

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

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

7:00 p.m.

**Holladay Municipal Center
4580 South 2300 East**

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Matt Snow, Chair
Jim Carter, Vice Chair
John Garver
Ann Mackin
Marianne Ricks
Alyssa Lloyd

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, City Planner

PRE-MEETING / WORK SESSION

(18:37:52) The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, introduced the first agenda item and reported that the applicant, Amir Haskic, purchased a home on Lincoln Lane and is proposing to construct a new accessory building to replace one that exists. The proposed structure will exceed the allowable square footage, which requires Planning Commission approval. Mr. Teerlink reminded the Commission that Conditional Use Permits are allowable but the difference must be mitigated by the conditions. The current requirements were identified. Mr. Teerlink explained that in the past, conditions have included increased setbacks.

It was noted that the Highland Drive Small Area Master Plan (HDMP) involves the townhome request. Mr. Teerlink stated that the applicants are seeking to develop in the NC zone. Currently, the property is in a Commercial zone, which was created to encourage retail business. The property was zoned RM when the Garden Spot occupied the property. The Council and Planning Commission recommended that the property be rezoned NC to accommodate a commercial use there. The previous business is no longer in operation, so the investors and property owner want to revert back to the original RM zoning. In the meantime, the HDMP was adopted, which specifies that RM zoning is no longer permitted. Staff counseled the applicant to first request a change to the General Plan. The proposed one sentence amendment was presented. It was suggested that a decision on the rezone be continued.

(19:04:06) Commissioner Carter moved to adjourn the Work Meeting. Commissioner Ricks seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

1. CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.

Chair Matt Snow called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:09 p.m. and read the Chair statement.

ACTION ITEMS

2. PUBLIC HEARING – Haskic Accessory Building, Conditional Use Permit – 1886 East Lincoln Lane.

(19:11:34) City Planner, Jonathan Teerlink, presented the staff report and stated that the applicant, Amir Haskic, is requesting to rebuild a detached garage on his property. Accessory buildings in the City have thresholds that the City Council determined to be appropriate for the size of lot on which they are built. In some cases, they are allowed to exceed that limit but conditions to mitigate the impacts may be imposed. There were a few accessory buildings on Mr. Haskic's property. He razed two large garages and would like to build a new one. With the existing shed on the property and the new garage, the total footprint is 200 square feet over the limit and requires Planning Commission approval. Staff recommended the Commission conduct the required public hearing and moderate a discussion with the applicant on what is proposed. It was noted that Mr. Haskic is proposing to construct a three-car garage.

Chair Snow opened the public hearing.

(19:15:34) Chris Jensen gave his address as 1878 East Lincoln Lane and stated that his home is directly behind the subject property. He did not object to the three-car garage but wanted to ensure that 1,050 square feet is the maximum allowed and that no alterations are proposed to the existing building. The request has a direct impact on Mr. Jensen and he has worked with the applicant on the lot line adjustment. Mr. Jensen did not want the proposed structure to be greater than one story and no taller than the existing 19-foot garage. He had heard that the intent was to place solar panels on the back side of the home, which will result in glare on Mr. Jensen's property. Because the proposal has a direct impact, he suggested that a fence be placed between his property and Mr. Haskic's south property line to enhance the buffer between the two properties.

Doug Herrscher gave his address as 1874 Lincoln Lane to the west of Mr. Haskic's property. He agreed with some of the comments made by Mr. Jensen. He commented that there did not seem to be a plan for the remodel that has been taking place and questioned whether there should be a plan before granting a permit. Mr. Teerlink offered to review the plans with Mr. Herrscher. He explained that permits are only issued deemed appropriate by the Building Official.

(19:23:24) There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Haskic plans to construct an 18-foot one-story structure. Solar panels were to be installed to service the home. With regard to the cost of the fence, it was clarified by Mr. Jensen that he and Mr. Haskic had been in discussions with respect to cost. Mr. Teerlink clarified that eight-foot fencing is not allowed in rear yards unless the two neighbors agree. The specifics of who pays for it are unclear.

Mr. Jensen explained that his concerns with the solar array pertained to the shed, which has a steep pitch and is only eight feet tall. If placed there it will be in close proximity to Mr. Jensen's property compared to the garage to the east. He did not want the solar panels to be over the top of his driveway. He recommended that there be no solar panels placed on the existing building but allowed on the garage.

Mr. Haskic stated that the existing structure is 18' x 30' and the roof will be replaced and will be south facing like the garage. The pitch of the roof will also be modified. It was noted that any glare could be mitigated by what the neighbor plants in their front yard.

