

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

**Tuesday, June 4, 2024
6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
4580 South 2300 East
Holladay, Utah**

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair
Paul Cunningham
Angela Gong
Ginger Vilchinsky

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner
Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Chair Dennis Roach called the Work Session to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. City Planner, Carrie Marsh reported that the Public Hearing item is a Historic Site Modification Permit for Brinton House at 1981 Murray Holladay Road in the R-M Zone. She explained that the application has been evaluated under the existing code, as the Historic Preservation Ordinance has not been passed at a City Council level.

Ms. Marsh noted that the Staff Report details some history of the site. The historic house is in the front of the property and there was an addition in 1979 on the rear side of the property that incorporated a lot of the same elements seen in the main house. The modifications that the applicant is requesting include tree removals, painting window trim, replacement of the south side entrance door and the east side entrance door, fencing, and removing an existing garage and carport on the site in order to build a new one. The applicant sent over some architectural details for the newly proposed garage, which can be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The Staff Report has a detailed review from Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, about each of the items that were suggested to be changed. There is a recommendation included for each of those items. Ms. Marsh suggested that the Commission review those recommendations first. A question was asked about the doors. Ms. Marsh explained that the current doors were not there from the beginning. At some point, there was a replacement.

Chair Roach asked about a Landscape Plan. Ms. Marsh reported that she spoke to the applicant about landscaping and trees earlier that day. She noted that it is possible to send him a tree recommendation list. Alternatively, the Commission can share tree recommendations.

Chair Roach asked for additional information about the fencing on the west side. Ms. Marsh clarified that no details were provided to outline what the fencing would be replaced with, but it is possible to ask the applicant about what is envisioned in this area. It is possible for there to be an iron fence on the front of the property. Chair Roach pointed out that the proposal is to demolish

the garage on the east side of the parking lot in the back and it will be moved further back. He asked what will be in the current garage location. Ms. Marsh explained that there will be parking.

As far as the doors, Chair Roach noted that what is proposed is a modern glass door. Ms. Marsh reported that new elevations were sent to City Staff earlier in the day. Those images were reviewed. She pointed out the east side of the property and the details for the new garage. Chair Roach stated that prior to the Work Session, he was advised by the City Attorney that notifications were sent out, but only to those in the immediate area. As a result, it is best to continue the Public Hearing to ensure that due process is met. The applicant can address Commissioner comments.

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

Chair Roach called the Regular Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Since there was no one from the public present outside of the applicant, the Commission Statement was not read.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **'Brinton House' Historic Site Modification Permit - 1981 Murray Holladay Road (R-M) Review and Consideration of a Request by Applicant Katie Thibodeaux, Representing Owner Roderick Enterprises, for Modifications to a Designated Historic House and Site. Item Reviewed as an Administrative, Conditional Use Application as per Provisions Stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.08.040, §13.86.030 & §13.86.050. File #24-2-05**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is a Historic Site Modification Permit for the Brinton House. She reported that the Brinton House is a historic home and site located at 1981 Murray Holladay Road. The existing property has a historical home on the south side with an addition that was added to the north side of the home in 1979. The applicant is proposing a replacement of the front doors on the south side and the east doors next to the parking lot. Other modifications include site landscaping, such as the removal of trees on the east side of the building. Those aspens will be replaced with some columnar evergreens. Three other trees on the site are shown to be removed. The applicant needs to submit a Landscape Plan showing the replacement location for those three trees. There is also a proposal to demolish a detached garage and carport on the site. A larger garage would then be built on the north side of the property.

Other proposed modifications include painting the window trim black. There is also a canopy proposed on the east side. The Staff recommendation is to add more ornate detailing so it ties in with the historical architecture and modification to the doors so there is more visual weight. Ms. Marsh noted that the applicant has a presentation to share with the Planning Commission.

The applicant representative, Ben Wheat, introduced himself to the Commission. He explained that the building was recently purchased for the Roderick Enterprises headquarters. Roderick Enterprises is a local land developer and property owner that has been in business since 1956. The company has been established in Murray for the last 17 years, but the business has outgrown that building. There is excitement to move to this location. The first floor will be the headquarters for their main operations. The building is in excellent shape, but some freshening up is needed.

Mr. Wheat reported that one part of the proposal is to paint the window trim, fascia, and railing black. There is also a proposal to replace the entrance doors that are not part of the original structure. He explained that the idea is to have a storefront door with black metal mullions with tempered glass. The current door is old, drafty, and is not period-specific to the house. Mr. Wheat clarified that a canopy will not be added, but there will be a black frame that will frame the entrance. There will not be a physical canopy that protrudes. He reviewed an example image.

