

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

Tuesday, October 21, 2025

5:30 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Karianne Prince, Vice-Chair

Paul Cunningham

Angela Gong

Jill Fonte

Brian Berndt

Patrick Tripeny

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.

In the absence of Chair Dennis Roach, Vice-Chair Karianne Prince called the Regular Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All other members of the Planning Commission were present. The Opening Statement was not read aloud because there were no members of the public in attendance.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

1. **City of Holladay General Plan Update - Public Hearing Continued. Continued Discussion and Presentation by City Staff and Third-Party Consultants, Logan Simpson of a 2025 Update to the Existing Holladay General Plan. 'Holladay Horizons' a 2025 Comprehensive General Plan Update will be Reviewed Over Multiple Meetings, Culminating with a Recommendation by the Commission to the City Council for Final Consideration. Review and Consideration Shall be in Accordance with Utah Code Ann. §10-9a-Part4. File #00-6-04-2.**

Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that the Planning Commission discussed the General Plan update at the last meeting. At that time, there were comments made about formatting and some of the photographs included in the draft version of the document. The third-party consultants, Logan Simpson, listened to those comments and made some changes. Mr. Teerlink suggested that the Planning Commission review at least Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the draft document during the current Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Teerlink explained that there has not been a lot of public comment or interaction at this point. While there is public interest in this process, there have not been a lot of formal comments made.

The representative from Logan Simpson, Delaney Sillman, reported that all feedback is being incorporated into a new draft. Substantive changes will be shown in red to make it easier to see where amendments have been made. At the last Planning Commission Meeting, there was feedback received that there should essentially be an introduction to the introduction. That language should be straightforward and easy to understand. That component has been added to the beginning. That introductory language states that the General Plan is a blueprint. It is a unified

place where there are visionary items. In Chapter 2, there were some changes made to the way land uses and place types are called out. The intention is to make it clear that land uses are distinct from place types. There was some feedback received about the graphic used, so it was amended for clarity. Ms. Sillman noted that several of the images in the document will look different based on previous Commission feedback. She added that a map in the document will be updated.

Ms. Sillman asked if there is Commissioner feedback about the changes that have been made. Commissioner Patrick Tripeny had a question about commercial land use. It seems the rest would fall under mixed-use, because there is far more commercial than what is shown. If there are only a few businesses shown, he wondered why the commercial category would remain. It seems there has been a decision made that commercial will happen in a mixed-use area. Ms. Sillman pointed out that there are a few additional spots along Highland Drive that are commercial. Those are a little hard to see on the map, so she asked if there is a desire to edit the map to provide more clarity. The second question is whether it is still important to have that distinction. Vice-Chair Prince mentioned the commercial as zones, such as C-1 and C-2. It is not possible to arbitrarily remove a zone, so it seems that this is something that has to be included in the General Plan document. Ms. Sillman confirmed that there are commercial zones that exist in the City, but explained that the commercial land use would only allow for commercial. On the other hand, a mixed-use land use might allow for residential, commercial, or some other mixture of uses.

There was additional discussion about the commercial land use areas on the map. Commissioner Tripeny clarified that he was not questioning whether commercial exists, as it does and should, but it seems that the City of Holladay has made a decision to move it into the mixed-use category. If there are only a handful of places that are not in that category, it might make sense to roll it all in. He did not understand why half a dozen properties or so are separate. Mr. Teerlink explained that this needs to be looked at in relation to Chapter 6 – A Strong Local Economy. He explained that potential commercial uses could be overrun with residential multi-family mixed-use projects if there are no exclusive commercial areas. Commissioner Gong asked if there should be more areas designated as only commercial. She wanted to know if there is an appropriate balance between the different uses. Mr. Teerlink reported that in the section shown, there are some other small economic centers identified that were not highlighted in previous General Plans.

Commissioner Berndt asked if the City looks at adjacent property in the other jurisdictions to see if there is consistency with the land uses. For example, if Millcreek did something at 3900 South and 2300 East that intensified the intersection, he wanted to know whether the City of Holladay would take that into account. Mr. Teerlink explained that what is before the Commission is an update of the General Plan. He would consider what was described a substantive change from the previous plan. However, if there is a recommendation to have that studied and looked at, then that can be made.

Commissioner Gong asked what protections there are within mixed-use for commercial. Mr. Teerlink explained that it depends on the zone. Using the Holladay Crossroads Zone as an example, it allows for a wide range of land uses. However, built into the zone is ground-floor retail and commercial space requirements. The Commissioners reviewed a map in the plan. Vice-Chair Prince mentioned the Holladay Crossroads area. She noted that there is a lot of commercial there, but the future land use is Mixed-Use Regional. Mr. Teerlink stated that a Small Area Master Plan has been approved for that area. It has been studied and allows for a wide range of uses.

