

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

Tuesday, October 7, 2025

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Karianne Prince,

Angela Gong

Jill Fonte

Paul Cunningham

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.

Chair Roach called the Regular Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. There was one Public Hearing item on the agenda. All members of the Commission were present with the exception of Commissioner Patrick Tripeny. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Prince.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

1. **City of Holladay General Plan Update - Public Hearing. 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 Planning 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.**

Chair Roach explained that this is a Continued Public Hearing item. A discussion and presentation took place at the last Planning Commission Meeting. It was determined that the General Plan would be discussed in sections so that all Commissioners were able to review the document in detail.

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

Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, suggested that before Chapters 1, 2, and 3 are reviewed, there should be a review of the draft document as a whole. There can be a review of the format, the chapter titles, layout, and overall presentation. If there is agreement about the presentation of the draft, then the specific chapters can be reviewed.

The Planning Commission discussed the formatting of the draft version of the General Plan. Commissioner Cunningham commented that he likes much of the draft document, but Section 3 it lists the policies and goals. It does not, however, link the goals to the title of the chapter. This

becomes a problem when there are Goals 1, 2, and 3 in the next chapter. If someone is referencing Goal 1, there are many different goals associated with it because of the different chapters. He thought it made sense to tie the goal to the title of each chapter for clarification. For example, it could be 3-1 or something similar. As for the image of the Casto Home, he did not believe it should be included because it is not necessarily a demonstration of strong planning.

Commissioner Fonte found the document to be easy to navigate, and she liked that it took into account a lot of feedback that was provided from the community. She likes the way the document is organized to focus on the priorities of the community moving forward. That being said, there is a lot of detail in the document that she does not believe most residents will be interested in. She suggested that summaries be provided where possible to make it more accessible for readers.

Chair Roach pointed out that the General Plan is a document the Planning Commission will often use as part of future agenda item reviews. He wanted to identify potential missteps during this process. Commissioner Fonte noted that there is a desire to understand where to look to obtain certain information. The Commission needs to understand the layout and where relevant information can be found. It will take time to become familiar with this version of the plan.

Chair Roach asked if it would be useful for Staff to reference specific sections of the General Plan when an item comes to the Planning Commission for consideration, which was confirmed. Commissioner Fonte stated that it would also be beneficial to have a physical copy of the General Plan available for Planning Commission Meetings rather than jumping back and forth on the digital version. It was confirmed that a physical copy of the General Plan can be provided. Mr. Teerlink reported that there can be a section in each Staff Report titled “General Plan Compliance.” Commissioner Berndt reported that the current Staff Reports include references. When looking at an electronic version of the document, it is possible to jump to a specific reference point. Commissioner Prince agreed that relevant references are normally provided in the reports.

Commissioner Prince not had the opportunity to fully review the draft version of the General Plan, but she liked what she has been able to review so far. Commissioner Gong liked many of elements of the draft document. She tried to read the introduction through her eyes, as someone who uses the plan often, and through the eyes of a resident who does not refer to the plan as often. While the details included in the first chapter are important, she believes there needs to be more generality to clearly outline what a General Plan does. It feels like there is something more general that could be added to make this document more accessible. Chair Roach wondered if there should be a subparagraph added with a more general explanation. There can be detailed information after that. Commissioner Gong thought that would be beneficial. As for the chart in Chapter 2, the colors used could be changed to reduce confusion.

Commissioner Gong referenced Page 26, which has the future land use versus zoning table. This is a helpful table, and she believes the differentiation is important. However, she wondered if it might be possible to expand that table. She did not want the information to be confusing to residents. Delaney Sillman from Logan Simpson Design, reported that the future land use versus zoning table could be expanded to encompass what the General Plan versus the other City regulations. That information could fit nicely into the introduction section. The direction provided by the Planning Commission has been beneficial so far. Some changes can be made, including a more general introduction for clarity and an expansion of certain items in the document.

Ms. Sillman shared a comment from the Steering Committee process. She explained that there was a comment made at that time that someone moving to Holladay might want to look at the Future Land Use Map to determine how the areas next to a property might change in the future. It is something that might be considered when someone is looking into purchasing a home or business. There are multiple ways someone might use the General Plan, so it is important to think about tweaks that can be made to the introductory section to better address the different users.