Commissioner Angela Gong asked whether the glass on the front will be frosted. Mr. Wheat denied this and explained that it would be clear glass. Additional discussions were had about the entrance doors. Mr. Wheat explained that the two yellow doors and surrounding windows will be replaced with the storefront glass door that has been proposed. Mr. Wheat informed the Commission that there would not be an awning, but a crossbar. There will be fence replacement done in accordance with the fence regulations in Holladay. Portions of the fence have been neglected in terms of maintenance. Fence material has not been proposed at this time, but that is regulated by the code. Metal rod fencing is likely what will be in the front. Since this is a historical site, there is a desire to bring all of the proposed changes to the City for consideration.

Commissioner Paul Cunningham expressed concerns that the application is premature to be in front of the Planning Commission. As for fencing, there are a lot of things that are allowed in the code that may not make sense for a historic site. There is a desire to maintain the historic character. Without knowing what kind of fence materials are envisioned, he is not sure that he could vote on this application. More details are needed before a motion is made on this application.

Ms. Marsh noted that guidance can be provided to the applicant. For example, what the Planning Commission would like to see on the site. Chair Roach explained that after the presentation from Mr. Wheat, there could be discussions about some possible material recommendations. City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, recommended opening and then continuing the public hearing.

Commissioner Cunningham asked whether the Historical Commission was notified about this application. Mr. Christopherson reported that the agenda was published according to requirements. There was no special consideration or notice given to the Historical Commission. Commissioner Cunningham thought it would make sense to hear from a member of the Historical Commission about an appropriate fence material. Ms. Marsh pointed out that there is no requirement for the applicant to discuss plans with the Historical Commission, but the applicant can take ideas to them and return to the Planning Commission with their suggestions. Alternatively, the applicant can share some sort of explanation for the choices made.

Mr. Wheat reported that renderings were provided to the Planning Commission for context. He reiterated that an awning is not being requested, so references to that in the Staff Report can be removed ahead of the next Planning Commission Meeting on this item. As far as fence replacement, whatever is proposed will be an improvement over the existing conditions. The fencing along the west side is the worst in terms of overall condition. On the north and east side, there is chain link fencing with privacy slats. If the recommendation from City Staff or the Historical Commission is to have a brick wall, chances are the existing fence will remain, due to the costs. On the west side, there will likely be some kind of wrought iron fencing. There will not be vinyl fencing or something that would look completely out of place on the property.

Mr. Wheat discussed the request for a Landscape Plan. He explained that it is possible to ask the Landscape Engineer to create that plan. The trees identified will have a 1:1 replacement with a columnar. The current trees are too close to the building and create issues from an insurance standpoint and a fire safety standpoint. The two trees out front are proposed to be replaced to provide more visibility to the site. He noted that trees will be relocated on the site.

Mr. Wheat explained that the placement of the existing garage takes away from the historical look of the site. It has no correlation or tie-in to the main structure. The proposal is to tear that down, add five parking stalls in that location, tear down the carport in the back, and relocate the garage to the rear of the building. This will be hidden from the street sight. The elevations provided to City Staff indicate there will be a full brick building to match the brick of the add-on structure from 1979. He acknowledged that all City standards and requirements need to be met.

Chair Roach believed a two-story building with setbacks right against the fence had been proposed. He wondered whether that was allowed in that zone. Mr. Wheat reported that the back parking lot of the commercial project is to the west and the north is the canal. Chair Roach expressed concerns that a neighbor across the canal might have a view of a wall where trees and a fence used to be located. Ms. Marsh stated that the location of the building is not something that is negotiable, as it is controlled by the zone. It will need to meet the setback requirements of the R-M Zone.

Commissioner Ginger Vilchinsky asked about the doors on the front side. It was brought to the attention of the Commission that the current door adds some dimension or heaviness, which keeps it closer to the original period of the house. She wondered whether something less modern could be considered. The Fox Market, for example, has metal doors at the front of the shop that are more ornate. Something similar to that could be considered instead of what is currently proposed.

Chair Roach reported that in order for the Planning Commission to vote on the application, there will need to be clarity about what kind of door will be installed. More details are required. Mr. Wheat understands some of the concerns about the door on the front but asked the Planning Commission to allow them to move forward with what is proposed on the east side. Commissioner Vilchinsky asked if the applicant needs a Conditional Use for the proposed changes on the east.