Commissioner Gong mentioned the Opportunity Categories map on Pages 46 and 47 of the draft document. There is still some uncertainty about what that is trying to communicate, especially as it relates to the Evolve section. Having the categories named (Evolve, Sustain, and Protect) makes the information more confusing. Commissioner Fonte agreed. Ms. Sillman noted that what should likely be maintained in that section, based on Steering Committee feedback and previous community member feedback, is some of the language within the Sustain category. It is possible to remove the three different categories, because it might be too complicated. Commissioner Fonte discussed her reading of the section. The General Plan document indicates that the City will evolve, but this section makes it seem like it will evolve a lot more. There was no clarity provided to indicate why specific areas might evolve more than the rest of the City.

Ms. Sillman recapped the feedback received from the Planning Commission. It seems there is support to remove the categories mentioned and maintain some of the language around the idea of entitled density. She reported that the Evolve areas shown on the map have Small Area Master Plans associated with them, with a few exceptions. Mr. Teerlink noted that it is important to think about the audience of the General Plan. There are multiple audiences, including potential developers. When developers look at General Plan documents, there is a desire to see opportunity areas. Some of the audience that is reading the General Plan will be interested in the information on that page, but it is possible to summarize the information in a way that addresses all audiences.

Commissioner Cunningham reported that he reviewed the document and believed the most important part was related to economics. He pointed out that the City is still unduly reliant on property taxes. He believed some of the decisions should be focused on shifting the balance. In order to retain the character of the City of Holladay and the various programs, there needs to be thought put into how all of those services will be paid for. He suggested that other Commissioners read the section about how the City of Holladay is funded. He felt it might make sense to move that chapter forward.

City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, discussed the sections with Small Area Master Plans. When a City puts resources into creating a plan, it is essentially an invitation for developers to come in and build. That is the reason those are highlighted in the General Plan. It can be made more explicit that these are areas where this is additional focus. Discussions were had about how to make sure the information is clear. Ms. Sillman stated that the land use chapter is an appropriate location. Commissioner Fonte asked if it is possible to link to the Small Area Master Plans, which was confirmed. Commissioner Cunningham noted that one of the maps has labeling issues.

Commissioner Gong asked if a Small Area Master Plan is on the horizon for 4500 South. Mr. Teerlink denied this and explained that 4500 South is a Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) road. This makes the creation of a Small Area Master Plan difficult unless UDOT is a partner in that process, which is not likely. 4500 South is considered a transition zone.

Commissioner Cunningham asked to further discuss the language that mentions allowing duplexes in all single-family zones. The idea of allowing some duplexes in some single-family zones is worthy of consideration, but that is not what the language states. He believed there should be different wording for that goal so it does not create the impression that someone has already decided duplexes will be allowed in all single-family zones. Mr. Teerlink reported that there are internal accessory dwelling unit (“I-ADU”) requirements from the State, so this already exists.

The language comes down to compliance with the State. Commissioner Cunningham thought there was better language that could be used, because softer language is used elsewhere.

Commissioner Fonte suggested that some wording be included that references the Utah Law so it clarifies that this is not something the General Plan is proposing. There could be language that mentions compliance with the State. Mr. Teerlink reported that at the end of this document, there will be an Appendix with a chart that shows House and Senate bills, the requirements of each bill, and where it can be found within the document. Having that information interspersed within the document would be difficult, but an Appendix will provide that additional clarity. Mr. Teerlink stated that when the City of Holladay incorporated, there were areas that the County had already zoned as duplex zones. The idea behind some of the goals is to look at where those existing duplexes are located. However, he confirmed that it is possible to look into softening the included language.

Mr. Christopherson shared information about cities that are mostly built out, like the City of Holladay. There were a limited number of strategies to choose from for the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. The Legislature had to add options in order to allow cities like Holladay to be compliant, because there were not enough in there for cities that were built out. He does not believe there is a lot of wiggle room with the strategies that Holladay has selected for their Moderate-Income Housing Plan.

Commissioner Cunningham shared suggested language for duplexes, as previously discussed. He suggested the following: “Allow duplexes in single-family zones, as required by Utah Law.” That is different than what is currently written and it clearly communicates the requirements. There needs to be consistency, because the same language is in a different section within the document.

