

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

Tuesday, October 28, 2025

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Patrick Tripeny

Angela Gong

Jill Fonte

Paul Cunningham

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

WORK SESSION

Chair Dennis Roach called the Work Session to order at 5:30 p.m. He noted that all Commissioners are present with the exception of Commissioner Karianne Prince. There are three items on the Regular Meeting agenda, including a Public Hearing – Continued on the Holladay General Plan Update and two Public Hearings on Text Amendments. Chair Roach noted that he was not at the last Planning Commission Meeting and missed some of the General Plan discussion. He asked if the hearing needs to be closed before a vote is taken. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, confirmed this and noted that there is a public comment included in the Meeting Materials Packet. He pointed out that there might be individuals present at the Planning Commission Meeting for the Wildland Urban Interface item on the Regular Meeting agenda. It might make sense for the Planning Commission to discuss that first.

Chair Roach noted that if there are members of the public present during the Regular Meeting, the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code Review item will be heard first. He asked if there will need to be a motion made to reorder the agenda. Mr. Teerlink explained that all of the items have been noticed for 6:00 p.m. so there does not necessarily need to be a motion.

Chair Roach asked for a summary of the General Plan discussions from the last meeting. Commissioner Brian Berndt explained that there were not a lot of additional changes recommended, but he appreciated the conversation that was had. He supports strong economic development. Commissioner Paul Cunningham reported that at the last meeting, he made a comment about economics. He felt that should be further emphasized by either moving the relevant chapter forward or adding language to the introduction. It was noted that at the last Planning Commission Meeting, there was also a discussion about the duplex language. Commissioner Jill Fonte noted that the items discussed at the last meeting were addressed in the next iteration of the document. The duplex language was adjusted based on the provided feedback.

Chair Roach reported that the second item on the Regular Meeting agenda is a Public Hearing for a Text Amendment. It is related to the Regional Mixed-Use (“R/MU”) Zone and the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”). Mr. Teerlink reported that in 2007, one of the elements of this project that was left out was signage. It was not a priority at that time. However, the applicant has proposed an appendix to the SDMP, which will refine the signage massing and location.

The design is not necessarily something the Commission needs to consider, but the massing, height, setbacks, and landscaping elements should be discussed. In 2000, pole signs were eliminated from the City. Over the years, those have slowly been removed from right-of-ways. As tenants change over, there must be conversion to a monument sign. There is only one zone in the City currently that allows a tall development sign, which is the Office Research Development (“ORD”) Zone. The sign types proposed in this case are monument style signs, but the proposed height measures in at 20 feet maximum. The Commission can discuss whether the 57 acres of the Royal Holladay Hills development is significant enough to warrant their own signage package.

Chair Roach mentioned the renderings included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It looked like the sign was close to the sidewalk with a foot of vegetation in front. He asked if that is approximately where the location would be. Mr. Teerlink reported that all of the clear view codes would still apply. It would need to be set back 40 feet from the clear view triangle, but the locations included in the Meeting Materials Packet are the approximate locations that have been proposed.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that there is already a sign on the property. He is frustrated that this request is before the Commission when something has already been installed. Mr. Teerlink noted that the applicant can address that. Discussions were had about temporary signs. Mr. Teerlink reported that in the City Code, temporary sign is defined but what has been built does not fit that definition. A temporary sign is usually a banner to announce an opening date or sale and it can be there for 30 days. He reiterated that there is a definition for this kind of sign.

Commissioner Cunningham did not believe there was a Staff recommendation included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Mr. Teerlink reported that there is a suggested motion included. He pointed out that there have not been findings included in the motion language, because the Planning Commission needs to determine whether there is support for the proposed heights. Commissioner Cunningham asked what the tallest sign is at Millrock. Mr. Teerlink believed it was 15 to 18 feet.

Commissioner Cunningham understands the advantage of having signs that are above pedestrians and traffic so the signs are more visible, but he is not certain that 20 feet is the appropriate number. It was noted that this project should not necessarily be identified by signs, but landscaping and building design. Chair Roach asked if a setback would be appropriate to allow for an increase in height. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that those types of elements can be implemented. There is no recommendation included in the Staff Report, because he has not had these conversations with the Planning Commission before. He shared additional information about the SDMP. There was discussion about the sign material. Mr. Teerlink noted that the applicant will be at the Regular Meeting and can share information about the material, but he believes it is painted aluminum.

