

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

Tuesday, March 24, 2026

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Angela Gong

Paul Cunningham

Brian Berndt

Patrick Tripeny

City Staff:

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

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 Commissioners Fonte and Prince. There were two Public Hearing items on the Regular Meeting agenda. However, the first Public Hearing, which is for “Casper Cottage,” has been rescheduled to April 14, 2026.

The second Public Hearing item on the agenda is “Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C.” Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that this is an application for a Preliminary Site Plan for Block A at the Royal Holladay Hills site. The Planning Commission will look at a Development Plan for Block A, which includes retail pads for three uses, with two on the north side and one on the south side, separated by a surface parking lot.

The uses for this site are in the Open Land Use District (“O Zone”) of the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”), which is the most flexible zone within the SDMP. Mr. Teerlink reminded the Planning Commission that there was recently an amendment made to the SDMP.

During the Regular Meeting, the Planning Commission will look at the site layout, access, utilities, parking, design parameters, and other relevant items. Staff is asking the Planning Commission to pay close attention to two specific items. This includes the chosen design of the two retail areas on the north side and an applicant's request for landscape modifications in the parking lot area.

An image was shared with the Commission. Mr. Teerlink explained that on the right side, the north end of the lot is shown. Around the corner from Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road will be a large landscape buffer before the retail pads. On the corner, there will be project signage for the site with a buffer against the back side of the building. When coming up Murray Holladay Road, before reaching Royce Drive, there is a large transformer and a historic marker for the City.

Mr. Teerlink explained that drawings were included in the Meeting Materials Packet that reflect what the applicant is looking for as far as the landscaping. He reminded those present that there

were amendments made to the Tree Canopy Sustainability Code, which required additional landscaped islands to be placed whenever there is a new parking lot being constructed or an existing parking lot is being rebuilt. In this case, there is a new parking lot proposed. This requires 10% of the area to have landscape islands placed in them. The Code requires these landscape islands to have trees. In addition, there are also some buffering requirements.

At the end of the Ordinance, there is an administrative relief request that the applicant can propose to the Land Use Authority. This allows the landscaping requirements to be relocated and buffered around another area on the site. Mr. Teerlink explained that the applicant is asking to remove the four landscape islands and increase the buffer size around Highland Drive where additional trees can be placed. The request is to increase the buffer width between Highland Drive and the parking lot to include additional tree planting areas. Chair Roach pointed out the location of a bus stop on the drawing. There was discussion about the existing trees in the area. Staff recommends the Planning Commission have a discussion with the applicant about the administrative relief request to relocate the tree islands from the middle of the parking lot to the perimeter of the site.

Chair Roach asked for additional information about the amendment made to the SDMP. Mr. Teerlink reported that the SDMP has a land use component that shows what land uses are allowed in certain locations. He shared information about the original SDMP and explained that through the amendment last year, the absolute corner was opened up for development. Mr. Teerlink explained that Block A was intended to be all surface parking, but the amendment modified it so that only the core of the area will have surface parking. The parking stalls count toward the minimum parking requirements. This released the north side and south side of Block A for retail pads. The remaining parking stalls were relocated to the parking garage that was recently approved.

The Planning Commission is being asked to consider the design for the north retail pads. From the Staff point of view, the chosen design for this corner turns its back to the primary streets, Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road. The applicant is aware of the concerns that have been expressed by the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”). There was supposed to be a revised drawing submitted, but it was not received ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. It is possible for the Commission to delay or defer the design approval, as Staff believes the design could use additional work to better comply with the design parameters of the SDMP.

Chair Roach asked to further discuss the landscaping. He expressed concerns about the heat islands that would be created and pointed out that this would be counterproductive to the adjustments made to the Ordinance. Commissioner Angela Gong asked about the location of Cottonwood Creek. There was discussion about the drawings in the Meeting Materials Packet.

Commissioner Gong noted that the Meeting Materials Packet stated there is one parking space planned for every 100 square feet, which is twice the requirement. She believed that one parking space for every 200 square feet is required, so it is possible to make the parking lot smaller. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. Commissioner Brian Berndt asked if it is the restaurants that want the additional parking. Mr. Teerlink stated that over-parking is normally a tenant-driven request.

Commissioner Gong does not believe the corner is walkable, as it does not invite people in from Highland Drive or Murray Holladay Road. People cannot easily walk in the area, because there

are so many parking openings. Commissioner Gong pointed out that part of the vision in the SDMP was mixed-use and a central plaza. Though more Blocks are being reviewed by the Planning Commission, the central plaza for the site is still unclear. The mixed-use also seems to be neglected. The site is mixed-use overall, but the individual parts of the development are not.

