

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

Tuesday, April 21, 2026

6:00 PM

Temporary City Council Chambers

3330 South 1300 East

Millcreek, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Jill Fonte

Karianne Prince

Angela Gong

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Chair Dennis Roach called the Work Session to order at 5:45 p.m. He noted that all Commissioners are present with the exception of Commissioner Paul Cunningham and Commissioner Patrick Tripeny. There are four Public Hearing items on the Regular Meeting agenda. Two of the Public Hearing items relate to the same property, which is “Casper Cottage.”

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, shared information about “The Woods Lot 3,” item on the agenda. She reported that this is a Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) that has been seen before, but that was for Lot 2. In this case, the PUD Amendment application is for Lot 3. In the Meeting Materials Packet, there is an exhibit that shows how the building area is being shifted. The applicant has provided a Boundary Survey to show the existing building area on Lot 3. In addition, the applicant has provided a Preliminary Plat. She explained that there is a building area boundary change requested by the applicant to facilitate an addition on the south side of the home. The new building area will not impact the existing fire turnaround on the site or the storm water retention on the site.

Chair Roach believed the applicant wants to move the buildable area to the other side of the home. Ms. Marsh confirmed this and reviewed a map of the area. The modification takes the 2,192 square feet that was within the allowed building area and shifts it to a different location on the site to create a new buildable area. Chair Roach asked if there would still be compliance with the setbacks, which was confirmed. Ms. Marsh reported that the same rear setback will be maintained. The building area will move closer to Lot 4. The applicant will be present at the Regular Meeting, so it is possible to ask for additional information about the setbacks and distances at that time.

Chair Roach asked if there are existing structures on Lot 2 or Lot 4. Ms. Marsh confirmed that there are and shared an image for reference. If the PUD Amendment is approved, the buildable area will be further away from the structure on Lot 2, but it will be closer to the structure on Lot 4. Chair Roach asked if the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”) has looked over this application. Ms. Marsh confirmed that the TRC has reviewed this, and it checks all of the boxes.

Commissioner Prince noted that the Planning Commission rarely addresses properties that are behind gates. She wanted to know what the best solution is when a property that the Planning Commission needs to discuss is behind a locked gate and cannot be viewed ahead of the meeting. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that it is possible for Commissioners to reach out to the Planner, who can then contact the owner for the access code.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the second and third items on the Regular Meeting agenda are for “Casper Cottage.” He explained that these items represent historic site preservation efforts by the property owner. The reason there are two items on the agenda is because the request is twofold. Mr. Teerlink reminded the Commission that a recommendation was forwarded to the City Council to make this site historic, and the City Council approved that recommendation. The site is now on the Historic Site Designation List for the City of Holladay. Designated properties have allowances that other properties in the City do not, because the intention is to encourage preservation.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the additional allowances might result in modifications to the historic property. For example, there could be modifications made to the façade or roof, there could be an addition put on, or the Site Plan could change. In those instances, there is a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) required from the Planning Commission. The proposal that has been brought forward in this case is a Historic Site Modification for some changes to the façade of the building, as well as additional land uses on the property. He clarified that these items can be considered separately. The additional land uses proposed include an antique shop and a secondary residential unit. The Commission will need to consider how the proposed uses will maintain the historic pioneer home.

There are still a lot of questions that need to be answered when it comes to the “Casper Cottage” applications, so the Staff recommendation is for there to be continued discussions. During the Regular Meeting, the applicant can answer Commissioner questions. Chair Roach believed the Commission is being asked to determine whether the applicant is submitting a request that will preserve the small home. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this and reiterated that there can be discussions with the applicant. Commissioner Prince mentioned the PUD that came before the Planning Commission previously, which included the cottage. At that time, there was discussion about this location as a residence. Mr. Teerlink reported that the PUD Plat has six lots within it and where this house is located, it is designated as the common area of the plat. The PUD was for six units in the subdivision, with four units on the north side and two units located on the south side.

Chair Roach asked if there is any preservation afforded to the house due to the designation from the City. Mr. Teerlink explained that if the property owner decided to tear it down and put in something else, that would be allowed. The intention is to encourage preservation when possible.