The third item on the Regular Meeting agenda is a Public Hearing for a Text Amendment to Title 13.70. It relates to the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code. Chair Roach reminded those present that this item might be discussed ahead of the other items during the

Regular Meeting. Mr. Teerlink reported that the Legislature wants to ensure that every municipality has a Wildland Urban Interface boundary in place. The State was tasked with looking at Structure Exposure Scores, so a scoring system has been established. Municipalities have been asked to take those scores and create their own boundary. Staff has created a boundary that relates to structure scores of five and above, which is recommended by Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”).

Mr. Teerlink reported that Staff has created two different boundaries. One is shown in the Meeting Materials Packet in a darker blue and one is shown in a lighter blue. Staff has notified all property owners within those two boundaries that these are the contemplated areas for the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone. Since that time, there has been a meeting with the City Council and representatives from UFA to receive feedback on the light blue area shown. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the light blue area is not within the Structure Exposure Score of five and above. However, the light blue area has historically been an area of concern for emergency services and fire crews.

Last week, the City Council was asked about their comfort including the light blue areas in what moves forward. The City Council acknowledged that the light blue areas are a concern and expressed a desire to study those in more detail. There was a request made that the dark blue area be considered by the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink explained that at this time, there is City Council support to consider properties within the dark blue area rather than the light blue. During the Regular Meeting, there might be individuals present from the dark blue and light blue areas. There will be a representative from UFA at the Regular Meeting to share additional information.

Mr. Teerlink reported that there will be a fee associated with homes that have higher Structure Exposure Score levels. He is not sure what level that will be, but the Utah Division of Fire, Forestry, and State Lands (“FFSL”) will look into this. Mr. Teerlink explained that properties within the dark blue area will not necessarily be assessed a fee unless the property is within the higher scale that is determined. For new construction, it will mean another type of fire code that must be adhered to. This includes definitions and criteria for defensible space. He stated that defensible space is the distance between the structure and whatever vegetation there is between a home and the neighboring home. That is in direct conflict with the canopy sustainability ordinance.

Commissioner Tripeny asked if the Planning Commission will be considering the light blue area. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the City Council has requested that the dark blue area be considered at this time. That is the overlay there is comfort applying at this time, because that is the overlay that directly aligns with the Structure Exposure Score of five and above. The light blue is not within the Structure Exposure Score of five and above, so there is a desire to study that separately and potentially look at that area in the future. Commissioner Fonte asked if this relates to new construction. Mr. Teerlink stated that it has to do with new construction and additions.

There are municipalities within the County and State who do not have Wildland Urban Interface areas, because there is no interaction with forest boundaries. As a result, there will be cities that do not adopt an overlay zone. Mr. Teerlink noted that if the overlay zone is not adopted and there is a wildland fire, the municipality will not be eligible to receive emergency funds from the State.

Commissioner Gong wanted to better understand what the role of the Planning Commission is for this item. Mr. Teerlink reported that the Commission is being asked to look at the boundary. There

has been work done with Millcreek, Cottonwood Heights, and Sandy while generating the maps. The Commission is being asked to look at the methodology used for the boundaries. He explained that this agenda item also impacts the Building Code, which is Title 13. If an overlay zone impacts structures and properties, it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation to the City Council. Commissioner Fonte asked when the map will be more clearly defined by the State. Mr. Teerlink explained that it will not be.

Chair Roach expressed concerns about the conflicts with the tree ordinance. He asked if that needs to be figured out before the Text Amendment can be approved. Mr. Teerlink reported that it will need to be looked at in retrospect. City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, explained that all of this is the State reaction to wildfires that occurred in California. Chair Roach thanked him for the clarification. It was noted that the Commission will move directly into the Regular Meeting.

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.

Chair Roach called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He reported that there are three items on the agenda. All members of the Commission are present with the exception of Commissioner Prince. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Tripeny.

During the Work Session, there was a discussion about reordering the agenda due to members of the public who are present for the third item on the Regular Meeting agenda. As a result, it was determined that the Text Amendment for Title 13.70 will be considered by the Commission first.

PUBLIC HEARING – CONTINUED

1. **City of Holladay General Plan Update – “Holladay Horizons.” Continued Discussion and Presentation by City Staff and Third-Party Consultants, Logan Simpson, of a 2025 Update to the Existing Holladay General Plan. Recommendation(s) on a Final Draft will be Forwarded to the City Council for Final Consideration. In Accordance with Utah Code §10-9a-Part 4. File #00-6-04-2.**

Chair Roach noted that during the previous meeting, there were comments made about duplexes and economic development. He asked for updates about the General Plan from Staff. Mr. Teerlink reported that since the last Planning Commission Meeting, there was an opportunity to work with Logan Simpson on the General Plan document. The feedback from the Planning Commission was incorporated into the document and can be seen in the redline version sent out to Commissioners.

