

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

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

7:00 p.m.

Holladay City Hall

4580 South 2300 East

FIELD TRIP: Attendance: Paul Allred, Jon Teerlink, Matt Snow. Two sites were visited; Hillsden Stream Exception and Bryson Subdivision. Field trip ended at 6:20pm.

PRE-MEETING: The pre-meeting was held with Staff and some commissioners present. Agenda items were summarized and briefly discussed during a meal. No decisions were made during this meeting. This meeting adjourned at approximately 7:00pm.

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Matt Snow, Chair

Jim Carter

John Garver

Chris Jensen

City Staff:

Paul Allred, Community Development Director

Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner

Pat Hanson, City Planner

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING

Chair Matt Snow called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

1. Welcome & Chair Opening Statement.

Chair Snow welcomed those present and described the role of the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Chapter 13.100-Allowed Uses-Dining Club (Liquor) as a Conditional Use in the HV Zone, Applicant, Loni Lowder, Agent for the Copper Kitchen Restaurant – Staff – Pat Hanson, City Planner.

(19:07:31) City Planner, Pat Hanson, presented the staff report and stated that the owners of the new Copper Kitchen Restaurant sent a letter to the City requesting that the land use allowances in the Holladay Village be reviewed and expanded to allow them to obtain a Dining Club License. Ms. Hanson explained that a dining club license allows a restaurant to have a dedicated bar area where they can serve mixed drinks, cocktails, and liquor. The applicants must show the UDABC that of their total sales; at least 60% is food, which must be provided whenever liquor is sold. The Utah Department of Alcohol Beverage Control (UDABC) has strict regulations about how the dining club portion of the business is operated, particularly where minors are in the restaurant. She noted that there are only limited occasions when minors are allowed to be in the area.

Ms. Hanson explained that these types of alcohol uses in the Land Use Code are always required to be an accessory use. The expansion of the liquor license would not allow someone to open a

tavern and that this type of alcohol use must always be in conjunction with a restaurant. Ms. Hanson presented a draft of a conditional use, which would require a conditional use permit be issued any time a dining club is allowed in the zone. Originally alcohol uses were all conditional. Over the years, however, conditions could not be imposed because all of the regulations were under the jurisdiction of the UDABC. The Commission can recommend the use remain conditional, allow it as a permitted use, or deny the request.

(19:12:48) Chair Snow opened the public hearing. There were no members of the public wishing to speak. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Carter referenced the use table showing that permitted uses in the Holladay Village Zone include off-premise sales of alcoholic beverages, on-premises banquets and catering, on-premises beer, full service restaurant, limited service restaurant, and special event permit. It seemed to Commissioner Carter to be consistent with the way the City has dealt with club licenses in other zones. Commissioner Jensen liked the consistency of it remaining a conditional use.

(19:15:22) *Commissioner Carter moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council amend the ordinance to make Club, Dining Liquor Use in the Holladay Village Zone a conditional use. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

3. **Bryson Subdivision – 1981 East 4625 South – Amended Plat and Conceptual Subdivision Approval, Applicants, Terri and Robert Bryson, Staff – Paul Allred, Community Development Director.**

(19:17:25) Community Development Director, Paul Allred, presented the staff report and explained that the applicants are proposing to take a long, narrow piece of property and split it in two from front to back. He spoke to a neighbor who owns property to the rear who had questions about the type of housing proposed. Mr. Allred explained to him that the proposal is to build two new single-family homes but only one (net) new dwelling. A single-family home already exists on the property and will be torn down. The new lot line will go through the existing home with a new property created to the rear. The homes will not be side-by-side on the street but will be situated with one home in the front and one in the rear. Each lot will be approximately 11,000 square feet in size with the minimum square footage in the zone being 10,000.

Mr. Allred reported that the existing streets are in place and there is a corner property owned by the Gambles who would like to give a small portion of their lot to the Bryson's to create a better drive entrance into the subdivision. The result would be a three-lot subdivision with only one new lot since two already exist. The public hearing would address two issues tonight. One was whether there is damage or harm to the neighborhood by allowing the Gamble property to separate from the subdivision it is in now and become part of the new one. One additional new home was proposed to be built in the back with a 20-foot wide driveway from front to back, which is the minimum necessary for fire engine access. The new subdivision requires enhanced

fire safety and the road will be have to be improved and widened. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Commissioner Jensen commented on the surrounding properties and stated that the new homes will be further away from the Miller home. Mr. Allred explained that the City requires new uses fit in with the neighborhood. In this instance, the requirements pertaining to setbacks and the placement of the home will be more restrictive than the homes around it. Mr. Allred noted that the building heights are capped at 32 feet. Sheds can be no more than 25% of the rear yard area and must have a minimum setback of five feet on the side and rear with a maximum height of 20 feet. He reported that outbuildings are not regulated by the City in terms of a building permit until they reach 200 square feet in size.

