

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

Tuesday, August 15, 2023

5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Martin Banks
Paul Cunningham
Ginger Vilchinsky
Jill Fonte
Angela Gong
Dennis Roach
Karianne Prince

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Development Director
Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Acting Chair, Martin Banks, called the Work Session to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. City Planner, Carrie Marsh, reported that there are two Public Hearing items on the Planning Commission Regular Meeting agenda. The first involves a Concept Plan for Block K of “Royal Holladay Hills.” It is the rear side of the Royal Holladay Hills mixed-use site and is being developed as a residential block with a mixture of single-family and multi-family homes. The main issues with the application were noted in the Staff Report and relate to the architectural details not matching with the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”). That was something the Planning Commission would want to ask the applicant about. In addition, the design and detail of the walking path and sidewalk would need to be discussed. Ms. Marsh noted that vehicular access off of Memory Lane was limited.

Chair Banks asked if vehicular access off of Memory Lane is limited or non-existent. Ms. Marsh reported that the SDMP does not allow for any vehicular access from Memory Lane. There was the potential for pedestrian access from Memory Lane to be established with a modification to the SDMP if that was something the Planning Commission was interested in pursuing. Chair Banks referenced language on the first page of the Staff Report that stated “If no vehicular access can be considered, neighborhood continuity with the existing homes on/along Arbor Lane should be discussed.” Chair Banks believed there could be no vehicular access according to the SDMP and it was not a matter of “if” as described. Ms. Marsh confirmed this.

Commissioner Prince mentioned the six estate lot homes that will be around the bottom and wondered if they will have access. Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, clarified that there is a private agreement between the property owner and the neighborhood to the east that goes back to when the Cottonwood Mall began to add additional retail space to the mall itself. The neighborhood to the east came together to restrict additional vehicular access to

Memory Lane. That agreement was established in 1962 and has been carried with the property ever since. When the new property owners acquired the land, it was modified slightly for the larger detached lots around Arbor Lane. The property that backs onto Memory Lane did not have vehicular access. Mr. Teerlink explained that there was a desire to discuss potential pedestrian access further. He believed that was a design concept worth exploring with the applicant.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the SDMP is essentially a Master Planned Zone. In the Master Plan, there are specific uses that are allowed and specific locations where they are permitted. The property is not necessarily tied to a density the same way that other zones are. For example, the R-1-10 Zone contains 10,000 square foot lots. Alternatively, the SDMP for Royal Holladay Hills has minimums and maximums for residential units and commercial properties. The property owner needs to meet the minimums and cannot exceed the maximums. The maximums were established based on a number of factors, including traffic impacts on the neighboring community. When looking at the individual blocks, it is important for the Planning Commission to consider what the SDMP indicates should apply to that block. Mr. Teerlink explained that specifics were outlined in the Staff Report relative to the SDMP and Block K.

Commissioner Vilchinsky asked if the architectural design seen in other blocks would be appropriate for Block K. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the design is site-wide. It was noted that there would be some variation in the architecture but the design approved in one block could be used in another block as well. If something fits in one area it should fit into another but does not necessarily need to. There was room for variation. There are samples in the SDMP, which was included in the Meeting Materials Packet, to illustrate what was permitted.

Commissioner Roach referenced the supplemental materials. Mr. Teerlink explained that the supplemental materials included one of the first Concept Plans for the site. He reminded the Commissioners that the process consists of Conceptual, Preliminary, and Final. To establish the entire subdivision plat, the applicant needs to show a conceptual layout. The supplemental material is the conceptual layout from 2018, which showed what Block K could potentially look like. As individual blocks are discussed, there will be modifications made to the drawing.

Commissioner Roach asked about the setback requirement from Memory Lane to the back of the buildings shown. Mr. Teerlink reported that no setbacks were defined in the SDMP. For the single-family homes on Arbor Lane, a standard setback for one-half and one-acre lots was used. Chair Banks asked if the omission of setbacks was done intentionally. This was confirmed. The intention was to allow flexibility in both marketing and how the properties can be developed.