Mr. Teerlink noted that there are a few outstanding items that were not incorporated into the latest version of the draft. His recommendation would be that the motion language mention the inclusion of those changes. It was explained that some of the changes to the maps have not been completed. There are also changes to the water element that need to be made. The majority of the proposed changes have been made to that section, but some additional review is needed. Mr. Teerlink added that the public hearing is still open. Staff was waiting to see if additional comments would be submitted. One email comment was received and is included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the email comment that was received. Mr. Teerlink explained that there can be a discussion about the contents of the email during the Planning Commission Meeting. There was a desire to understand the difference between the Future Land Use District Map and the Zone Map. It was clarified that there is no zoning being changed with

the General Plan update. That has been a consistent concern from residents, especially during one on one discussions. Since this is an update, there are not boundaries being changed to the Land Use Districts. There were changes made to the descriptions and representations within the document. Chair Roach asked if the text in red indicates the changes that have been made, which was confirmed. There is strikethrough text where pieces have been removed and there is red text to indicate additions. The additions are based on the feedback that has been received.

The representative from Logan Simpson, Delaney Sillman, reviewed the draft version of the General Plan with the Commission. She reported that there were minor changes made where sentences were restructured, but she wanted to highlight some of the more significant changes. Ms. Sillman reported that the Appendix has been added, which includes the following:

- Appendix A: Required General Plan Element Matrix;
- Appendix B: Glossary of Terms;
- Appendix C: Engagement Summary;
- Appendix D: Implementation Summary Table;
- Appendix E: Small Area Plans; and
- Appendix F: Moderate-Income Housing Plan.

The introduction section was reviewed. Ms. Sillman explained that there was additional clarity provided as well as some new graphics. The Future Land Use chapter was discussed. It was noted that there were some significant changes made to this chapter. The Opportunity Categories were removed and there are now Areas of Opportunity. She explained that the information covers the Small Area Master Plans as well as high traffic corridors. In the Future Land Use versus Zoning section, there was text added to clarify the relationship between the two. Some edits were also made to the graphic. The Areas of Opportunity language was further reviewed. Ms. Sillman explained that these are places the City has already designated as having the potential to change. There was a request made to include images of what these areas look like, so that was done.

Commissioner Gong asked if there will be a Small Area Master Plan for Murray Holladay Road between Holladay Village and Holladay Hills. Mr. Teerlink explained that it was started at one point, but essentially tabled by the City Council. With this document as guidance, it will be possible to bring something back for consideration. Ms. Sillman continued to review the General Plan document and pointed out the different amendments made. There were specific questions about the policies and some adjustments were made. For example, DC Policy 1.1 now states: “Prioritize compatible development patterns in existing stable residential areas, while acknowledging trade-offs when changes occur.” There is a desire to allow for some flexibility.

Commissioner Cunningham believed the word “stable” indicates that nothing will change. He noted that the word was removed in other portions of the General Plan, but remained in this case. He asked if it made sense to remove “stable” from the DC Policy 1.1 language. Ms. Sillman reported that there is a list of amendments to be made and the removal of the word “stable” can be added to that list. The list is something that Commissioners can review ahead of a recommendation. Additional discussions were had about the drafted DC Policy 1.1 language. Ms. Sillman reiterated that it is possible to make changes to the language, if desired by the Commission. Commissioner Fonte believed it would make more sense if the word “stable” was removed.

Ms. Sillman reported that some changes have been made to the graphics to make the maps easier to read. There was a lot of previous discussion about the housing section. One of the changes made there was to remove some of the data. However, it will remain in the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. Ms. Sillman reviewed a suggested change with the Commission. She explained that the policies shown are related to the strategies that have been identified in the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. The goals developed as part of the General Plan process are not in the Moderate-Income Housing Plan, but the strategies and actions are. In order to avoid having these listed in multiple places, the suggestion is to remove the action items that reference pieces of the Moderate-Income Housing Plan and instead reference the document within the General Plan. Mr. Teerlink reported that Ann Frances Garcia is the Economic Development and Housing Manager. It is her responsibility to oversee that component of the General Plan. Mr. Teerlink reminded the Commission that the Moderate-Income Housing Plan is included in the Appendix of the document.

