

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

Tuesday, January 7, 2025

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Karianne Prince, Vice-Chair

Dennis Roach

Ginger Vilchinsky

Angela Gong

Paul Cunningham

Jill Fonte

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

Jonathan Teerlink, Community & Economic
Development Director

Jared Bunch, City Engineer

Jayme Blakesley, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Vice-Chair Karianne Prince called the Work Session to order at 5:30 p.m. The Regular Meeting agenda items were discussed. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, shared information about Item 3 on the agenda, which relates to a General Plan and Ordinance Amendment. During the Regular Meeting, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation on the appropriateness of an amendment to Title 13 to standardize the widths in a section of Murray Holladay Road as well as the appropriateness of a General Plan amendment foreseeing the width in perpetuity. Commissioner Dennis Roach asked about that section of Murray Holladay Road. He wanted to know if it widens again after it narrows out. Mr. Teerlink explained that when specific cross-sections of roads are looked at, it is done in a Small Area Master Plan scenario. That is the reason there are different cross-sections for the Holladay Village in particular. Those are used to determine the widths and standard dimensions for items such as sidewalks and gutters.

Commissioner Jill Fonte asked if it is appropriate for the Planning Commission to consider an administrative change, like what has been proposed because a General Plan update is about to occur. Mr. Teerlink noted that the applicant can speak to the timeliness of the request. Commissioner Brian Berndt wondered whether Murray Holladay Road changes to a collector east of Holladay Boulevard. Mr. Teerlink reported that it maintains a collector status on Clearview Street.

Commissioner Paul Cunningham wanted to know if there is another area where the proposed change will create a similar situation. Mr. Teerlink explained that in this case, the focus is on a specific section. However, the idea of the General Plan is for it to apply in various locations. The City Council can then use that standard to address similar issues City-wide. Commissioner Cunningham asked what the argument is to amend the General Plan in order to address one specific

location. Mr. Teerlink stated that the Commission can pose that question to the applicant during the Regular Meeting.

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, shared a Landscape Plan with the Planning Commission for Item 2. Commissioner Roach wanted to see whether there would be trees placed near the units or not. Additional discussions were had about the placement of the landscaping and what has been proposed.

The Planning Commission took a five-minute break before the Regular Meeting.

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

Vice-Chair Prince called the Regular Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Commissioner Ginger Vilchinsky read the Opening Statement aloud for the benefit of those present.

ACTION ITEMS

1. “Highwood” – Preliminary Plat – 1919 East Baywood Drive and 5821 Highland Drive (R-1-21 and R-2-10). Preliminary Level Review and Consideration of Development Details by Property Owner, Ashley Woolley. Review of this 0.94 Acre, Two-Lot Subdivision is Conducted According to Residential Subdivision Development Standards According to Holladay Ordinance §13.10a. File #24-1-10.

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Preliminary Plat application for property located at 1919 East Baywood Drive and 5821 Highland Drive. She reported that this is a proposal for a subdivision. The property was previously two properties owned by two separate owners. The owner of the Baywood Drive property purchased the Highland Drive property and combined those parcels in 2013. The current property owner wants to undo the combination and re-establish the two separate parcels that were there originally. The applicant has gone through a rezone process so the front portion of the original parcel is compliant with minimum lot size requirements and the Highland Drive Master Plan. There is no proposal to redevelop either property. Ms. Marsh noted that the Baywood Drive property will be sold and will have a separate owner. The access to that property will only be on Baywood Drive. The access to the front property will only be on Highland Drive. The applicant, Ashley Woolley, was not at the Planning Commission Meeting.

Vice-Chair Prince opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

Commissioner Angela Gong disclosed that she has a family connection and will recuse herself from the vote. Vice-Chair Prince felt that the application made sense and expressed her support. Since there is no development proposed at this time, only a Preliminary Plat approval is required.