Commissioner Fonte asked how the walking path would be impacted. Mr. Teerlink suggested that the issue be addressed with the applicant. Commissioner Roach noted that there are no setback requirements but he believed there will be a buffer of 20 to 30 feet. Mr. Teerlink explained that it could be a starting point to compare what was proposed to what other single-family zones require within the City. Commissioner Roach was curious as to how the setbacks would impact Memory Lane. There was discussion regarding a potential landscape buffer. It was noted that the developer of Royal Holladay Hills has been very open and transparent throughout the process. If there are concerns or issues, it is important to speak to the applicant.

Chair Banks asked about the language in the SDMP that speaks to the discretion the applicant and the Planning Commission have in suggesting a design style. Mr. Teerlink explained that it was in the R/M-U Zone codified language. It states that the “Planning Commission shall act as the authority to review compliance with the SDMP.” The first page of the SDMP noted that the applicant or the property owner could propose that the development meet market needs. The SDMP could be used as guidance by the Planning Commission but there were also specific regulations. This means there was some level of specificity but there is flexibility to accommodate market stresses. There was discussion regarding the proposed design style.

Commissioner Roach asked about discretion in terms of density. Block K shows the residential unit count as 100. He wondered if that was the single-family dwelling units that were being proposed along the east side in addition to the multi-family units across the street. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that was the case. In the Restricted Zone there can only be single-family homes. In the Limited Zone, it is possible to have attached multi-family homes. The Open Zone is much more unrestricted with most of the intensity concentrated in the center of the lot. The number of units proposed will be tracked as the site progresses to make sure the minimum is met. A chart was included in the Meeting Materials Packet identifying the residential unit locations. Mr. Teerlink noted that a drawing in the SDMP was included in the Meeting Materials Packet that showed an attached single-family home with a common courtyard. Those were the only single-family home styles that were foreseen in the SDMP. It was what City Staff and the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”) had to look at when comparing compliance.

Commissioner Fonte asked about a letter that was received from a neighbor. The neighbor expressed concerns about the heights. Commissioner Fonte wondered if the height needed to be considered. Mr. Teerlink explained that the height was considered within the SDMP. That area was restricted to 40 feet, which was the allowed height for the homes across the street. The intention was to match the heights. There was additional discussion about the shelf, the heights, and the surrounding area. He noted that if height was a concern, the Planning Commission could ensure that the proposed heights comply with the SDMP. It was noted that the proposed heights are lower than the maximums.

Ms. Marsh reported that the second item on the Planning Commission Regular Meeting agenda was a Concept/Preliminary/Final Plat for “Highland 4141 Office Condominiums.” It would take suites within an office building and convert them into condominiums. It needs to be platted as individual ownership so each of the suites can be sold. It was noted that the item had not been noticed. City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, explained that because the matter was not noticed, it would be on the next meeting agenda as well. The applicant asked to begin the discussions tonight. Mr. Christopherson suggested not opening the public hearing. If anyone is present to talk about the item he believed it would be appropriate for the Commission to accept comment. Any comments will be reflected in the meeting record.

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

Chair Banks called the Regular Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. and read the Commission Statement for the benefit of those present and discussed the Public Hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **“Royal Holladay Hills” Block K, Concept Plan – 4835 South Highland Drive (R/M-U) Conceptual Review and Consideration of a Residential Site Plan Proposal by Applicant/Owner, Steve Peterson. The Commission will review the 6.87 Acre “BLOCK K” of the Holladay Hills Mixed-Use Development as a Permitted Residential Use According to Regulatory Provisions of the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP 2007”) and Holladay Ordinance §13.65.07(C) File #19-9-19-6.**

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and stated that the above item relates to a Concept Plan for Block K of “Royal Holladay Hills.” The property is located at 4835 South Highland Drive. The application was an administrative request from the property owners of Royal Holladay Hills. Block K is the fourth block that is under consideration for the subdivision formally known as the Cottonwood Mall. Blocks, as submitted, are considered in the same process as a subdivision for the Planning Commission to review. This means there are Conceptual, Preliminary, and Final phases. The Conceptual phase allows the Commission to review the proposal and compare it to the zone standards. In this case, the R/M-U Zone is the overlying zone for the area. The R/M-U Zone enacted a Master Plan understanding that the 57 acres will have multiple uses, including mixed, residential, and commercial. There will also be different building heights and accesses. He explained that the SDMP is the controlling document for the zone.