Commissioner Carter asked to what extent the City regulates solar panels. Mr. Teerlink explained that the City requires permitting of the racking and the connection to the panel. Commissioner Carter commented that how the structure is configured is beyond the purview of the Planning Commission unless there are regulations in place that require conditional use approval for solar installations. In that case, they could review orientation, non-reflective surfaces, and other conditions. The conditions that seemed appropriate to the impact pertained to adequate lot coverage and height. Potential conditions of approval were discussed.

Mr. Haskic reported that he replaced the sewer because it collapsed and was extended. Commissioner Carter was more concerned about limiting the occupancy than whether there is plumbing in the accessory building. Chair Snow commented that the zoning already addresses the concerns of someone living in the accessory structure. Commissioner Carter was hesitant to bog the approval down with numerous conditions in anticipation of future illegal behavior. His preference was to take enforcement action in the event of a violation.

(19:42:13) Commissioner Carter moved to approve the Haskic Accessory Building Conditional Use Permit subject to the following:

Findings:

- 1. The building will be set at the required four-foot setbacks and under the maximum 20-foot height limit.***
- 2. The total of existing and proposed accessory buildings is less than the total of all previous accessory buildings combined, effectively bringing the property more into compliance.***
- 3. When applying 13.08.040E “Conditional Use Approvals”, this project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and/or welfare of Holladay residents, persons in the vicinity or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity and is necessary and desirable for this particular location and will contribute to the well-being of the neighborhood.***
- 4. The proposal does not conflict with the intent of the General Plan.***

Conditions:

- 1. A Storm Water Detention Plan shall be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.***
- 2. Construction drawings shall be submitted and the permit approved by the Building Official.***
- 3. Exterior lighting, if any, shall be a full hood cut-off fixture and mounted in a manner so as to minimize element exposure of the lighting element(s) to neighboring properties.***

4. *The buildings use shall comply with the permitted uses stated in the R-1 zone.*
5. *There shall be an eight-foot fence to screen the larger structure.*
6. *The combined size of the two structures shall be limited to 1,050 square feet. This results in an overall reduction of the footprint of the accessory structures given that the building that the building that was taken down was 980 square feet and the new one is 750 square feet.*

Commissioner Ricks seconded the motion: Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Ann Mackin-Aye, Alyssa Lloyd-Aye, Marianne Ricks-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC HEARING – General Plan Amendment; Highland Drive Small Area Master Plan.

(19:43:54) Mr. Teerlink presented the staff report and stated that the Highland Drive Small Area Master Plan focuses on Highland Drive and divides it into three segments. The northern segment comprises 3900 South to Arbor Lane; the middle portion includes Arbor Lane to 6200 South; and the final segment consists of 6200 South to the freeway. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property in the middle segment from NC (Neighborhood Commercial) to RM (Residential Multi-Family). The property in question is in Segment B, which no longer allows for RM. The subject property was RM until 2012 when the Garden Spot went out of business. The property owners maintained a retail space there for many years and are allowed to continue under a grandfathered right. A new business would like to open in the proposed location; however, the RM zone does not allow it. The applicants requested that the zoning be changed to NC to allow for the Roots Nursery to continue to operate there. The applicant was requesting a General Plan Amendment to change the description of Segment B to allow for the one parcel to relocate into Segment A.

The applicant, Kent Hogan, commented that he and his partner, Myron Child, feel this is a good transition between the existing residential property to the south and the Mall to the north. He felt that they would be compatible with the neighbors and that the product is needed in the area. They are proposing a senior townhome community with four units per building. Each unit will have an elevator and two-car parking beneath. The units will be low maintenance and high quality.

Chair Snow opened the public hearing.

(19:50:25) Sidney Robertson gave his address as 2006 Arbor Lane and asked for clarification on whether it can be only be a two-story structure. Mr. Teerlink explained that the applicant is limited to 35 feet, which would allow for two stories. He noted that there is a footprint maximum in the NC zone of 5,000 square feet. No residential is currently allowed in the NC zone. In order for the applicants to proceed, they would need a zone change.

In response to a question raised, Mr. Teerlink stated that the committee discussed where the boundaries should be. Commercial Retail was intended to end at the Cottonwood Mall and the property to the south was to be Low Density Residential.