Ms. Sillman reported that the policies and actions in the chapter being discussed were taken directly from the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. Mr. Teerlink explained that there is a certain amount of flexibility built into the action items, as there are words used such as consider, initiate, and study. City Planner, Carrie Marsh, noted that the State has specific language requirements.

Vice-Chair Prince referenced Page 57 of the draft document. She wanted to discuss Figure 4 – Annexation Map. The colors used made it difficult to tell the difference between the different areas. There are several shades of green, and it is difficult to tell which represents each year. There are also two yellow sections that wash out all of the details in those sections. She wondered whether it would be possible to make some improvements to Figure 4, which was confirmed.

Vice-Chair Prince had a problem with the organization of the goals and policies. There are several chapters that talk about goals and policies, but the numbering restarts each time. This was mentioned at the last Planning Commission Meeting, but she wanted to make sure it was addressed. Ms. Sillman clarified that the Commission is not currently looking at an edited version of the draft. Comments from the previous Planning Commission Meeting have been taken into account. She explained that items can be labeled for each chapter or the numbers can continue throughout. Commissioners liked the idea of having numbering specific to each chapter, such as Housing Goal 1, and so on. This makes it clear that the goals are different to the previous ones shown.

Commissioner Gong asked about ways to direct readers across the chapters. She understands there is a Table of Contents, but it might be beneficial if there some sort of connection was made. Ms. Sillman explained that in some other plans, all of the goals, policies, and actions are put into a chart at the end of the document. In this case, the chart would make it possible for the Planning Commission to quickly reference something without needing to look through the entire document. Vice-Chair Prince and Commissioner Fonte expressed support for the addition of this chart.

Vice-Chair Prince wanted to understand how the order of the chapters was determined. Mr. Teerlink explained that the chapter order from previous versions of the General Plan was used. It can be reorganized as long as all of the required chapters from the State are included. Vice-Chair Prince thought it made sense to think about the two most important components and make sure those are placed appropriately within the document. Mr. Teerlink reported that the City Council will consider all of the recommendations made from the Planning Commission on the draft plan.

Vice-Chair Prince noted that there are now some members of the public in attendance. As a result, Commissioner Berndt read the Opening Statement for the benefit of those present.

Vice-Chair Prince opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing remained open.

Commissioner Fonte further discussed the order of the chapters in the General Plan. There is a reason that the City of Holladay is so special. She believes that if the chapters are reordered and A Strong Local Economy chapter is moved forward, then this will send a message that economic vitality should be prioritized over some of the other items. She believes it is necessary to focus on the things that make Holladay unique. This is a City of quality neighborhoods. In addition, there is a desire to create a walkable and connected community. There are also remarkable recreational spaces and natural spaces. These are things that characterize the City of Holladay. As a result, she suggested that the chapter related to A Strong Local Economy not be moved up in the Table of Contents.

Commissioner Berndt pointed out that the order of the chapters is not based on priorities. Each chapter is significant in its own way. There was additional discussion about the order of the chapters in the General Plan. Ms. Sillman reported that there can be additional clarity provided in the introduction chapter. She stressed the importance of acknowledging the community engagement that took place and explaining that there is no prioritization of the action items that are incorporated. It is possible to leave the chapter order as is but provide additional clarity about the importance of each of the individual chapters. Commissioner Cunningham thought that was a good compromise. He feels it is important to have economic information included in the introduction, because he does not want it to first be mentioned 90 pages into the document.

Commissioner Cunningham read the following language from the document: “Identify specific neighborhoods where sidewalks are not present and are not wanted or needed by the property owners.” He is not sure what the goal of that particular statement is, and noted that safe walkability is important. In other areas, there is a desire to add sidewalks or have wider sidewalks installed to increase safety. This language makes it sound like sidewalks are not being prioritized by the City. Mr. Teerlink reported that when the City first incorporated, there was a 70/30 percentage of

residents that did not want sidewalks. However, that shifted over time, and it moved to 60/40. It is now closer to 50/50. There is more of a rural feel when there are no sidewalks in place, but it also makes the City less walkable. The City has tackled the subject of sidewalks by relying on the School District's safe walking routes. Those policies and criteria were used to require installation work. Rather than a walking route, it is possible to focus on areas that are in proximity to a public amenity, such a library, school, downtown area, intersection, and so on. The language read by Commissioner Cunningham came out of the workshops, but it can be modified slightly.

