummet as a result of the proposed development. He urged the Commission to carefully consider the proposal and table the matter to allow further study and preserve the area.

(20:32:38) Gary Shields, a nearby resident stated that he has lived in the area for the past 40 years. During that time there has always been a good relationship between the citizens and the dentists in the complex. When he first moved to Holladay, the buildings were 12 feet high with one story and a flat roof. The most recent building was 35 to 40 feet high and blocks the view of the home immediately to the west. Mr. Shields identified his concerns, particularly with the canal and the potential for children to drown. He also questioned how much additional traffic would be generated. He calculated that only about 2.5 acres will be left for future development for the office building and the required parking.

(20:5:48) John Anderson gave his address as 2490 Walker Lane and stated that he is part owner in several commercial properties in Holladay. He appreciated Mr. Cannon's comments and understood the risks involved. His concern was that a PUD is proposed along with a dental building. His understanding was that with a PUD, the zoning requirements still must be met. He did not object to the apartments but stated that the applicants must redevelop the land occupied by the dental building in order to comply.

(20:37:50) Patricia Falk stated that she has owned property in Holladay for 20 years and has had a home in Holladay for 15 years. She also owns high-density apartments in Provo. She referred to the Fairbrook Apartments, which sit on a larger piece of property with 48 units. She stated that a luxury condo project exists on Murray Holladay Road but the units are 2,000 to 2,500 square feet in size and the building is nearly empty. Ms. Falk stated that there are always apartments available for rent in the area. She pointed out that the Brooks Condominiums lost three-quarters of their value and the Cottonwood Mall will no doubt result in a large residential development. She asked why residential and restaurant uses would be placed as close to Highland Drive as possible. She was concerned about the potential for traffic accidents.

(20:41:20) Candace Frioux gave her address as 1990 Pheasant Circle, directly across from the proposed project. She lives in a historical 130-year-old home and has spent 10 years restoring it.

She recognized the traffic issues on Highland Drive and felt that approving the proposed development would go against the goals of the City. She and her neighbors have gone to great lengths to preserve and keep the area beautiful and she hoped it would continue. Ms. Frioux thought it would be unfortunate to lose the dentists that she and many of her neighbors use. She did not think the proposed project was the right choice for the corner.

(20:44:52) Kevin Watts, a Pheasant Way resident, stated that a decision has already been made to rezone the area RM. He addressed the material elements that the neighbors will live with for years to come. He stated that those elements will be part of the character of the entry to the City. Mr. Watts considered the job of the Planning Commission to be significant since they will determine what the neighbors will have to live with for years to come. He noted that the density proposed cannot be achieved without three-level structures. He recommended there be a gradual residential transition and that the character that exists across the street be developed on this side.

(20:48:55) Dan Price gave his address as 2113 Pheasant Way and identified himself as a 20-year resident. The main reason he and his family moved to Holladay was because of the large lots and the atmosphere that makes Holladay so prestigious. To him, a keystone of the incorporation effort was that the residents wanted to control their destiny in terms of planning and zoning and stop projects like the one being proposed. Many enjoy the low densities that exist and the proposed development is diametrically opposed to the principles that Holladay was incorporated under. Mr. Price stated that the noticing done by the City of tonight's meeting required only that Mrs. Frioux be notified. Signatures were collected on a petition expressing strong opposition to the project. In a 12-hour period, approximately 100 signatures were collected. Given more time, he expected to be able to gather many more. Mr. Price expressed concern about the potential for property values to decrease. He works in property management and decided early on to work with only single-family residences.

(20:55:00) Paula Bowman resides next to Gary Shields and directly west of the subject property. She works very hard to keep her property in pristine condition. She thought the developer was misrepresenting what was proposed. Ms. Bowman stated that she lost her view with the clinic upgrade and the overall experience was unpleasant. As a landlord herself, she owns rental properties, and did not consider what was proposed to be "luxury" apartments. She expressed concern with potential noise and traffic accidents. She asked to see examples of other developments the applicants own. Ms. Bowman expressed appreciation to Tom Nelson for his input.

