

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

Tuesday, November 7, 2023

5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair
Ginger Vilchinsky
Paul Cunningham
Karianne Prince
Jill Fonte
Angela Gong
Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Jayme Blakesley, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Chair Roach called the Work Session to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. He asked New Planning Commission Member, Brian Berndt, to introduce himself. Commissioner Berndt reported that he has been in City Planning and Community Development for the last 40 years. He retired a few years ago but still has a desire to serve the community. He worked in Colorado, Arizona, and Utah during his career. Commissioner Berndt lives in District 1 and his family has lived in the City of Holladay for the last 20 years. He was excited to work with his fellow Commissioners.

The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. City Planner, Carrie Marsh, reported that the first item on the Regular Meeting agenda was a public hearing for “Wright Mind, LLC.” It was an application for a Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for business consulting. Clients will be seen within the home. She noted that the use will take place in a condominium complex. The hours of operation were listed in the applicant's narrative. There was some variation in how often the meetings would be held and the number of clients. Most of the time, there would be one to two clients, but on occasion, there could be three or four. Any concerns about the number of clients or variation could be addressed with Conditions of Approval. There is a Homeowners Association (“HOA”) and Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (“CC&R”). Some of the comments received ahead of the meeting came from the HOA. There was a suggestion that parking be restricted to the designated homeowner spot to avoid impacts to common areas.

Chair Roach believed there might be some comments shared during the public hearing for the “Wright Mind, LLC” application. He clarified that the Conditional Use that was applied for is allowed in the zone. The Planning Commission needs to consider parking but will not consider the HOA or CC&Rs as they are not governed by the City. The CC&Rs are private agreements between the homeowners and the larger association. Commissioner Prince asked if restricting parking is within the purview of the Planning Commission. Ms. Marsh confirmed that it is. Limiting the parking to property that the homeowner owns would be a reasonable restriction.

Commissioner Berndt had looked at the Site Plan and stated that parking was shown as being designated for clients. When there are four clients on site, that would likely exceed any allowance for parking. Ms. Marsh explained that the applicant could address that. She reminded the Commissioners that it would be possible to

impose a Condition of Approval for parking. She noted that a parking map was submitted that utilized the guest parking on the site. Commissioner Berndt was concerned that there could be conflicts with other property owners.

Commissioner Cunningham referenced the diagram submitted. He questioned whether this was truly a residence or a rental for the purpose of conducting business. Ms. Marsh reported that as far as the City was aware, it is a residence that is zoned residential. If that is not accurate, there would need to be a Code Enforcement case brought forward. Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that the diagram in the Meeting Materials Packet labeled bedrooms as office areas and the living room as an office area, which was where his concerns came from. There were questions about whether this was being used as a residence or not.

The second item on the Regular Meeting agenda was a Zone Map Amendment. Ms. Marsh reported that the request was to rezone from RM (Multi-Family Residential) to PO (Professional Office) for property at 5200 South Highland Drive. The proposed rezone would recognize the current use of the building. In the County zoning, RM includes offices and multi-family residential. The Code was a holdover from that, but it was encouraged that office uses in an RM Zone be rezoned to PO.

Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, explained that when the City of Holladay was incorporated, the RM Zone was a zone adopted from the County. That zone was originally a mixed-use zone that included multi-family and professional offices. In many RM Zone areas, there were multi-family buildings and office buildings. In 2018, the Council realized that the use list for offices allowed in the RM Zone was fairly minimal. A lot of building owners who owned office buildings in the RM Zone wanted to have the land use table expanded. The Council ultimately decided to create the PO Zone specifically for the office buildings located within the RM Zone. The use table was expanded in the PO Zone. The City Council did not want to rezone all of the office buildings in the RM Zone but wanted applications to be made when desired.

Commissioner Cunningham had a technical concern. The address was labeled as Highland Drive and 5600 South but is actually located at 5200 South. He was concerned that noticing had not been done appropriately as a result of that error. Mr. Teerlink explained that the mailer requirements had changed Statewide for rezones. He confirmed that the address is 5200 South, which was on the agenda and the notice published in the newspaper. There was a typo in the Staff Report.

The third item on the Regular Meeting agenda was the “Holladay Heights” Residential Subdivision. Ms. Marsh reported that it was an application for 4930 Westmoor Road. The layout showed 10 lots, which there was enough land area for. The size of each of the lots was shown as over 10,000 square feet. The street would connect from Delaware Circle to Westmoor Road. Each of the lots would then be managed as individual building lots. Many of the comments from interested residents had to do with what would be built there in the future. She informed the Commissioners that the Planning Commission could decide whether to keep the public hearing open to continue to receive comments through the preliminary review. That decision would likely depend on what kind of comments were received during the public hearing process. At the current meeting, the Planning Commission would either approve, deny, or continue the conceptual application. The preliminary portion of the application will be continued to the next meeting.

The fourth item on the Regular Meeting agenda was for the “Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision. It was a conceptual review of property at 5560 South Wasatch Boulevard. The property owner wanted to add 1.9 acres to the Silver Hawk 2 Subdivision. That would involve a lot line adjustment for Lot 15. It needed to be reflected on the existing Subdivision Plat. The application involved moving a lot line, adding in the area, and then subdividing that into two lots. There were three components, but everything would be addressed within one application. Commissioner Prince referenced the narratives that were submitted. The homeowner who would have their lot reduced in size seemed to have some confusion. She felt that the issue should be resolved before

anything moved forward. Ms. Marsh reported that the property owner of Lot 15 sold a piece of their property to the applicant. The confusion likely had to do with why there needed to be a change made to the Subdivision Plat, but that needed to be done to reflect the proper boundaries.

