

**MINUTES OF THE
HOLLADAY CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, January 18, 2024

6:00 p.m.

**Mt. Olympus Room
4580 South 2300 East
Holladay, Utah**

BRIEFING SESSION - 5:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Rob Dahle
Paul Fotheringham
Emily Gray
Matt Durham
Ty Brewer
Drew Quinn

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Jayme Blakesley, City Attorney
Ann Frances Garcia, Economic Dev. & Housing
Manager

Mayor Dahle called the Briefing Session to order at 5:33 p.m. The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.

Mayor Dahle discussed the presentation and recognition of Jo Jo. This was something the Council has not done in the past but felt the Council should recognize citizens in our community for their accomplishments. Jo Jo has received national recognition and he felt that should be acknowledged and recognized by the Council and the citizens of Holladay.

The rezone on Murray Holladay Road was discussed. This item could get a lot of public comment and therefore may need to be kept open for another week in order to review comments, etc.

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF HOLLADAY CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, January 18, 2024

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Rob Dahle
Paul Fotheringham
Emily Gray
Matt Durham
Ty Brewer
Drew Quinn

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Jayme Blakesley, City Attorney
Ann Frances Garcia, Economic Dev. & Housing
Manager

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Rob Dahle called the City Council Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

Mayor Dahle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Public Comments.*

Ahead of the public comment period, Mayor Dahle reported that Finance Director, Diane Burandt, passed away unexpectedly. It was a significant loss to the City. He read a letter that City Manager, Gina Chamness, prepared for City Staff. It stated that Ms. Burandt served in her role as Finance Director since the City's incorporation nearly 25 years ago. She was committed to her position and fellow employees. Her dedication and kindness will be missed. Grief support would be offered to City Staff. Mayor Dahle expressed his condolences to family, friends, and all who knew Ms. Burandt.

There were no public comments.

IV. *Recognition of JoJo Jourdon.*

Mayor Dahle reported that the next item on the City Council agenda is the recognition of JoJo Jourdon. He noted that there are some incredible young people in the community. Brad Rutledge addressed the Council and shared information about the Nike Cross Nationals ("NXN"). It includes eight regional qualifying meets across the United States. The NXN is the national meet. The top runners in the United States were at the race. Mr. Jourdon qualified individually, representing both Olympus High School and the City of Holladay. His teammates have been running together since junior high school. It was wonderful to see this level of achievement come from a member of the community.

A video of the final moments of the NXN race was shared with those present. It showed Mr. Jourdon becoming the NXN Champion. Mayor Dahle reported that it was a 5,000 meter race and Mr. Jourdon finished with a time of 15:16.5. There were 204 individuals in the race. It was an incredible accomplishment. There are a lot of impressive young people in the community and he stressed the importance of recognizing them. Mayor Dahle congratulated Mr. Jourdon for his success. A certificate was presented to Mr. Jourdon and a photograph was taken with the Mayor and Council.

V. *Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments to Title 13 Addressing Mandated Subdivision Processes (Proposed Updates, Consolidations, and/or Clarifying Amendments to Title 13, as they relate to Statute Obligations, Set Forth by State of Utah Legislation, Modifying Provisions Related to Subdivisions).*

Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, stated that in November of last year, discussions started with the Planning Commission. The amendments have to do with how subdivisions are handled with the focus primarily on expediting the subdivision of property so development can take place. From the point of view of the home builder, there are delays when subdivisions go through public hearings and Planning Commission Meetings. The State has requested that all municipalities have a truncated process for reviewing subdivisions. The process is outlined in the draft language.

Mr. Teerlink shared additional information about the draft language. He reported that the Technical Review Committee has been charged with administering a Preliminary Concept review and a Final Plat review. The Final Plat review is required to happen in four distinct review cycles. If the municipality cannot meet those four review cycles, there is an appeal process.

Council Member Matt Durham understood this change was mandated by State Statute. He wondered how much discretion the City had in terms of drafting specific provisions and wanted to know if there were portions of the ordinance where a particularly conservative or aggressive approach was taken. Mr. Teerlink explained that the ordinance limited the subdivision amendments to one-lot, two-lot, and townhome subdivisions. However, this was applied across the board so it applied to other types as well, such as multi-family condominium plats. He discussed the changes made to the language and explained that 13.10 was redacted and a clean version was written to provide additional clarity.