(19:53:47) Camille Pierce gave her address as 2052 East Arbor Lane and expressed concern with the additional high-density multi-family development proposed with this project and by Ivory. She was concerned about her neighborhood and the cost of providing services to thousands of new residents. She commented that with more residents, there will be fewer services available. She urged the Commission to not allow ingress and egress on Arbor Lane for the project because it is a narrow, winding lane with no shoulder. Ms. Pierce commented that it is already difficult to get in and out onto Highland Drive and to access their driveway because of increased traffic. She asked that the Commission require both entrances be from Highland Drive and that no additional parking be allowed on Arbor Lane. Ms. Pierce also asked that the lighting be down facing to not shine into the neighborhood. She noted that their neighborhood is comprised of larger properties on the creek that have a rural feel. She also did not want to see sidewalks along Arbor Lane because they will destroy the rural feel of the lane. She wanted vegetation but no walls along Arbor Lane near the proposed development. If her conditions cannot be met she asked that the property remain commercial.

Sarah Pierce gave her address as 2004 Arbor Lane and stated that her property directly borders the subject property to the east. She had design concerns relative to the requested zone change. She expressed concern with height, density, and egress onto Arbor Lane. Initially, she preferred residential but now that she understands the density, she was not so sure. The neighborhood is very quiet and she hoped to preserve that to the extent possible. She recognized that that will change when the Mall property is developed.

(19:58:48) Steve Glaser gave his address as 2052 East Arbor Lane and expressed opposition to changing the General Plan. A neighborhood meeting was conducted and it was reported that in order to allow residential development, they need a second exit onto Arbor Lane. That is directly across from where Ivory is planning an entrance into their development once the Mall is developed. Having the two accesses across from one other had the potential to be a problem. Mr. Glaser's preference was to retain the area as Neighborhood Commercial. He commented that when he moved to Holladay 18 years ago, the property was the Garden Spot Nursery. His primary concerns were traffic on Arbor Lane and density.

(20:01:37) Steve Breitling identified himself as the current owner of the property and stated that he considered the proposal to be an enhancement. They have waited many years for the Mall to develop and still do not know when and if anything will happen. He understood the concerns raised and stated that even as commercial, the property will generate a significant amount of traffic and even perhaps more than residential depending on the use. He commented that the property has always been accessed off of Arbor Lane and has never had an entrance directly onto Highland Drive. If anything, the proposed plan will alleviate traffic because there would be an option to use both Highland Drive and Arbor Lane. Mr. Breitling stated that the proposed project will be of a lower profile than what exists to the south. With regard to design, Mr. Breitling reported that he owned the property for a number of years and wants it to be an enhancement and asset to the community. If the property remains NC it could be developed as a restaurant or other use that could be viewed as a greater negative to the neighborhood than what is proposed.

Mr. Hogan commented that perhaps the proposed use will generate less traffic than a normal residential area because it will be senior living and seniors do not drive as much as younger

people. The main access to the property will be off of Highland Drive. In terms of height the structures will be lower than what exists to the south. The main structure will be 22 to 24 feet tall. In response to a comment made by Chair Snow, Mr. Hogan stated that they would not be opposed to a gated entrance.

(20:07:42) Mr. Teerlink explained that when the City Council considers rezone possibilities and potential, one of their concerns is whether a developer is actually going to build what they are promising. Most of the time a Development Agreement is entered into that is tied directly to the approval. If the agreement is broken, the applicant loses the zoning.

Kristin Brown gave her address as 1784 East 3900 South and stated that the development next to her was originally proposed and approved as single-level 1,600 to 2,100 square-foot homes. The developers later changed the plan drastically. She asked if there was any assurance that what is proposed will be built. Chair Snow stated that approval can be tied to the original proposal. If the applicant does not see the project through, another developer would have to start the process over.

(20:11:14) Project Architect, Nolan Mendenhall, gave his address as 1409 South Spring Lane and was curious to see what the Neighborhood Commercial height limitation was relative to the RM zone, which allows up to 35 feet. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the height limitation is the same for both zones. Mr. Mendenhall commented that in terms of parking on the street, it is owned by the City who can dictate whether there can be on-street parking. Night lighting issues were discussed as well as limiting light trespass onto neighboring properties. With regard to fencing along Arbor Lane, Mr. Mendenhall stated that in other communities, if a fence is placed along a public road, they typically put in wrought iron fencing which is more decorative than a privacy fence. A gated entry into the site had not yet been discussed. It was noted that sidewalks are also under the directive of the City. Mr. Mendenhall's opinion was that if Arbor Lane had curb, gutter, and sidewalk in place there would be enhanced safety for pedestrians.