Chair Roach wanted to know if the applicant could still tear down the home even if these applications were approved. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. There is nothing that ensures long-term preservation. He added that nothing in the Historic Preservation Ordinance removes the right of a property owner to further develop the property as they see fit. Commissioner Prince noted that this is the common area for the PUD. She asked if it would be possible to make this a buildable lot. Mr. Teerlink explained that there would need to be a PUD Amendment brought forward.

The last Public Hearing item on the Regular Meeting agenda is the Final Plan for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C.” Chair Roach explained that this review has to do with the parking lot-

related items, which were discussed at the last Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Teerlink reported that the Planning Commission asked for the landscaping and architecture to come back for approval. Staff has reviewed what has been proposed by the applicant. The Landscaping Plan in the Meeting Materials Packet complies with the ordinance. The building designs are better than before, but the applicant team will review the proposal in more detail during the meeting.

CONVENE REGULAR MEETING – Public Welcome and Chair Opening Statement.

Chair Roach called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All members of the Commission are present with the exception of Commissioner Cunningham and Commissioner Tripeny. There are four Public Hearing items on the Regular Meeting agenda. He clarified that Item 2 and Item 3 are located at 2394 East Murray Holladay Road rather than 4910 South Holladay Boulevard. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Jill Fonte for the benefit of those present.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **“The Woods Lot 3” - PUD Amendment - 6325 South 2710 East (R-1-43 Zone). Review and Consideration of a Proposal for an Amendment to The Woods Planned Unit Development. The Proposal is to Modify the Areas and Boundaries Previously Approved for the Building Footprint and Open Space Area Designations only within Lot 3 of The Woods Planned Unit Development. Review Conducted According to Regulatory Provisions of Holladay Ordinance §13.78.130(D). File #04-01-12-3.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a PUD Amendment for “The Woods Lot 3,” which is located at 6325 South 2710 East. The PUD was originally approved in 2004, but there have been amendments since then on other lots within the PUD. She reported that the amendment in this case is for Lot 3, which is the second lot from the south end of the PUD.

The applicant wants to move a previously approved building area. The proposal is to move it from the north side of the existing structure to the south side of the existing structure. There would be a slightly different configuration, but the same total square footage. This will preserve landscaping on the north side of the structure, but some landscaping on the south side will be impacted.

The proposed amendment will bring a portion of the structure that is currently outside of the building area into the building area. Ms. Marsh reported that the setbacks on the south side will be impacted by the PUD Amendment, but she does not know how far back the existing house is on the south property line. However, it is estimated that the new building envelope will be modified to be approximately 35 feet from the property line. The applicant provided a summary of the project, which is to add onto the house and to maintain some of the landscaping improvements that have been made on the north side. The trees on the south side are recommended to be replaced if any are removed or impacted by a future addition on the south side of the house.

There was a discussion during the Work Session about the property on Lot 4, which is to the south of this property. Ms. Marsh reported that the Lot 4 house is built closer to the property line due to a slope from the south side of the property. The PUD amendment would bring a proposed structure closer to Lot 4. As a result, this will decrease the total setbacks between the structures.

The property owner, Robert Schafer, introduced himself to the Planning Commission and explained that his stepson, Bobby Pankow, is the contractor. Mr. Schafer explained that the plan

is to build a garage in that location that is identical in architecture to the existing garage. The reason for the PUD Amendment is that the existing garage will be converted into an apartment for his 93-year-old mother-in-law. There will be a two-car garage to replace the existing garage. He noted that there is a large, rounded driveway, and the turnaround area will not be impacted.

Chair Roach noted that there are two different motions included in the Meeting Materials Packet. There is a Subdivision Amendment and a PUD CUP Amendment. There are seven recommended findings listed for the Subdivision Amendment and five recommended findings for the PUD CUP Amendment. Ms. Marsh confirmed that there needs to be two separate motions made.