The fifth item on the Regular Meeting agenda was the “Oly Vista Subdivision – Landscaping Plan Amendment.” Mr. Teerlink explained that this was for property located at 4877 South Murray Holladay Road and it was located in the R-1-10 Zone. The request was to amend an approved Landscaping Site Plan. One of the trees included in a previous Preservation Plan needed to be removed. It was currently in the way of some relandscaping and patio work that was proposed. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Tree Canopy Preservation and Sustainability Plan needed to be taken into account. There needed to be a 1:1 replacement in canopy size. He believed the applicant had a compensation plan for that loss of canopy coverage. The juniper that was in question had a canopy coverage of approximately 50 square feet. The applicant proposed to replace that with at least five new maple trees. Discussions were had about different types of trees and shade coverage.

Commissioner Ginger Vilchinsky questioned whether the year-round canopy was considered when making these kinds of replacement decisions. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Planning Commission had some discretion. There was no specific guidance in the Code about that as it only discussed the canopy. It was possible to have those types of conversations with the applicant during the Regular Meeting. Commissioner Fonte asked about the Tree Committee and their input on these types of issues. Chair Roach explained that the Tree Committee worked with City Staff to craft the ordinance that is currently in place, but the Tree Committee does not have the authority to enforce the ordinance. City Staff and Code Enforcement were responsible for enforcing ordinance requirements. The Tree Committee focuses on education and outreach.

It was noted that there were three Discussion Items on the Regular Meeting agenda. Ms. Marsh stated that some Text Amendments were proposed. The first was a Text Amendment to Chapter 13.10 – Subdivisions. The proposed amendments would ensure that the language met the State requirements. The second Text Amendment was for Chapters 13.76.730, 13.08.040, and 13.80.020 – Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit. There would be set conditions that City Staff could approve rather than those being reviewed by the Planning Commission. The last Text Amendment on the Regular Meeting agenda related to Chapter 13.14.031 – Accessory Dwelling Units. There would be a discussion about external dwelling units and possible changes there.

Feedback from the Planning Commission would impact the draft text for the Text Amendments. Those amendments would be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration in the future. The purpose of the discussions was to receive feedback on what was desired from the Planning Commission. She believed the subdivision discussion would be fairly straightforward because the amendments would ensure that State requirements were met. As for the subdivision discussions, there could be suggestions shared about what the conditions might look like. For the external dwelling units, there were a few different options and direction could be received.

Commissioner Fonte asked about the second item on the Regular Meeting agenda. She wanted additional information about the noticing process. Mr. Teerlink explained that the State law had changed. For Legislative actions, the State law required that affected entities be noticed. An affected entities notice had been mailed out. There was also public noticing on the website, but there had not been direct mailers sent out to people within a certain distance from the property.

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

Chair Roach called the Regular Meeting to order at approximately 6:03 p.m. He reviewed the agenda. Commissioner Fonte read the Commission Statement for the benefit of those present.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. “Wright Mind LLC” – Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit – 2220 East Murray Holladay Road Unit #229 (“RM”) Review and Consideration of a Request by Applicant David Wright, as Owner, for a Home Occupation Providing Business Consulting Services. Item Reviewed as an Administrative Application as per Provisions stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.08.040. File #23-2-13.

Ms. Marsh reported that the application was for “Wright Mind, LLC.” It was a Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit for property located at 2220 East Murray Holladay Road, Unit #229. The applicant wanted to operate a business from their dwelling unit. She explained that the applicant would see business clients in their home and the number of clients would range from one to four clients at a time. The applicant had a Parking Plan and Site Plan that showed traffic circulation and proposed parking locations. Comments had been received from the HOA and other residents in the complex. Concerns were expressed about parking on the site. The hours of operation were included in the applicant narrative and were requested to be 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on weekdays with some occasional hours on the weekends. She asked the applicant to share more details.

The applicant, David Wright, introduced himself and explained that this is a small business that does a lot of pro bono work. Having meetings at home will ensure that there is a more intimate setting than in a public place. The discussions would be less disrupted that way. Mr. Wright read the comments and did not believe parking would be an issue. He listed one to four clients at a time, but that would be a high volume. In the month of October, he met with only four associates and clients the entire month. He believed the actual use would have a fairly low impact. He understood the concerns but noted that the parking in the south guest parking area is normally empty during the day and fills in later on.

Mr. Wright referenced one of the comments submitted that stated that he had tried to do this before but was denied. He clarified that he was approved and operated in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. He was open to whatever conditions the Commission felt were necessary. Chair Roach wanted to clarify whether this was a residence that he occupied or if it was something utilized for business. Mr. Wright confirmed that it was residential. His father resides in the unit, and he goes there to take care of him. The primary use of the unit is residential. Chair Roach asked how many parking stalls are associated with the property. Mr. Wright reported that there was one parking spot associated with the unit. Chair Roach noted that some of the comments received stated that the HOA did not permit businesses to operate. He wondered how that would be addressed. Mr. Wright explained that there was nothing in the CC&Rs or bylaws to state that. There were some inaccuracies in the comments that had been submitted by HOA members.

Commissioner Fonte noted that a lot of concerns had been expressed about parking. In the Meeting Materials Packet, it stated that client meetings normally involved one to two clients, but may involve three to four clients. It also stated that meetings were usually an hour long but could run for two to three hours. She wanted to better understand where the visitors would park. For instance, whether the clients would use guest parking on the site. Mr. Wright stated that there was visitor parking on the south and it was rarely even half full. He expressed a willingness to work with the HOA Board and abide by any Conditions of Approval the Planning Commission felt were necessary. Commissioner Cunningham asked to review the diagram of the condominium. He believed what was shown did not look like a residence. Mr. Wright explained that he had marked the rooms in the condominium for the purpose of business operations. No one would be entering the bedrooms, so those had been marked as private rooms or sleeping quarters. There was a desk in the bedroom, but that did not mean that the room would be used for office purposes.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if Mr. Wright had a Business License or a Home Occupation previously. Mr. Wright had the old paperwork available for review. He explained that he was approved to have visitors at the time. Ms. Marsh reported that Conditional Use Permits ran with the land, and she did not have a record of

a Conditional Use Permit, so it was likely that there was a Business License that permitted visitors to the location. Mr. Teerlink explained that in 2019, the State Legislators mandated that every municipality needed to amend its Home Occupation Ordinances. If there was no impact on the community, a Business License was needed, but if there would be an impact where someone came to the residence, a Conditional Use Permit could be issued, and the Planning Commission could review that application. That occurred in 2019. Things were different back in 2012 when Mr. Wright had last applied for the use.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Fonte believed the Planning Commission could not take the comments related to the HOA and CC&Rs into consideration. City Attorney, Jayme Blakesley, explained that the Planning Commission needed to apply the rules of the City. The CC&Rs that the HOA had were recorded against the property, so those were durable, but those were for the HOA to enforce and communicate to residents and owners. It was not the responsibility of the City to enforce it. It might be the case that the CC&Rs restricted this type of activity, but if so, the HOA needed to enforce it.