(20:58:56) Harvey Lloyd gave his address as 2119 Pheasant Lane, across from the subject property. He expressed opposition to the project. He was about to celebrate his 88th birthday and stated that he has owned his home for many years. He echoed the previous comments made and encouraged the Commission to consider the comments made before granting approval.

(21:00:10) Jenny Epperson, a Pheasant Way resident, was concerned as a runner and cyclist. She was hit and run over by a semi truck at the intersection of Holladay Boulevard and 6200 South and knows firsthand what heavy traffic can do to runners. They bought their older home because of the neighborhood and the large lots. She was shocked to learn that the zoning on the subject property is something other than commercial. She was also concerned that 56 apartment units

are proposed.

(21:01:54) Linda Burbidge, a Lakewood Drive resident, has a history with the property as her family bought a farm there many years ago and developed the property all the way to VanWinkle. She owns property in the area to the west of the canal. She reported that to the west of the subject property there is a bridge that crosses the canal and goes into a neighborhood. If the project were developed, people could access private homes and a large number of children could use the short cut to get to school. She noted that the privacy of some of the homeowners will be compromised if the project is developed as planned. She agreed with the previous concerns raised, particularly with respect to parking.

(21:05:00) Gil Schorlemmer identified himself as a physician and stated that he lives next to Linda Shields. He reminded the Commission that the density was supposed to have been no more than 10 or 12 units on the two-acre plot if density were to remain the same. For those who own larger properties, their property values will decrease if multi-family development occurs. The neighbors do not want the residential nature of the neighborhood to change. He considered the duty of the Planning Commission to be to protect the citizens from changes that materially affect the way their properties were meant to be used. Dr. Schorlemmer hoped the Commission would not turn the neighborhood into “East Valley City”.

(21:07:17) Nadine Nelson reported that she has resided at 2155 Pheasant Way for the past 59 years. She thought the subject property would be a wonderful place for three or four homes, which would be a credit to the community rather than a blight. She stated that they worked very long and hard as citizens to incorporate. Now they find themselves begging and pleading with the City to protect and preserve this special area.

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

(21:09:25) Mr. Cannon was surprised to hear Dr. Winegar’s position since one of the reasons the project was proposed was to accommodate the dentists. He recognized the need for balance between the neighbors and the economic imperative. Mr. Cannon informed Mr. Nelson that the ditch was left open and it flows across the creek. He agreed that the density is higher than what currently exists, but in the industry it is considered very low. Mr. Cannon stated that Gary Shields has been a neighbor for many years and he recognizes that there has to be a visual block between his property and the subject parcel because the Salt Lake City and Jordan Canal requires it be shaded at all times. That has been accomplished next to the Bowman’s property. That is not the case; however, near the Shields property and more trees need to be planted to adhere to that requirement. Mr. Cannon stated that their intent was not to block Mr. Shields’ view and they plan to accommodate the neighborhood as best they can.

Mr. Cannon referenced Mr. Watts’ comments and stated that their desire would be to move the buildings to the back and leave the trees at the front. He offered to discuss the issue with the neighbors in more detail. He stated that it was possible to make the units 1½ stories high, which would make them half the height of the home to the north and lower than the renovated building.

(21:22:56) Commissioner Garver appreciated the Cannons' desire to improve the property and the appearance of the building. He hoped a solution could be reached that makes owning the property still lucrative for the property owner while addressing the neighbors' concerns.

(21:24:30) *Commissioner Snow moved to table the public hearing until a second neighborhood meeting can be held. Commissioner Lowry seconded the motion.*

Commissioner Khodadad made a friendly amendment and suggested staff and the Commission conduct additional research on the issue and study the code and the intent of the area. Commissioners Snow and Lowry accepted the friendly amendment.

Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Building Height in "P" Zone – Planner: Paul Allred.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Residential Building Corridor and Front Setback Code Amendment – Planners: Paul Allred and Jonathan Teerlink.

(21:36:06) City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, explained that building corridors and front setbacks do and must correlate. He explained that a building corridor is a measurement from the street and includes the depth of the property to a distance determined as the building corridor limit, which is the area where the maximum height of the home may be built. This limit is determined by measuring the depths of homes on either side of the subject property. In essence it is a backyard view corridor protection area. It limits the maximum heights of homes running the entire length of the property down the side of the property line.