Mr. Teerlink shared information about the SDMP. Individual blocks are regulated by land use, which means detached residential, attached residential, and certain types of commercial uses are allowed within specific areas. The SDMP was included in the Meeting Materials Packet and contained a drawing illustrating the Restricted, Limited, and Open Zones. They are sub-use zones in the SDMP. The entire 57 acres of Royal Holladay Hills were broken out into individual-use zones. For Block K, the zones to consider were Restricted and Limited. On the east side of Block K, the Restricted Zone only allows detached single-family. The Limited Zone allows for multi-family residential uses, some office, and some live/work spaces. Mr. Teerlink reported that the maximums are 40 feet in the Restricted Zone and 60 feet in the Limited Zone.

The Planning Commission will review the Concept Plan application for Block K during this meeting. For a Concept Plan, the Commission needs to determine whether the application complies with the use of the zone and the layout of the overall SDMP as previously approved. The TRC reviewed what was proposed for Block K to verify that the detached single-family lots and the attached multi-family components comply with the land uses in the SDMP. However, there were other components that the Planning Commission had the purview to review. Street cross-sections were required for each block and street in the SDMP. Mr. Teerlink explained that this may or may not include things like on-street parking allowances, sidewalk widths, streetscapes, and plantings.

Architecture and design will establish the feel of the development itself. The SDMP provided a few styles for design. In this case, the Planning Commission did not have the Design Review Board (“DRB”) make a recommendation beforehand. As a result, the Planning Commission must rely on the TRC to provide a recommendation as to whether the chosen styles comply with the SDMP. Mr. Teerlink discussed what was proposed by the applicant. It was difficult for City Staff to find the resemblances of the style chosen. It would be up to the Planning Commission to query the applicant and better understand their desired approach. For the Concept Plan, the TRC recommended approval. Some other elements the Planning Commission normally looks at include

Utility Service Letters, which had already been obtained and established. The intention was to look at compliance in terms of use and location.

Staff recommended approval of the Concept Plan and asked that the Planning Commission discuss the streetscape, open space, trail elements, and the design of the buildings with the applicant. Commissioner Prince wondered what would happen if the Planning Commission approved the Concept Plan but still had concerns about the design. She questioned whether approval means the design is accepted. Mr. Christopherson explained that at a Concept Plan level, the design was not being approved. It was possible for the Commission to weigh in on the design. What was being considered tonight was the concept level approval. The Preliminary Plan process pertains to the design itself. The layout and use were currently being considered.

The applicant, Steve Peterson, introduced himself and stated that a lot of time and effort has been dedicated to Royal Holladay Hills. He was excited about the progress made so far. Currently, the market conditions lean toward a residential focus. There seemed to be a strong demand for residential in the community. The office uses are more challenging but they found a lender who would assist with that aspect of the overall development. He acknowledged that the Block K work needs to stay within the parameters of the SDMP. In terms of the setback, there was only a reference to the setback on the front page of the SDMP. He explained that for Block K it was proposed that there be a 10-foot minimum setback from Memory Lane to the housing units. Responsible designs transition from one area to the next. As a result, Block K was designed as a buffer area. It would eliminate the view of any of the commercial uses down below so that residents living to the east will see the three-story homes and the four-story building behind. Most of the commercial behind will be lower and hidden from the residential community to the east. That was done intentionally to create a buffer.

Mr. Peterson addressed the placement of the units and the unit counts. He reported that there are 614 units total with approximately one-sixth being in Block K. It was noted that Block L will also act as a buffer. In terms of access for Block K, there was an agreement with Cottonwood, Inc. that was amended and updated. The residents representing the area wanted there to be no access from Arbor or Memory Lanes into the project other than for the six one-half-acre lots. The six one-half-acre lots would act as a buffer in Block L with driveways coming into Arbor and Memory Lanes. Cottonwood, Inc. wants to restrict traffic coming out of the project.