If the City were to grant a Conditional Use Permit for the activity but the private covenants forbid the use, then the HOA could enforce that. The City did not need to make that determination on behalf of the HOA. There were certain things related to the HOA that it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to consider, such as parking. If there were parking spaces that were marked or owned collectively among the owners of the property and not by the individual applicant, he did not believe the applicant could represent that the spaces were within his control and available for the patrons of the business. There would have to be some evidence that there was parking that the applicant controlled either through agreement or ownership.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that the applicant is not a resident of the complex, although he owns the condominium. He questioned whether the ordinance requires the applicant to be a resident in the home. Mr. Blakesley believed the owner could submit the application. It appeared that the owner of the unit intends to have the secondary business use. He did not think there was a requirement that the owner be a permanent resident as well. Commissioner Cunningham did not believe there had been another application during his time on the Planning Commission where three to four clients were proposed to visit a home at one time. Typically, the Commission wants to see there be one client at a home at a time and a gap between visits. He wondered if it would be possible to limit the number of visitors to the property at a time. There had been some comments submitted about the less than-adequate soundproofing between units. Due to the parking and noise concerns, he suggested limiting the number of visitors.

Commissioner Fonte asked if limiting the number of visitors should be a condition. Chair Roach reminded the Commissioners that there are home businesses that have several visitors come to the home, such as daycares, pre-schools, and music lessons. He would be more concerned about the number of clients if the applicant was proposing a use similar to that. However, this type of use would likely be fairly quiet. He was not as concerned about the noise levels but there were concerns related to parking availability. It did not sound like the amount of traffic associated with the application would result in a dramatic increase to a 200+ unit condominium complex but nothing had been submitted to indicate that permission had been granted for additional parking.

Commissioner Cunningham noted that while no one had shared public comments during the public hearing, a lot of public input was submitted ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Roach asked the applicant to respond to some of the comments and concerns. Mr. Wright understood the concerns expressed by the Commission. A condition that seemed reasonable was to request that the client park in the designated parking stall. When a client comes to the unit, he could walk there instead of driving to make sure the stall is available. Chair Roach stated that this satisfied his concerns. Other Commissioners also liked the suggestion.

Commissioner Berndt pointed out that the Code requires there be two designated parking spaces. It seemed that another parking space needed to be secured for the use. Chair Roach asked if two designated ownership stalls are required. Ms. Marsh confirmed that under the current Code, two parking stalls are required. This was similar to another Home Occupation application that the Planning Commission looked at where there was not enough parking. She noted that this was something being addressed in the proposed text amendments. With the previous application where there is not enough parking, the application was put on hold. That applicant could come back and resubmit the application once the Code is changed.

Given this information, the Planning Commission was unable to vote in favor of the application unless the applicant could demonstrate that there are two designated parking stalls. Chair Roach noted that the application could be put on hold until a neighbor provides written permission to utilize one of their stalls or the HOA permits guaranteed access to a guest stall at certain times of the day. Alternatively, it would be possible to wait for the text amendment to move ahead.

Mr. Wright questioned whether street parking could be considered designated parking. Ms. Marsh reported that the current Code does not allow Home Occupations to involve street parking. Two on-site parking spots are required. In this case, there could be a written agreement with a neighbor or HOA to utilize one of the other parking spaces. Mr. Blakesley noted that the City would allow for a written agreement with an adjacent business. Ms. Marsh confirmed that off-site parking agreements could be utilized. If there is an adjacent business within walking distance that would permit him to use a parking stall for this purpose, that agreement could be brought forward. Mr. Wright asked that the Planning Commission consider approval of the application but with a Condition of Approval that requires there be a Parking Agreement in place. Commissioner Cunningham did not have a problem with the approval being conditional as long as it is approved by City Staff. Mr. Blakesley was comfortable with the Commission taking that approach.

Mr. Wright pointed out that when someone purchases a condominium, it is reasonable to expect visitors to come and utilize one of the guest parking spaces. Commissioner Cunningham felt there was a difference between running a business and having guests visit the home. Mr. Wright understood that perspective but explained that he would not be advertising his business. Chair Roach asked if he would be able to work with a Condition of Approval that required an additional parking stall be obtained for the use. Mr. Wright confirmed this.

Commissioner Fonte reported that she drove past the property on the weekend during the proposed business hours. There was a lot of guest parking available that was clearly designated. At the times that she drove past, the guest parking was more than half empty. It was clearly designated as guest parking, which is available to the residents and their guests. It did not state that it was available to clients of home-based businesses. She thought that the Conditions of Approval discussed were reasonable and would mitigate any possible issues.

Commissioner Fonte moved to APPROVE the application, subject to the findings and conditions listed in the Staff Report and the condition that had been discussed during the meeting, which was to have written proof of a second parking stall. Commissioner Prince seconded the motion.

