

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

Tuesday, January 10, 2023

5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Howard Layton, Chair

Karianne Prince

Chris Layton

Dennis Roach

Paul Cunningham

Ginger Vilchinsky

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, Community Development Director

Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

WORK SESSION

Chair Howard Layton called the Work Session to order at 5:35 p.m. All Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Banks, who was excused.

The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. City Planner, Carrie Marsh reported that there is one public hearing on the Regular Meeting agenda and two Action Items. The hearing pertained to the Millwood Estates Townhomes. The item would be presented by Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink. The Action Items related to the Highland Park Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) and the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Teerlink shared information regarding the Millwood Estates Townhomes. He explained that this project is in the Holladay Village Zone, which is a mixed-use zone. Residential, retail, and office uses are permitted in any combination. Mr. Teerlink reported that the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”) reviewed the architecture and the Site Plan layout for the Millwood Estates Townhomes application. The applicant, who is the property owner, selected residential-only use. This was acceptable as long as there are fewer than 24 units per acre. Based on the lot size of approximately 0.73 acres, the maximum density was 17 units. The proposal was for 16 total units, which was under the maximum allowed in the zone.

An architectural review was conducted by the Design Review Board (“DRB”). Mr. Teerlink reported that the DRB reviews applications and makes recommendations to the Planning Commission about the style of buildings. The DRB was used to looking at larger mixed-use buildings in the Holladay Village Zone but this proposal was similar to the Locust Lane Townhomes project located directly to the south. It was all residential and went through a similar design process.

Mr. Teerlink explained that with the Millwood Estates Townhomes application, the DRB wanted the drawings to match the existing home as much as possible. The intention was for the early 1900s home aesthetic to be incorporated into the architecture of the new homes. Luckily for the applicant, the term for DRB Member, Nolan Mendenhall had ended. Mr. Mendenhall served on the DRB for six years and was hired by the applicant after his term. He assisted with the designs and shared his interpretation of what the DRB was looking for. Those designs had since been approved by the DRB and were included in the packet. Mr. Teerlink informed the Commission that the drawings met the Holladay Village Zone standards and matched many features of the existing 1912 home. The DRB recommended approval.

Chair Howard Layton noted that each of the cottage homes is a duplex. There would be separate living areas and separate entrances. Commissioner Chris Layton wondered if there were four units in the existing home. Mr. Teerlink clarified that there are three units in the existing home. The south side included five twin homes with a detached, single-family home on the north end. Commissioner Chris Layton expressed concerns about parking. He wondered if the 20 stalls proposed met the requirements of the Holladay Village Zone. Additionally, he wanted to understand whether the Holladay Village Zone allows for tandem parking for different dwelling units. Mr. Teerlink explained that tandem parking is an efficient use of parking stalls but works best within the same unit. As far as the calculations were concerned, parking was a ratio based on the number of bedrooms in a unit. The units will have fewer than three bedrooms and 1.5 stalls per unit are required. That resulted in an overall parking calculation of 21 stalls.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the conceptual layout was reviewed by the TRC. It was determined to be sufficient for Planning Commission consideration. However, though the Millwood Estates Townhomes item had been noticed for preliminary level review as well, he did not think the application was quite ready. There were still some outstanding issues from the TRC. Specifically, Utility Service Letters were missing. The entitlement process could not move forward without verification that the new units can be serviced by water, sewer, and power. In terms of the Planning Commission determination, the Conceptual Plan could be reviewed. A decision could be made about whether the Preliminary Plan approval should be continued to another meeting or if the items should be reviewed by Staff and brought back to the Final Site Plan level.

Commissioner Prince asked for clarification and wanted to know if the suggestion was that there not be a Preliminary Plan approval. This was confirmed. Mr. Teerlink explained that once a Preliminary Site Plan is approved, the site is entitled to those units. The City should not be entitling units without knowing whether those units can be serviced. Commissioner Cunningham asked about parking. He believed there were three driveways to the back. Mr. Teerlink stated that there is a primary driveway that had been there for a long time. It services the units in the home. The existing carport was put in a year ago. The proposal was to add another carport. With regard to traffic, the Public Works and Engineering Departments had issues with the proposal. The City Engineer had not made an official recommendation because that was part of the preliminary level review. By the time the item came back to the Commission for preliminary review, there would likely be a determination that there should not be any parking on one side of the street.