Chair Roach asked if the Zoning Map could be placed next to the Future Land Use Map so there is a clear comparison. It was noted that this information is in the plan portal. As for inclusion in the General Plan, it is important to remember that zoning maps change. Mr. Teerlink explained that the portal is convenient because the zoning map changes can be seen there. Putting it in the portal means there can be updates made whenever there is a change. It is still possible to make side-by-side comparisons. Chair Roach noted that the General Plan could include a map, but the document could indicate when that map was approved. Discussions were had about zoning.

The goals, policies, and actions were discussed. When looking at the policies, the Planning Commission should consider what subsequent changes would potentially come from this policy and whether that is the correct direction. Commissioner Berndt asked about the survey that was conducted. He wanted to know if survey respondents were asked how many times they used the General Plan. This was denied. Commissioner Berndt wanted to understand how often it is used by residents. He read language related to responsible infill and renewal. While he understands the intent of the language, the interpretation will be different depending on whether the reader is a developer or a neighbor. A neighbor is less likely to consider something to be responsible development. Some of the language in the introduction section can be simplified. He asked if there was a reference to the survey responses in the General Plan document, which was confirmed. Ms. Sillman clarified that the introductions for the chapters mention community support. In the Appendix, specific numbers from the community engagement process will be included.

Commissioner Berndt asked about the process for developing the survey questions. He wanted to know if the previous plan had been examined. Ms. Sillman explained that there were initial discussions about items from the previous plan, including items that have already been done or are not as relevant. In addition, there were discussions about issues that Staff has dealt with consistently. In order to update the General Plan document, the previous goals and policies were the starting point. The goals look a lot different than before. On the other hand, the policies were tweaked slightly from the previous versions. There was then feedback received from the community on the drafted policies. After that, there was work done with the Steering Community to think about how to interpret all of the community engagement. That is how the goals and policies were determined.

Commissioner Berndt mentioned the primary and secondary listed. He asked if secondary means it can be approved as an allowed use. Ms. Sillman shared an example for Country Estates. When there are discussions about primary and secondary uses, it represents the whole area and not only the individual parcels within it. This is not something that is happening at the lot level, but within the entire Country Estates area. It is envisioned that primarily, the uses will be single-family residential, but there will likely also be some integration of open space and recreation. The primary and secondary here are very different than the concept of primary and secondary uses within the Zoning Ordinance. Commissioner Berndt wanted to make sure all of the information was clear.

Commissioner Berndt mentioned the land uses on Page 13 and pointed out that there are restaurants listed as a land use. There is no land use category for restaurants. Some of the land uses listed are land use categories, and some are not, which could be problematic. Commissioner Cunningham noted that this is not a zone map, but is a vision of what could change in the future. He shared an example scenario from Midvale. It is important to clarify that the General Plan represents a vision of what the City could look like in the future. The City Council will ultimately make policy decisions that will impact what the City looks like, but the General Plan is a visioning document.

Mr. Teerlink asked if there is a belief that there is too much specificity. Commissioner Berndt confirmed this. He reiterated that a restaurant is not a land use, and he is unsure why it is listed here. The General Plan should be as general as possible with specificity where appropriate. Mr. Teerlink asked if something more generalized would be more acceptable to the Commission. Commissioner Berndt explained that he found this section confusing because certain items are listed as land uses, but on the map, that is not a reference point. He did not want to create confusion. While he understands why it is being listed, it might be mislabeled. Ms. Sillman stated that it is possible to change the “land uses” name if that is confusing for readers. Since there are a lot of mixed-use designations in Holladay, a breakout of the intent could be helpful. She reiterated that it is possible to change the names for clarity, but the broader question is whether that level of detail is still helpful to guide what that mixed-use designation would potentially look like. Commissioner Fonte believed the level of detail provided was helpful. She pointed out that personal services are not considered a land use either, but they provide clarity about the mixed-use areas.

Commissioner Berndt mentioned the map on Page 24 of the draft document. It has the opportunity zones and the opportunity corridors. He suggested that some sections be bolded so there is more clarity. In the opportunity corridors, he also suggested that the size of the street be included for reference. Commissioner Berndt mentioned Chapter 3. There has been a lot of discussion about the expectation that there be good design, but there is no real direction provided. It might be helpful to have an implementation strategy related to design standards or something with more direction. Mr. Teerlink explained that this element is complicated by the State Legislature, which tied the hands of cities on single-family residential zones. Commissioner Berndt agreed that for residential, there should not be design standards. However, there should be a measure of scale. For example, in his neighborhood, a house was torn down and a much larger house was built there, which towers over everything else in the area. That decision completely changed the character of the neighborhood. Scale is something the City could focus on to address neighborhood character.