Commissioner Roach moved to APPROVE the Preliminary Plat application by Ashley Woolley for “Highwood Subdivision,” a two-lot subdivision, located at 1919 East Baywood Drive and 5428 South Highland Drive in the R-1-21 and R-2-10 Zones, based upon the following findings:

- 1. Development details required for a Preliminary and Final Plat have been submitted and reviewed by the TRC.***

2. *Each of the lots shall comply with the minimum width and area for single-family home development in the R-1-21 and R-2-10 zones.*
3. *The development complies with the General Plan.*
4. *The required submittals for preliminary subdivision development have been provided where applicable and have been found to be complete and acceptable.*
5. *Fire access is existing, labeled, and approved by the UFA.*
6. *Vehicular access and utility easements are shown on the plat.*

Also, within one year and in accordance with 13.10A.070.E, to complete administrative review and approval of the FINAL PLAT by the Community and Economic Development Director - following a positive, written recommendation from the TRC.

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

2. “Villages at Cottonwood Creek” Subdivision – Preliminary Plat - 4821 South 1740 East (R-M). Preliminary Level Review and Consideration of Development Details by Application/Property Owner Brad Reynolds. Review of this 0.57-acre Development is Conducted According to Residential Subdivision Development Standards According to Holladay Ordinance §13.10a. File #24-1-09.

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this is an application for a subdivision in the R-M (Residential Multi-Family) Zone. The property is located at 4821 South 1740 East. The project previously received Site Plan approval for the addition of nine townhome units on the site. Access has been reviewed by the Fire Marshal, Public Works, and Engineering. There have been a few iterations of the access. Ms. Marsh shared the final iteration, as was approved during the Site Plan approval. The subdivision process takes each of the nine townhome units and creates a separate legal property for each unit. What is proposed now is in line with the existing approval, as it will create legal properties for each of the townhome units. The property owner can address any questions.

The applicant, Brad Reynolds, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. Since the last Planning Commission Meeting on the item, four additional parking stalls have been added to address Commissioner concerns. The necessary permits have been obtained through Salt Lake County Flood Control, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of Utah Engineering. There is a need in Holladay to have a for-sale product that is a little more affordable. He feels this will be beneficial to the City. Mr. Reynolds explained that the intention is to finish the units with granite or quartz countertops and two-toned paint. The idea is to make the units high quality, but still maintain some affordability.

Commissioner Roach asked about the façade on the outside. Mr. Reynolds reported that there will be a considerable amount of stone and Hardie plank. There will be no stucco. It will have an

aluminum soffit and fascia. With those elements, there will be long-term benefits, as the units will look aesthetically pleasing in the future. Commissioner Gong mentioned the additional parking. It used to be that the turnaround was straight, but now there is a T shape, which is where the additional four parking spaces have come from. Mr. Reynolds confirmed that there are four additional stalls, with two on each side of the T shape. Council Member Fonte asked how the units would be made more affordable. Mr. Reynolds explained that cost efficiency will be considered while still maintaining high-quality units. The units are slightly smaller and have rooftop decks. He believes these will sell.

Commissioner Roach asked if the rooftop deck will be on the front or the back of the unit. Mr. Reynolds explained that it depends. For the units that are facing north, the rooftop deck will be on the front. Those on the back will be facing the creek. Commissioner Fonte wanted to know what the size of the units will be. Mr. Reynolds stated that the units are between 1,600 and 1,700 square feet.

Vice-Chair Prince opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Prince reported that there was an email comment received ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. The comment related to the roads and some stop lights, but nothing that was specifically pertaining to the application that is currently before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Berndt noted that it is unusual to park in the floodway. Ms. Marsh explained that with waterway protection, there are specific standards. Parking areas and roads are allowed with a permit. Public Works Director and City Engineer, Jared Bunch, explained that this is in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) floodplain. Parking is allowed within the floodway. What the City looks at when issuing permits in the FEMA floodplain is the habitable space. Commissioner Berndt does not want the parking areas to drain off into the creek, as that can create certain issues. Vice-Chair Prince noted that there are some bushes and landscaping proposed around the units.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to APPROVE the Preliminary Plat application by Brad Reynolds for “Holladay Cottages,” a nine-unit townhome subdivision, located at 4821 South 1740 East in the R-M Zone, based upon the following findings:

- 1. Development details required for a Preliminary Plat have been submitted and reviewed by the TRC and found to be complete and acceptable.***
- 2. The number of units is compliant with the R-M Zone regulations.***
- 3. The Subdivision is in line with the previously approved Site Plan.***
- 4. The development complies with the General Plan.***
- 5. Fire access is approved by UFA.***
- 6. On-site stormwater retention is compliant with requirements.***
- 7. Vehicular access, emergency access, and utility easements are shown on the plat.***

This approval is subject to the following condition:

- 1. CC&Rs for the maintenance of common areas, stormwater retention, and access must be submitted prior to final approval and are to be recorded with the Final Plat.***

Also, within one year and in accordance with 13.10A.070.E, to complete administrative review and approval of the FINAL PLAT by the Community and Economic Development Director - following a positive, written recommendation from the TRC.

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

3. General Plan and Ordinance Amendment – Map 3.1 of Chapter 3, Transportation Element of the General Plan and Ordinance 13.02.030: Planning Documents; Roadway Map Review and Recommendation to the City Council on a Proposal Made by Applicant Ron Hilton to Amend Title 13, of the Holladay City Code, Land Use and Development Regulations by Modifying Public Travel Widths and Dimensional Aspects of Public Improvements at a Select Section of Murray Holladay Road. In Addition, a Modification to the Planned Width of all Secondary Residential Streets in the City. Item Reviewed as a Legislative Action, According to Procedures Set Forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #25-4-01.

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that this item relates to a General Plan and Ordinance amendment. He reported that the application is a legislative request to amend Title 13.02.030 of the Holladay Municipal Land Use Code and Map 3.1 in the Transportation chapter of the General Plan (Chapter 3). The application is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to a recommendation being made to the City Council. Ultimately, the City Council will make the final decision. The applicant is Ron Hilton and the Meeting Materials Packet includes the Staff Report, feedback from various members of the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”), and the applicant narrative. This request relates to a section of Murray Holladay Road and the Commission is asked to review some dimensional standards. The intention is to discuss the merits of the requests. Mr. Teerlink pointed out that there is an addendum request to amend secondary residential streets on the Roadway Map from 50 feet to 40 feet. There is a signed addendum with the map and a redline.

Mr. Teerlink explained that when new roadway dedication widths are considered, if something falls within a secondary residential roadway, normally there is a 50-foot dedication. Everything has to be included in that 50-foot, including lanes, gutter, park strip, and sidewalk. The proposal is to consider 40 feet for a dedicated right-of-way width for all new streets within the City. As for the Staff Report, there are some addendums from Planner I, Justice Tuffour, and the City Engineer.

Commissioner Roach asked about the reduction from 50 feet to 40 feet. He wondered whether that would primarily reduce the park strip. Mr. Teerlink noted that it is unclear where that would be taken from. For the benefit of the pedestrian right-of-way, it would likely need to be taken from the park strip. Commissioner Roach thought that would hurt the Holladay efforts with Tree City USA. He pointed out that many trees are required to be planted in those park strips. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this and acknowledged that the park strip width is critical. It is possible to reduce the size of the travel lane instead, but the 10 feet would have to come from somewhere in order to see that reduction. Commissioner Roach believed the reduction would result in either more traffic or less green space.

Vice-Chair Prince wanted to know if parking would be prohibited if the width was reduced moving forward. Mr. Teerlink explained that this would need to be looked into. Parking on streets is generally allowed unless there is a specific safety concern where on-street parking needs to be eliminated.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if this is conceptual in nature or if there is actual language proposed. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that there is language available for Commissioner review. Commissioner Cunningham asked the City Attorney to weigh in on what has been presented. City Attorney, Jayme Blakesley, has questions about whether it is sufficient. Having more precise language for a text amendment is a cleaner approach, but it is still possible to have a robust discussion.

Mr. Hilton introduced himself as the manager of Holladay Cottages, LLC, which is doing a subdivision in this location called Hulton Park. His address is 2394 East Murray Holladay Road. Mr. Hilton explained that Hulton Park is in the middle of the Medium Density District in the General Plan. Hulton Park is a single-family development with higher density than the Low Density District. The property is in the middle of the medium-density area, so the idea is for Hulton Park to be a transitional area where there is the character of a single-family neighborhood with slightly higher density. This creates a transition both in character and density. There is a similar transition happening with the road. Hulton Park is divided into a north and south phase. It straddles Murray Holladay Road and there is a requirement to make improvements on both sides of the road. When the project first started out, there was a lot of input received from residents who requested that the density be kept down.