There was discussion about the motion. Commissioner Cunningham asked that an additional condition be listed to specify that no more than four clients be at the property at one time.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to AMEND the motion, to include a Condition of Approval to state that no more than four clients would be at the property at one time. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Fonte moved to APPROVE the application for a Home Occupation for “Wright Mind, LLC,” located at 2220 East Murray Holladay Road Unit #229, based upon the findings:

- 1. Land Use and Home Occupation requirements, as proposed, are in compliance with existing City Ordinances.*
- 2. The Conditional Use, as proposed, meets approval standards as outlined in Chapter 13.08.040.*

This motion is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Off-street parking areas shall be maintained as available during business hours – no street parking allowed.*
- 2. Obtain a Holladay Business License.*
- 3. Hours of operation are limited to those detailed by the applicant.*
- 4. Conditions or complaints found to violate set standards will require re-review by the Planning Commission or possible revocation of this permit, as determined by the Community Development Director.*
- 5. That the applicant provide evidence to City Staff of the right to use a second parking stall and that the second parking stall be approved by City Staff.*
- 6. That the number of clients will not exceed more than four at one time.*

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

- 2. Zone Map Amendment – Rezone from RM to PO – 5200 South Highland Drive (“RM”). Review and Recommendation to City Council on a Proposal by Applicant Tim Sleeper to Amend the Holladay Zone Map at this location from the Current, Residential Multi-Family Zone (“RM”) to the Professional Office Zone (“PO”) for Approximately 1.13 acres of Land in Order to More Accurately Reflect the Use of the Land. Item Reviewed as a Legislative Action, According to Procedures Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #23-4-09.**

Mr. Teerlink reported that the above request is for a rezone from the RM Zone to the PO Zone for property located at 5200 South Highland Drive. The application before the Commission is a Legislative recommendation to the City Council to rezone a piece of property at the corner of Spring Lane and Highland Drive. The existing office building is currently located in the RM Zone. He clarified that the RM Zone was a holdover brought over from the County when the City of Holladay was incorporated in 2000. At the time, it included office buildings and multi-family development. The land use table for the existing office buildings was fairly limited. In 2018, the City Council decided to amend that list by creating the PO Zone, which it was determined would be applicable to the office buildings in the RM Zone.

The Planning Commission reviewed the standards for the PO Zone in the past and the Council adopted the Zone. However, what was not done was a rezone of the existing office buildings. Instead, each individual office owner was able to approach the City with a rezone application. Mr. Teerlink reported that the current applicant had applied for some uses that were allowed in the PO Zone. Those were pending approval of the rezone request. The Council expected these types of applications to be reviewed and recommended by the Commission, but the Council was the deciding body. Staff recommended that the Commission forward a positive recommendation.

The applicant, Tim Sleeper, introduced himself to the Commission and reported that the building was purchased in the summer of 2022. Since then, there have been two applications for an Occupancy Permit. The

latest one that came through in the summer was denied. That started the conversation about what uses were grandfathered in under the RM Zone and what the options were in the PO Zone. He did not necessarily know that a zone change was needed and hoped that it would be possible to update the grandfathered uses to match the PO Zone. That being said, the better fit for the building at the current time was the PO Zone so the office building could be used appropriately. Commissioner Angela Gong thought the rezone sounded reasonable as there was precedent.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Prince moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to APPROVE an application by Tim Sleeper to amend the Holladay Zoning Map for 1.13 acres of land, located at 5200 South Highland Drive from RM to PO based on the precedent to rezone to the PO Zone when requested by a business owner. Commissioner Berndt seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Prince-Aye; Commissioner Fonte-Aye; Commissioner Gong-Aye; Commissioner Berndt-Aye; Chair Roach-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **“Holladay Heights” Residential Subdivision – Concept/Preliminary Plat – 4930 Westmoor Road (R-1-10) Conceptual and Preliminary Review and Consideration of a Residential Subdivision Proposed by Applicant Benjamin Wheat to Subdivide 2.88 Acres of Land to Accommodate 10 Lots within the R-1-10 Zone. Item Reviewed as an Administrative Action for Permitted Uses in Accordance to Zone and Subdivision Standards Required by Holladay Ord §13.10. File #23-1-11.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for the “Holladay Heights” Residential Subdivision for property located at 4930 Westmoor Road. The property was previously rezoned as it was a church property in the past. It had been rezoned from the Public Zone to the R-1-10 Zone, which had a 10,000-square-foot lot minimum size. The proposal was for 10 lots as well as an extension to an existing road, which would create a through street. All of the lots met the 10,000 square-foot minimum required for the zone. As a result, it met the conceptual approval requirements. The preliminary would be reviewed at a later date. The Planning Commission could decide whether there was a desire to continue the public hearing until that time or close the public hearing.

The applicant, Benjamin Wheat, introduced himself to the Commission and shared an image of the church that is currently under contract, which was just west of the old Cottonwood Mall site. The property was rezoned from the P Zone to the R-1-10 Zone last month. Mr. Wheat reviewed the conceptual materials, which outlined the subdivision and the new road that would connect. There would be 10 lots in total and the road would be deeded back to the City.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Dan Brissenden gave his address as 4911 Westmoor Road, which is the northmost home on Westmoor Road. There is a small piece of land on the far north end of Westmoor Road that is currently owned by the church, and he questioned what would happen to it. He identified the area on a map. It was noted that it is right-of-way. Mr. Brissenden had questions about what would become of that area now that the church was no longer there because the church had handled the maintenance. Mr. Teerlink explained that it would be similar to a park strip. Anyone with abutting ownership who had a park strip in front of their property had to maintain that. As the new lot was developed and subsequently purchased by a property owner, whoever abutted the right-of-way would need to maintain that. The park strip maintenance requirements were flexible.

Mr. Brissenden was surprised to hear that Delaware Circle will now go through and dead end at Westmoor Road. He asked about traffic controls. Chair Roach noted that it would be a public road, so it would be

applicable to the requirements there were for a public street. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. If the request was for speedbumps, that would be a City Council determination.

There was discussion about whether to leave the public hearing open for the preliminary process. Mr. Blakesly explained that whenever a public hearing was identified, the date for that hearing needed to be identified, otherwise the hearing would need to be re-noticed. If the Planning Commission wanted to continue the public hearing, he asked that a date be selected. Ms. Marsh informed the Commission that subdivisions only required one public hearing. It would be possible to close the conceptual public hearing as the noticing had been for conceptual and preliminary.