Mr. Allred explained that years ago the City tried to adopt rules limiting the construction of dwellings that resemble rectangular boxes. Property owners are allowed to average their yards and architectural movement of buildings is encouraged with a flexible building envelope. In addition it is not a requirement that yards be fenced, however, most property owners want them out of self-interest.

An unidentified neighbor commented that her home will be much higher and was concerned that the second home will detract from her privacy and view. Mr. Allred indicated that currently safety rules regarding fencing around pools should already be in place.. What is proposed would not change that since the pool is in place now and there is no pool planned for the new home. Pool must be enclosed with a five-foot tall self-closing, self-latching gate. The new home would not change that. If additional privacy is desired, the possibility of an eight-foot fence could be discussed with the new owner.

Randy Krantz was present on behalf of the applicants and gave his address as 5005 Heather Lynn Lane. He noted that with regard to the side yards, everyone has the same setbacks and what is proposed would be no different than what exists currently. The applicants are not seeking a variance or anything beyond what is allowed currently. Mr. Krantz explained that the location of the proposed driveway is intended to allow more room on the front lot. Also, the existing home will still meet all requirements once the proposed changes are made to the property.

(19:50:45) Chair Snow opened the public hearing. Written comments submitted by Margaret Little and Ryan Price were made part of the record.

Ryan Price gave his address as 4581 South Willow Road and stated that his property is directly north of the subject property. He asked about the streetlight and if it will be shining down or out. Mr. Allred explained that the applicants are not required to install a new streetlight and he doubted they were planning to. Mr. Price asked about irrigation canal access through driveway. Mr. Allred stated that that issue would be dealt with at the next stage. The operator of the utility will want to continue to have access. In terms of potential impact to the neighborhood, Mr. Price stated that there are eight lots that are all of the exact same size as the one being proposed to be split. His main concern was with the precedent being set. Currently there is a vacant lot three or four properties down and he envisioned someone buying it and trying to develop a PUD.

(19:54:45) Bilden Miller gave her address as 1973 East Crest Hill and stated that she lives next to the subject property. She asked for clarification on the side yard setbacks. Mr. Allred explained that the setbacks for the front lot must be an average the four closest properties along the street. The property owners are, however, limited because of the driveway and have a more restrictive side yard than they would have otherwise. The side yard rules specify that 25% of the total property width must be in side yards with one being at least 10 percent of the lot width.

Nancy Proctor gave her address as 4580 Sycamore and stated that her main issue is privacy. She reported that they have lived in the home for the past 38 years and would not have built a pool without the privacy they have enjoyed. In response to a question raised, Mr. Allred clarified that the fence could be eight-foot chain link or a wall with the consent of the neighboring property owner. The irrigation ditch access had already been accessed through the subject property rather than Ms. Proctor's and stated that there was a fence in between the two at one point. Ms. Proctor was concerned that things will change for her and that she has few options because she is retired and widowed. She stated that having lighting at the rear of the second lot will impact her and result in lights shining into her living room and bedrooms. It was noted that the pool is located in the south corner of the property.

(20:00:32) There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Krantz stated that they would continue to allow irrigation access from the property. With regard to lighting, the applicants will work with the neighbors and not place lights in questionable areas.

A question was raised by Commissioner Garver about how large the home could be on the lot. Mr. Allred stated that in 2007 the City rewrote all of its regulations in an effort to address the "monster" home issue. A very large and tall home was built on Olympus Drive on an existing property that was not being divided. Similarly, in this case a very large home could be built, however, the height would be limited to 32 feet in the building corridor, which is an average of the depth of the four closest homes plus an additional 15% allowance. Because the property is being divided, it prevents a massive home from going in that might dwarf the neighboring homes, however, the rule does prevent a very tall, large and long home from going in and ruining the neighbors' views.

Commissioner Carter commented that as land values increase, people take closer looks at one-half acre lots and areas where one-quarter acre subdivisions are allowed and how they can increase the property value. In many cases, redevelopment is being considered even in stable neighborhoods. Mr. Allred stated that in terms of policy, these two new homes are being built in context and are similar to those surrounding them with lots in the 10,000 to 12,000 square foot range. The proposed lot, for example, is 11,000 square feet in size.

Procedural issues were discussed. Mr. Allred described the three motions to be made by the Planning Commission.