After speaking to neighbors, there were also concerns expressed about the traffic, speed, and safety in the area. Since some right-of-way improvements need to be made as part of this project, it makes sense to propose some other changes. Mr. Hilton reported that a neighborhood petition was created approximately 18 months ago, but nothing has moved forward with that. This application will allow residents to share comments and provide feedback. He noted that the main priority is safety. There is a lot of cut-through traffic in the area, which is a concern to the residents there. The City Council at one point proposed one-way streets to address the problem, but the residents were not supportive of that solution. What is now being proposed might be a preferable solution for the residents.

Mr. Hilton introduced Brian Horan from Galloway & Company. Mr. Horan explained that he is a Licensed Traffic Engineer in the State and is also a professional Traffic Operations Engineer. He was asked to speak about this proposal from a safety and traffic standpoint. Mr. Horan has only recently become involved with this project, so he is unable to speak to the history of the proposal. However, he understands that the neighbors and Mr. Hilton are looking to create an improvement that is focused on safety. Commissioners can ask him traffic and safety questions that are related to the proposal.

Mr. Horan understands that the mechanism to provide these safety improvements involves an amendment to the General Plan. Based on his knowledge, there was work done with City Staff to determine the best mechanism in order to provide those specific improvements. He read from

Chapter 3 of the General Plan, which states that the primary goals for the City’s Vehicle Network are to:

- Ensure the safety of all users;
- Continue to build upon and maintain the existing infrastructure;
- Mitigate and absorb traffic impacts of new development; and
- Reduce impediments to convenient use of main traffic corridors and discourage cut-through use of local residential streets.

Mr. Horan noted that many cities are focused on moving towards more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly networks, which is represented in the General Plan. The proposal in this case is to narrow a particular section. This is most accurately defined as a choker. Narrowing streets has been proven to increase safety and lower speeds. The National Association of City Transportation Officials (“NACTO”) specifically states that lane widths of 10 feet are appropriate in urban areas and have a positive impact on street safety without impacting traffic operations. Lanes greater than 11 feet should not be used, as it can result in unintended speeding. Two-way streets with low or medium volumes of traffic may benefit from the use of a dashed center line with narrow lane widths or no center line at all. Mr. Horan explained that a search for lane width versus speed will bring up the NACTO study. The study found that narrower lanes decrease speed. He reported that lower speeds are safer for all and noted that there is a 15% increase in fatalities every 5 miles per hour when the speed is increased on a road.

The speed study provided in the application was reviewed. Mr. Horan noted that it states the 85th percentile speed is 31 miles per hour. In traffic engineering, the 85th percentile speed is used as the measure for speeding. If the 85th percentile is more than 5 miles per hour over the speed limit, that indicates something needs to be mitigated. Based on the numbers, it is reasonable to pursue some sort of traffic calming measure to reduce the number and be back within the 5 MPH range.

Mr. Horan reported that wider streets attract cut-through. As mentioned in the General Plan, cut-through is something to be avoided. He shared some context about the area associated with the application and noted that there are opportunities for cut-through. Mr. Horan noted that the road is a Class III bicycle facility. He clarified that Class III is on-street and bicycles should take up the travel lane. This helps to reduce speeds in the area. Providing too much width in an area like this will encourage bicyclists to use the shoulder, which then encourages vehicles and bicycles to use the same area. Reducing the width puts the bicycle in the appropriate lane. Continuing to encourage appropriate use in the area makes sense given the context. The proposal is not out of line with what exists.

This roadway is a neighborhood pedestrian corridor. The intention is to connect the neighbors to the commercial center. Mr. Horan explained that keeping the sections narrow and the provided crosswalk are elements that connect the neighborhood to the commercial center. Smaller roadway widths also reduce the crossing time. In areas like this, where there is a crosswalk nearby, eliminating on-street parking can be beneficial for the overall visibility of pedestrians and vehicles. Based on the 3.1 map information, this is the only collector road in the City that does not connect to arterials.