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

Commissioner Prince had a question about the trees. The suggested motions for both the Subdivision Amendment and PUD CUP Amendment refer to more trees being preserved than removed. It also states that any removed trees must be replaced with trees that will provide an equivalent tree canopy at maturity. Mr. Schafer confirmed that any trees removed will be replaced.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Subdivision Amendment to Lot 3 of “The Woods” Planned Unit Development, a four-lot residential development within the R-1-43 Zone, located at 6325 South 2710 East. This is based on the following findings:

- 1. All properties considered part of this application and Plat Amendment currently comply with the R-1-43 Zone.***
- 2. No new property/lots or right-of-way will be created by the amendment.***
- 3. An equivalent area of building space is being exchanged.***
- 4. The changes to the buildable area are outside of all utility and common area easements.***
- 5. The changes to the buildable area do not affect the required fire turnaround.***
- 6. More trees are being preserved than removed.***
- 7. Ordinance requires any removed trees to be replaced with tree(s) that will provide an equivalent tree canopy at maturity.***

The applicant must follow all of the conditions suggested by the Technical Review Committee. Commissioner Berndt seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Following the Subdivision Amendment, the Commission considered the PUD CUP Amendment.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit related to the Site Plan of Lot 3 of “The Woods” Planned Unit Development, a four-lot

residential development within the R-1-43 Zone, located at 6325 South 2710 East. This is based on the following findings:

- 1. An equivalent area of building space is being exchanged.*
- 2. The changes to the buildable area are outside of all utility and common area easements.*
- 3. The changes to the buildable area do not affect the required fire turnaround.*
- 4. More trees are being preserved than removed.*
- 5. Ordinance requires any removed trees to be replaced with tree(s) that will provide an equivalent tree canopy at maturity.*

The applicant must follow all of the conditions suggested by the Technical Review Committee. Commissioner Fonte seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: 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.

2. “Casper Cottage” – Historic Site Conditional Land Use Permit – 2394 East Murray Holladay Road (R-1-10) Review and Consideration of a Request by the Property Owner for Modifications to a Historic Site. Item Reviewed as Conditional Use as per Provisions Stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.86.030. File #26-01-05.

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that there are two items related to “Casper Cottage,” which is located at 2394 East Murray Holladay Road. He explained that Items 2 and 3 on the Regular Meeting agenda involve the same property. The reason these are separated out into different items is because the first relates to a modification to an existing historic use. The applicant is proposing some changes to the façade and roofline of the property. As for the second item, there are some additional land uses requested at the site. Mr. Teerlink reported that, in order to encourage historic preservation, certain land uses are allowed to be granted at historic properties. The list of uses is included in the Meeting Materials Packet, and the applicant has selected two from the list. The proposed uses are an antique shop and an additional dwelling unit.

Staff has reviewed both applications based on the historic preservation goals. Mr. Teerlink does not believe there will need to be two separate hearings held. It is possible to hold a Public Hearing for Item 2 and Item 3 at the same time, but the Planning Commission can make that decision.

Mr. Teerlink discussed the Historic Site Modification application. He explained that the applicant has not proposed any changes to the site as far as landscaping or parking areas, but there is a modification proposed to the façade and the roofline. There was an assessment of the property when it was designated historic, and it was found to be a cross-wing style of the early 1900s. Mr. Teerlink stated that the current application is missing some materials and details about the modification, so he would be interested in having outstanding questions posed by the Commission.

In addition to the modification request, there is a request to have a retail use at the site, which would be an antique shop. There is also a request to have a residential use that is additional to

what the structure currently provides. Mr. Teerlink noted that there are some museum examples included in the narrative. However, what is considered during the review process is how the additional land uses would support historic preservation. It would be beneficial for the Commission to moderate a discussion and determine how the additional land uses will support “Casper Cottage” as a historic pioneer home. He reiterated that there are still unknown details.

Commissioner Brian Berndt asked if there is an expectation for a particular architectural style. Mr. Teerlink stated that there should be some examples of early 1900s architecture, but he has not seen those details. Commissioner Berndt is not sure that the Planning Commission can make a decision about the applications without all of the necessary information. It seems more specificity needs to be provided. Commissioner Fonte noted that when similar projects were considered in the past, there was more detail about the business side of the proposal. For example, information about parking, traffic, and lighting. This application does not seem to include that information.