Commissioner Cunningham referenced the in-and-out driveway off Holladay Boulevard. The area was identified on a map displayed. Mr. Teerlink explained that it had been considered for guest

parking. He was not sure whether the dimensions worked for parallel parking there. There was a desire for it to be surveyed but he believed there was room for three or four guest parking stalls in the circular drive. However, those were not included in the 21 parking space count. Commissioner Cunningham believed the overflow parking from those residences would end up on a public street. This was a concern. Mr. Teerlink informed the Commission that he did not have a full review from the Engineering Department. The concept level idea currently was that parking shall be prohibited on Locust Lane on one side or both sides. If it was determined that it would not be allowed on both sides that would impact everyone that accessed Locust Lane.

Commissioner Prince asked if there was a way to grandfather in the existing use. For instance, there could be a resident permit for those who currently live in the area. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that this was possible. Locust Lane could be added to a residential permitting program. There were residential permits in other areas of the City. Commissioner Prince was concerned about the narrative that described construction taking up part of a public road. Mr. Teerlink explained that at the preliminary level for a Master Site Plan review, the applicant would need to share a staging and construction schedule with the Commission. Once a larger site plan is in place, trucking routes and access points for staging materials would be required. Theoretically, there would not be overflow onto Locust Lane during the construction process.

Commissioner Chris Layton believed the parking strategy was tandem parking for two different owners and dwelling units rather than one dwelling unit. Mr. Teerlink noted that there would be two spaces for each duplex. There would be tandem parking for the shared units. He identified the additional parking areas for the larger models. Commissioner Chris Layton pointed out another tandem parking spot for the units in the north building. That was the single-family home. Commissioner Chris Layton wondered if the parking requirements in the City allowed different dwelling units to park in tandem. Mr. Teerlink reported that it was not specifically mentioned as an allowed use, but it was something that could be reviewed further with the applicant.

There was discussion regarding emergency access. Mr. Teerlink explained that when there is a 20-foot-wide emergency access point, there is always a No Parking condition. That would carry over to the plat when it is recorded. The Fire Marshal would look for No Parking signs to be posted once the houses are occupied. Commissioner Cunningham expressed concerns about the parking presented. He was not certain it was adequate.

Ms. Marsh reviewed one of the Action Items on the Regular Meeting agenda. It related to the Highland Park PUD. She explained that the Concept Plan was reviewed and approved on October 4, 2022. The property is located off Highland Circle just west of the Cottonwood Mall. The proposal was to put in three triplexes and one duplex for 11 total units. The buildings would be grouped in a way that would preserve open space to the extent possible. All of the civil plans were done and a construction narrative was submitted. The last item on the agenda was the approval of the Meeting Minutes from September 27, 2022, and December 6, 2022.

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Opening Statement by Commission Chair.

Chair Howard Layton called the Regular Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. He read the Commission Statement for the benefit of those present.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **“Millwood Estates” Townhomes – Conceptual/Preliminary Plan & Building Design – 4600 South Holladay Boulevard (HV ZONE). Conceptual/Preliminary Level Review and Consideration of a Residential Development Proposal by Property Owner, Marlyn Miller for 6 Duplex Townhomes within the Holladay Village Zone. Item to be Reviewed as an Administrative Action of a Permitted Land Use. Review to Include Architectural Design, Amenities, and Site Layout Details as Per Procedures and Development Standards of the Holladay Village Zone §13.71, and §13.08.080 of the Holladay Code. File #18-9-02-1.**

Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink reported that the above item relates to the Millwood Estates Townhomes. This was an administrative application for a property within the Holladay Village Zone. The Holladay Village Zone allows different types of residential, retail, and commercial uses. The applicant was focused on residential development. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”) reviewed the application for compliance with land use. Site layout, parking, and density allowances were also examined. Most of the buildings in the Holladay Village Zone have 24 units per acre. The property size for this application allowed 17 units with 16 proposed. The proposed use and density were permitted. The site plan layout and conceptual layout focused on the proposed parking, driveway access points, and unit placement. Those items were reviewed conceptually and then at the preliminary level. The Conceptual Plan was a higher-level review. For instance, what the proposed layout could look like and where parking could be located.