Mr. Peterson reviewed some of the information provided in the Meetings Materials Packet. He referenced steep-pitched roofs and explained that those were regional examples. The homes were designed with steep-pitched roofs to conform to certain elements of the SDMP. Sample images were shared. Mr. Peterson explained that the first 100 feet had to be detached and those homes can only be 40 feet. In the second component of Block K, the height maximum is 60 feet but the homes were proposed at approximately 45 feet. There will be four-story buildings there with elevators. Those will be flats that will be approximately 2,000 square feet in size on one level. The community wants more affordable flats to be available that are still high-quality. Some of the proposed design features were described. Mr. Peterson reported that the architect for Block K differs from the architect for Blocks B, D, and E. The intention was to create a village with some differences in appearance. He believed the SDMP had been conformed to. Mr. Peterson informed the Commission that he was seeking Concept Plan approval for Block K.

Information about the park and the trail system was shared. Mr. Peterson presented an updated exhibit. The SDMP includes a parameter of 11 to 13.8 acres of green space and hardscape. Currently, the plan contains approximately 19.6 acres of green space and hardscape. He hoped the City would allow for a modification at some point so there could be additional green space permitted. However, currently, there are only 13.8 acres of green space allowed within the SDMP. In terms of the trail system, when the Preliminary Plan process takes place, he hoped to show where that trail system will be located. He discussed the proposed layout of the trail system and noted that the trail system across Block K will be 10 feet wide in front of the flats.

Commissioner Roach asked about the Memory Lane portion of the property and wondered if there was a plan for what would be done as far as curb and gutter up to the street. He was specifically referring to the east end along Memory Lane, across from the cemetery, where there is a chain link fence currently. Mr. Peterson referenced the survey map. It was reported that the City owns the property in that area. The fence lines of the homes will be on the Royal Holladay Hills property. He expected trees to be planted on the inside of the fences in the backyards to soften the look of the buildings. Commissioner Roach asked if the fence line was where the property stops. Mr. Peterson confirmed that was the case and shared an aerial view of the property.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the interpretation of the private agreement between Cottonwood, Inc. and the property owner. He wanted to know if there was anything that would prevent the City from requiring pedestrian access from Memory Lane. Mr. Peterson shared a copy of the agreement and explained that he would be supportive of that kind of access. It would, however, depend on whether Cottonwood, Inc. is also supportive. Currently, the agreement does not allow for pedestrian access. He was not sure if there would be opposition but offered to reach out to Cottonwood, Inc. about that. There was discussion about the agreement that is in place and the recorded easement. Mr. Peterson felt it was important to honor what was agreed to with Cottonwood, Inc. He was willing to ask if pedestrian access was something there was support for.

Chair Banks asked for additional information about Cottonwood, Inc. Mr. Peterson reported that Cottonwood, Inc. represents a large group of individuals who live near the project area. Mr. Christopherson reviewed the agreement and indicated that vehicular access off of Memory Lane from the property is expressly prohibited. There had been discussion about the front doors of the homes exiting out onto a pedestrian walkway fronting Memory Lane. As he read it, he did not believe there was anything that would prevent that scenario specifically. However, if a recorded easement is in place it would need to be considered in the layout. Chair Banks believed the easement runs parallel to Memory Lane and 10 feet off of Memory Lane. Mr. Peterson identified the location of the easement on a map of the area for reference.

There was discussion regarding potentially switching the direction of the homes on Memory Lane so that they face east rather than west. Mr. Peterson stated that as long as there is no access, the houses can face east. It had not been considered a possibility but was something that could be explored further if desired by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Cunningham believed what was currently contemplated was a six-foot fence with trees and a 10-foot setback. Along Memory Lane, it seemed that the two neighborhoods would be separated. Mr. Peterson reiterated that the agreement with Cottonwood, Inc. requires that there be no access off of Memory Lane. As a result, it made sense that there would be some level of separation. He acknowledged the

suggestion of the Commission to have the front of the homes face east. The question was whether residents would worry about vehicles being parked on Memory Lane.