Commissioner Berndt asked about the volume of traffic that would move to adjacent residential streets if the traffic levels were reduced. He wanted to understand whether the proposed changes might shift the traffic patterns. Mr. Horan does not believe an extensive Origin Destination Study has been done at this point, so there is no data available to answer that question. Commissioner Berndt asked if the design that is currently being reviewed was done by Mr. Horan. It was clarified that the applicant put together the proposal and he was brought on to share information about impacts.

Commissioner Berndt wanted to know if what is proposed is the most effective option available. If this is reduced, but the traffic still does not slow, then there could be a problem. Mr. Horan noted that there are a lot of ways to increase friction. What has been proposed is one way to do so and it seems to fit within the existing conditions. From a cost and available infrastructure standpoint, this is a solid attempt. Incremental changes that are cost-effective are usually the best approach.

Commissioner Cunningham believes there were some previous requests to address the road. A decision was made and it seems this is an attempt to change that decision. Mr. Hilton clarified that he has brought this forward so the neighbors have the opportunity to be heard on this issue. He wants the petition to be considered by the elected officials. City Staff recommended that an appeal be filed, so that is what was done. That appeal brought it to the Mayor, but the City Attorney stated that it was inadmissible in that form and no decision could be made. It was then sent back to City Staff.

Mr. Hilton reported that something constructive came out of the appeal process. Mayor Rob Dahle said that he would be open to the idea of restriping the road to narrow the right-of-way. That was something he had seen done previously on Spring Lane and it had been effective in that area. That comment was another motivation for submitting this application. Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that the costs associated with the work need to be considered. This is the first time since he has been on the Planning Commission that the Commission is involved in a budget-related issue. He expressed concerns that this appears to shift some of the costs to the City in order to solve a development matter. Mr. Hilton explained that moving the power pole and the costs associated with that are not really the issue. The real issue relates to safety, which is the reason this has been brought forward. Since it falls in the middle of his project, he has offered to pay for the cost of Phase I and II of this proposal, which includes the restriping of the road. It is \$25,000 for the road restriping.

Discussions were had about the different phases associated with the proposal before the Commission. Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that there are likely other areas in the City that have similar needs. Those needs are usually handled through the budget process. It feels like a text amendment is being used to prioritize this safety issue over other existing issues in the City. If the Planning Commission supports this amendment, the recommendation would essentially be to prioritize this project during the budget process. Mr. Hilton recognizes that concern, which is the reason the amendment language states that Phase III would be subject to a normal budgetary process and is conditioned upon that. Phase III is somewhat optional and he is willing to pay for Phases I and II.

Mr. Blakesley offered to share some legal clarifications with the Commission. The basic context of the prior request from Mr. Hilton and how it was handled is separate from this request legally, but the background might be relevant. The Commission is being asked to make a legislative decision. Mr. Hilton has applied for a land use change and the change takes place in two locations. There is a text amendment to the code and a General Plan amendment that the Planning Commission is being asked to consider. He explained that both are needed in order to effectuate what has been requested.

When the development came forward and the bond was posted for the public improvements that are required with the development, there was a question about road widths. The City agreed to a reduction of the road width to 32 feet for the paved road width. There was a question about a utility pole and its location. Mr. Blakesley stated that the utility pole was initially understood to be located on a neighboring property that had been redeveloped prior to this development, but it was later learned that the utility pole was in fact on the Hilton property and was therefore the responsibility of this development. The utility pole is in a location where if you look at the roadway width, it interferes with the shoulder, pedestrian, and park strip infrastructure that would be along that side. There was discussion with the City about who would be responsible for relocating that utility pole and whether the road widths could be changed in a way that would not require the pole to be moved.

Vice-Chair Prince asked whether the drainage would be impacted by the location of the utility pole. Mr. Blakesley was not certain. He explained that the appeal that went to the Mayor was styled as a variation. It was not a variance necessarily but was a request to adjust the City standards for road widths in that location. The Mayor considered statements from the City Engineer, City Planner, and the City Attorney. Mr. Hilton and his representative were present at the hearing. The decision of the Mayor was to deny the request for the variation, which essentially required the 32-foot width of the roadway, the relocation of that utility pole, and the pedestrian improvements. The current application is related to the fact that it involves the same location and there is a similar request. That being said, legally, it is not part of the same process. The Planning Commission has the ability to consider it as a legislative decision. He hopes that the context provided has been useful for Commissioners.