Council Member Drew Quinn believed the role of the Planning Commission would change as a result of the State Statute. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. The State is reiterating that the municipality process for approving subdivisions is not discretionary and it must meet certain standards. The Planning Commission verifies that those standards are being met. The State felt that municipalities were taking too long to process those reviews, so it was determined that the review processes could be standardized and moved to Staff for an administrative review.

Council Member Quinn wanted to know if the Planning Commission has less flexibility now. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Commission did not have a lot of flexibility before. Certain verifications need to be done. At the concept level, the Planning Commission needed to verify that the lot sizes were meeting the minimums. At the preliminary level, the Planning Commission needed to look at the construction level details, such as where the development of the subdivision would take place, the utilities, and so on. The final level was the actual recorded document that went to the County. The Planning Commission was there to verify certain standards of the zone were met.

Council Member Fotheringham believed the workload of the Planning Commission would decrease as a result of this change. He pointed out that there are not a significant amount of subdivision applications. The City averages a dozen subdivisions per year.

Council Member Brewer wanted to understand how the process will be different for the property owner. Mr. Teerlink explained that there will be a public hearing and Staff will bring the applicant to the Planning Commission for the preliminary review. The public hearing and noticing will stay the same and the applicant still has an opportunity to share comments as well. Unless the Planning Commission continues the item to another meeting for clarification, there will not be another meeting after that. The applicant will then work directly with Staff to finish the final steps for the subdivision. That being said, Staff is proposing that the City maintain the neighborhood meeting requirement.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:23 pm. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

VI. *Public Hearing on Proposed Rezone for 2051 and 2061 East Murray Holladay Road from Residential Multi-Family (“RM”) Zone to the Professional Office (“PO”) Zone. (0.49 Acres of Property that is currently used as Office and Residential. The Applicant would like to Retain and Expand Potential Office and Residential Uses.)*

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, explained that the application is for a rezone and it involves two parcels: 2051 and 2061 East Murray Holladay Road. Both parcels are owned by the same property owner who wants to redevelop the property and retain their office use. To retain office and either redevelop or construct new buildings on the property, the owner needs to come into conformance with a zone that allows office use. That is the reason for the rezone request from RM to PO. With the PO Zone, to have any sort of mixed-use between residential and office, the applicant needs a Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission would ultimately review that Conditional Use Permit application and hold a public hearing on the request. She informed those present that any potential impacts would be addressed through the Conditional Use Permit process.

Brad Helsten, applicant, - 3120 S Metropolitan Way in Salt Lake. He explained that he and his partners purchased 2061 East Murray Holladay Road for an office. The intention is to remain in the City of Holladay and expand the law office. The office is currently in the RM Zone under Conditional Use, which was brought over from the annexation. There was a desire to expand the office, so he approached a neighboring property about a potential sale. The 2051 East Murray Holladay Road property was purchased in 2022. The intention is to increase the office footprint because, under the current Conditional Use, it is not possible to change the footprint of the office. Mr. Helsten discussed the Holladay Half Mile and the desire for there to be a buffer between residential and commercial uses in the area, with a complete restriction on retail. A mixed-use plan was proposed, which went to the Planning Commission. Understandably, the neighbors were concerned about height, density, and setbacks in that zone. However, he reminded those present that this process has at least two steps. That includes the rezone and the Conditional Use Permit process. Mr. Helsten explained that there is a desire to be in the PO Zone so it is possible to continue with the office use. The idea was to offset some of the costs of redevelopment by adding some multi-family as well.

Mr. Helsten explained that the request is to be allowed to continue the office use as a permitted use rather than a conditional one. This will ensure there is some flexibility when it comes to redeveloping the property and updating the existing buildings. As for the existing buildings, each is approximately

70 years old. The hope is to redevelop those so there will be new buildings that are more aesthetically pleasing. He believes that a new, aesthetically pleasing, and compatible development within the Holladay Half Mile will increase the property values and contribute positively to the City.

Currently, the RM Zone allows them to build three units on 2061 and four units on 2051, with 20-foot setbacks and 35-foot heights. With the PO Zone, any changes from the office use to a mixed-use would require a Conditional Use Permit. That would result in a Planning Commission process. Mr. Helsten explained that in the PO Zone, it will be possible to improve the building and improve the area. The Conditional Use Permit process would still be needed for any residential component.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:40 pm and noted that the City Council received eight email comments ahead meeting. Those comments were generally not in favor of the rezone application. Comments were received from David and Diane Dean, Myron and Suzanne Wills, Jesse Black, Jamie Covington, Kay Reed, John and Chris Erickson, Troy and Michelle Mearings, and Debbie Hafer. He explained that those emails would be considered during the deliberation process.