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

Commissioner Cunningham noted that a neighborhood meeting was held with some members of the public in attendance. At that time, there was discussion of a plan that did not look like what had been submitted to the Commission. Many of the comments received about the application referred to nine lots instead of 10 lots and having a dead end as opposed to an open road. The Planning Commission needed to make a decision about what had been submitted. For instance, whether it met the zoning requirements and the ordinance. He did not have concerns with the Concept Plan.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to APPROVE the Conceptual Plan application by Benjamin Wheat for a 10-unit residential subdivision, located at 4930 South Westmoor Road in the R-1-10 Zone, based on the following findings:

- 1. The requirements for Conceptual Subdivision have been substantially completed.***
- 2. Each of the lots complies with the minimum width and area for single-family home developments in the R-1-10 Zone.***
- 3. The development complies with the General Plan.***
- 4. Fire access meets the standards required by the Unified Fire Authority ("UFA").***

The motion is subject to the following requirements:

- 1. Submit the required area and use table, per the Concept Plan checklist.***
- 2. Obtain and submit all utility connection letters prior to Final Plat submittal to the TRC.***
- 3. Propose a new name for the subdivision, as Holladay Heights is already in use.***

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

4. **“Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision – Conceptual Amendment and Extension– 5560 South Wasatch Boulevard (“FCOZ”) Conceptual Review and Consideration of an Application by Applicants Robert and Connie Jensen, to Amend the “Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision and Subdivide Two Acres of Land. This Two-Lot, Residential Subdivision will be Added as an Amendment to the Abutting, “Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision. Item Reviewed as an Administrative Action for Permitted Uses in Accordance to Zone and Subdivision Standards Required by Holladay Ord §13.10 File #18-1-04.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for the “Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision, which is located at 5560 South Wasatch Boulevard. The request was for a subdivision amendment and extension. “Silver Hawk 2” was originally platted in 1996, but an area of land owned by the applicant was not included in that original subdivision. The application was to bring 1.9 acres to that subdivision and to alter a lot line on Lot 15 to reflect the new ownership of the land purchased. That total property size of two acres would be subdivided into two lots. All of that information was reflected on the Subdivision Plat, as amended and extended. This was a conceptual review and approval. She asked the applicant to share additional information.

The applicant, Robert Jensen, introduced himself and explained that he is the property owner and has owned it for approximately 30 years. Since it fell under the Foothill Canyons Overlay Zone (“FCOZ”), the intention was to increase the property to two acres in the hope that there could be a two-lot subdivision there with two 1-acre lots. There was access to one lot off of Silver Hawk Drive. There was one lot up on Wasatch Boulevard that would access in that direction. He did not believe there would be significant traffic impacts as only one additional lot would be added to the subdivision. He hoped the Commission would vote in favor of the request.

Commissioner Berndt referenced Lot 101 on the Site Plan. It appeared that there was a fairly limited amount of buildable space without disturbing the slope. He wondered whether it was possible to encroach into the 30% with the building envelope or if that was a restricted area for construction. Mr. Jensen reported that Meridian Engineering had done the topography work, and two buildable areas were shown. A modern home would fit there and not exceed 30%. Ms. Marsh reported that it was not permissible to build into areas with 30% slope or greater. At this level, the Commission was reviewing the concept to determine if it met the zoning requirements. FCOZ required a one-acre lot size. All of the civil and buildable areas would be identified at the preliminary level. The applicant would bring back the application with those details at that time.

Commissioner Prince noted that there had been previous discussions about this property and the lot that was not quite large enough to subdivide. The applicant had purchased some property to reach the 2-acre size. At this point, the property size met the two-acre requirement, which is required for subdivision in the FCOZ. From her perspective, it seemed this matter was now very cut and dry. Chair Roach explained that the only concern he had related to the accessibility to Wasatch Boulevard, just because of the amount of traffic on that curve. There had been discussions in the past about a drive being accessed down lower and not directly off of Wasatch Boulevard. In his opinion, something like that would be more favorable due to the nature of the traffic in that area. At this phase, the requirements had been met in terms of the lot size needed for subdivision.

Commissioner Prince pointed out that access discussions would take place during a future meeting. Ms. Marsh reported that driveways and accesses could go across a 30% slope, so it was possible to cross the 30% slope with the appropriate permits and civil engineering required to do so. Commissioner Fonte asked if the access from Lot 101 was from Silver Hawk Drive and the access from Lot 100 from Wasatch Boulevard. Ms. Marsh confirmed the access locations.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Heather Green identified herself as the owner of Lot 15. She was fully aware that she had sold a piece of her property to the applicants. Her question was about the other parcel to the east of her property. Ms. Marsh believed she was referring to the strip that was on the east side. This was confirmed. Ms. Marsh clarified that it was a separate parcel and was likely taxed at a lower rate. That was normally done when there was an area that was unbuildable due to the slope. She added that the area would be included in the total parcel to maintain the 1-acre lot minimum for the zone.

Ms. Green asked about the Lot 101 approach from Silver Hawk Drive. If there was road damage or any road repairs needed, she wanted to know who would be responsible for that work. Mr. Teerlink explained that because the overall subdivision was being amended, the two lots would be included in some way as part of the HOA or CC&Rs established previously. There should be a maintenance agreement for the road. Those details could be determined after the meeting.