Commissioner Roach wondered whether the utility pole would need to be moved if the application was ultimately approved. Mr. Hilton explained that when it came to his attention that the pole might need to be moved, he decided to look in the area to see if there were any other poles with this issue. There are approximately a dozen power poles on that side of the street and eight of them would need to be moved if the original plan was used. Mr. Hilton shared information about the neighborhood petition that was submitted previously. Commissioner Roach noted that he appreciates citizen efforts to improve community safety. He asked what it would cost to have the pole moved that is on his property. Mr. Hilton reported that Rocky Mountain Power initially stated that the pole could not be moved and the power for the entire block would need to be buried. The City then spoke to Rocky Mountain Power and came back with an estimate of \$16,000 to move the one pole. He is offering to spend \$25,000 on what the neighbors want. It is not necessarily an issue of cost, but what is desired.

Commissioner Fonte asked if there were other ways to slow the traffic down. Mr. Hilton explained that it is up to the City to determine the best path forward. This application was submitted so there

could be a discussion and a decision could be made. This was the only avenue to bring the matter forward. The General Plan is a guideline and already more or less is in agreement with what is envisioned. However, according to City Staff, it would need to be amended to become more focused. The text amendment was first and then City Staff suggested that the General Plan amendment be added.

Vice-Chair Prince opened the public hearing.

Phillip Cone gave his address as 2636 Murray Holladay Road. He has lived there for 13 years and his home would be directly impacted by what has been proposed. There is traffic in the area and it has increased somewhat over the years, but he does not see traffic issues in general. Mr. Cone does not believe there is a problem that needs to be solved here. The narrowing of the road means that guests who come to visit would be unable to park on the side of the road. He expressed concerns about the elimination of on-street parking as a result of the proposal. Mr. Cone pointed out that the value of his home would be impacted if roadside parking was eliminated. If there is an issue in the neighborhood, it is that some people run the stop signs. He does not see significant traffic problems.

Brian Jackman gave his address as 4644 South Chapel Drive, which is approximately two and a half blocks from where this is proposed. He has lived in the area for 34 years and has seen traffic increase. However, most of the traffic appears to be residential. Mr. Jackman has heard about the petition that was mentioned and wondered how many residents actually signed it. As for how to slow down vehicles, he suggested stop signs on Chapel Drive, Clearview Street, or Russell Street. There could also be additional enforcement for the existing stop signs to ensure that vehicles are actually slowing down. Mr. Jackman believes reducing the width of the road will lead to more issues for pedestrians. He had questions about on-street parking and how the proposal will impact the ability of vehicles to park. Based on what he has seen, he believes the proposal will make the area less safe than it is.

Hank Volker gave his address as 2500 Murray Holladay Road and noted that he has lived there for 15 years. He does not see an issue with the current configuration. Some of the changes that are proposed do not seem necessary. If the power poles are removed and the mailboxes there are removed, no one will be able to park on that side of the street, because there will not be enough room. This means the people who live on Murray Holladay Road would not be able to park in front of their homes and would not be able to have guests park on the road. As far as speeding, one of the blinking speed limit signs was put out previously, which led to a shift in behaviors. There are bicyclists that use the road, and he has seen them in both directions, but there are not a lot of bicyclists there. Mr. Volker does not see a lot of the issues that have been mentioned during the Planning Commission Meeting.

It was noted that Mr. Volker signed the resident petition included in the Meeting Materials Packet. At one time, he was in favor of the proposed changes, but now his comments appear in opposition.

Melissa Hilton gave her address as 2394 East Murray Holladay Road. She wanted to address the idea of park strips, which were discussed earlier in the meeting. There is a drought issue and there are water issues. Trees, grass, and landscaping are all important, but as for the park strips, most of the recommendations are to move away from them. She referenced what is in place on the north

side of Murray Holladay Road, which is the sidewalk right on the street. It would make more sense to have the trees behind the sidewalk so there is more shade created for pedestrians. This would also address other issues, such as lifting of the sidewalks. Ms. Hilton noted that neighbors were told that the sidewalk would eventually go all the way up Murray Holladay Road, which is the reason many of the people on Murray Holladay Road expressed opposition because there is a desire to park on the street.