There was a change made to the Pedestrian Network Map. Ms. Sillman reported that the Schools and Activity Centers were highlighted. She noted that a State requirement is to identify project cost estimates for multimodal transportation improvements. The City diligently worked with the Engineering Department to identify some specific locations. Commissioner Gong pointed out that this feels different than the rest of the General Plan document, because it is not timeless. Ms. Sillman explained that a lot of other communities have pulled back on the level of detail. This section is relatively detailed, but the location has to be. The funding sources and cost estimates are detailed as well, which she believes is beneficial. There was a typo noted for correction.

Ms. Sillman reported that a previously discussed change was made to the sidewalk language. She explained that there was language incorporated related to feasibility. Some other relatively minor changes were made. She noted that a graphic will be updated to reflect the Small Area Master Plan map. The last chapter of the document has more significant changes to the goals and policies. In addition, there were specifics requested from the State in their review of the water element. That includes additional information about irrigation companies. The share of the City of Holladay water budget is also shown in a graphic. She highlighted the goals and policies that have changed to address Commissioner comments. Commissioner Gong asked about the graphic on Page 113. Ms. Sillman explained that it shows what the different water suppliers are able to supply to the City. It begins at 2020 and concludes at 2065, but more clarity can be provided to communicate that.

Ms. Sillman explained that there are still a few minor edits that need to be made to the document to address spacing and typos. There is a list that outlines the changes that still need to be made. Chair Roach asked if the Planning Commission feels a need to review the General Plan document after this meeting, which was denied. He noted that there has been a long review process.

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

Chair Roach moved that the City of Holladay Planning Commission forward to the City Council all prepared recommended edits to the Draft General Plan Update, "Holladay Horizons," based upon the following findings:

1. *The update maintains statutory compliance with General Plan adoption processes.*
2. *Via a City initiated “Request For Proposal” process, the City of Holladay has interviewed and selected a consultant to guide the City on research, public outreach, drafting, and adoption of a General Plan update.*
3. *Logan Simpson, the chosen consultant, is a research-driven firm that has provided transparent data presentation and public engagement to provide the City with an update which maintains past City visions and goals while providing guidance on aligning future goals with statutory compliance and resident values.*
4. *Public comment period has been held open from September 30th to receive public input.*
5. *As drafted, the proposed update and accompanying online portal have been found to provide clear and approachable tools to assist residents, business owners, development community, and City Staff in understanding the City of Holladay’s vision for its future.*

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

PUBLIC HEARING

2. **Text Amendment – Regional Mixed-Use (R/MU) Zone, Site Development Master Plan (SDMP 2007). Review and Recommendation to City Council on Proposed Text Amendment to the Site Development Master Plan for the Royal Holladay Hills Redevelopment Area (aka Cottonwood Mall Redevelopment Area, 2007) within the Regional Mixed-Use Zone (R/M-U). The Proposal, Brought by the Applicant, Steve Petersen, will Provide New Signage Criteria for the Development Area as an Appendix to the SDMP. Item reviewed as a Legislative Action in accordance with Holladay Ordinance §13.07.030 & §13.65.080. (#07-7-01-2)**

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Text Amendment application related to the Royal Holladay Hills development. Since 2007, this site has had various development criteria applied to it, but the signage was something that was intended to be addressed at a later date. The applicant is now requesting review of new signage standards that would be addressed as an Appendix to the SDMP. When the SDMP was originally approved, there was a mention that this would be addressed at a later date. Staff has received an application to create some signage standards, specifically for the entrance and interior signs. Various heights and massing have been proposed. Mr. Teerlink reminded Commissioners that pole signs are something the City Council wanted to remove generally, so pole signs have slowly been removed in the City.

The types of signs that are being proposed are not necessarily pole signs, but are similar to a monument sign with higher heights and massing. Mr. Teerlink reported that all of the standards that are being reviewed will be applicable only to the Regional Mixed-Use (“R/MU”) Zone, as enforced by the SDMP. The applicant is present at the meeting to discuss the proposal.

The applicant representative, Kris Longson, introduced himself to the Commission. He shared details about the Exhibit information. It includes the locations where the main signs and directional signs will be located. In the development agreement with the City, electronic billboards were prohibited, so that restriction is in place. There is a slight disagreement between the attorneys about the language on Page 17 as far as Temporary Sign Signage Criteria. For the project development signs, it states that it can be up to 800 square feet, which is not a temporary sign. The attorney interpretation is that this was actually an intended limit for the project signs.