The Holladay Village Zone is fairly flexible in terms of setbacks, landscaping, and the location of buildings. As a result, the TRC found that the proposed location was in line with what is allowed. One of the primary issues the TRC wanted to make sure that the applicant complied with was architecture. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Design Review Board (“DRB”) also reviewed the application. The DRB is a recommending body to the Planning Commission and made a recommendation regarding the application and the style of the homes. Since the Holladay Village Zone is a mixed-use zone, there were a lot of elements in the design standards that envisioned larger buildings. When residential homes were reviewed, there was less nuance. However, the DRB wanted the Commission to understand that it is important to match the homes to the early 1900s style. That was what influenced their recommendation.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the matter was scheduled for a Conceptual and Preliminary Plan review. Based on essential elements that a preliminary-level design needs to have, the TRC was unable to make that recommendation. There were some issues that the TRC needed to address, which were listed in the Staff Report. The Commission had the option of either continuing the Preliminary Plan to another meeting or there being a conditional preliminary approval. Mr. Teerlink recommended that the Commission review architecture and the Conceptual Plan. The preliminary aspects of the application could be deferred to a future meeting once the items are finalized. There could be two separate motions made by the Planning Commission.

The applicant’s representative, Nolan Mendenhall, introduced himself to the Commission and gave his address as 4635 South Highland Drive. He reported that he is the Project Architect. Mr. Mendenhall was still serving on the DRB when the project came through for consideration.

As a group, there were concerns that the architectural design would not comply with the Holladay Village Zone. Once he completed his term on the DRB, the applicant approached him about creating an appropriate architectural design. He reviewed the existing home on the property. The rooflines, window treatments, chimney elements, and stonework were highlighted. The intention was to incorporate those elements into each of the proposed buildings. There were four different building types but each one included the same architectural language.

Mr. Mendenhall shared street views of the area, which included the existing home on the property. The client did not want to disturb the existing home but enhance the area around it. Additional views and renderings were shared. The closest building would be a single-family home. The other buildings in the background were duplexes. There was an existing roundabout on the property that would remain in place and be utilized for guest parking. Mr. Mendenhall reported that there are mature trees on the site. The intention was to leave as many trees as possible. If there was any disturbance, the Tree Code would be complied with in terms of replacement.

There was a desire to create a secure area. As a result, there would be a fence and gate in place. Additional street views were shared. There were two parking stalls allocated for each unit with tandem parking and a covered carport. Mr. Mendenhall shared a 3D site plan with the Commission. The six buildings across the back were identified. The driveway and proposed carports were highlighted. Mr. Mendenhall pointed out the single-family structure, which would have tandem parking. The existing home included parking that was already allocated. He reiterated that the intention was to mimic the style of the existing home in the rest of the design.

Mr. Mendenhall liked that the property owner wanted to keep the development fairly small. In addition, the owner wanted to tie in the existing structure design. Chair Howard Layton believed the units would mostly be two-bedroom. This was confirmed. Mr. Mendenhall reported that the units range from 600 to 1,100 square feet. Commissioner Chris Layton asked about the parking requirements in the Holladay Village Zone. Mr. Mendenhall stated that the requirement is 1.5 parking stalls per two bedrooms. Commissioner Chris Layton noted that each of the units has two bedrooms. The proposal was to provide 21 parking stalls.