Commissioner Berndt asked if the parking will be located off-site. Mr. Teerlink assumed so, as there is a section in the narrative that talks about using off-site parking. Chair Roach understands that the historic designation provides some flexibility, but asked if there is precedent in the community where there is a business located inside of a historic property that is in a PUD. Mr. Teerlink denied this. He reminded the Commission that there was a previous application where a CUP was granted for an interior design space, but that was in a subdivision rather than a PUD.

The applicant, Ron Hilton, introduced himself to the Planning Commission and explained that he lives directly across the street from the subject property and within the PUD. He shared information about the Historic Site Modification. The existing and proposed façade details were shared. The original building was a two-room cottage. It was not a cross-wing style when it was built in 1898. There were two additions made that shifted it to the cross-wing style. There is some uncertainty about when the additions were made, but those likely occurred before 1920. He shared additional information about the materials used in the original construction and in the additions.

Mr. Hilton reviewed some of the proposed modifications, including restoration of the original window size and style. He noted that the additions put on this home in the early 1900s have a different exterior finish and the proposal is for it to be all brick. There is also a desire to restore the porch area. The work on the windows and porch will restore the home to its original look.

Mr. Hilton shared background information about the Casper family and noted that certain decisions might have been made because of costs. He noted that the family took out a mortgage on the property right after the building was done. There was also a family dispute about selling off other parts of the property. It was a larger property at the time, but part of it was sold to another family. He noted that the Casper family might have done more of a full cross-wing design if there were resources available at the time, so the intention is to honor that with the proposed modifications.

Chair Roach asked if there were images of the back of the property included in the Meeting Materials Packet, which was denied. Mr. Hilton explained that the back of the main two-room cottage is brick. There is a window, and it is possible to see where there used to be a door that was bricked over. He clarified that there is no intention to restore the door. Chair Roach asked about the porch. Mr. Hilton reported that the brick wall on the west side of the porch is mostly gone, as

the porch became a foyer into the house. The rest of the brick wall on the west side is still there, but it is now an interior wall. Commissioner Prince wanted to better understand what is existing and what is new on the plans that have been provided. There was discussion about what currently exists. Commissioner Prince stated that it is difficult to visualize what exists without a submitted diagram.

Chair Roach wanted to know when the porch was added to the property. Mr. Hilton believed the porch was original. Steven Cornell from Utah Valley University (“UVU”) looked at the property and made note of the porch that was originally on the site. Chair Roach asked when the livable space foyer that exists currently was converted from a porch to the livable space. Mr. Hilton was not certain, but it is estimated that it occurred in the 1920s. The Casper family owned the home until 1916. In a photograph from the 1930s, it is possible to see that the conversion had occurred.

Mr. Hilton next discussed the Additional Uses proposed for the site. He addressed the question posed earlier, which was how the proposed uses enhance historic preservation. The request is for an antique shop use and an additional residential use, but there have also been discussions with the City about donating the property so it can be used as a public history museum, as the City of Holladay does not currently have a history museum. Mr. Hilton explained that the antique shop is meant to be ancillary to the museum. The Historical Commission thought that would be a good idea, because the merchant running the antique shop would be on site and could manage the museum.

There has been some research conducted about the demand for antique shops. Mr. Hilton reported that he visited the Capital City Antique Mall and spoke to the owner. This mall subleases space to dealers, and there is a long wait list, because so many people want space to sell their antiques. He does not believe it will be difficult to find someone who would like to use the subject property. It was reiterated that the antique shop will not be the primary use, as the goal is to have a museum.

Chair Roach asked if the proposal is to have an accessory building adjacent to the antique shop and museum. Mr. Hilton reported that the lot itself is quite large and the house takes up less than a third of the property. It is possible to build a residence behind this as part of the PUD. Chair Roach believed this is considered a common area, which was denied. Mr. Hilton clarified that this lot is Lot 2A and it is essentially part of Lot 2. It is possible to put a common space easement there, but it could also be used as a separate lot. He stated that the proposal is for it to be separate. As for how this will assist with historic preservation, the property is in an area with a lot of historic bungalows. The intention is to be compatible and preserve the same look with the PUD. The goal is to match the same style that is in the area, in terms of size and overall character. The reason there is a desire to have an additional unit is so there can be a bungalow-style home.