The reason this is coming to the Planning Commission now is because of discussions with tenants. One of the tenants who will open on Friday has demanded signage in order to come here. It is a criteria in the lease, so it is possible for the tenant to back out of the lease if there is not signage available. Mr. Longson reported that the signs have a height limitation of 20 feet. This area is 57 acres in an SDMP and there is different zoning than anywhere else in the City. When looking at other properties of a similar size, the signs are larger than 10x30 billboards in a lot of cases. Mr. Longson reported that there has been work with tenants to explain the differences in the City of Holladay. There has also been work done with a signage and design company. The Trader Joe's sign is required under the lease. It is 20 feet tall and has a signage base of less than 200 square feet.

Mr. Longson stated that the designs tie in with the buildings that have already been developed. He offered to answer Commissioner questions. Commissioner Berndt asked about the arrival signs. Mr. Longson reported that there are only two arrival signs, one on the corner of Murray Holladay Road and Highland Drive and the other down at Rodeo Walk Drive and Highland Drive. Those arrival signs will not have tenant signage on them. He explained that this will need to be brought back to the Commission, because the designs for those have not been completed. Additional information was shared about the signage locations and the design of the multi-tenant sign.

Chair Roach pointed out the arrival signage on the Site Signage Standards document. There is an illustration in the Meeting Materials Packet that shows those on the corner. Mr. Longson clarified that there is not a design for the arrival sign at this point. That will come back to the Planning Commission once the design has been completed. Chair Roach asked if there is anything in the Text Amendment currently before the Planning Commission related to the arrival signs. It was clarified that there is nothing in the current application that is related to the arrival signs.

Commissioner Cunningham does not like the fact that there is not a full plan in place. He wanted to know more about the height of the arrival signs. Mr. Longson does not see those being more than 10 feet. Those are the only two signs missing from this application and those will be brought to the Commission for consideration in the future. Commissioner Cunningham is uncomfortable approving something that does not include all of the signs. Mr. Longson understood that but reiterated that it is only arrival signs that are missing and those are not related to tenant signage.

Commissioner Fonte believed the proposal is to have six 20 foot signs on this property. Mr. Longson reported that the proposal is to have three 20 foot signs and then some smaller 14-foot signs. He clarified that the smaller signs will not be out on the street, but will be set back within the property. Chair Roach asked about the setbacks on the 20 foot signs. Mr. Longson reported that on Murray Holladay Road, there are setbacks from the power lines. He believes there needs to be a clearance of 20 feet from those power lines. The temporary Trader Joe's sign that is

up illustrates the setback. It cannot be closer to the road than that due to the overhead lines there. On Highland Drive, the proposal is to have it outside of the clear view triangle for the intersection.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the signs that are proposed at the back of the property. Mr. Longson clarified that those are small directional signs inside the property. Mr. Teerlink explained that when it comes to signage, the location and size can be considered, but the content cannot be controlled that much. Most sign related ordinances deal with the size and location.

Chair Roach likes the style of the directional signs that have been shown in the Meeting Materials Packet. He doesn't mind the monument signs either, but his concern has to do with the height. Discussions were had about how visible the signs would be. Mr. Longson explained that there is a need to be competitive in order to bring in tenants. Commissioner Fonte stated that everything in Holladay Hills has been tastefully done so far. She is concerned about what has been proposed, because three 20 foot signs feels out of character for the community. It is not in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Longson reported that an attempt was made to ensure that it matched the character of the architecture and materials. Commissioner Fonte reiterated her concerns.

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

Chair Roach likes the sign design but feels it was a disservice to show the location with a 2D image, as it appears to be right against the Murray Holladay Road and Highland Drive intersection. However, it was clarified that there is a setback from Murray Holladay Road. The proposal makes sense when he understands the dimensions, but the submitted materials are unclear.

Commissioner Gong noted that the Holladay Village took care to make the signage feel pedestrian scale, because that was the goal for that area. That is not necessarily the goal for this area, as there is an understanding that this will be a regional hub and people will drive there. That being said, she was concerned that the height will make it easier for people to read the sign while driving quickly. Commissioner Gong stated that the setbacks make sense and she appreciates the clarity provided.