(20:16:50) Camille Pierce reported that she raised the issue of money because she knew that the Cottonwood Mall generated a great deal of sales tax that went directly to the City. She did not think residential units would do the same unless the residents shop in the community.

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

Commissioner Carter appreciated the neighbors' concerns about the future. Given the current and proposed zoning, they should determine what would be the maximum intensity of the use in terms of traffic, lighting, trucks, hours, etc. He felt that the first step should be to determine whether the commercial area should be allowed to be developed as residential before specifying the zoning or the intensity of the use. He envisioned the parcel being higher intensity residential and was not opposed to amending the plan to allow consideration of residential uses.

Chair Snow pointed out that there would be residential uses on three sides of the property. The Mall will be across Arbor Lane. Commissioner Carter commented that the commercial on the west side of Highland Drive has historically related to the commercial at the Mall site. He did not believe that the commercial on the subject parcel relates well to the Mall site and seemed to be an island of commercial. Chair Snow felt that residential zoning perhaps makes more sense.

(20:22:51) Commissioner Ricks was of the opinion that the Highland Drive Master Plan in this section allows for small commercial areas on the corners and adds variety, character, and an opportunity for small businesses in the community. She did not believe the City needs another age restrictive use. She commented that the corner has a lot of character and to include it in the Mall zoning will detract from its appeal.

Commissioner Garver agreed with Commissioner Ricks and gave examples of successful businesses in the various neighborhoods. He thought it was better to not place all businesses in one location. He was opposed to moving the property into Segment A and felt that the road serves as a good boundary. He was not sure that making a decision tonight was the prudent thing to do.

(20:26:30) Commissioner Lloyds' opinion was swayed after hearing from the residents. She suggested that the zoning remain as-is.

Commissioner Mackin agreed that the zoning should not be changed. She commented that the staff report states that the potential loss of NC zoning eliminates the possibility of attractive uses and flexibility in design.

Commissioner Lloyd thought that one of the benefits of living in Holladay is that there is a balance of space and commerce. She did not consider the proposed rezone to be appropriate.

Commissioner Carter commented that will happen on the Cottonwood Mall site is unknown and was something the Commission should contemplate.

(20:30:18) Richard Duggar gave his address as 6173 Carriage Park Circle and identified himself as an area property owner. He wanted to know what is to be done with the Mall property. He recognized that his property is an eyesore with rundown buildings. He wants to be a good landlord but it has been difficult to keep the property in good condition. He has rented it but has had to release each tenant from their lease early because they could not make a profit. He commented that it is an empty space that needs something. The reality is that it is difficult for businesses in the area to succeed. Mr. Duggar did not expect anything to happen on the Mall site for a very long time. He viewed the proposal as an opportunity to improve the area and begin development. He apologized for the condition of his property and stated that he would try to improve it even if it continues to sit vacant. Mr. Duggar wanted to see the property developed and would consider anything presented to him.

(20:36:43) *Commissioner Ricks moved to recommend denial to the City Council of the request to remove the property at 5025 South Highland Drive from Segment B and relocate it to Segment A based on the following:*

Finding:

- 1. The City needs more commercial uses like the NC zone, which is a better option in this location. This adds variety to our commercial uses, and is more consistent with the objective of the Holladay City Master Plan.***

Commissioner Mackin seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Jim Carter-Aye, Marianne Ricks-Aye, Alyssa Lloyd-Aye, Ann Mackin-Aye, John Garver-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Nay. The motion passed 5-to-1.

4. PUBLIC HEARING – Zone Map Amendment – Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to Residential Multi-Family (RM) – 5025 South Highland Drive.

(20:39:21) Mr. Teerlink presented the staff report and stated that agenda items 3 and 4 are connected. Staff recommended continuation of the rezone. It was noted that the staff report explored the history of the zone.

The property owner, Steve Breitling, commented on the deteriorating nature of the area and stated that several property owners were interested in hearing about the details of the project. He hoped to see the property developed. The fact that a few residents were present to speak indicated to him that there is not much opposition to what is proposed.

(20:43:32) Chair Snow opened the public hearing. There were no public comments.

Nolan Mendenhall asked about the history of the site and was of the understanding that at one time the property was zoned RM. Mr. Teerlink stated that the Garden Spot occupied the site prior to the City being incorporated in 2000. At that time, the property was placed in the R-1-10 zone and eventually the zoning was changed to RM. In the meantime, however, the Garden Spot had been operating as a nursery under a grandfathered status. In 2012, when Roots came in, The Garden Spot location had been vacant for six months, which was the threshold for losing the grandfathered status. The applicant requested NC zoning, which was appropriate for the size of the use and was granted to operate the nursery. The Garden Spot has since gone out of business. In response to a question raised, Mr. Teerlink stated that he was unaware of a development agreement associated with this property for a nursery use.