Commissioner Prince referenced the drawing with the carports. She wondered if they were tandem stalls. Mr. Mendenhall clarified that they are one-car stalls with storage on the backside. The carports adjacent to the south buildings were tandem and the carports across the way were singles. Commissioner Chris Layton wanted to understand if the tandem stalls would be shared between two units. Mr. Mendenhall was not certain that those details had been determined. He believed it would make the most sense to assign them to each unit. Commissioner Chris Layton understood that this was a Conceptual Plan review and not a Final Site Plan but he felt that the parking situation was the least resolved part of the application. Mr. Mendenhall noted that it was possible to add more parking on the site but the owner wanted to leave as much green space as possible. Commissioner Prince pointed out that the security fence would not include the first two units, Units 12 and 13. Those stalls were not included in the secured area.

Commissioner Roach asked about the duplexes. Mr. Mendenhall explained that there is a door for the front entry that would provide access to the main level and the basement. There was a

secondary door either on the side or the back of the structure to provide access to the upper-level unit. There were separate entrances.

Chair Howard Layton opened the public hearing.

Cindy George gave her address as 4600 South Locust Lane, directly west of the subject property. Ms. George explained that her complex has eight condominium units that are attached through the garage. She serves as the Homeowners Association (“HOA”) President and was asked to share comments on behalf of the owners. A letter had been submitted to the Commission. The HOA’s concerns pertained to safety as there will be increased traffic and parking on Locust Lane. She acknowledged individual property rights but stated that the condominium owners have been living with noise, parking, and safety issues for approximately four years. These concerns had previously been shared with the Miller Family and the HOA tried to be respectful. However, she did not feel their concerns were being considered.

During a previous Planning Commission Meeting, Ms. George asked the Millers if it would be possible for them not to add the seventh building, which is directly across from the eight-unit condominiums. Residents were concerned about the traffic that will enter and exit from the east and west sides of Locust Lane. There are young children in the area and the increased traffic could impact their safety. She noted that this was also a path that Olympus Junior High students use to walk home. The HOA asked that no overflow parking from the proposed new units be allowed on Locust Lane. Additionally, the hope was that the Millers would not add the seventh unit near the current home. If that unit is constructed, the preference was that the exit be on Holladay Boulevard. Ms. George reiterated her concerns.

Adam Dewaal gave his address as 4253 Cumberland Road. He reported that he developed the townhomes south of the subject property and owns five of the townhomes. Mr. Dewaal wanted to make sure that the application addresses the drainage and retention of water. There must be proper drainage so that properties are not flooded. He agreed with the previous comments shared by Ms. George with respect to parking.

Roger Beardshall identified himself as President of the Wildflower HOA. He explained that the 10 homes are located on Iverson Woods Place to the north of the proposal. If there are parking issues and vehicles park on Holladay Boulevard or Locust Lane, it makes it difficult for residents to pull out. This is especially true when there are sporting events. Adding another 13 units beyond what already exists was of concern. Mr. Beardshall was worried about parking and the number of vehicles each unit will have. The proposal could create additional congestion and contribute to existing problems in the area. Mr. Beardshall noted that the construction process could take many years if one building is constructed at a time. He wanted to understand how many years the applicant had to complete the project.

Scott Cameron reported that he owns a six-plex on the corner and identified the location on a map displayed. Mr. Cameron was not opposed to the project as long as there are proper solutions to the problems that exist. Through his years of renting the six-plex, there had never been a tenant with fewer than two vehicles. Some had three. It seemed that parking for the current application was an issue as there will likely be additional parking on Locust Lane. He asked the Commission

to visit the site and look at Locust Lane. Mr. Cameron hoped that an adequate solution could be reached but felt that the parking was underestimated.

Ron Hilton gave his address as 2394 Murray Holladay Road. He was generally supportive of the project and believed it would be a good addition to the Holladay Village. The parking issues mentioned were concerning. He stated that the Holladay Village is supposed to be a walkable environment and the idea was that there would be a lot of pedestrian use. That could be factored into the parking discussions. Mr. Hilton noted that a food truck in the turnabout area was included in an earlier version of the plan. That was presented as a possible public amenity since the Holladay Village requires a public amenity within the development. However, that food truck was eliminated due to safety concerns. Mr. Hilton suggested that the green island in that area be enlarged so that there could be a small public green space instead.