Commissioners further discussed the sidewalk language. Commissioner Cunningham does not like the idea that a property owner could decide whether there was a sidewalk. There could be language instead that talks about prioritizing walking zones near parks and schools. Commissioner Gong stated that sidewalks should be placed in practical and tactical locations. There are a lot of places where it does not make sense to put in a sidewalk, so she suggested that there be clarity about what there is a desire to achieve. Mr. Teerlink pointed out that the populations in the schools are in flux right now. He does not want something that needs to be modified often. There could be something general to state that anything within a 10-minute walk from a school should have a sidewalk. Commissioner Fonte noted that the location of the parks is not changing, so there could be language referencing the prioritization of sidewalks there.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the Constraints Map. He mentioned Holladay Hills and believed the floodplain was removed from the map, so it is no longer a constraint. Mr. Teerlink reported that there was a map revision that was approved, and the majority was removed from the floodplain. Commissioner Gong asked if any of the waterways have floodplains. Ms. Sillman further reviewed the Constraints Map with the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink suggested that there be a note added to refer back to the Natural Hazards Map for specific data.

Commissioner Gong referenced Page 105 of the draft version of the General Plan. She read the following language: "Single-family land uses use 65% of their water outdoors, duplexes use 45%, and triplexes up to apartments use 32%." She suggested including the overall usage in gallons. This addition would make it possible to understand what the numbers in the paragraph mean. Ms. Sillman noted that a chart can be added to provide a visual representation of the numbers.

Commissioner Gong next discussed the following sentence: "The City's projected demand of 7391.5 ac-ft. per year or 2,407 Mgal per year." She asked about the timeframe for that projection. Ms. Sillman informed the Commission that there has been some feedback received on this chapter and some minor changes have been made. Commissioner Gong suggested that the date be added.

Commissioner Gong thought the information about the Residential Water Method and Employment Water Method was interesting and asked that there be a section in the Appendix where this is explained. Vice-Chair Prince agreed that it would be better suited in the Appendix, because there was a lot of detail in this particular section. Commissioner Gong mentioned Policy 1.1 and noted that the reference to "energy efficiency" did not seem to fit in there, as there was not a lot about energy efficiency in the actual chapter. She asked if that is something that should be expanded throughout the rest of the chapter. Suggestions were shared for Goal 2 and Goal 3. Commissioner Gong believed there should be more specific goals for Goal 3. She pointed out that the City highly values the tree canopy. One comment she has heard from people is that reducing

water usage sounds like reducing the number of trees in the community. Since Holladay is a part of Tree City USA, it is possible to educate on how to optimize trees without sprinkling or irrigating.

Vice-Chair Prince asked if there are specific areas Mr. Teerlink would like the Commission to discuss during the remainder of the meeting. Mr. Teerlink denied this. He reported that there is a Special Planning Commission Meeting scheduled next week, on October 28, 2025. The following Planning Commission Meeting will take place on November 18, 2025. Commissioner Cunningham asked if there will be an updated version of the General Plan document provided for those meetings. Ms. Sillman reported that the Commission comments have been incorporated into another version of the document. All of the additional comments will need to be added as well.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the Constraints Map shows some natural hazard situations. The State is requiring all cities to adopt Urban Wildland Interface mapping. The City Council will have a discussion about that later in the week and will talk about what the overlay map will look like. He explained that it will be an overlay zone that implements Urban Wildland Interface Building Code. There is a specific area along Wasatch Boulevard that will be within that Urban Wildland Interface Zone. Once the City Council establishes what those boundaries are, this will be shared with Logan Simpson, and that will be on the Constraints Map. Vice-Chair Prince asked if that is different than the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (“FCOZ”). Mr. Teerlink confirmed that it is different.

Vice-Chair Prince asked Staff to review meeting dates with the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink reported that there will be a Planning Commission Meeting on October 28, 2025, November 18, 2025, December 2, 2025, and December 16, 2025. Vice-Chair Prince noted that in the past, the Planning Commission has reviewed the tentative meeting schedule for the next year to review. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that this will be included on a future meeting agenda.

Commissioner Fonte asked where the Planning Commission Meetings will be held when the building shuts down. Mr. Teerlink was not certain. There are a couple of locations that the City Council and City Manager are contemplating but it comes down to the cost associated with the location. He explained that moving a City Hall to a different location is difficult when there is a desire to have office space. Some of the spaces that were toured do not meet the needs of the City. There are a few locations the Council is still considering, but nothing has been finalized. Vice-Chair Prince asked about the timeline. Mr. Teerlink stated that the move will be at the beginning of April. For 18 months, meetings will be in another location while this building is retrofitted.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Berndt moved to ADJOURN. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:19 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 21, 2025.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: DECEMBER 16, 2025