Ms. Marsh clarified that anything that is substantially modified on the site requires the applicant to come forward to the City. With the rear addition, there were still historical elements incorporated. She suggested that the doors tie in some of the previous architectural elements. Mr. Wheat informed the Commission that he is open to something different on the south side, but on the east side, he would like to see what is currently planned to be incorporated into the site.

Discussions were had about the window styles. Mr. Wheat reported that the black lines shown in the example images are mullions. Commissioner Vilchinsky still thought the design looked too modern. She does not necessarily feel what is proposed matches the historical look of the building. However, if the applicant is able to incorporate some of the suggestions from City Staff, it might blend in a little bit better with the historical character. Ms. Marsh believes slight modifications can be made, which will allow for the more modern door, but ensure that it looks more traditional. For instance, more mullions or arched features that reflect the architecture of the historical structure.

Mr. Wheat reviewed some example images with the Commission and additional discussions were had about the door style. Chair Roach noted that there are ways to tie in historic elements without them looking the exact same as the historic design. Ms. Marsh wondered whether there could be some sort of fill on the doors, where the doors have a slight arch and a larger bodied frame. A glass door could be filled with extra trim so it mimics the visual weight without a wooden door. Additional details can make a difference in the overall look and feel of the door. Ms. Marsh likes the idea of a transom window with some extra mullions so it pulls the line across more. Mr. Wheat asked whether this is envisioned as horizontal or vertical. Ms. Marsh stated that either could work in certain locations. Those details can create a more traditional look, which is missing in the proposal. It is possible to have a modern structure, but add fill to the glass door to make it more traditional.

Chair Roach suggested that a meeting take place with a member or members of the Historical Commission. It would be meaningful to return to the Planning Commission with some feedback. Chair Roach clarified that the Historical Commission is not a deciding factor when it comes to this application, but it could be worthwhile to hear from them, as the opinion of the Historical Commission would carry a lot of weight with him. Commissioner Gong acknowledged that the existing door is not historic. A historic style door is not being suggested, but the Planning Commission wants to see small nods to the historic style in the more modern elements proposed. She appreciates that the applicant is considering wrought iron for some of the fencing, but suggested that Mr. Wheat return to the Planning Commission with more specificity.

Chair Roach shared comments about trees on the site. On the Landscape Plan, he wants to see what trees will be replaced and what those trees will be replaced with. He noted that the property is limited and there is not a lot of green space. While he understands that the aspens are not properly placed, those provide a certain shade element to the parking lot, which the columnar evergreen will not. Mr. Wheat confirmed that a Landscape Plan can be created to outline what is proposed for the site. He explained that the trees grow out instead of down. Inside the building, on the west wall, when the drywall was torn out, there were aspen tree roots found. Chair Roach acknowledged that it was not the right tree in the right location. Mr. Wheat stressed the importance of removing them and adding something that is better suited for the property. Chair Roach suggested that since the garage is being torn out, there be a landscape island placed there instead. That addition could provide more shade canopy and address the heat island. If the cost of that is prohibitive, he understands that, but it is something that could be a benefit to the overall site.

Commissioner Gong asked about the two trees in front that are blocking visibility from the street. Mr. Wheat reported that he will have a Landscape Plan created. It will show the trees that are proposed to be removed as well as the location of the new trees and the type of new trees. Ms. Marsh discussed the tree canopy replacement requirements. Applicants have the option to plant trees off-site. If there is a situation where it is not possible to fit enough trees on the site, it is possible to plant them elsewhere. There is a specific distance for that option. She offered to share those details with the applicant following the meeting. Chair Roach noted that there is line of sight trimming that can be done for some of the existing trees on the site. It sounds like this has already been planned for some of the trees. Commissioner Gong asked about the trees along the fence. Mr. Wheat noted that an Arborist Report is included in the Staff Report. Half of those trees were determined to be sickly enough that removal is necessary. Ms. Marsh pointed out that if some trees along the fence line are removed, there could be space to plant replacement trees there.

Ms. Marsh reported that the tree canopy sustainability language intends to ensure that when trees are removed, the trees are replaced. The replacement replenishes the canopy. It will not be mature right away, but over time, there will be improved conditions on the property.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing remained open.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to CONTINUE the application for the ‘Brinton House’ Historic Site Modification Permit at 1981 Murray Holladay Road and leave the public hearing open. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Aye; Commissioner Gong-Aye; Commissioner Vilchinsky-Aye; Chair Roach-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

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 6:47 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, June 4, 2024.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes , Minutes Secretary
T Forbes Group

Minutes Approved: **August 20, 2024**