The applicant was invited to respond to the comments made during the public hearing. Mr. Hilton explained that he is a developer but also lives in the area. As a result, he has two perspectives on the situation. In the original plan, the sidewalk would continue straight with a park strip. That would require the power poles to be moved and eminent domain or exaction. The property owners did not want portions of their property taken, so the petition was created. After the petition, there was some further feedback received from neighbors. A minority of neighbors were supportive of a sidewalk but did not want to take away from their yards. The intention is to increase overall safety.

Mr. Horan noted that the current proposal appears to be less expensive for the City because it results in fewer poles that the City needs to move. He noted that City Staff could provide clarification on that.

There were no further comments. The hearing was closed.

Commissioner Roach noted that relocation of poles and sidewalks was mentioned multiple times during the public hearing. He asked for clarification about whether or not what currently exists will remain until there is a permit for development and changes made to the site. He believed at that point, it would be brought into new plan conformance. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this and explained that off-site improvements are enacted when new development occurs on the property. If a neighbor up the street with a power pole and no sidewalk does nothing, there is no requirement for them to add a sidewalk or remove the pole. Commissioner Roach thanked him for providing that clarification.

Commissioner Berndt noted that what is proposed will impact all secondary residential roads. It will not only apply to this particular section. Mr. Blakesley reads it the same way and it would have broad applicability the way it is written and proposed. Commissioner Berndt asked how to measure that impact and expressed his concerns. Commissioner Gong appreciates the research on traffic calming. It seems like there are mixed opinions about the needs based on some of the resident feedback. She wants to have a better understanding of the broader implications of all secondary residential roads. Commissioner Roach has some concerns about what has been proposed. If the right-of-way is narrowed, it is important to consider what will be lost in order to make that happen. It seems like the park strips will be eliminated, which means buildings will be pushed closer to the road. He does not feel that the proposed text amendment makes a lot of sense based on that.

Commissioner Cunningham asked that the proposed text language be shared, specifically Section A and Section B. The petition has somehow morphed into the language that is now before the Commission and it includes a deadline date of April 11, 2025, for Phase I and Phase II. There are specifics about the different phases, but none of that appears in the original petitions that were

signed. He expressed concerns about Phase III, as he feels that will force the Council to prioritize the project.

Commissioner Vilchinsky agrees with the previous comments shared by the Commission. It is important that people have the ability to access their neighborhoods and communities. If it is not from this street, then it will be from another street. There has to be a way for people to get to and from the village center and schools. She does not want to push traffic problems to other areas. Commissioner Vilchinsky encouraged the residents at the meeting to be vocal during the General Plan process so it is clear what there is a desire to see in the future. Commissioner Fonte studied the Meeting Materials Packet carefully and reviewed all of the information. She will not be voting in favor of this change, because it would be irresponsible for the Planning Commission to do so. If the issue is safety, the Commission has not seen clear evidence that there is a safety issue in the area. There are other opportunities to calm the traffic without narrowing the road. Commissioner Fonte pointed out that the City is working on a General Plan update. It is necessary to think about that update and what is desired for the City of Holladay in the future. For example, maintaining the tree canopy.

Commissioner Roach moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to DENY an application by Ron Hilton to amend Land Use Ordinance 13.02.030 and Map 3.1 of Chapter 3 of the General Plan, based upon the following findings:

- 1. The proposal does not seem to fit with the intent of what the applicant submitted.***
- 2. In light of the upcoming General Plan update, it would be better vetted and worked through during that process rather than trying to amend it at this time.***

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

ACTION ITEMS

4. Approval of Minutes – October 29, 2024.

Commissioner Berndt noted that he was not at the meeting and will not vote on the Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to APPROVE the October 29, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Commissioner Roach seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission, with an abstention from Commissioner Berndt.

ADJOURN

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting held on Tuesday, January 7, 2025.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: **February 4, 2025**