Mr. Christopherson believed the agreement would prohibit any vehicular access to the homes off of Memory Lane. No traffic from the development will be permitted there, including into a garage. If the applicant were to entertain the idea of flipping the direction of the homes to face east, the garages would need to be placed in the rear. Mr. Peterson reported that he would reach out to Cottonwood, Inc. to ask how those involved feel about that suggestion. Chair Banks believed there were two potential options including modifying the agreement to allow access from Memory Lane into garages or having access to the garages on the back west side instead.

Commissioner Prince wanted to discuss one of the design elements and stated that steep-pitched roofs were referenced earlier in relation to the three-story townhomes in the Restricted Zone. Based on the regional example shared and the drawings included in the Meeting Materials Packet, she struggled to see how the steep-pitched roofs are similar. They looked angular to her. Mr. Peterson clarified that the side views were shown. Additional sample images were reviewed. Commissioner Prince reiterated her concerns based on the design drawings that were submitted. Mr. Peterson stated that the drawings could be further refined moving forward.

Commissioner Fonte was not sure how homes facing east would be beneficial. Even if there is garage access to the west, she believed the result would be increased traffic on Memory Lane. She assumed that guests would park in front of the homes. Mr. Peterson reiterated his desire to speak to the representative of Cottonwood, Inc. to find out what they think of the proposal. He could report the results of that discussion to the Planning Commission in the future. The existing residents in the area were concerned about traffic. There was a desire to limit those impacts. Commissioner Fonte wondered if a walking path would be placed between the single-family homes and the four-story building. Mr. Peterson explained that it would be in front of the four-story building. Additional information about the trail system location was shared with those present.

Mr. Teerlink believed there were a few different paths forward. The Planning Commission could consider the Concept Plan, as proposed. Alternatively, the homes could be flipped or there could be common courtyards used as access points. As long as all parties involved reach an agreement, there were several options that could be considered. Mr. Peterson expressed concerns about a courtyard proposal from a security standpoint and stated that access should be at controlled points.

Chair Banks opened the public hearing.

Gary Poulton was excited about the development and thought it would be nice for there to be access so that those living in the Memory Lane apartments could access the commercial portions of the development. He was in support of some pathways there. Additionally, he thought it was important to properly develop the end that faces Memory Lane.

Kimo Jones reported that he lives on Memory Lane, across from the proposed development. He considered what was proposed to be too dense and he did not like that there would be three-story homes. In other plans, more open space was shown than is currently proposed. There are 32 units down Memory Lane and there did not appear to be a lot of room between the homes. Chair Banks

wondered if Mr. Jones would prefer the front of the homes to face east instead. Mr. Jones thought that layout would be better as would some kind of pathway rather than a fence. He reiterated his concern about the density proposed in the current application.

Steve Glaser gave his address as 2052 East Arbor Lane and noted that reference was made to the curb and gutter earlier in the meeting. He liked that there was no curb or gutter there. He hoped that the City would not insist on that being included. Mr. Glaser asked for additional details regarding the commercial components of the development. As for the proposed layout, he preferred a fence to a wall. He thought that would provide a more open view.

Mr. Peterson was allowed to respond to the comments shared during the public hearing. He clarified that commercial components will not be in Restricted or Limited areas. Block K will act as a buffer for the commercial to the west. Commissioner Roach noted that reference was made to affordable housing during the earlier discussion about the flats. He wondered what was considered affordable. He also wondered if Mr. Peterson could address the open space comment made by Mr. Jones. Mr. Peterson explained that the flats will not be low cost or assisted but more affordable than other housing products. A lot of buyers in the area want something more affordable.