Commissioner Tripeny understands the concerns about 20-foot signs, but it is a large development and he does not believe 20-foot signs will look out of place. Chair Roach likes the applicant design and now that setbacks have been clarified, he feels more comfortable with what has been proposed.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the recommendation to the City Council will need to include sections of the sign ordinance that address clear view. Chair Roach confirmed that clear view has to be a priority for safety. Discussions were had about elevations, setbacks, and clear view. Chair Roach stated that he feels good about the clear view aspect of the proposal. Commissioner Gong asked for additional information about the size of the signs on Murray Holladay Road. She noted that it might be possible to have some sort of transition, with one sign at 20 feet and another slightly smaller so it scales down. The Commission discussed appropriate language for a motion.

Commissioner Berndt moved to Forward a Recommendation to the City Council to APPROVE an application by Steve Petersen to amend Page 17 and include Appendix Sign Criteria of the Site Development Master Plan (2007) by providing anticipated sign criteria, as is expected and noted on Page 17 of the SDMP, including criteria for the clear view triangle and noting that the

setbacks for each sign will be set back a minimum of 1 foot for every 1 foot of height. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Tripeny-Yes; Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Text Amendment – Title 13.70; Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code. Review and Recommendation to City Council on Creation of Title 13.70, of the Holladay City Code, Land Use and Development Regulations, as they Relate to Statute Obligations, as set forth by State of Utah Legislation, HB 48, Creating a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Boundary Zone and Adopting the 2006 Utah WUI Building Code. Item reviewed as a Legislative Action, According to Procedures set forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. (#25-4-11)

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a request based on statutory compliance with House Bill (“H.B.”) 48. He noted that there was some discussion about this item during the Work Session. This relates to a Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone in the City that would require the 2006 Wildland Urban Interface Building Code. There would be some building construction requirements that would be applied to new construction. This is a boundary overlay zone that will be applied. This allows compliant municipalities to collect emergency funds if there is a wildland fire. Mr. Teerlink shared information about the Structure Exposure Score.

UFA Captain Dan Brown introduced himself to those present. He explained that the Structure Exposure Score is a score that the State has determined. It takes into account slope, ember travel, and fuel load. It rates the risk to the area if there was a wildfire. The State has recommended a Structure Exposure Score of five and above be included on the Wildland Urban Interface map.

Commissioner Berndt wanted to understand how someone could build in these areas. Captain Brown reported that new construction will need to follow the code. Existing structures will need to follow the defensible space portion of the code. Commissioner Berndt asked if the fire code will be part of the building code in this case, which was confirmed. Chair Roach believed the scoring system is based on location on the map and not on materials and existing vegetation.

Commissioner Fonte noted that there was a reference made to existing structures. She asked if the State will assess each structure, even existing structures, and assign a Structure Exposure Score. Captain Brown clarified that there will be a fee that is assessed for certain homes, but the details of that are still unclear. This will not be handled at a City level. What the Planning Commission is considering now has to do with the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the responsibility of the City is to create a boundary based on the Structure Exposure Scores. He explained that there were two zones proposed: a dark blue area and light blue area. There were 800 notices sent out, which included properties in both of these areas. Mr. Teerlink stated that there was a discussion with the City Council about the areas. The light blue area is not within the Structure Exposure Score of five and above, but it has historically been an area of concern to the City because of accessibility and hydrant water flow. Those areas were included as part of a potential zone, but the City Council clarified that the light blue area is not the priority at this time. However, it is an area that will be looked into further in the future. The City Council has asked the Planning Commission to consider the dark blue boundary shown.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the Planning Commission is being asked to look at the boundaries and the methodology that has been proposed. A recommendation to the City Council based on public comments and a discussion on possible refinement of the boundary is within the purview of the Commission. Mr. Teerlink explained that the focus is on the Structure Exposure Score and the boundary that has been created. Mr. Christopherson reported that the State mandated that this be passed before the end of the year, because the fee is supposed to be assessed in January. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that municipalities have a requirement to adopt a boundary by January 1, 2026. Chair Roach noted that if this item was continued, it would still be possible to meet the deadline.

Commissioner Gong asked about the boundary shown on the map. Mr. Teerlink explained that there was a State assessment, but then the City is responsible for refining the area. The State boundary created does not follow streets or property lines, so some adjustments were made. He shared information about properties that have better access and conditions. Chair Roach wanted to know if a residential street is considered enough of a fire break that there would be justification for a score difference. Captain Brown explained that it depends on the situation. He shared additional information about the map provided by the State and mentioned the poor resolution.