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

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Concept Plat application submitted by Robert and Connie Jensen for “Silver Hawk 2 Amend and Extend,” a residential subdivision in the R-1-21 underlying zone and Foothill and Canyons Overlay Zone, finding that the subdivision:

1. **The proposed amendment and extension to the “Silver Hawk 2” Subdivision meet lot minimum standards for the FCOZ.**
2. **Utility Service Letters have been provided.**

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

5. **“Oly Vista Subdivision - Landscaping Plan Amendment” – 4877 South Murray Holladay Road (“R-1-10 Zone”). Applicant Proposes an Amendment to Approved Landscaping Plans Approved by the Planning Commission in accordance with Applicable Holladay Ordinance 13.08.010D(5) 13.08.170.H, 13.10.050B2c(7) and 13.77.D2(c). File #22-1-03-2.**

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for the “Oly Vista Subdivision,” which was a Landscaping Plan Amendment for property located at 4877 South Murray Holladay Road. The application before the Commission was an administrative review for consideration of an amendment to a Landscaping Plan. He explained that the Landscaping Plan was part of the preliminary level review for the subdivision. A request had been made to amend that. The property owner had provided the Commission with an amendment for a juniper tree that was on the front against the sidewalk on Holladay Boulevard. That tree was indicated to be in the way of a patio improvement. The property owner was proposing replacement of the canopy coverage.

Chair Roach noted that it looked like there were five maple trees in the plan that had been presented. He wondered whether those trees would be planted to replace the one juniper tree that would be removed. This was confirmed. The applicant, Buck Swaney, reported that the replacement trees had shifted from five to 13. There would be eight additional trees compared to the last amendment. There was a commitment to increase the amount of canopy and to beautify the site. Mr. Swaney noted that the amendment was partly related to the proposed patio, but it was also there to address drainage issues. The amendments would ensure that the site drains well.

Chair Roach wondered whether there was a reason that all maple trees had been selected. He wanted to know why no variations were proposed. Mr. Swaney noted that there was no particular reason for that choice. The

main thing that the landscape architect was instructed to do was to put healthy species of columnar trees so there would not be interference with power lines. The intention was to plant something that would be beautiful and would stay beautiful. Mr. Swaney pointed out the tree on the bottom right that was adjacent to his neighbor to the south. It had been requested that columnar flowering pears be considered, which he was open to. He had not made a commitment but asked for the flexibility to adjust that tree to satisfy his neighbor. Additionally, he was open to suggestions about other columnar tree species from the Commission.

Chair Roach believed that the applicant was requesting the shift from the one juniper to the five replacement trees, but there was also a request to have the flexibility to change the honey locust to a grove of flowering pears. He wondered how many flowering pears had been contemplated. Mr. Swaney noted that there would be a minimum of three to replace the existing canopy. Chair Roach was supportive of that request as long as the canopy coverage remained the same.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Vilchinsky noted that after reviewing the information provided, it was clear that the applicant intended to increase the canopy size rather than reduce it. It was also clear that the existing juniper also prevented him from being able to use the property most effectively. Additionally, the existing juniper tree was very old and would likely need to be replaced in the future anyway. She had no problem approving the application with that information in mind. Commissioner Gong appreciated that the applicant was open to suggestions from the neighbor.

Commissioner Vilchinsky moved to APPROVE the Landscaping Amendment application by Landblu, LLC, for Lot 1 of the “Oly Vista Subdivision,” located at 4877 South Holladay Boulevard in the R-1-10 Zone, based upon the following findings:

- 1. The landowner is increasing the canopy rather than diminishing it on the property.***
- 2. The tree that needs to be removed is preventing development and/or physical use and enjoyment of the property.***

This motion is subject to the following condition:

- 1. That there be flexibility provided in the southeast corner of the lot, in order to deviate from the honey locust to three or more trees of equal canopy size.***

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

The Planning Commission took a brief five-minute recess before the Discussion Items.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 6. Text Amendment – Chapter 13.10; SUBDIVISIONS (A STATE REQUIRED AMENDMENT) Subdivision Process. Review and Discuss Proposed Amendments to Title 13, of the Holladay City Code, Land Use and Development Regulations as they Relate to Subdivisions in Accordance with State Requirements. Discussion Item Only for Future Review as a Legislative Action to Make a Recommendation to the City Council, According to Procedures Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #23-4-05.**

Mr. Teerlink reported that the Legislature discussed how to address affordable housing and how to have enough product that was accessible in municipalities. One of the hurdles that was brought to the Legislature was the process by which land was entitled. That had to do with how quickly subdivisions moved through the Planning Commission process. Looking at all of the municipalities across the State, it was discovered that many processes were similar to what was seen in Holladay, but some other municipalities had one hearing. The development community had informed the Legislature that the different processes in different places could be confusing.

The State mandate was to standardize the process. The City of Holladay has until February 1, 2023, to standardize the subdivision process, specifically moving away from a three-step process: Concept, Preliminary, and Final. The Planning Commission would no longer have a concept review. The concept review would take place at a Staff level or would be rolled into the preliminary review. Some of the technical items that were included in the preliminary level of review would roll into the final review, which would be conducted by Staff. The municipality had four opportunities to review a final plat, which included four rounds of back and forth with the engineering firm.

Something somewhat new to Holladay was the appeal process. If after four reviews, the City and the applicant could not agree on an element, the applicant could appeal that decision to a specific body that was made up of professionals in the field. Proposed amendments would be made to some sections of the Holladay Municipal Land Use and Management Code Act:

- Title 13, Chapter 6 – General Administrative and Development Review Procedures;
- Title 13, Chapter 8 – Development Review and Approval for Administrative Procedures;
- Title 13, Chapter 8 – Subdivisions;
- Title 13, Chapter 78 – Planned Unit Developments.

The State of Utah is funding various groups to allow municipalities to be counseled on this type of amendment to make sure the standards were met and approved. The Legal Counsel for the City was on that list and some counsel would be received from them. Once a draft was written, it would be reviewed for compliance with the State laws. The Meeting Materials Packet included a portion of the State law language, which was Senate Bill (“S.B.”) 174. That language would be matched as much as possible. The ordinance would be impacted greatly as there were four sections in the Title where subdivision processes were addressed. However, in the end, the process would become more streamlined, and it would be easier for the applicants to understand what was required.