(20:11:36) *Commissioner Carter moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they vacate the cul-de-sac portion of the existing right-of-way on the north side as shown on the conceptual subdivision plat based on the following:*

Findings:

- a. The portion of the City's right-of-way is not now, nor has been for many years, neither used for City purposes.*
- b. The road is complete and is in use in both directions and, therefore, won't be needed for turnaround purposes. It connects all the way through.*
- c. The area of the cul-de-sac that is vacated contributes to a larger lot area, more attractive shape of the front yard, more usable area, and the area has already been ostensibly in private use for many years without objection by the City. The vacation of the space is a better option than entering into an agreement with the City for its long-term use.*

John Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Jim Carter-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

(20:13:00) *Commissioner Jensen moved to approve the removal of Lot 3 from the Holladay Estates Subdivision included in the proposed Bryson Subdivision subject to the following:*

Findings:

- a. The removal of Lot 9 Holladay Estates (Lot 3 Bryson) constitutes no harm to the existing subdivision; it simply relocates it into another plat.*
- b. 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.*
- c. 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 Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Jim Carter-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Carter stated that he is a long-time resident and has personal concern about what is in effect the redevelopment of the City of Holladay. His sense was that moving forward there are existing zoning, entitlements, and personal property rights to respect. He noted that the rules are in place. Absent a change of heart or thinking by the City Council, in these circumstances he leaned toward allowing for reasonable rezoning of large lots as long as they are consistent with the underlying standards of the existing zoning. The end result is large setbacks and less building mass on the lots than the option mentioned earlier.

(20:16:04) *Commissioner Carter moved to approve the conceptual subdivision plan request noting that there will be a preliminary plat at which time they will look at the specifics and access to the irrigation ditch in the rear. Approval was subject to the following:*

Finding:

- a. *The subdivision complies with the City's standards for conceptual subdivision plan for all lots in the proposed development in the existing R-1-10 zone regardless whether or not the area of the City's right-of-way is included in the subdivision or not.*

Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Jim Carter-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Allred informed the Commission that only the street vacation will go on to the City Council. City Planner, Pat Hanson, suggested that they not wait until the end of the subdivision process to take the matter to the Council and instead send it on to them now so that they can give input on the subdivision prior to the Commission making a recommendation. For that reason, the matter included three separate motions.

4. Schaeffer Residence – 2478 East Haven Lane – Residential Development Near a Waterway, Applicant Daniel Schaffer – Staff – Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner.

(20:17:50) City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, presented the staff report and stated that normally residential construction is a permitted activity that only staff reviews based on codifying codes, ordinances, and regulations. The exception is if they are within 100 feet of Big Cottonwood Creek. The exception is the result of water quality issues, water that is owned by Salt Lake Public Utilities, flood control issues, and bank stability concerns. It was noted that whenever there is construction within 100 feet of streams it must be reviewed specifically in the public realm. The concerns are to be addressed by the Planning Commission via a review and recommendation either for or against, and reviewed by the City Engineer based on what plans have been submitted to staff for review. The Schaffer residence is an existing developed lot with a single-family home and a detached guesthouse. The guesthouse is on the bank and has been there for a long time. The applicant is proposing to leave the majority of the guesthouse, tear down the existing front home, and rebuild and attach the two structures.

Mr. Teerlink reported that with the proposed reconstruction of the home, the architect has done a very good job of noting the 100-foot review line. He estimated that the new construction is 25% of the proposed project, which was being reviewed tonight. City Engineer, Clarence Kemp, reviewed the project with the plans on site and found there to be no bank destabilization or alteration of the stream water, he verified that it is not in the flood plain, and that there are no significant trees along the banks that need to be removed because most of the area is not proposed to be within the project area. There is, however, one irrigation lateral that runs east/west. It is currently piped under the guest house and daylights further west. The majority of the water is owned and maintained by Mr. McCarthy who lives adjacent to the property. Mr. McCarthy contacted staff and expressed concern with maintaining the quantity and quality of the irrigation water being purveyed through the property. Mr. Kemp reviewed the situation and maintained that it has not been proposed to be relocated or changed in any other way. As long as it remains in its current configuration and the same amount of water comes in as flows out, there

should not be a problem. If it needs to be modified in any manner, it would have to come back to the City Engineer for approval. Mr. Teerlink stated that the City Engineer recommended approval of the project as proposed with the conditions and findings set forth in the staff report.

(20:24:28) Lance Howell gave his address as 4832 Wander Lane and identified himself as the General Contractor employed by the Schaffer's to complete the project. He clarified that the majority of the guesthouse will be retained, which is the portion closest to the creek. With regard to the irrigation ditch, the intent is for it to remain undisturbed.