Commissioner Lloyd commented that her decision was not solely based on having empathy for the neighbors. She stated that the City is ending a moratorium period in terms of development along Highland Drive because it has been widely perceived that the maximum density has continually been sought by developers. Various studies have been conducted and numerous meetings have been held on how much more density will be allowed on Highland Drive. This was the first proposal coming off the moratorium asking for increased density. She considered Highland Drive to be a bigger issue and was not compelled to increase the density, especially on that corner.

(20:48:46) Commissioner Carter commented that the main issue is how much residential density there will be if the Cottonwood Mall site is ever developed. Commissioner Garver commented that the City Council can still add the parcel to Segment A.

Kristin Brown gave her address as 1784 East 3900 South and recalled a flower shop called Tronier that operated for many years south of The Garden Spot.

Sarah Pierce gave her address as 2004 Arbor Lane and clarified that she is not opposed to residential but is concerned about density. She commented that the egress proposed in the plan is in the middle of the property going onto Arbor Lane. Theoretically, they exit onto Arbor Lane

but it is near the edge of Highland Drive so it does not feel like it is Arbor Lane. Ms. Pierce was present representing a group of 12 homeowners along the Arbor Lane corridor known as Cottonwood, Inc.

Mr. Breitling commented that the Tronier building still exists and is part of the subject property. It is located to the south of the residential homes that have always been part of the property. He stated that the Cottonwood Mall site consists of 57 acres yet it is not known how it will develop. He suggested that the Council consider keeping the mixed-use designation and noted that there will be more options with such a large parcel than what is being considered with this 1.12-acre site. He commented that many of the concerns raised could be better addressed with the development that comes forward on the Cottonwood Mall property.

(20:55:33) Commissioner Carter moved to continue consideration of the rezone request and continue the public hearing pending a determination by the City Council on the segment change. John Garver seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Ann Mackin-Aye, Alyssa Lloyd-Aye, Marianne Ricks-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5. CONTINUED – Oakwood Villa Estates PUD Plat Amendment – 3958 South Woodline Drive.

(20:57:26) Mr. Teerlink presented the staff report and stated that the above matter involves a previous request from Bill Diamant who submitted an application to amend the Oakwood Villa Estate PUD. Several considerations were discussed by the Planning Commission over the course of three meetings regarding the potential amendment of a no-build entry and slope protection area. The applicant returned to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) with a revised set of drawings, which was considerably different than what was previously discussed. Based on discussions with the Planning Commission, Mr. Diamant was requesting to amend the Conditional Use Permit for the PUD to allow the owner of Lot 8 to move the home up the hill to a flatter location with a 10-foot setback. Combined with the redesign of the home, the result will be to remove it completely from the no-build area. The other portion would involve a revegetation and restabilization plan for the tree and slope protection areas.

The City Engineer reviewed the rip rap walls and vegetation plan and found that they would favorably restabilize the slope. Salt Lake City Water also reviewed the application and made some requests. The TRC was pleased with the redesign and found it to be in compliance with the intent of the PUD Ordinance of the Slope Protection Area and recommended approval of a Conditional Use Permit Amendment for a 10-foot setback on Lot 8.

Mr. Diamant identified himself as the owner of Lot 8 and reported that since they last met, he was able to meet with the Holladay City Arborists who made a recommendation on the type of trees and vegetation they would like to see on the wall. This was reflected on the current plan. Mr. Diamant was also able to meet with a representative from Salt Lake City Utilities who was willing to cooperate and work with him. Their main request was that there be no vegetation within five feet of the canal walls, flatten the area out, and provide 24/7 access through a locked gate. Since the previous request, they have reduced the footprint of the home and pulled the footings back seven feet on both sides. They also pulled the home forward to the east and south to allow for the utility easement. As a result of the change, a bedroom was eliminated and the

square footage reduced by seven feet on the south and west sides. The overall square footage was reduced by approximately 900 square feet.

Chair Snow was pleased with how the applicant had responded to the Commission's concerns. Commissioner Ricks thanked Mr. Diamant for listening to their comments and appreciated his efforts.