Chair Roach believed that what was proposed would significantly impact the Planning Commission's work. He questioned whether the Planning Commission would receive training to better understand what was expected in the future compared to what was expected currently. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that there would be a full review with the Commission. When the discussions continued, it would be possible to ask questions and better understand the Planning Commission's responsibilities. The more technical elements would not be considered by the Commission in the future, as those details would be addressed by the Engineering and Public Works Departments. Chair Roach asked when the tree review would take place in the process. Mr. Teerlink stated that it would be done during the preliminary process. If there was a multi-family or multi-use project, then parking would also be included in the preliminary phase as that related to zone compliance.

One and two-lot subdivisions were not required to go to the Land Use Authority. Mr. Teerlink explained that those could be done administratively by Staff. It had always been the policy of the Holladay City Council to review those at the Land Use Authority level. That matter would be brought to the Planning Commission and the City Council for additional discussion and consideration. It was possible to have the one and two-lot subdivisions handled by Staff in the future as most cities did not take the one and two-lot subdivisions to the

Planning Commission. Chair Roach asked whether those would be noticed still. Mr. Teerlink explained that if those were handled at a Staff level, there would be a different noticing process. The site would be posted and there would be a 10-day comment period. If there was anything abnormal, the matter would be brought to the Planning Commission for review. Otherwise, after the 10-day comment period, Staff would follow through with the preliminary and final plat process.

7. **Text Amendment – Chapter 13.76.730, 13.08.040, 13.80.020; HOME OCCUPATION; CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; Sections Relating to Home Occupations Including Conditional Use Permits, Parking Standards, and Business Licensing. Review and Discuss Proposed Amendments to Title 13, of the Holladay City Code, Land Use and Development Regulations as they Relate to Home Occupations and Conditional Use Permits. Discussion Item Only for Future Review as a Legislative Action to Make a Recommendation to the City Council, According to Procedures Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #23-4-08.**

Ms. Marsh reported that the next Discussion Item related to a Text Amendment for sections related to Home Occupations, including Conditional Use Permits, parking standards, and Business Licensing. The proposal was to take the Conditional Use that was associated with a Home Occupation and create a set list of conditions that would be applied to all Home Occupation Permits. In the review process, there were typically similar conditions imposed. For example, parking had to be all on the site, there were limited hours of operation, and drop-off and pick-up needed to be managed. Those types of items would be included within the list of conditions. Some of those were outlined in the table that was part of the Staff Report. Ms. Marsh explained that some of the changes were more minor housekeeping items. She reviewed the table in the materials.

Another issue that Staff was looking at related to accessory buildings and yard space. The current code did not allow the use of yard space or accessory buildings for Home Occupations. Ms. Marsh clarified that the production of things could occur in those spaces, but the actual business had to occur within the primary dwelling. There could be a discussion about allowing someone to use an accessory building or part of a detached garage for business purposes. She noted that the matter was something that the Planning Commission could consider. As for parking, the code referred to the on-site parking requirements, which included two parking spaces for a business use. The proposed change would allow the use of one street parking space directly abutting the residence.

Chair Roach asked about the potential change to the parking requirement. He wondered whether there would be consideration given to the different Master Plans. He noted that allowing street parking in the Village would be more significant than allowing street parking in an R-1-10 Zone. Ms. Marsh explained that there could be zone considerations. Mr. Teerlink wanted to make sure the City was in a position where the requirements were defensible. It was difficult for the municipality to defend the fact that clients could not use a public street to park for a home-based business use, but other guests could. If on-street parking was permitted to be used for home-based businesses, the Commission could think about percentages or permitted parking hours.

Commissioner Cunningham was concerned that making changes to the parking would lead residents to believe that the parking in front of their homes was for their use only. He thought it was dangerous to contribute to the idea that the public owned the parking in front of their house. That being said, he believed it would be beneficial to have additional discussions about parking. Ms. Marsh noted that there could be a differentiation between low-impact and high-impact uses. For low impact, it was possible to require parking to be provided on-site and if street parking was used, then there could only be one vehicle at a time. That would restrict to some degree the parking.

Commissioner Cunningham thought it was important to think about what would be done if the Home Occupation was in an apartment complex. That was different than a condominium complex or a single-family home. There were unique circumstances for each of those. If a Conditional Use Permit ran with the land and

someone renting an apartment made the request, some legal clarifications were needed. He believed there should be different considerations for different housing types. Mr. Blakesley noted that some work would need to be done to determine the best solutions. One way some of those unique circumstances could be addressed was to tie a Business License requirement that did not run with the land to any Home Occupation.

There was discussion about public notices and public hearings for those processes. Ms. Marsh explained that the purpose of a Conditional Use was to mitigate the impacts on surrounding properties. Some of the impacts may not be immediately foreseeable without public comments. She asked the City Attorney whether noticing could still be a requirement without a public hearing. Mr. Teerlink believed the best way to address concerns was to find Home Occupation uses that had been routine and uncontested in the past. Applications where there were unusual circumstances would be noticed and come before the Planning Commission for consideration. Some examples included a Home Occupation in a condominium complex or a different kind of use. Anything that could be contested would have a public hearing and comments would be heard.

Commissioner Gong liked the idea of looking at low-impact uses versus high-impact uses. If only one person was coming to a home-based business at a time, it did not necessarily make sense to require two on-site parking stalls. That requirement was restricting a lot of people when that restriction did not necessarily make sense. She was in favor of making the parking more flexible. There were certain circumstances where it made sense to have a lower minimum. In places with more density, there was still a desire to allow residents to have businesses. She felt it was possible to find out a way to make that possible, especially since there were a lot of parking lots in the City.

Commissioner Gong asked about the prohibited uses. It looked like there were no prohibited uses and some suggestions had been made. Ms. Marsh explained that there were a few cities that called out specific uses in the Home Occupation section that were not allowed. Some examples included salons with multiple employees, kennels, and commercial stables. Those uses were examples of Home Occupations that could occur but would have a much larger impact. The Commission could include those examples or add additional examples that might be problematic. Alternatively, there could be a general provision to state that any uses outside of a normal, customary use would require there to be a review by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Fonte thought it was important to be sensitive and understand that people did not like change. It was also necessary to be welcoming and friendly to residents who wanted to have home-based businesses.