Mr. Hilton reported that this property has a high-density and multi-family area on one side and low-density residential on the other. The intention is to provide a transitional buffer between the high-density and multi-family on one side and the low-density residential on the other. These homes will have the character of single-family detached houses, but there will be medium density.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Kim Duffy gave her address as 2195 Walker Lane. She clarified that her comments are being provided as a resident and not in any official capacity. Ms. Duffy read comments on behalf of Martha Bradley, who is a Professor at the University of Utah School of Architecture, and was unable to attend the Planning Commission Meeting. All comments were agreed on by Ms. Duffy and Ms. Bradley. While there was support for the “Casper Cottage” nomination for the Historic Site Designation List, there is opposition to the current proposal, which includes the proposed addition. The addition does not meet the nationally accepted definitions of a compatible addition.

Ms. Duffy read language about compatible additions. It stated that compatible additions to historic buildings must be subordinate to the original structure, using a differentiation and compatibility approach. New additions should be smaller in scale, set back from the primary façade, and utilize materials that echo, but do not perfectly replicate the original. Key principles include maintaining historic integrity, ensuring reversibility, and using a connector to separate the new from the old.

While Ms. Duffy and Ms. Bradley respect the willingness of the applicant to save a historic site, it is believed that the proposed addition goes above and beyond the acceptable definition of a compatible addition. The roofline of the addition, which matches the original structure, suggests the addition is original, which it is not. In addition, the scale is larger than the original structure and is not set back from the primary façade. The Commission was asked to further consider compatibility.

Roger Reese gave his address as 4685 Grosvenor Court. He reported that at one point, there was going to be a townhome on the property. In another iteration, there was going to be a clubhouse. Mr. Reese read from the applicant narrative, which stated that the intention is to provide a transitional buffer in both density and character between the different districts on either side. It also states that the vision is to provide some open green space as a public amenity. He is not sure that it is appropriate for a property owner to make a decision about the creation of a buffer.

Mr. Reese reported that there is a 938-square-foot building that is proposed to be a museum and an antique shop. The applicant narrative states that the use would have a low impact on the neighborhood with a walk-in clientele. He pointed out that there is an inconsistency between that statement and the earlier statement made about the popularity of antique shop businesses. Mr. Reese read the additional language submitted by the applicant. He believed the alternative suggestion for a park sounds like the private property owner wants to shift certain expenses to the City. He does not see the viability of the project and does not feel it will enhance the neighborhood.

Clark Richards stated that his address is 2470 Kentucky Avenue and he is not supportive of the proposal by Mr. Hilton. Mr. Richards believes the applicant wants to build more than the R-1-10 Zone allows. He also has concerns about the proposed uses, because he does not believe an antique shop fits in with the character of the neighborhood. There are concerns about the amount of parking available. Mr. Richards does not think the proposal is beneficial to the residents of the City of Holladay. He pointed out that businesses have deliveries, and it will be difficult for delivery trucks to navigate the area. There are parking concerns, traffic concerns, and overall safety concerns.

Alicia Reese gave her address as 4685 Grosvenor Court and asked to add to some of the comments that have been made. She shared information about the current parking availability. If there was

a business in the area, it would likely result in additional hazards. There would need to be a lot of improvements made if the City chose to take on the responsibility mentioned by Mr. Hilton in the submitted documents. Ms. Reese noted that the applicant has tried to use this property in many different ways, so she is uncertain that the intention is to maintain and preserve the property.

Denise Cecil stated that her address is 4673 South Hadley Pines Court. She lives in the smaller duplexes to the west of the property. She appreciates the historic value of the house and has been inside of it in the past. However, she wants to reiterate the concerns that have been expressed about parking in the area, because there are already existing safety and visibility concerns.