Commissioner Garver asked if any other residents within the PUD had any concerns with the home being pushed closer to the street. Mr. Diamant stated that the matter was taken to the homeowners' association who was unanimously in favor of the new model.

(21:05:18) Commissioner Lloyd moved to approve an amendment to the Conditional Use Permit to allow specifically for a 10-foot setback. Approval was based on the following:

Findings:

- 1. Flexibility in setbacks is favored in Planned Unit Developments, as it allows the project to minimize potential impacts by clustering residential units closer together, avoiding potentially detrimental impacts to natural landscapes.*
- 2. It is the opinion of the TRC that the front yards of all homes along the no-build zone should have been granted this flexibility in order to allow, more fully, the protection of the slope and trees.*
- 3. Salt Lake City Canal Company has reviewed and approved the proposed retaining wall design – requesting a five-foot access area at the base of the lowest wall.*
- 4. The proposal makes a concerted effort to comply with the intent of the original plat to protect trees and slopes.*
- 5. If approved, the plan may eventually improve upon the condition of the lot prior to removal of the vegetation and represents a laudable degree of care for this property and for the community of Holladay as a whole.*
- 6. The proposal is supported by goals and objectives of the 2016 Holladay General Plan.*

Conditions:

- 1. The conditional use permit is subject to all provisions of 13.78 of the Holladay Code including the provision that any changes to the approved plan must be reviewed and approved by the Holladay Planning Commission.*
- 2. The occupancy of the new home is subject to the completion of the approved landscaping and slope protection plan. If weather prohibits this from occurring, the applicant may submit a bond in the estimated amount of the cost of the improvements to be held until they are fully installed within no more than six months of occupancy.*

It was recommended that final plat approval be deferred to staff.

Commissioner Ricks seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Ann Mackin-Aye, Alyssa Lloyd-Aye, Marianne Ricks-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6. CONTINUED – Lincoln Heights – Residential Three-Lot Subdivision – Preliminary Plat – 2013 and 2015 East Lincoln Circle – R-1-15 Zone.

(21:06:57) Mr. Teerlink presented the staff report and stated that the above request involves preliminary subdivision plat approval of a three-lot subdivision on Lincoln Circle for the Lincoln Heights Subdivision. The proposal is an amendment of the Holladay Heights subdivision amending two lots to combine them into three in the R-1-15 zone. Conceptual approval was granted previously and preliminary plat review took place at the last Planning Commission Meeting. At that time there were items that the TRC had concerns with in addition to an issue involving addressing. The applicant provided a solution to the addressing issue, which was that Lot 3 will have its own private drive addressed as Lincoln View Lane and have an east coordinate and a south number. No other residents would need to change their address in the neighborhood. The TRC confirmed that all of the Utility Availability Letters were submitted to service the new lot. The City Engineer reviewed the property description boundaries and the adjustment of the Public Utility Easement was completed. The TRC recommended preliminary plat approval of the Lincoln Heights three-lot subdivision based on the findings set forth in the staff report. It was requested that the TRC work with the applicant on the final plat approval.

The applicant, Brandon Fry, was pleased that they were able to resolve the outstanding issues raised at the last meeting.

(21:11:49) *Commissioner Mackin moved that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Plat for Lincoln Heights, a three-lot subdivision, based on the following:*

Findings:

- 1. The conceptual plan and subdivision amendments have been reviewed and approved.*
- 2. The drawings meet the standards.*
- 3. The applicant proved that the project will provide for the health and safety of the residential development.*
- 4. Final plat approval shall be deferred to staff.*

Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. Vote on motion: John Garver-Aye, Ann Mackin-Aye, Alyssa Lloyd-Aye, Marianne Ricks-Aye, Jim Carter-Aye, Chair Matt Snow-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Approval of Minutes; April 18 and May 2, 2017.

(21:14:09) *Commissioner Ricks moved to approve the minutes of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting of April 18, 2017. Commissioner Mackin seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

The minutes of May 2, 2017 were reviewed and modified.

City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 06/06/2017

(21:16:00) *Commissioner Ricks moved to approve the minutes of the City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting of May 2, 2017, as amended. Commissioner Garver seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Ordinance Amendment Drafts:

- a. **Highland Drive Master Plan; Residential Densities – Final Draft Review.**
- b. **Holladay Tree Protection Amendments – Final Draft Review.**
- c. **Residential Front Yard Setback Amendment.**

There was no discussion on the above items.

ADJOURN

(21:16:32) *Commissioner Mackin moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:16 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 6, 2017.



Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: July 25, 2017