Commissioner Berndt asked for additional information about the TRC feedback on the Preliminary Site Plan. Mr. Teerlink reported that this meets the standard for use and layout. Commissioner Berndt believed the architecture should look more original and be less generic. He feels the cornerstone intersections should be dynamic. Mr. Teerlink agreed with that statement. Chair Roach noted that it is possible to ask the applicant additional questions during the Regular Meeting.

Chair Roach closed the Work Session at 5:54 p.m. The Planning Commission took a short break.

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 Fonte and Commissioner Prince. There are two Public Hearing items, but one has been rescheduled to the Planning Commission Meeting on April 14, 2026. With no members of the public present, the Opening Statement was not read aloud.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **“Casper Cottage” – Historic Site Conditional Land Use Permit – 4910 South Holladay Boulevard (R-2-10). File #26-1-05. This item has been rescheduled to April 14th.**

It was noted that the Public Hearing on “Casper Cottage” has been rescheduled to April 14, 2026.

2. **“Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C” – Preliminary Plan – 4825 South Royce Drive. (R/M-U Zone). Preliminary 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 Public Hearing item is for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block A and C.” This is a Preliminary Site Plan and Block A is located at the corner of Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road. It is essentially the entry point to the City of Holladay coming from the north and coming from the west. In the SDMP, the entire Block was originally intended to be a surface parking lot, but as the site began to develop with tenants, there was an opportunity to refine the Block as far as the primary land uses on this corner. In the SDMP, the O Zone allows for the most intense uses and the highest heights in the development. At this location, commercial pads are being presented to the Planning Commission for review and consideration.

Most of the pedestrian improvements have been installed along Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road. The interior of Royce Drive and Rodeo Walk Drive is intended to be part of the development of this Block. The TRC has reviewed the application against the SDMP and City Ordinance 13.08. Mr. Teerlink reported that the TRC is satisfied that the application can be brought forward to the Planning Commission for review, based on the applicant providing the TRC with site development details that support a Commercial Site Plan. This includes the associated parking stalls, dumpster enclosures, a circulation plan, a design compatible with the SDMP, and

the associated landscaping requirements. The TRC recommends the Planning Commission discuss the design and orientation of the buildings. In addition, the TRC recommends that the Planning Commission consider the request for administrative relief for the landscaping requirements.

In the Meeting Materials Packet, there are two different Landscape Site Plans. One is compliant with code and the other is what the applicant proposes for administrative relief. The TRC is asking the Planning Commission to moderate a discussion with the applicant related to this request. The other element the TRC is recommending the Planning Commission moderate a discussion with the applicant about is the design of the buildings and the orientations of the buildings. Mr. Teerlink discussed the orientation of Pad A. This specific site lends itself to being a primary entrance point to the City. He explained that the applicant is proposing single-story retail, but the TRC is asking the Planning Commission to have a discussion with the applicant about the design characteristics.

Mr. Teerlink reported that there is another element to this application. This includes the design request that was not reviewed when Block C was considered. There are three different pads that were approved previously, with the exception of the southernmost pad. The applicant has provided a Landscaping Plan and a Lighting Plan as well as a design for the building, which is primarily painted brick with some glass storefronts. The Planning Commission is asked to moderate a discussion about architecture and design with the applicant for that site as well. For Block A, there is site development, landscaping, and building design to discuss, but for Block C, there is the building design for the indicated pad. There was discussion about the building orientation.

The applicant representative, Chris Longson, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. It was noted that the applicant, Steve Peterson, is also available to answer Commissioner questions. Mr. Longson offered to address some of the comments that were made during the Work Session.

The two versions of the Landscaping Plan mentioned earlier were reviewed. Coming off of the creek, there is a box culvert that conveys water along the front of the parking lot. In order to have a standard parking lot with the trees, the parking would be elevated on Highland Drive. The request is to have a wider landscape buffer over that area so the parking lot is lower and there is more of a buffer provided from Highland Drive. Mr. Longson reported that the landscaping requirement is 7.5% and there is 19% proposed in the area. As for the Work Session suggestion for additional density, it is not possible to build additional square footage per the Trader Joe's lease. The square footage on this block has been maxed out. Mr. Longson reported that the mixed-use requirements are being met and this application also meets the requirements of the SDMP.