Ms. Marsh reported that there are some email comments that need to be read into the record. One address has been added to a comment included in the Meeting Materials Packet. In addition, there was a comment submitted by Ms. Cecil, who shared comments during the Public Hearing, and there was a third comment received over the weekend that was not included in the published Meeting Materials Packet. Chair Roach stated that the written comment from Ms. Cecil highlighted four points related to compatibility, parking, driveways, and lighting. There was also an email comment received over the weekend from Sandy Overmon, who also lives in the Hadley Pines townhouse development directly west. The comment stated that in its current condition, the “Casper Cottage” is unattractive and a potential detriment to the sale of the two buildings on the parcel. Even if the cottage is renovated, it will be difficult to sell those lots. There is not support for a museum or commercial property that will invite increased traffic, noise, and street parking.

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

Mr. Hilton responded to the comments made during the hearing. He noted that there was a reference made to two lots versus three lots. Originally, the intention was to rezone the property and have five or six single-family homes in this space, but that was not approved. In retrospect, he believes that was the right decision, as it would have been too much density for the area. Mr. Hilton explained that the proposal has evolved, and what is proposed is approximately half the density that was originally envisioned. In the past, there were discussions about having two larger homes rather than three smaller homes. He noted that because of the PUD, it was possible to equalize lot sizes. The north side could have had five units with two on the south, but the proposal was to have four and three, with the density of seven units, but that was not approved.

Mr. Hilton acknowledged that there have been previous proposals, but hopes the current proposal will be considered based on its merits. During the Public Hearing, there were comments made about the antique shop and the fact that there will be a lot of demand but a small clientele. Mr. Hilton clarified that antique dealers are looking for a space like this, which is not the same as stating there will be a lot of clientele and traffic. It will not be difficult to find dealers who want to use this space, but the amount of traffic associated with the use will not necessarily be high.

There was a Traffic Engineer hired to look at Murray Holladay Road, and it was recommended that there be parking on both sides of the road, because it would have a calming effect on the traffic. As a result, there is no agreement with the comments that indicated parking would negatively impact safety. Mr. Hilton reminded those present that the applications currently before the Planning Commission have to do with proposed modifications and additional uses. Both of the additional uses are allowed conditionally under the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Chair Roach discussed the Historic Site Modification application. Outside of changing the windows and adding some shutters, he is not sure the modification feels necessary. As for the Additional Uses, the request feels disingenuous when looking back at the last four or five years.

Commissioner Berndt asked if there is a Site Plan that shows where everything will be located, which was denied. He wanted to know if there is a Landscaping Plan. Mr. Teerlink reported that those drawings were not included in the application. Commissioner Berndt is concerned about making a decision without more information available for the Commission to review. He asked if the street parking has to be adjacent to the site. Mr. Teerlink explained that a percentage of the required parking can be provided off-site. An agreement can be made with off-site property owners for a certain number of stalls.

Commissioner Berndt expressed concerns that the parking in this area will shift over to Harmons, even if there are no formal agreements in place. He asked if the City is interested in having a museum in this location. Mr. Teerlink stated that he is unable to speak on behalf of the City about the interest in a museum. Commissioner Berndt believed there should be a Site Plan available for the Planning Commission to review. He also felt that additional information about parking is needed before the Commission makes a decision, such as a Parking Analysis based on the proposed use. He pointed out that the parking will be more intense if there is a museum and an antique shop.

Commissioner Angela Gong agreed that there is context missing at this point, especially since this is part of a PUD. Commissioner Prince noted that the PUD exists, but there is no information about how this proposal fits within the vision of the PUD as it was previously planned. She echoed other comments from Commissioners that there is not enough information to make a decision.

Commissioner Fonte went to visit the property ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting and could not find a place to park. She ended up driving around the corner and parking in a neighborhood. If there is a retail business in the area, it is unclear where customers will park. Commissioner Fonte noted that if there is an antique shop, people will need to park somewhere near the store to take items home. If there are large items sold, trucks might need to be brought into the area. She does not believe there has been enough information provided to the Planning Commission. Commissioners discussed whether a continuance or denial would be appropriate.

City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, explained that, typically, with a CUP, as long as certain items are met, there is an obligation to approve. However, in the ordinance that the City of Holladay adopted, it states that this is not something that is done by right, and there is no guarantee of a conditional use. Based on the TRC report, there was no strong connection between historic preservation and the proposed additional uses. The Planning Commission can continue the items and request that the applicant bring back additional information that would allow a decision to be made. Alternatively, the Planning Commission can determine that the obligations of the application were not met and deny the two items. He agreed that the most generous thing the Commission could do is continue Item 2 and Item 3 to allow the applicant to bring back additional information.