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

Commissioner Cunningham suggested that the Planning Commission be careful and only address the Concept Plan. He did not believe the design itself was ready to be approved. He acknowledged that there was still an issue with the private agreement. Comments were made during the public hearing from residents who were not included in that agreement. He was not sure who the agreement was with if it did not include all adjacent neighbors. Commissioner Cunningham believed the idea of walkability and pedestrian access was critical. He felt it was fine to move forward from a conceptual level but there was still a lot that needed to be determined.

Commissioner Roach liked the layout because it progresses from single-family to multi-family units and becomes denser as the project moves in. He thought this was the right approach. The density of homes pushed along Memory Lane was likely impactful because of the change in use. However, the layout presented makes sense and is congruent with the SDMP. He thought there was an opportunity after this phase to incorporate more pedestrian access. Adding more pedestrian access to the Block K development will enhance the project.

Commissioner Gong did not believe there was a clear sense of which residents were included in the private agreement. That was something the Commission would want more information on at a future phase of the application process. Commissioner Gong believed the question of pedestrian access was especially important because walkability is essential.

Commissioner Prince liked the progression from single-family to multi-family units. She thought that was well done and met the requirements of the SDMP. That being said, she had concerns about some of the design elements. Those do not necessarily need to be addressed during the Concept Plan phase but she stressed the importance of continuing to discuss those matters during future phases of the process. She looked forward to seeing what the applicant would come back with after speaking to Cottonwood, Inc. and incorporating additional feedback.

Commissioner Fonte was surprised by the first proposal compared to the current proposal in terms of density. She wondered what happened during the process to make Memory Lane so dense relative to what was initially proposed. Commissioner Vilchinsky echoed the comments shared by other Commissioners with regard to the graduation from single-family to multi-family homes. It made a lot of sense and she liked the concept proposed. She understood the reason for the private agreement but was not sure what the right solution would be. It would be possible to continue to have discussions and focus on green space and a walking path. As for the concept, which was what the Commission was reviewing, she felt it was appropriate.

Commissioner Prince moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Conceptual Site Plan for Block K in the “Royal Holladay Hills” subdivision, based on the following findings:

- 1. The Conceptual Site Plan requirements are sufficiently and substantially met and comply with the requirements for submissions, the SDMP, and the R/M-U Zone.***
- 2. The TRC cannot find a semblance in the residential facades of non-mixed-use design precedents shown on Page 16 of the SDMP, nor does the Planning Commission.***
- 3. The Planning Commission encourages a conversation regarding walkability and possible pedestrian access with the Memory Lane residents.***

Commissioner Vilchinsky seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Fonte-Aye; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Commissioner Gong-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Chair Banks-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

- 2. “Highland 4141 Office Condominiums” Subdivision – Concept/Preliminary/Final Plat - 4141 South Highland Drive (“PO Zone”) Preliminary Level Review and Consideration of Development Details by Applicant, Stout Building Construction. Review of this 1.9-acre Development is Conducted According to Concurrent Concept and Preliminary Review Procedures According to PO Zone Compliance and Conversion to Condominium Development Requirements of Holladay Ordinance §13.85. File #23-1-09.**

It was reported that there was no applicant present. In addition, notices were not sent out for the application. This meant that the public hearing would not take place. It was suggested that the item be deferred to a future meeting.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to CONTINUE the Concept/Preliminary/Final Plat application by Stout Building Construction for “Highland 4141 Office Condominiums,” to the next available Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Prince seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Fonte-Aye; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Commissioner Gong-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Chair Banks-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2023.

Commissioner Fonte asked about the process for approving Meeting Minutes. She wondered if the intention was to confirm that the contents of the meeting had been recorded. Chair Banks explained that those present at the Planning Commission Meeting need to confirm that the Meeting Minutes roughly reflect the substance of the comments made during the meeting. Once the Meeting Minutes are approved they become the official record of the meeting.

Commissioner Roach moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 18, 2023. Commissioner Vilchinsky seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Fonte-Abstain; Commissioner Roach-Aye; Commissioner Gong-Abstain; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Chair Banks-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURN

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:15 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, August 15, 2023.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes, Minutes Secretary
T Forbes Group

Minutes Approved: September 19, 2023