Jamie Covington - 1956 E Sycamore Lane. She explained that she has family members who are developers and are in real estate, so she has an understanding of the process. She is concerned with the way the City is handling this rezone application. Ms. Covington expressed sympathy that the applicant purchased the land thinking there would be approval to rezone the property, but it is not recommended that someone purchase a piece of land that is not zoned for the desired use. Mr. Helsten purchased the land and took a risk, but it is not the responsibility of the City to support that investment. The applicant states that he has plans for the piece of land and it will be beautiful, but no plans have been submitted. The ideas the applicant has might not come to fruition, especially when the various costs are considered. She has not seen any clear plans related to the site.

Ms. Covington stated that she is worried about the way the City is handling construction currently, as there are many safety concerns. For example, there are private vehicles and equipment parked on City property without safety guards or ADA-compliant sidewalks to redirect traffic. She noted that the City is not ensuring that current construction leaves the sidewalks accessible. Ms. Covington shared additional comments about the applicant site and stated that there is no proof of need. When considering a rezone, Council Members generally must prove that there is a need for that rezone to take place. Commercial real estate office space is at an all-time low, so there is no need indicated.

Jesse Black - 4740 Sycamore Dr. He noted that there was a change in tone between the Planning Commission Meeting and the City Council Meeting. The message during the Planning Commission Meeting was that the applicant could place a three-story building on the lot, whether it is residential or mixed-use. Most of the constituents in the area were disheartened from that experience. As a resident who lives near the subject property, it is not that there is opposition to a business or mixed-use there, but a three-story building would be very out of character for the area. A two-story building would fit in much better. There are also concerns about parking and traffic. He asked the Council to consider parking and traffic in discussions about the property.

Mike Stone - 2050 Delmont Dr. He expressed concerns about the rezone and pointed out his property on a rendering of the area. What was envisioned would overtake his backyard and his family would lose their privacy. The property value of his home would likely decrease as well. Additionally, he was concerned about parking and how that would impact the neighborhood.

Dave Parkinson - 4714 Holly Lane. He is speaking on behalf of himself, his wife, Dave and Diane Dean, Dave and Eunice Black, and Chris and Julie Birch. A letter was also sent to the Planning Commission on December 1, 2023. Mr. Parkinson reported that he has lived in Holladay for over 50 years. It is historically a walkable City with open sight lines. He is not opposed to development in the community, but he believes it can be done in a way that will actually enhance the value of the neighboring properties. Mr. Parkinson expressed strong opposition to the requested rezone, because the requested PO Zone would permit a three-story office building that will back onto single-story residential properties. That is something that does not exist anywhere else in the Holladay Half Mile. He requested that the rezone application be denied and that further applications in the area be held until a Small Area Master Plan is developed for the Holladay Half Mile.

The Staff Report notes that the City of Holladay General Plan states that the development of the Holladay Half Mile “should be guided by a Small Area Master Plan.” Mr. Parkinson also referenced language that stated preference for the zoning change should be given to properties that will enhance property values and contribute to the economic sustainability of the City. The use of the plural “values” indicates that the impact on the value of the adjacent properties should also be taken into account. A three-story building looming over a newly remodeled single-story residence will not enhance the value of the nearby residential properties. He noted that a three-story building in the area is not consistent with the other development that has taken place in the Holladay Half Mile corridor. There are typically single-story or two-story buildings along the Holladay Half Mile corridor.

The neighborhood adjoining the subject property needs to be protected for the sake of the junior high and high school students. Preservation of the residential neighborhoods benefits the community as a whole. Mr. Parkinson pointed out that Holladay Village and Holladay Hills each have a Small Area Master Plan. Something similar is needed for the Holladay Half Mile corridor. Mr. Parkinson explained that he loves Holladay and he loves the area. It is possible to preserve and protect the area while allowing it to develop in a manner that is beneficial to all in the community. There is a willingness to work with the applicant and with the City to create a Small Area Master Plan.

Suzanne Wills - 2015 Sycamore Lane. She wondered whether it would be possible to have the Planning Commission Meeting comments and responses be forwarded to the City Council. Mayor Dahle explained that it is public record and that information has been shared with the Council.