Chair Roach reported that the last time the Planning Commission considered a historic house that wanted to locate a business inside the house, there was plenty of off-street parking already

established. In addition, the house was already built. There was no request to build something in addition to that. In this case, it is possible to continue Item 2 and Item 3, so the applicant has more time to gather information. Chair Roach asked about the Historic Site Modification that is proposed. He believed there is information missing for the modification request. It is possible to continue the modification, but deny the additional uses. There was additional discussion about the two items related to “Casper Cottage” and how to best proceed. Commissioner Prince stated that she is not sure the Planning Commission can approve what has been proposed by the applicant.

Commissioner Gong explained that she is considering what it means to continue versus deny. She asked if an applicant can bring back a variation of the request with additional details if there is a denial. Mr. Teerlink clarified that it would be possible to bring back something different at another time, but that would be a different application. Commissioner Gong wanted to know if there is a time limit once something has been continued. Mr. Teerlink reported that a continuation presumes the item will return to the Planning Commission in the next few meetings. Alternatively, it is possible to table the item until the applicant is ready with a complete application. There could be work done with Staff before the application returns to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Chair Roach asked Mr. Hilton if he would like to withdraw the application for Item 2 or Item 3. Mr. Hilton requested additional clarification. Chair Roach explained that if the applicant would like to withdraw Item 2 or Item 3 at this time, then it will be possible for him to return at a later date. Mr. Hilton stated that he did not want to withdraw either of the “Casper Cottage” items.

Commissioner Prince explained that her concern with a continuance is that the next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2026, and the following meeting is May 5, 2026. She does not want to see the “Casper Cottage” applications until there is enough information to make a decision. There has not been enough detail provided at this point. Commissioner Prince believed the most appropriate action would be to table the item. She asked the City Attorney how to table the applications rather than continue them. Mr. Christopherson reported that the Planning Commission can table the applications and direct Staff not to put the items back on the agenda until there is a complete application. It is also possible to deny or continue the applications.

Commissioner Fonte asked what the difference is between tabling and continuing an application. Mr. Christopherson explained that tabling an application allows the applicant to complete and add to the application. The information requirements can be met and then it can be added to a future Planning Commission Meeting agenda. If an application is denied, then it cannot come back for at least a year. Chair Roach pointed out that the applicant chose not to withdraw the applications. In his opinion, it would make sense to deny the applications based on what has been presented.

Chair Roach moved to DENY the application for a Conditional Use Permit for a Historic Site Modification for the “Casper Cottage,” designated as a historic site by Section 13.86.020 of the City of Holladay Code, based on the Planning Commission finding that there was not a complete application submitted. The applicant was given an opportunity to withdraw the application and rejected that option. Commissioner Fonte seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **“Casper Cottage” – Historic Site Conditional Land Use Permit – 2394 East Murray Holladay Road (R-1-10) Review and Consideration of a Request by the Property Owner for Additional Land Uses for a Historic Site, including as an Antique Shop and the Construction of One New Residential Dwelling Unit. Item Reviewed as a Conditional Use as per Provisions Stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.08.040. File #26-01-05.**

Item 3 on the Regular Meeting agenda was discussed with Item 2.

Chair Roach moved to DENY the application for Additional Uses for Historic Sites for the “Casper Cottage,” designated as a historic site by Section 13.86.020 of the City of Holladay Code, based on the Planning Commission finding that there was not a complete application submitted. The applicant was given an opportunity to withdraw the application and rejected that option. Commissioner Prince seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission took a short break before hearing the final Public Hearing item.