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

Mr. Mendenhall identified all of the parking areas and reiterated that there will be 21 parking stalls provided, which meet the requirements for the development. Commissioner Prince asked about access to the southwest corner carport. It was shown on a map. She wanted to understand if there is an existing curb cut. Mr. Mendenhall explained that there is nothing there now. He pointed out the existing garage and the access.

Commissioner Chris Layton believed one duplex and two-single family dwellings would be accessed off of Locust Lane. He wanted to better understand the amount of traffic that will come to the development via Locust Lane. Mr. Mendenhall pointed out the four stalls that will serve one of the duplexes. The single-family home with two spaces will have access off Locust Lane. That meant there would be six additional parking spaces and potentially six additional vehicles accessing Locust Lane in addition to the existing home. Commissioner Cunningham noted that there will be a security gate off Holladay Boulevard. He wondered if that gate will block traffic. It was stated that the gate will not block traffic. Since the entire complex will be fenced, the guest parking will be outside of the fence.

Commissioner Vilchinsky asked if there was a plan for garbage collection and asked where garbage cans will be stored. Mr. Mendenhall stated that the tandem parking area is deeper than necessary for two vehicles. As a result, the back portion could be used for garbage cans. For garbage collection, those cans would need to be placed on either Locust Lane or Holladay Boulevard. There would not be a private dumpster and each unit would have an individual collection. It was noted that as a private HOA, there will need to be a contract for collection. Commissioner Vilchinsky referenced the drainage issue raised during the public hearing. It was noted that the drainage and utilities would be part of the Preliminary Site Plan. Commissioner Vilchinsky wondered if a retaining wall would be needed to protect the adjoining properties. Mr. Mendenhall explained that those types of decisions would be made by a Civil Engineer.

Commissioner Roach wondered if the new carport that was proposed would architecturally match the homes. Mr. Mendenhall explained that the back portion will have storage and vehicle parking. It would be enclosed on three sides. The same materials would be used for cohesion. The renderings showed that there was a desire to landscape as well. The Commission reviewed the

submitted documents and discussed the carport design. Chair Howard Layton pointed out that there would be additional discussions about the design details during the next stage of the approval process. He added that parking was of concern for the surrounding area. However, the Commission recognized that the application met the basic zoning requirements for density and parking allowances. It was important that the Commission address some of the outstanding concerns.

Commissioner Chris Layton asked if this project was considered a Planned Unit Development (“PUD”). Mr. Teerlink denied this and explained that the setbacks were as proposed. The Holladay Village standards perceive buildings that will be brought up right to the sidewalk. The projects to the south have a setback so there was more of a formal stoop with a porch. Chair Howard Layton assumed that all of the units would be for rent and not for sale. Mr. Teerlink reported that there would be a condominium plat brought forward to the Commission.

Chair Howard Layton asked about restricting parking along Locust Lane. He wondered how that fit in as part of the approval process recommendation. Mr. Teerlink explained that the City Engineer had concerns about traffic since there needs to be a way for emergency vehicles to turn around. The details had not been resolved but the City Engineer could look at the traffic impact and that information could be brought back to the Commission in the future. That would take place during the next phase. Mr. Teerlink noted that there could be a recommendation for no parking on one or both sides of the road. Alternatively, there might be a way for the carports to be accessed through the site rather than through Locust Lane. The City Engineer would look into different options.

Commissioner Prince referenced a concern raised during the public comment period. She wanted to understand the length of construction. Mr. Teerlink explained that the entitlement process could expire. By the time there is preliminary approval, the property owner has one year to record the plat. The time for construction would not start until the Building Permit is issued. The property owner would have six months to keep a Building Permit active. The State allows a property owner to keep a Building Permit active for as long as necessary as long as every six months there is progress being made on the site.

Commissioner Chris Layton believed it was important for the Commission to look at the issues separately. His opinion on the building design portion was that a nice job had been done of capturing the context, materials, and aesthetics of the existing architecture. He did not see an issue with making a motion to approve the building design but he had concerns about the Site Plan. There were a lot of issues related to parking and access. Though minimum requirements would be met based on the proposal, he thought it would be best to continue the approval until the details are more thought out and the site utilization for parking is adequately planned. It seemed that there were a lot of unresolved Conceptual Site Plan issues that needed to be better defined.