Adeline Black - 4740 Sycamore Dr. She is 18 years old and started working earlier this year. Right around the corner where the applicant building is located is where she walks to reach her place of work. There are already several dangerous areas. Her concern is that if the building is constructed, it will lead to more dangerous conditions and another path will be needed.

There were no further comments. The public hearing will remain open.

VII. *Consideration of Ordinance 2024-01 – Adopting Amendments to Title 13 Regarding Subdivision Processes.*

Council Member Fotheringham moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2024-01 – Adopting Amendments to Title 13 Regarding Subdivision Processes. Council Member Brewer seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Brewer-Aye; Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member

Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gray-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2024-01 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

VIII. *Consideration of Resolution 2024-04 – Granting the Advice and Consent for the Appointment of Emily Gray to the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling Board.*

Council Member Quinn moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-04 – Granting Advice and Consent for the Appointment of Emily Gray to the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling Board. Council Member Gray seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Brewer-Aye; Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gray-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Resolution 2024-04 was approved by a unanimous vote.

IX. *City Manager Report – Gina Chamness.*

Ms. Chamness had nothing to share with the City Council.

X. *Council Reports & District Issues*

Council Member Brewer noted that the rezone application was the main area of discussion in his district.

Council Member Durham reported that there will be naloxone training on January 24, 2024, as part of the work done by the Healthy Happy Holladay Coalition. The training will educate residents about how to use naloxone kits to prevent opioid overdoses and encouraged residents to attend.

Council Member Fotheringham reported that earlier that afternoon, a Working Group with Mayor Dahle, Council Member Fotheringham, and City Staff, discussed the Spring Lane Park progress with potential landscape architect firms. A decision was made about how to move forward. It will be a fairly quick process and over the next several months, there will be discussions with the community, stakeholders, and nearby residents. It will be interesting to see the park property develop. Council Member Fotheringham explained that the Arts Council met earlier in the week. It was the first meeting with the new Arts and Culture Manager. It went well and there is a lot of excitement. He also reported that he attended his first Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) Board Meeting. He noted that Mayor Dahle was honored for his service on the Board at that time. Mayor Dahle stated that it was an honor to serve on that Board and he praised the organization.

Council Member Quinn attended both of the Community Council Meetings for Howard R. Driggs Elementary School and Churchill Junior High School. Both were discussing the statements made by Governor Spencer Cox about removing cell phones from classrooms entirely. The elementary school level does not have as much of an issue with cell phones as the junior high school, but it was interesting to hear the discussions. Different schools around Churchill Junior High School have different policies in place for cell phones. Churchill Junior High School has arranged for Ben Horsley with the Granite School District to attend the school on February 1, 2024. The intention is to speak to the communities about this matter. She does not know if there is a district-wide policy contemplated, but the cell phone issue will continue to be a significant area of discussion in the future.

Council Member Gray reported that she met with the Community Councils for Cottonwood Elementary School and Oakwood Elementary School. Oakwood Elementary School is incredibly grateful that the Police Department has worked out the traffic situation there. It is much better than it was at the beginning of the year. The cell phone discussion also took place at the meetings she

attended. The understanding at those meetings is that the Granite School District will do a study. It sounds like different schools and classrooms have different policies and levels of enforcement in place. A lot of people were supportive of a more unified policy throughout the Granite School District.

Council Member Gray stated that Mayor Dahle, Council Member Quinn, Council Member Brewer, and herself were able to meet with State Representatives at the Legislature. One of the main issues at the Legislature relates to affordable housing. It is a serious problem in the State. She was impressed with the leadership there at the Legislature. They understand the unique position of Holladay and other East Bench communities in trying to address those affordable housing issues.

Mayor Dahle thanked Police Chief Justin Hoyal for his work at Oakwood Elementary School. A lot was done to try and assist the community there. He appreciated that level of engagement. Mayor Dahle reported that Captain Dan Brown met with the Youth Council yesterday at Station 104. There were approximately 20 attendees. Information was shared about naloxone and overdose issues. Holladay per capita is one of the highest in terms of overdoses in the County. Captain Brown also did some CPR training and a station tour with the young people who attended the event. Mayor Dahle reminded those present that the Historical Commission will have a presentation on the Moyle Family and their impact on Holladay over the years. That will take place on January 29, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. Additionally, the Interfaith Council will meet next Wednesday and comments will be shared.