Mr. Teerlink explained that in order to start a measurement of where the building corridor begins, a determination must be made as to where the front yard setback starts using the homes on either side. The intent would be for the front wall to mimic the existing development pattern on the street. Specific examples were given along with details of how the setbacks were calculated. Mr. Teerlink planned to present the Commission with proposed new language to be adopted at a future meeting.

(21:55:00) Mr. Teerlink further explained that the goal is to find out what the Code does prior to the temporary regulations and what the temporary regulations do to the building corridor and the front yard setback. More specific examples were given regarding how to calculate the front yard setback, side yards, and backyards using the previous method. If setbacks cannot be determined, the temporary regulation proposes that it be allowed to continue down the street, terminating at the corner.

The Commission discussed further the 15% increase that would be applied to homes built prior to the year 2000. Mr. Teerlink stated that the strategy going forward was to limit the increase factor. Commissioner Lowry was interested to see if trends have changed. She remarked that in the 1940s and 1950s homes were built according to a family's needs and homes were not overly

large. She thought it would be interesting to see if the preference for huge homes will continue. Mr. Allred remarked that the apex of that has already passed. He had read several articles that indicate that home sizes are rapidly decreasing. He conducted a study in 2005 for Davis County where he discovered that Utah has the largest average home size and car ownership in the nation. The trend now is scaling back.

(20:04:13) In response to a question raised by Commissioner Lowry, Mr. Whiting stated that excessively large homes in the City became a problem. He took pictures of homes throughout the City and found that there were 20 to 30 that fit into the category of “overly large and imposing” and where the massing did not fit the fabric of the neighborhood. Mr. Teerlink estimated that prior to 2007 there were fewer than 10 such homes. Staff agreed that imposing the timeline would eliminate future issues.

5. Building Height in “P” Zone – Planner: Paul Allred.

(22:11:26) Mr. Allred described the proposal to add height flexibility to the Public Zone. Within the P Zone are located most churches, schools, quasi public and public institutions. The item in question was what kind of height should be allowed in the zone. The current provision states that no structure in the P Zone can contain more than three stories or exceed 35 feet in height. Mr. Allred thought the question to be raised was whether any problems will be being created by simply allowing additional height in the P Zone, and what that height should be. He thought 35 feet was fairly restrictive, particularly when homes are allowed 40 feet on the same sized lot. The proposed code amendment addresses architectural elements and the height of buildings. Mr. Allred recommended the Commission approve the amendment or suggest changes prior to it being reviewed by the City Council.

Chair Chatelain asked the architects serving on the Commission to give suggestions regarding the details of allowable heights. Further details were offered regarding the allowance of three stories as well as the building height being increased to 48 feet.

(22:23:16) Chair Chatelain opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. The public hearing was closed.

(22:23:31) Commissioner Snow moved to recommend the City Council adopt the 48-foot height limitation in the P Zone. Commissioner Bowthorpe seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

MINUTES

6. Approve Minutes of the April 17, 2012 Meeting.

The minutes were reviewed and modified.

(22:30:45) Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to continue consideration of the minutes and approve them at the next meeting. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

(22:31:35) A question was raised about an arcade use on Highland Drive. Mr. Allred stated that the applicants obtained approval to open.

Commissioner Lowry observed that Kokopelis is now open for business.

Problems with graffiti were discussed. Mr. Allred stated that Doug Brewer informed him that there were over 100 hits in April. Graffiti has become a serious problem that has come to the attention of the Council. They are considering whether to provide materials or a crew to clean it up.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Khodadad, Mr. Allred clarified that if the proposed language in the P Zone is adopted, the Cottonwood Country Club could be built to a height of 48 feet.

8. Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.

(22:33:35) Mr. Allred updated the Commission on the Village Center and stated that the application has been submitted. The basics of the design were reviewed and discussed.

9. Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.

ADJOURN

(22:41:05) *Commissioner Garver moved to adjourn. Commissioner Lowry seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Troy Holbrook-Aye, Lori Khodadad-Aye, Matt Snow-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Paula Lowry-Aye, Spence Bowthorpe-Aye, Chair Les Chatelain-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:41 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, May 15, 2012.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: June 19, 2012