There has been work done on revised elevations for Block A, but the architects did not return the documents to the applicant team before the Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Longson noted that the Planning Commission can have the applicant team return with those, or the review could be delegated to the Community and Economic Development Director. He stated that there is no issue working on the landscape drawings in order to address the concerns raised by the TRC.

Chair Roach asked for additional information about the elevated parking and the proposal to move the trees. Mr. Longson explained that there would be a landscape berm over that instead of raising the parking to a higher level. Chair Roach believed the entire parking lot would need to be elevated. Mr. Longson clarified that in order for the parking to be functional, the area would need to be raised. There is a requirement to have the proposed number of stalls per the Trader Joe's

lease. Commissioner Berndt wanted to know if what is proposed will save the applicant team money, which was denied. Mr. Longson stated that it could cost more because of the raised berm.

Chair Roach suggested that the applicant representative share comments about the building orientation. Mr. Longson explained that these types of restaurant buildings will not put their entrances out on the street where there is no street parking. However, it is possible to add some additional architectural detail. There are no dumpsters or truck docks located on the public street.

Commissioner Patrick Tripeny mentioned the landscape berm along Highland Drive. He wanted to know how tall the berm will be. Mr. Longson clarified that the berm exists currently. Mr. Peterson provided additional information. He also noted that the building is on the corner of Highland Drive and Murray Holladay Road and there will be a large monument sign, which will add dimension. The traffic noise is something else that needs to be taken into account as well. Mr. Longson shared comments about a pedestrian connection. Those who come from the main intersection will be able to come through rather than walk all the way around the buildings.

Commissioner Berndt wanted to know more about the delivery trucks. Mr. Longson reported that the deliveries will be handled before operating hours. Commissioner Berndt pointed out that Harmons has a serious problem with truck noise. Mr. Longson informed the Commission that there are not a lot of residents living near these pads. He also acknowledged that there is a Noise Ordinance that needs to be followed. Commissioner Berndt is not inclined to approve the application at this time, because the applicant team has already stated that there is additional work that needs to be done. The TRC also needs time to work through some of its concerns.

Chair Roach asked about the dumpster stalls and noted that those appear to be very spaced out. It seems that it would be a long way for trash to be moved, so there might be trash that spills in the parking lot. Mr. Longson clarified that the spacing is intentional so the garbage is not located next to the restaurants and the patios. The garbage will be hauled away from where the visitors are sitting. Mr. Peterson reported that the location of the dumpsters was based off of other properties. Originally, the dumpsters were located closer to Royce Drive, but Jeff Woodbury stated that it was not the correct location. The dumpster location was then moved to incorporate that feedback.

Commissioner Gong mentioned an earlier comment made by the applicant team, which is that no additional square footage is allowed in the Block. Mr. Longson reiterated that additional square footage is not permitted because of the agreement that is in place with Trader Joe's. Commissioner Gong understands that there is a certain balance that is needed to attract tenants. Commissioner Paul Cunningham asked if there will be any restaurant signage visible from either Highland Drive or Murray Holladay Road. Mr. Longson reported that it will only be on the actual buildings.

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

Commissioner Berndt wanted to know if there are any Staff recommendations about a treatment that could be used on the buildings facing the major roads. He does not want everything to face in, because the project should still be aesthetically pleasing when driving past the development. This is a statement project, and that should be reflected in the architecture and landscaping. Mr. Teerlink reported that there has been a conversation with the applicant about what could be added. Since that area reflects the back of the use, it is not possible to have an entrance located

there. There could be window panes added, but because this is the back, it is more likely that there would be faux windows. Staff was anxious to see what the applicant's team will come back with to break up the façade. As for the corner, several examples have been provided to the applicant team.

Commissioner Berndt asked if the proposed architecture has come from the corporate companies or if it is related to the overall project design. Mr. Longson stated that it is a bit of both. The Commissioner discussed the proposed materials and compliance with the SDMP. Mr. Teerlink reviewed a portion of the Staff Report and read the following language: "The scale and mass of the larger buildings will be softened through the use of articulation and building materials."

Commissioner Cunningham believed there should be a color band that breaks up the massing horizontally, because there is a lot of mass with one color currently proposed. The detail disappears when there is only one color chosen. There was additional discussion about the proposal.