XI. *Recess City Council in a Work Meeting:*

Council Member Fotheringham moved to RECESS the City Council Meeting and RECONVENE in a Work Meeting. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council. The Council convened in a work meeting at approximately 7:15pm.

a. *Discussion on Previous Rezone Public Hearing.*

Council Member Fotheringham noted that a comment was raised during the public hearing about walkability. He wondered whether there was anything about a rezone that would reduce walkability in the area. Ms. Marsh explained that the setbacks in the PO Zone bring the building closer to Murray Holladay Road. Bringing buildings closer to roadways creates a pedestrian-friendly environment. Redevelopment would also include a requirement for the property owner to install sidewalks. Sidewalks would then wrap onto Sycamore Lane, where there is not currently a sidewalk.

Mayor Dahle asked if it is possible to determine a difference in the intensity of use between the RM Zone and PO Zone. Ms. Marsh asked whether he thought of intensity as the amount of coverage. Mayor Dahle believed it had more to do with the traffic generation, based on the comments received. Ms. Marsh stated that the major concern relates to the entrance of traffic from Sycamore. Right now, there is a driveway that exists on the subject property. The ingress and egress to the site would be looked at if the applicant wanted to have mixed-use and applied for a Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission could then provide some oversight there. As is, if the applicant chose to focus on redevelopment in the RM Zone, that would be done under the review of the City Engineer.

Council Member Gray believed that if it went through a rezone, an additional process through the Planning Commission would be needed for issues like the entrance and exit to the property. If the applicant just wanted to build an office building, it would not require a Conditional Use Permit.

However, the mixture of residential use with the office use would require there to be a Conditional Use Permit. If the property remains in the RM Zone, it can be redeveloped as multi-family with seven units across the two parcels. In that scenario, there would be no Conditional Use Permit and no oversight by the Commission.

Mayor Dahle mentioned the public comments related to two-story and three-story buildings. He asked if the 35-foot height maximum would allow for a three-story building. Ms. Marsh was not certain about that but noted that parking could be done underneath and a building that was 35 feet from the natural grade could be pursued. Council Member Fotheringham asked about the setbacks in the RM Zone and PO Zone. Ms. Marsh reported that it is 20 feet for the RM Zone and 30 feet for the PO Zone. The building is set back an additional 10 feet in the PO Zone to create a buffer.

Mayor Dahle explained that the City Council is discussing whether the PO Zone is appropriate for this particular site. This is currently in the RM Zone and the owner has an entitled property right under that zone. If the applicant decides to sell the property, whoever buys that property can come in with an RM application, and as long as it meets the standards of the zone, there will be a permit without public input. There is an entitled property right under the RM Zone. However, the applicant is asking to rezone to the PO Zone, because there is a desire to rebuild the existing office. Whether the applicant builds under RM or PO, there will be a requirement to wrap the sidewalks around and create more pedestrian accessibility. It seems there is a lot of negative public sentiment because of the 5-foot difference between the 35-foot height entitlement and the 40-foot height entitlement. When the PO Zone was created, it was done so it would push the building away from residences with a larger setback. The intention was to protect residences more through those requirements. Mayor Dahle explained that he is thinking about whether or not the PO Zone is appropriate for the property.

Additional discussions were had about what is allowed in each zone. Council Member Fotheringham encouraged the City to look at a Small Area Master Plan again. Council Member Gray noted that even if a Small Area Master Plan was created, all of the current rights under the RM Zone would be grandfathered in. Ms. Marsh reported that when the PO Zone was developed, the City looked at RM properties that were being used as offices. All of the offices on Murray Holladay Road between the Village and Royal Holladay Hills were looked at during the development of the PO Zone. It was understood that those could be redeveloped with the standards. Having the building be 10 feet back from the sidewalk creates a pedestrian-friendly environment, which is one of the main goals of the Holladay Half Mile corridor. Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that the current application seems to match the intention of the PO Zone.

Council Member Brewer wanted to know at what point the applicant properties became offices. He also wanted to understand why those were put into an RM Zone instead of an office-related zone. Ms. Marsh reported that the County zoning for RM included office uses and multi-family uses as permitted uses. When the City was incorporated, the zoning from the County was retained, and those two uses were allowed in the RM Zone. There was some conflict about the expansion of office uses, such as medical or dental offices. Staff was directed to look into a new office-specific zone. City Attorney, Jayme Blakesley, noted that where there was County zoning that pre-dated incorporation, there were some non-conforming uses. State Law recognizes a non-conforming use by right.