Commissioner Gong asked if Commissioner Berndt was talking about Page 52, which has Policy 1.3. It mentions maintaining the established development pattern and neighborhood character by guiding the scale, form, and style of new construction to reflect the existing context. Mr. Teerlink referenced the current Zoning Ordinance, which has six different dimensions of mass and scale requirements. It is possible to craft language for the General Plan that points the City in the direction of the goal to further refine what “neighborhood character” looks like.

Commissioner Berndt discussed the transportation section of the draft document. There is a lot of language related to transportation and walkability, but there is no implementation strategy that outlines how issues will be solved. For instance, if Holladay Boulevard is backed up and congested for a significant portion of the day, there should be language about how that could be solved or how the City will address that in the future. There does not need to be a lot of specificity, but there

should be an acknowledgement that the City has considered the existing issues. In Cottonwood Heights, there were difficulties because there were so many access points on arterial streets. Part of the strategy was to control access points with medians, which changed the function of the street.

Commissioner Berndt next discussed economic development on Page 45 of the document and noted that there aren't specific target industries mentioned. Part of what the City should be doing is identifying businesses that are not in the City, but there is a desire to see in the future. Mr. Teerlink reported that there has been some discussion about this topic. Commissioner Berndt thought it would be meaningful to have additional discussions about this and how it fits into the plan. He referenced a term on Page 46 of the draft document and suggested it be further clarified.

Chair Roach mentioned Page 47 of the document. He asked if the infographic in the top right corner would be updated, because Country Estates does not seem to be accurate. Ms. Sillman confirmed that there will be an update because there is an error on that map. Commissioner Prince is not sure that the photograph chosen is the best one and suggested it be changed to something else. Ms. Sillman confirmed that the photo in the document can be changed. Chair Roach appreciated the images that are included in the document, but believes the pictures should draw attention to what is being outlined in the text. Commissioner Prince shared additional comments about the photographs chosen. There are some locations that she recognizes, but there are others that she is unable to identify. She asked if there would be value in stating the image location.

Ms. Sillman reported that community feedback indicated there is no desire to see Holladay change in a lot of ways. When it comes to the photographs chosen, there is a privacy component. The focus should be on the idea of what the area could look like rather than something that is overly specific or identifiable. Commissioner Fonte reported that the Holladay Business Advisory Board and Mayor Rob Dahle have emphasized the shop local campaign over the past couple of years. If there is going to continue to be an emphasis on shopping local she questioned whether there should be something related to this included in the General Plan. Mr. Teerlink reported that the scale of economy was addressed in previous versions of the General Plan and was highlighted as something that needs to be retained in this updated version. He mentioned the language on pages 88 and 89 of the document, which relates to shopping locally. Ms. Sillman reported that it is possible to call out a specific program in the draft document if that is desired by the Commission.

Chair Roach referenced the following language: "Investigate the feasibility of increased density," and "Consider implementing a community redevelopment agency." He asked if this kind of language is standard for a General Plan. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that these can be looked into as options. When the City pursues grants, it can be helpful to have that kind of language included.

Chair Roach asked for additional comments about the format of the draft General Plan document. He questioned whether the Commission would like to focus on ahead of the next Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Cunningham noted that Commissioners previously reviewed the first three chapters of the draft plan. He believes there are some goals and policies that need additional refinement, especially in Chapter 4 of the draft document. At the next meeting, there should be a discussion about that section in particular. Commissioner Gong would like to spend more time discussing the policies, because spread across the chapters, there are some that are in tension with one another. She mentioned some of the policies in the chapter about natural spaces. She pointed out that it can be hard to focus on those while also tackling some of the other policies. It is important that all of the different policies in the document are able to co-exist.

Chair Roach asked the Commissioners to continue to review the draft document ahead of the next meeting. It was reported that the next Planning Commission Meeting will take place on October 21, 2025. Mr. Teerlink noted that there will also be a meeting on October 28, 2025. At the meeting on October 28, 2025, there will be a Code Amendment brought to the Commission, which relates to the Urban Wildland Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code. Commissioner Prince will not be able to attend that meeting in person but might be able to call into the meeting. Chair Roach will not be in town on October 21, 2025, and asked Commissioner Prince to run that meeting.

Commissioner Prince moved to CONTINUE the City of Holladay General Plan Update and the Public Hearing to the Planning Commission Meeting on October 21, 2025. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

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 6:45 p.m.

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

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes, Minutes Secretary
T Forbes Group

Minutes Approved: DECEMBER 16, 2025