Commissioner Prince noted that the Commission could move to approve the building design and there could be a separate motion to continue the Conceptual Site Plan. Commissioner Chris Layton wanted the Commission to discuss that possibility as he was not comfortable approving the Site Plan as presented. He had concerns about the tandem parking. As a result, he did not feel it was appropriate to approve the Conceptual Site Plan when the parking proposal is not adequate.

Commissioner Cunningham agreed that there were parking issues. He believed there needed to be additional thought given to the development. Additionally, he requested that there be a discussion about how to address tandem parking proposals in the future.

Mr. Mendenhall reported that the tandem parking concept would ensure there are no excessive garages. Commissioner Chris Layton understood the reason for the proposal but did not necessarily believe the proposal was functional. Mr. Mendenhall noted that since the pandemic, a lot more people are working from home. Parking is becoming less of an issue. Commissioner Chris Layton pointed out that working from home does not mean there are no personal vehicles on site. Chair Howard Layton agreed that a continuance of the Conceptual Plan made sense. Commissioner Roach was supportive of the suggestion shared by Commissioner Chris Layton to vote on the items separately. The Commission discussed what would be voted on and the appropriate motion language.

Mr. Teerlink informed the Commission that the Conceptual Plan pertained to whether the density, use, and location of parking are adequate. Staff could take another look at the location of the parking if desired by the Commission, however, that could be done with the Conceptual Plan approval. The approval was based on whether the application met the zoning and parking requirements. As for preliminary development review, there would need to be additional details provided such as retaining walls, drainage, driveway locations, and the layout of carports. He reminded the Commission that the zone allows for off-site parking.

Commissioner Chris Layton noted that even if the Conceptual Plan is approved, it is important for the applicant to understand that the parking as proposed is unacceptable. There are better ways to address the issue. He wanted to see the applicant return with a better parking plan. Commissioner Chris Layton could see the Commission recommending approval of the Conceptual Plan with certain conditions. It was noted that the application meets the minimum standards. It did not sound like the application would have Commission approval for a Preliminary Plan. Based on the feedback so far, it seemed that the Commission did not like the tandem parking and was concerned about access off of Locust Lane. It was possible to approve the Conceptual Plan since it meets the minimums but still request that the applicant come back with some other suggestions.

Commissioner Chris Layton explained that the Commission was not comfortable with the Preliminary Plan. Staff and Engineering were also not comfortable with that aspect of the application. It was unlikely that the Preliminary Plan would be recommended tonight. However, it made sense to look at the Conceptual Plan and the Building Design. He believed the Conceptual Site Plan could be approved based on the minimum requirements but there was a lot of work to be done before it would be approved at a preliminary level. The Commission discussed recommendations for the City Engineer. Commissioner Prince wanted to understand whether the direction for the City Engineer needed to be included in a motion. Mr. Teerlink stated that the direction the Planning Commission was looking for would need to be made clear. Chair Howard Layton believed that there were three motions to consider. Since the notice included the Preliminary Plan, there would need to be a motion on that as well as the Conceptual Plan and Building Design.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Building Design for “Millwood Estates Townhomes,” located at 4600 South Holladay Boulevard in the Holladay Village Zone, finding that the design:

- 1. Has received a favorable recommendation from the Design Review Board.*
- 2. Complies with the vision and design guidelines as a residential development within the Holladay Village.*

Commissioner Chris Layton seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Chris Layton-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Chair Howard Layton-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Howard Layton moved to APPROVE the Conceptual Site Plan for “Millwood Estates Townhomes,” located at 4600 South Holladay Boulevard in the Holladay Village Zone, finding that the Site Plan:

- 1. Complies with the Holladay Village Zone in regard to density and the number of parking stalls that are shown on the site, recognizing that additional design would be required through the preliminary layout through the Engineering Department.*

Commissioner Prince seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Nay; Commission Vilchinsky-Nay; Commissioner Chris Layton-Nay; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Chair Howard Layton-Aye. The motion failed 3-to-3.