Commissioner Fonte pointed out the Millrock area and stated that it appears to have a Structure Exposure Score of three. She asked if it is because of the nature of the structures and the limited vegetation there. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this and mentioned the separation of buildings.

Commissioner Cunningham reported that there are 435 houses in the dark blue area, which is what the Planning Commission is considering at the current meeting. He asked if there is anything in the proposed ordinance that would allow an individual homeowner to submit an appeal based on a unique circumstance. He wanted to know if an appeal process is possible, which could potentially remove a property from the boundary and fee. Mr. Teerlink is not certain about the fee, because there is still uncertainty about that process. At this time, the State judgement of a Structure Exposure Score of five and above is the best information available. However, he believes there would be an application process that could potentially remove a property from the boundary.

Chair Roach noted that the fee is not part of this Text Amendment and clarified that the City is not implementing a fee. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that the City has no control over the fee. He wished there was more information available from the State, but those parameters are still being discussed.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Linda Leckman gave her address as 6447 Canyon Crest Drive and noted that it is in the Canyon Cove Subdivision. She explained that Canyon Cove is shown in dark blue. The biggest problem right now is a lack of information. She understands that the City has to create a map, but there is uncertainty about what will happen once the State Law goes into effect. She expressed a desire for more information. Ms. Leckman wanted to better understand defensible space. She has lived in her home for 41 years and has beautiful trees on her property. There is no desire to cut down those trees. She reiterated the need for additional information about what this will mean.

Philip Policelli gave his address as 4891 South Wallace Lane. His comments have to do with the extension of the dark blue area to the north. He also asked about I-215 being used as a boundary.

City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 10/28/2025

Lori Khodadad gave her address as 6575 Canyon Crest Drive. She explained that it is hard to know what questions to ask because of the limited information. While she understands this will impact her property in a serious way, there needs to be more education about what will happen. Ms. Khodadad expressed concerns that insurance companies will use this map to take away insurance from people living within the boundary area. Her insurance increased significantly last year, so she would like additional information so she can know what to expect in the future.

Gaylord Bartholoma gave his address as 5904 South Tolcate Woods Lane. He explained that Progressive was his insurance company, but last year, they decided not to insure anymore because the property was within a certain fire zone. He asked if this will make insurance impossible.

Connie Jensen stated that she owns property at 5560 South Wasatch Boulevard, which falls into the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (“FCOZ”). She wanted to know how this will impact the property. There have been attempts to build there, but there have been some difficulties. She asked if the changes that are being considered differ from FCOZ and if FCOZ is being changed in some way. Ms. Jensen asked about access and whether an entrance will need to be provided off of her property. She also wanted to better understand the timing of the current discussion.

Anna Policelli gave her address as 4891 South Wallace Lane and pointed out her home on the map. Based on what has been presented, her home would be impacted, but not the home across the street. There is a fire hydrant in front of her house, so she asked if her property should be included.

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

Mr. Teerlink addressed some of the public comments. He reviewed Page 33 of the Meeting Materials Packet, which is the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code. In 2006, the State adopted this code in response to some major fires that happened on the west side of the valley.

Mr. Teerlink shared information about ember travel and the issues that can occur, even if there is a hydrant located close to a property. From the State point of view, the Structure Exposure Scores essentially establish a threshold. The code itself will apply to new construction, additions, and new buildings. The Building Official will need to review the code and be certified to apply it. Mr. Teerlink offered to sit down with Captain Brown to consider scenarios the public is worried about.

Mr. Teerlink mentioned the public comment related to I-215. He explained that he has gone to look at some of the streets to see the situations the Structure Exposure Score is trying to address. He can see the same conditions in both a five score and four score, which are usually found along the I-215 corridor. From a planning perspective, the worst-case scenario is considered. The boundary has been extended because it has the same conditions all the way to 4500. Moving away from Wallace Lane, the areas with a Structure Exposure Score of five that are next door to fours have better accessibility from a public street. In those situations, the most rational geographic location was selected. He reported that a boundary was proposed in order to start discussions. Captain Brown shared a comment about insurance and the State mandate for the boundary map. He informed those present that FFSL will hold a public meeting on November 6, 2025.