Council Member Durham asked what was meant by an upgrade to the site. Ms. Marsh explained that it had to do with improvements. Since this is an application for a rezone, likely, the Planning Commission did not see what redevelopment would look like. The applicant stated that there is an intention to redevelop, but the Planning Commission did not see a building plan or a similar document. The Commission did not feel there was sufficient evidence related to the redevelopment.

Council Member Quinn wanted to know at what point plans would be submitted. Additionally, she wanted to know if there would be another Planning Commission Meeting when those types of documents were submitted. Ms. Marsh explained that the applicant can currently apply for a Building Permit and build to the standards of the RM Zone without any sort of public input and without presenting any plans to the public. The only time there would be additional public oversight and a hearing is with a Conditional Use Permit. If the rezone to the PO Zone is approved and there is a desire to move forward with a mixed-use development, there will be a Planning Commission process. Ms. Marsh reported that conditional uses are essentially permitted uses with additional conditions imposed to mitigate potential impacts.

Council Member Brewer pointed out that there is no guarantee that a Conditional Use Permit would be granted even if the rezone application was approved. Council Member Durham wondered whether it is common to have plans to review during the rezone process. If there is a desire to use the land for office uses, the PO Zone is most appropriate, but the rezone process still needs to take place. With the PO Zone, priority is given to applicants who want to redevelop their property. It is an incentive for landowners.

Council Member Durham reminded City Staff that there were comments during the public hearing about the fact that a plan was not submitted. He wanted to understand whether it is normal at this point to not have a clear view of the plan. Ms. Marsh confirmed this and explained that there are a lot of details that could change. Council Member Gray believed those types of plans would be presented during the Conditional Use Permit process, which was confirmed. Council Member Brewer asked if a Conditional Use Permit in the existing zone has been contemplated. Ms. Marsh reported that in the RM Zone, a Conditional Use Permit for a mixed-use development is not permitted.

Mayor Dahle reported that if the property is redeveloped, the pedestrian issue will be resolved either way. If it is rezoned PO and the applicant wants to put residential onto the site, there will be conditions placed to mitigate the issues. That is a risk that the applicant would be taking on. Mayor Dahle reiterated that the property owner has an entitled property right under the RM Zone. If the decision is made to develop under the existing zone, an application can be submitted for that. As long as the requirements are met, there will be a Building Permit issued. He reiterated that he has not made a decision and stated that he wants to look into the recommendation from the Planning Commission.

b. Moderate-Income Housing Plan Discussion – *Ann Frances Garcia.*

Economic Development and Housing Manager, Ann Frances Garcia, shared some Moderate-Income Housing strategies. She explained that the Moderate-Income Housing 2023 Annual Report was brought to the City Council in July 2023. At that time, there were discussions about the challenges associated with reporting to the State. The report is due again on August 1, 2024, and there is a desire to prepare for that. She asked for direction from the Council so she can start evaluating and researching some of the strategies applicable to Holladay. A chart was included in the Meeting

Materials Packet to outline the statute definitions and their applicability. Some items she believes apply to Holladay are: Strategy B, Strategy K, and Strategy X. She asked for Council feedback.

Council Member Fotheringham noted that there are six items currently in the plan. He wanted to understand if additional items now need to be added to the report. Ms. Frances clarified that this will assist with the report and ensure that the City remains in compliance. There were issues with some of the existing items when it comes to measuring progress. Ms. Garcia explained that the suggestion is to select additional items that have more measurable parameters so the City remains in compliance.

Mr. Blakesley discussed the requirements and noted that several cities had their initial plans denied, as those plans were not in compliance. He believed that each year, cities will need to find other ways to do more with an existing strategy or will need to add a new strategy to the list for implementation.

Ms. Chamness noted that there could be additional changes as a result of the Legislative Session. Council Member Fotheringham thought the Council discussion might be premature given that things could change after the Legislative Session. Mr. Teerlink felt that it was important to start the discussion process. The Council reviewed Strategy F, which was to zone or rezone for higher-density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers. Council Member Durham thought the strategies highlighted by Ms. Garcia made sense for the community. Ms. Garcia explained that if there is support from the Council, she will start to research some tasks and actions for those strategies.

Council Member Durham thought it was best to capture what is currently being done in the City and look into the other strategies highlighted by Ms. Garcia. There was support to move forward in this manner. Ms. Chamness reported that this matter will first be considered by the Planning Commission and will then come back to the City Council for consideration and approval.

XII. *Adjourn.*

Council Member Fotheringham moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Brewer seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:06 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, January 18, 2024.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **April 25, 2024**