In light of the failed Conceptual Plan motion, there was no need to vote on the Preliminary Plan. Chair Howard Layton informed those present that work would continue on the application.

ACTION ITEMS

2. “Highland Park” PUD – Preliminary – 4880 South Highland Circle (R-M). Previously Known as “Highland Circle PUD”. Preliminary Level Review and Consideration of Development Details by Applicant, Alec Moffat. Review of this 11-Unit Development is Conducted According to Compliance with Previously Approved Concept Plan (10/4/2022) and Subdivision Development Standards Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.10. File #22-1-11.

Chair Howard Layton noted that the above item related to the Highland Park PUD located at 4880 South Highland Circle in the R-M Zone. Ms. Marsh reported that the Conceptual Plan for the property was approved on October 4, 2022. It was previously presented as Highland Circle PUD but was now known as Highland Park PUD. There was an existing historical house on the site, and during the Conceptual Plan phase, it was determined that the home could be safely moved. As a result, the Preliminary Plan did not show the existing home. Three triplexes and one duplex would be built on the site for a total of 11 units. Each of the buildings would be three stories. All of the items necessary for the Preliminary Plan had been submitted, including information related

to utilities, grading, stormwater management, parking, and roadway locations. Additionally, the proposed Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (“CC&R”) for the community had been prepared and all of the utility letters were submitted. Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan. Ms. Marsh reviewed the findings set forth in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Roach inquired about the Preliminary Plan handout and compared it to what was originally submitted. The only difference he noticed was that the road had moved to the other side where it curves. The front section did not appear to be altered. Ms. Marsh explained that the concept level approval was high-level but the preliminary level was more finalized and had a lot more detail about what is feasible.

Commissioner Chris Layton noted that there are double garages and there would be a total of 22 parking spaces. He wondered what the parking requirements were. Ms. Marsh reported that parking is dependent on the number of bedrooms. Two-bedroom units would require 1.5 parking stalls and three-bedroom units would require two parking stalls per unit. Chair Howard Layton noted that there were three guest parking spots available. That was compliant with the zone requirements.

The applicant, Alec Moffat, gave his address as 9055 South 1300 East in Sandy. He discussed the materials and explained that there would be a combination of brick stucco and siding. The garage would be stone. Some of the drawings were outdated. He explained that the center unit would be inset slightly to break up the design. There would also be balconies to create more dimension. Mr. Moffat explained that there would be continued work with the architect to finalize the design. He informed the Commission that the reason the road was moved to the other side was to provide more room for backyards. It also made it possible to save more trees on the north side.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the lighting on the patio roof. Mr. Moffat explained that the details had not yet been determined but there would likely be one outdoor lamp. Commissioner Chris Layton pointed out that this is not a Final Site Plan approval. Mr. Teerlink added that night sky compliance for light fixtures was a requirement. Staff would be looking at those kinds of fixtures and details at the Building Permit stage. Commissioner Chris Layton stated that all of the Civil Engineering documentation was very well done.

Chair Howard Layton moved to APPROVE the Preliminary Subdivision Plan for the Highland Park PUD, located at 4880 South Highland Circle, based on the following findings:

- 1. Follows the findings and recommendations of the Technical Review Committee.***
- 2. That the design and the requirements for the Preliminary Subdivision have been substantially completed.***
- 3. The layout of the lots complies with lot area regulations in the R-M Zone.***
- 4. The parking meets the standards required by Chapter 13.8.***

Commissioner Roach seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Chris Layton-Aye; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Chair Howard Layton-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Approval of Minutes – 9/27/22 and 12/6/22.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from September 27, 2022. Commissioner Chris Layton seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from December 6, 2022. Commissioner Roach seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Roach moved to ADJOURN. The motion was not seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting held Tuesday, January 10, 2023.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes, Minutes Secretary
T Forbes Group

Minutes Approved: **February 21st 2023**