Commissioner Prince liked the suggestion from Ms. Marsh about uses that would fall outside of normal and customary uses. She thought that was a reasonable way of addressing permitted and prohibited uses. It would be easier than listing out everything that was not permitted. Mr. Blakesley noted that there were certain categories of uses that were dangerous in a home environment. He encouraged Commissioners to look at the list of suggestions as well. There were some items that the City would likely want to have listed, otherwise, it could be difficult to defend denying a use. The Commission discussed some example uses that would not be appropriate.

Chair Roach thought the number of allowed Conditional Uses on a street or in a neighborhood should be considered. Mr. Teerlink noted that the Planning Commission could deny a Conditional Use Permit if there was an unusual concentration of those types of uses within a certain distance. He had not run into that issue before, but that language was already written in the code.

Commissioner Berndt thought the proposed amendments made sense. His biggest concern was how to define what neighborhood traffic was. There was a standard for the number of vehicles that could come to a residence. Beyond that, it would be considered an increase in neighborhood traffic. He noted that delivery trucks on streets had really changed the dynamic of neighborhood traffic. Commissioner Berndt reiterated concerns about traffic and parking in neighborhoods.

8. Text Amendment – Chapter 13.14.031; ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, External Dwelling Units. Review and Discuss Proposed Amendments to Title 13, of the Holladay City Code, Land Use and Development Regulations as they Relate to Accessory Dwelling Units. Discussion Item Only for Future Review as a Legislative Action to Make a Recommendation to the City Council, According to Procedures Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #23-4-08.

Ms. Marsh reported that the next Text Amendment discussion related to Title 13, which had to do with Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”). She reminded Commissioners of a rezone application that involved an ADU. The ADU was underneath a detached garage and was on a lot that was less than 8,000 square feet. She explained that the City Council did not approve that rezone but directed City Staff to look at the ADU Ordinance and look into the conversion of existing accessory buildings. Right now, the Code does not allow external dwelling units on lots that are less than one-half acre or twice the minimum lot size. Chair Roach asked about restrictions. For instance, if there was a shed and a greenhouse in his backyard, he wanted to know whether two ADUs would be permitted. Ms. Marsh clarified that the code limited ADUs so one could be on the property.

The City Council thought a potential amendment could address some of the moderate-income housing goals. One of those goals was to remove restrictions around ADUs. It was recommended that the current code be explored to determine how restrictive it was and what changes could be made to meet those moderate-income housing goals. Ms. Marsh noted that something commonly requested was a detached garage with a dwelling unit added. There were people in the community who want to build ADUs that were detached and separate from the house. Those were often associated with some sort of detached garage. She informed the Commission that accessory buildings have a set footprint size, which stated there was a minimum of 200 square feet.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if there was a difference in setbacks between accessory buildings and ADUs. Ms. Marsh confirmed this. The code stated that there needed to be a 25% increase in setback distances if it involved a dwelling unit. That was where conflicts arose with existing accessory structures. Existing accessory structures were built to one standard, but to convert that to a dwelling unit meant there would be different standards. The standard it was built under would apply, so there could be some accessory structures that were converted that had the setbacks required for an accessory building as opposed to those required for a new dwelling unit. Information was shared about the maximum size for accessory structures and ADUs.

Ms. Marsh reported that there were several options for the Commission to consider. It was possible to allow for the conversion of existing structures that were on lots smaller than half an acre. If there was a desire to eliminate the one-half acre minimum lot size and allow external dwelling units to be built on smaller lots, that was another option to consider. The Commission could discuss limitations to mitigate impacts, such as having doors facing the inside of the property or having landscaping or fencing that would buffer the structure from neighboring properties. There could also be requirements for larger setbacks. There were several options to think about. Commissioner Fonte wanted to focus on whatever was most respectful for the existing residents.

Commissioner Cunningham asked how the City was tracking the success of moderate-income housing. Mr. Teerlink reported that there was a pretty good idea of how many units there were. Those numbers had to be reported each year. Commissioner Cunningham wondered how much of an impact the amendments would make. He thought it would be useful to have an estimate. Ms. Marsh believed the larger discussion was whether allowing smaller units was significantly different than adding onto a primary structure. That was something to think about in the future.

Commissioner Fonte wanted to discuss lighting. It looked like all of the references to dark sky compliance and LED lighting had been removed from the materials included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Ms. Marsh clarified that the current language and the proposed changes would not necessarily result in the removal of

those references. Anything that was there could remain. Since an external dwelling unit had more of an impact in terms of lighting, it would likely be important to have dark sky-compliant fixtures. There could be requirements listed to state that.

Commissioner Gong thought ADUs struck a balance between maintaining a neighborhood feel and acknowledging population growth and the need for additional housing. She pointed out that ADUs felt more residential than high-rise buildings. This was the kind of densification that she was interested in as a resident of Holladay. It seemed that ADUs were an effective way to keep things residential in nature. ADUs were a responsible way to acknowledge future growth.

Chair Roach asked about parking if an existing accessory building was converted to an ADU. There might not be appropriate parking on site to accommodate that extra dwelling unit. Ms. Marsh explained that she could bring some proposed options to the Commission for consideration. Some cities stated that parking for an ADU could not be tandem parking. There were ways to be specific about the parking requirements for an ADU. Commissioner Cunningham liked the idea of addressing the tandem parking issue. Ms. Marsh offered to look into that matter further and see what other cities had in their codes when it came to external dwelling units specifically.

Commissioner Prince informed those present that the Planning Commission page on the Holladay website was out of date. She asked that it be updated and that the calendar be made available. Ms. Marsh reported that the City was currently in the process of updating the website. It was something that City Staff was currently working on. Discussions were had about the meeting schedule.

ADJOURN

Chair 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 8:47 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, November 7, 2023.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: December 19, 2023