4. **“Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C” – Final Plan – 4825 South Royce Drive. (R/M-U Zone). Final Review and Consideration of Development/Construction Details Submitted by Applicant, Steve Peterson, for Block A and C within the Royal Holladay Hills Mixed-Use Development. Review Conducted According to Regulatory Provisions of the Site Development Master Plan (SDMP 2007) and Holladay Ordinance §13.65.070(C). File #19-9-19-12.**

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that this is the Final Plan for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C.” He noted that some information was shared during the Work Session, but after speaking to the applicant, there are one or two elevations that were not included in the Meeting Materials Packet. The Planning Commission was reminded that the Final Site Plan was continued to this meeting. The applicant design team is present at the Planning Commission Meeting to answer outstanding questions. The TRC has reviewed the application and is satisfied with what has been provided for the retail pads located in Block A and the retail pad in Block C.

The applicant, Steve Peterson, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He reported that the Site Plan and elevations have been provided. On the corner of Holladay Boulevard and Murray Holladay Road, there will be two restaurants. On the south side, there will be another restaurant. It is exciting that there will be sit-down restaurants located within this development. As for the signage out front on the corner, this is something that will come back to the Commission in the future.

Commissioner Prince asked if there will be a giant ampersand on the Visual Comfort & Co. building, which was confirmed. Mr. Peterson explained that this is the logo of the business, which is a high-end lighting store. Chair Roach believed the original exterior was mostly brick walls on each side. Mr. Peterson reported that this has been updated. He shared renderings with the Commission. There was discussion about the renderings and the updated designs for the site.

Chair Roach noted that the tree islands were added back into the plan. Mr. Peterson confirmed this and expressed appreciation for the feedback that was received at the last Planning Commission

Meeting. Commissioner Gong asked if there are currently trees along the river, which was confirmed. Mr. Peterson reported that those were intentionally planted when the site was reclaimed by general growth, so those will remain. The Landscaping Plan was reviewed.

Commissioner Gong expressed concerns about the mention of Kentucky bluegrass sod, because it is one of the highest water sods. There are lower water options that provide the same visual effect. She recommended a Tall Fescue sod or a Fine Fescue sod. Chair Roach stated that a Tall Fescue requires a lot of mowing, and Fine Fescue will burn in sunny conditions. It might be best to look into Red Fescue sod instead. There was additional discussion about the different sod options. Mr. Peterson stated that he will ask the Landscape Architect to look into the options that are available.

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

Commissioner Prince was encouraged by the progress that has been made. Commissioner Gong believed the previous Planning Commission concerns had been addressed. Commissioner Berndt appreciated the additional work that has been done to make the corner stand out. As far as the color palette for the buildings, he did not realize that there could be a single color. Mr. Teerlink explained that the architectural palette in the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”) mentions the articulation of walls and large blank walls, but not necessarily the single use of materials. He noted that the SDMP focused on the walls having texture and interest.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Final Site Development and Building Design for Block A of the “Royal Holladay Hills” development, located in the R/M-U Zone, located at 4825 South Royce Drive, with Final Site Plan approvals to be delegated to Staff. This is based on the following findings:

- 1. Proposal aligns with the Preliminary Site approval granted by the Planning Commission on March 24, 2026.***
- 2. Applicants have provided revisions which address the Commission’s previous concerns.***
- 3. All development details comply with the R/M-U Zone and SDMP as a Master Planned project.***
- 4. Proposed building design more closely aligns with the Architectural Design Styles provided on Page 16 of the SDMP.***
- 5. Parking Lot Landscaping Plan is found to comply with the standards provided in §13.77.060.***

There is a desire for the applicant to consult with City Staff on drought-tolerant vegetation and grasses that are appropriate for the climate. Commissioner Berndt seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission discussed the motion related to Block C of the development.

Commissioner Fonte moved to APPROVE the Building Design for Block C, Lot C, of the “Royal Holladay Hills” development, located in the R/M-U Zone, located at 4825 South Royce Drive, with Final Site Plan approvals to be delegated to Staff. This is based on the following findings:

- 1. Site Plan for the building location received approval on January 9, 2025.***
- 2. Proposed building design provides compliance with the Architectural Design Styles provided on Page 16 of the SDMP.***

There is a desire for the applicant to consult with City Staff on drought-tolerant vegetation and grasses that are appropriate for the climate. Commissioner Berndt seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

5. Approval of Minutes.

Chair Roach reported that there were no Meeting Minutes for the Commission to vote on.

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 7:56 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, April 21, 2026.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: June 2, 2026