Chair Snow opened the public hearing.

Barry Topham gave his address as 2520 Haven Lane, which is three doors up from the subject property. Dr. Topham is a 37-year resident and purchased the property because of the ditch, which is beautiful and comes out of the Big Cottonwood Stream about 1 ½ blocks above his home. It has been for the use of the residents on the south side of Haven Lane. It originally ran under Cottonwood Lane and entered the Big Cottonwood Stream. Over the past 25 years, Lindsay McCarthy has diverted the ditch so that it goes under Haven Lane and waters the pasture at the bottom of Haven Lane on the north side. Dr. Topham reported that a previous owner put the addition directly on the bank. He noted that it never should have been approved and the neighbors were never notified. He was upset that the ditch was put into a culvert underneath the construction. There have been no problems to his knowledge with the ditch and the culvert but it now appears that the portion of the structure that covered the ditch is being removed except for a 10-foot wide connection between the addition and the proposed new home. Dr. Topham thought now would be an ideal time to expose the ditch, reopen it, and let it flow freely. He stated that it would be much easier to maintain the flow against any possible obstruction if there were a culvert rather than the existing 30 to 40-foot culvert.

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

Mr. Howell clarified that the Schaffers' intent is to have the ditch be a significant part of the back of their home, as it is currently.

Commissioner Jensen asked if there is a recorded easement around the ditch and if the existing home was built before or after the City of Holladay was incorporated. He also asked to be provided with more history on the existing guesthouse and why it is so close to the stream. Mr. Teerlink stated that he did not conduct any research on when the structure was built. The stream is a private water utility and is maintained as such. It was proposed to Mr. Teerlink that Mr. McCarthy has access through a maintenance easement to the head gates to maintain the ditch and lateral. Historical water rights users and owners have to maintain the lateral through which their water runs. If the water runs through the backyards of private property owners, they have to grant access to them. Mr. Teerlink stated that there are a lot of canal and irrigation laterals that are piped through backyards. Over the years, hundreds of feet of irrigation laterals have been piped. When that occurs, the private property owner enters into an agreement with the ditch company that they will own and maintain the facility. He explained that if the ditch fails, the City doesn't maintain it and it will be the responsibility of the private property owner who could be liable for the lost water rights for the downstream user.

With regard to the guesthouse being placed on the bank, Salt Lake County only had rear yard setbacks and flood control requirements, which require at least 20 feet in width to access a water body. The only restriction would be for the structure to have a rear yard setback. Mr. Howell explained that what Mr. Teerlink described were the non-specific easements that all water appropriators have, which is to go to the point of diversion, divert the water, and ensure that the transfer is conveyed. For the non-specific easements, which are prevalent throughout the City, there are no recorded easements. Most water companies establish easements of record so that they show up on plats. The non-specific easement is free-floating and they have the right to get the water to their property. However, the property owners across from which the water flows have the right to move it around and culvert it as long as they are not reducing either the quantity or quality of the water. Mr. Teerlink stated that the City's desire is to protect the rights of the water users and the safety of the structure that goes over those types of facilities.

Mr. Howell stated that one of the goals of what is proposed is to provide cost savings for the Schaffers in looking at the entire project. The original architectural design was to remove that portion as well and build on to the existing foundation. In looking at that, however, they realized that the cost would be more than was feasible and they could simply preserve the rear structure, which was newer than the front portion.

(20:48:33) In response to a comment, Mr. Teerlink clarified that the non-conforming section of the ordinance addresses the removal of more than 50% of the non-conforming structure. He was aware of no portion that is non-conforming because the County never had a 100-foot buffer and it is not a setback. If more than 50% were demolished they would lose that.

Dr. Topham was surprised at the cement ditch the Houstons' installed that the water runs through into the culvert as a diversion. He stated that that should not be done and water that goes into the ditch is supposed to keep flowing through it. He hoped that that could be closed off in addition to opening up the ditch. He thought that would assure better water flows and stated that the greater amount of pipe the greater the chance of a clog.

Chair Snow's understanding was that the ditch, its flow, and water rights are a valid point that may need to be addressed but are not part of the stream setback issue being considered tonight.

Commissioner Carter commented that the bigger issue is to put water from an irrigation ditch back into the stream. He noted that it is a point source and needs to be permitted under the MPDES discharge permit requirements. He explained that the tools in place are focused on protecting the water quality and Big Cottonwood Creek, which is the reason for the 100-foot special protection area. He did not think the City had created tools for the Planning Commission to weigh in on what happens to the ditch unless they can conclude that what is occurring with the ditch is adversely affecting Big Cottonwood Creek.