Commissioner Cunningham noted that landscaping can be used as an enhancement to the architecture. Chair Roach believed the request for relief is for more trees to be placed along Highland Drive rather than having tree islands. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. Chair Roach noted that the other rendering shows no trees along Highland Drive. Mr. Teerlink clarified that this should not be used as the Landscaping Plan, but as a conceptual layout. Commissioner Tripeny wondered whether the landscaping and trees could be placed around the outdoor restaurant space. There could be a buffer created in those areas with the landscaping, which might be preferable to pushing the landscaping toward Highland Drive. He pointed out that anyone sitting in an outdoor dining area would likely prefer to see landscaping in the area rather than a view of the parking lot.

Chair Roach shared information about the Tree Canopy Sustainability process and the parking lot discussions. The intent of the Ordinance was to break up heat islands. There is a three story parking structure with a handful of trees around it that was approved by the Planning Commission recently as part of this development. As a result, he believes the applicant can reduce a small number of stalls in this area and plant the trees according to what is outlined in the Ordinance.

Chair Roach believed this item should have been continued until the details were finalized. He has heard comments from the applicant and Staff that additional documents will be brought forward. He does not understand why this has been presented to the Planning Commission at this time. Based on what is currently in front of the Commission, he is not inclined to approve this.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that if there is a walkway connecting the two buildings, there could be trees beside the walkway. That could create some shaded areas and make the landscaping more of a feature. Different options can be explored further.

Commissioner Gong noted that there has been a rolling process, where different portions of the development are approved at a time. There is not always a full context. She appreciates that the applicant has to make certain promises to tenants and that can influence the design, but if the Planning Commission had known six months ago that Trader Joe's would have certain requirements for this Block, she would have made different requests in some of the other Blocks. The SDMP creates a vision for the entire development, but the process has thrown off the balance.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the sites the Commission has been reviewing and approving have had permitted uses and not conditional uses. There is no way to bring those previous approvals back. However, moving forward, it is possible to request additional context from the applicant. The applicant can outline how each Block interacts with the other Blocks within the site. Commissioner Gong stated that the development does not feel like mixed-use, which is part of the vision of the SDMP. She noted that the different Blocks seem to be very separate from one another.

Commissioner Berndt agreed with the other Commission comments. He does not know if this is what was intended when the original SDMP was approved. It would be beneficial for there to be more creativity when it comes to the parking lot layout. The heat islands are extreme, and what is proposed does not address that issue. Commissioner Berndt hopes this corner will be a significant one, but he is not sure that the current proposal demonstrates that. Mr. Teerlink shared additional information about the SDMP and the role of the Planning Commission. He reported that the Planning Commission can make a motion on the preliminary layout for use, access, life safety, and utilities. As for the landscaping and how that interacts with the parking lot, that can be brought back to the Planning Commission, or that review process can be deferred to Staff.

Commissioner Berndt asked about the number of parking spaces that will be lost if the four islands are installed. Mr. Teerlink reported that there will be 18 spaces impacted. Chair Roach believed the islands are supposed to be the width of approximately one parking stall. Mr. Teerlink explained that the islands are slightly larger with the gutters around them, at approximately one and a half stalls. Commissioner Berndt agreed with the earlier comment shared by Chair Roach. He does not believe this application is ready to be voted on by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Cunningham reported that he drove by the area ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. The clearing and leveling in the parking lot area is already well underway. Mr. Teerlink clarified that he issued a Demolition Permit for that site in order to clear out the old asphalt.

There was discussion about a potential motion and what should be considered at the next meeting. Mr. Teerlink noted that the extent of the approval would be for the civil site work, which includes setting the elevations of the pads, parking lot, drive aisles, and showing where the utilities would be located. The next discussion could involve the finalized Landscaping Plan and building designs. Mr. Teerlink shared information about a possible Planning Commission motion.

Commissioner Roach moved to APPROVE the Preliminary 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 the Final Site Plan to return to the Planning Commission for review. This is based on the following findings:

- 1. Proposal provides compliance to applicable review standards provided in Holladay Ordinance §13.08.080(E).***
- 2. Applicant has provided evidence that all proposed uses can be serviced by all life safety utilities.***

3. *All development details and all related components comply with the R/M-U Zone and SDMP as a master planned project.*

The following items are proposed to be continued and come back to the Planning Commission:

1. *Proposal building design provides compliance with Architectural Design Styles provided on Page 16 of the SDMP.*
2. *Parking Lot landscaping plan is found to comply with standards provided in §13.77.060.*
3. *The Block C items are proposed to be continued.*

Commissioner Berndt seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Commissioner Tripeny-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Nay; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed 4-to-1.

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 6:53 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, March 24, 2026.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: June 2, 2026