Chair Roach asked for additional clarification about defensible space and FCOZ. Mr. Teerlink reported that what is being considered by the Planning Commission does not change FCOZ but would be in addition. He explained that FCOZ regulates how lots are split on slopes and hillsides. As for accessibility, the Fire Department will use private fire lanes and public roads to access wildland fires. Mr. Teerlink shared information about defensible space. He expressed concerns about quick burning underbrush and scrub oak. Chair Roach noted that a question was asked about the overhead electrical facilities. Mr. Teerlink reported that Rocky Mountain Power normally has their own easement around power lines, which ranges between 5 and 10 feet depending on the voltage that runs through that line. Those should be cleared anyway, regardless of this code.

Members of the public asked to share additional comments. Chair Roach re-opened the hearing.

Lori Khodadad asked if the City is responsible for drawing the map. Mr. Teerlink shared information about assessments and the boundary that has been presented to the Commission.

Heidi Tward gave her address as 6247 Canyon Cove Court. If there is vegetation within 30 feet of her home, but the vegetation is on a neighboring yard, she wanted to know who is responsible for clearing the buffer zone. Mr. Teerlink stated that this will come down to enforcement. Mr. Christopherson reported that the defensible setback is not set by property lines. In this particular situation, it does not mention a setback from a property line, but from a structure. He reminded those present that the City is reacting to the mandate that came from the State Legislature. Mr. Christopherson reiterated that the setback is from structures and not from property lines. There is a possibility that if vegetation is within 30 feet of a neighboring house, it may need to be removed.

Tina Katz gave her address as 6450 Crest Mount Drive and asked about disclosure. She wanted to know where to direct someone interested in purchasing property in this area. Mr. Teerlink stated that every municipality is intended to adopt an overlay zone. It would be possible to call the Building Department and ask for information about the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone.

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

Commissioner Tripeny believed the Commission has been asked to look at the boundary and make a recommendation to the City Council. Chair Roach acknowledged that several public comments asked what happens after the boundary map is adopted. He wanted to know how this will impact current property owners. Mr. Teerlink clarified that there would primarily be impacts seen when redevelopment is considered or proposed. Chair Roach believed that other than the unknown insurance factor, this is unlikely to lead to a lot of changes unless building that takes place. Mr. Teerlink noted that there will likely be a letter sent out from UFA related to defensible space.

Mr. Christopherson stated that part of the idea behind H.B. 48 was to address insurance companies coming in and cancelling coverage due to wildfire concerns. With that defensible barrier, the fire risk is reduced. He shared information about fires that occurred in California. The idea is not to create an additional burden for property owners, but to eliminate the burden of insurance companies canceling coverage. He believes the State is attempting to take proactive steps.

Commissioner Gong noted that one path forward would be to state that there are a lot of unknowns, but the State has to clarify those. The Commission could note that the map makes sense for what it is intending to do, but there is still some uncertainty about the implications. Another path is to acknowledge that there is a deadline for this, but more answers might be obtained before the next Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Commission could state that the proposed boundary is a good place to start. In that case, there could be a recommendation of approval made to the City Council with an acknowledgement that the boundary could be amended at a later date, if necessary. Alternatively, there can be discussions about the boundary area now. Mr. Christopherson reminded those present that the Planning Commission is not adopting the map. The Planning Commission will ultimately make a recommendation for City Council consideration.

Commissioner Cunningham asked what would happen if the Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council. He wanted to know if the map could change without coming back to the Commission. This was confirmed, but there will be a public hearing at the City Council level as well. Mr. Teerlink added that the homes shown in the light blue area would not be noticed next time. Commissioner Cunningham thought it made sense to approve the boundary map with the dark blue area, but he thought there should be some language about a property owner appeal.

Discussions were had about the language included in the Building Code. Commissioner Cunningham does not believe the Planning Commission will have more information to review in two weeks. As a result, it makes sense to forward a recommendation of approval. Commissioner Tripeny noted that the fees will not be from the City. He added that a property in the dark blue section will not necessarily have to deal with fees. The Commission reviewed the map in the Meeting Materials Packet. Mr. Teerlink wished he had additional information now, but it is possible there will be more details provided during the FFSL meeting that is scheduled.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to Forward a Recommendation to the City Council to APPROVE a drafted proposal by City Staff and UFA to establish a Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and associated Code based on the following findings:

- 1. Proposals align with the State of Utah H.B. 48 as established to create an Overlay Zone in which the Utah Wildland Fire Code (2006) may be applied.***
- 2. The proposed Overlay Zone creation has been reviewed by UFA and the City Council as the preferred alignment.***

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

ADJOURN

Chair Roach moved to ADJOURN. There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:23 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, October 28, 2025.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: DECEMBER 16, 2025