(20:54:50) Commissioner Jensen commented that if a pipe has to be sized to carry a capacity of water in a short distance, if water is being diverted, the capacity of the pipe has to be taken into account because it may not meet the requirements if the diversion is closed off. Mr. Howell explained that the quality of the construction and the culvert will be designed with a significant safety feature in terms of volume of flow, which will be greater than the entry, exit, or size of the

ditch. It was recognized that from a private perspective there may be issues that the Schaffers will have to address with regard to a diversion that may have been installed illegally. Commissioner Jensen stated that that issue would need to be addressed before moving forward. Mr. Teerlink suggested that perhaps it would be best to remove the diversion so that it would not be feasible to divert water there. In addition, the culvert needs to be adequately sized to avoid overflow and consequential damage to the creek. He considered the issue to be an engineering issue in terms of culvert sizing rather than a stream exception issue.

(21:05:37) Commissioner Jensen moved to approve the stream exception at 2478 East Haven Lane in Holladay, Utah, known as the Daniel Schaffer Property subject to the following:

Findings:

- 1. Finding listed in the City Engineer's letter of consent (09/23/2015).*

Approval of the single-family redevelopment is based on the following:

Findings:

- 1. Finding listed in the City Engineer's letter of consent (09/23/2015).*
- 2. There is no stream course alteration is proposed.*
- 3. The project is not within a FEMA regulated floodplain*
- 4. The area is not considered wetlands.*
- 5. The project replaces an existing home located partially within the 100-foot stream review area.*
- 6. No expansion closer to the creek of the existing rear structure is proposed.*
- 7. The proposal exceeds the Utah Division of Water rights requirement of "two times the bank full width from the bank full elevation to permanent structures such as houses..."*
- 8. The proposal does not require review of other agencies.*
- 9. No bank disturbance or modification is proposed.*

Requirements/Limitations:

- 1. Limitations 1-3 shall be followed as listed in the City Engineer's letter of consent (09/23/2015 attached).*
- 2. Prior to demolition, a construction fence shall be installed west of the new home as a "project disturbance limit" protecting and preserving the large grove of existing trees located adjacent the project and shall be maintained throughout the construction period.*

3. *All future landscaping, flatwork, and grading are not approved by this request and must be submitted for approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer prior to commencing work.*
4. *All conditions listed in the City Engineer's consent letter must be followed and reviewed and regularly monitored by staff during construction.*
5. *All construction-related improvements must follow current applicable Holladay zoning and building codes.*
6. *Calculations for the flow of water must be provided as part of the construction documents for the existing ditch that will be maintained and remain in the existing condition going under the new garage portion of the house. The calculations will show that the capacity of the culvert or the canal is capable of meeting all of the requirements of the ditch.*
7. *Any structural modifications that will affect the footprint of the existing pool house are not allowed and will require a new approval above and beyond windows, siding, roofing, and interior construction. No footprint modifications, other than what has been proposed for the demolition of the portion shown, shall be approved.*

Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER ACTION ITEMS

5. Minutes – September 1, 15, and 23, and October 1, 2015 Meetings.

(21:18:43) The minutes of September 1, 2015, were reviewed and modified.

(21:31:10) *Commissioner Jensen moved to approve the meeting minutes of September 1, 2015, with the changes provided by staff and the additional changes made tonight. Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

The minutes of September 15, 2015, were reviewed and modified. Due to the critical nature of issues discussed at the meeting, it was suggested that they be transcribed verbatim. Mr. Allred noted, however, that the minutes are the official record and not a verbatim transcript. The minutes were to be modified by staff and brought back for approval at a future meeting.

The minutes of September 23, 2015, were reviewed and discussed.

(21:40:10) *Commissioner Jensen moved to approve the meeting minutes from the Planning Commission Special Work Meeting held on Wednesday, September 23, 2015, as noted. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

The minutes of October 1, 2015, were reviewed and modified.

City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 10/20/2015

(21:42:48) *Commissioner Jensen moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Special Work Meeting held on Thursday, October 1, 2015, with the changes as noted. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

6. **General Plan Amendment Public Hearing – (Continued) & Work Session on Draft Chapters.**

OTHER BUSINESS

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

8. **Report from Staff on Upcoming Applications.**

9. **Discussion of Possible Future Amendments to Code.**

10. **Calendar for Future Meeting on General Plan Update.**

ADJOURN

(21:43:08) *Commissioner Jensen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Chris Jensen-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting held Tuesday, October 20, 2015.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: 12/8/15